Gifts to the Gods: *Aparchai*, *Dekatai* and Related Offerings in Archaic and Classical Greece

Suk Fong (Theodora) Jim
St. Antony's College, Oxford
Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Ancient History
Hilary Term, 2011

Acknowledgements

That this D.Phil thesis came into being owes a great deal to my supervisor, Robert Parker, whose wisdom, patience and humanity are beyond what I ever expected from anyone. It is only with hindsight that many pieces of his advice make sense, although I did not fully understand them at the time. I owe more to him than to anyone else in my academic pursuits. I am deeply indebted to the Swire Educational Trust, whose generous financial support over the years has enabled me to read my undergraduate and postgraduate degrees at Oxford and to travel extensively in Greece. I thank Barbara Kowalzig, whose inspiration and encouragement while I was an undergraduate instilled in me an interest in the ancient world. I am grateful to Catherine Holmes, Alexander Murray, Oswyn Murray, and Mary Whitby for their moral support and help in various ways. Peter Faucett, Vincent Gabrielsen, and Alfonso Moreno kindly discussed with me specific points in the thesis. Lindsay Driediger, Paddy Law and Catherine Wong are invaluable friends and a constant source of support. Miscellaneous people kindly helped with proof-reading the final drafts. Above all, I thank my family for giving me the freedom to pursue what seems a very remote dream, for the loving care they have bestowed on me (and my beloved animals while I was away), and for putting up with my extended period of absence from home.

Table of Contents

Abstract ii

Acknowledgements iv

Conventions and Abbreviations vii

Introduction: Early Scholarship, Problems, Methods and Sources 1
- I. Existing Scholarship
- II. Methods and Sources

I. The Various Religious Applications of *Aparche, Aparchesthai,* and Related Terms 38
- I. Homeric Usages
- II. Post-Homeric Usages
- III. *Aparchai* and *Dekatai*
- IV. Sacrificial and Dedicatory Applications of the Terms

II. Religious Mentality in First Offerings 73
- I. Possible Motivations behind First Offerings
- II. Conclusion

III. Agricultural First Offerings 109
- I. Agricultural Festivals Related to First Offerings
- II. Farmers' First Offerings Outside Festivals
- III. Risks and Hazards in Agricultural Societies
- IV. First-fruit Festivals and Social Functions

IV. First Offerings at Meals 132
- I. Offerings of Food and Drink: the Sources
- II. Regularity and Practicalities

V. Private Dedications 147
- I. 'Occupational' Designations
- II. Reasons or Occasions for Dedication
- III. First Offerings and their Dedicators: Some Observations

VI. Military First Offerings 187
- I. Public Dedications
- II. Private Dedications
- III. Ritualization and Social Function

VII. Dispatched First Offerings to Distant Sanctuaries 215
- I. First Offerings in Imperial and Colonial Relations
- II. First Offerings to Delos, Delphi and New Panhellenic Festivals
- III. Conclusion

VIII. *A/eparchai* and *Dekatai* in Cult finance 276
I. Cult Fees
II. Cult Taxes
III. Voluntary Religious Contributions
IV. Sacred Fines
V. Conclusion
Table 1: *A/eparchai*, *Dekatai* and *A/Epargmata* in Cult Finance

Conclusion: Gifts and Giving Back to the Gods 302

Catalogue of Military First Offerings 308

Bibliography 317

Conventions and Abbreviations

Abbreviations of periodicals follow those recommended in the *American Journal of Archaeology* (*AJA*) 95 (1991), 1-16, supplemented by those in *L'Année Philologique.*

Abbreviations of ancient authors are those in S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.), *Oxford Classical Dictionay*[3] (Oxford, 1996), supplemented by those in H.G. Liddell, R. Scott and H.S. Jones (eds.), *A Greek English Lexicon with a Revised Supplement* (Oxford, 1996). Translations of quoted texts are taken or adapted from a variety of existing editions, and are thus indicated in the footnotes. All translations of Theophrastus' *De Pietate* are quoted from Fortenbaugh et al. (1992) unless otherwise stated. For all other texts, where no translator is stated, the translation is my own. All dates refer to B.C. unless otherwise indicated.

Abbreviations of reference works follow those in S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.), *Oxford Classical Dictionay*[3] (Oxford, 1996), and in H.G. Liddell, R. Scott and H.S. Jones (eds.), *A Greek English Lexicon with a Revised Supplement* (Oxford, 1996), with a few additions listed below.

Abbreviations of epigraphical publications follow H.G. Liddell, R. Scott and H.S. Jones (eds.), *A Greek English Lexicon with a revised supplement* (Oxford, 1996), with the following additions:

Clara Rhodos	*Clara Rhodos. Studi e materiali pubblicati a cura dell' Istituto storico-archeologico di Rodi* (Rhodes, 1928-41), vols. 1-10.
FD	*Fouilles de Delphes. École française d' Athènes* (Paris, 1902-).
I. Eleusis	K. Clinton, *Eleusis, the Inscriptions on Stone* (Athens, 2005-2008), vols. 1-2.
IGASMG	R. Arena, *Iscrizioni Greche Archiche di Sicilia e Magna Grecia* (Milan, 1989-98), vols. 1-5.
LGPN	M.J. Osborne and S.G. Byrne, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* (Oxford, 1987-2010).
McCabe, *Chios Inscriptions*	D.F. McCabe and J.V. Brownson, *Chios Inscriptions. Texts and List* (Princeton, 1986).
McCabe, *Didyma Inscriptions*	D.F. McCabe, *Didyma Inscriptions. Texts and List* (Princeton, 1985).
McCabe, *Miletos Inscriptions*	D.F. McCabe and M.A. Plunkett, *Miletos Inscriptions. Texts and List* (Princeton, 1984).
McCabe, *Samos Inscriptions*	D.F. McCabe, J.V. Brownson and B.D. Erhman, *Samos Inscriptions. Texts and Lists*

	(Princeton, 1986).
McCabe, *Halikarnassos Inscriptions*	D.F. McCabe and J.V. Brownson, *Halikarnassos Inscriptions. Texts and List* (Princeton, 1991).
MaCabe, *Teos Inscriptions*	D.F. McCabe and M.A. Plunkett, *Teos Inscriptions. Texts and List* (Princeton, 1985).
ML	R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1989), revised ed.
NGSL	E. Lupu, *Greek Sacred Law. 2nd Edition with a Postscript* (Leiden, 2009).
PAA	J.S. Traill, *Persons of Ancient Athens* (Toronto, 1994-).
RO	P.J. Rhodes and R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404-323 B.C.* (Oxford, 2003).
TAM II	E. Kalinka (ed.) *Tituli Lyciae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti*, (Vienna, 1920-1944), fasc. 1-3.
ThesCRA	*Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum* (Basel; Los Angeles, 2004), vols. 1-4.

Abstract
Gifts to the Gods: *Aparchai*, *Dekatai* and Related Offerings in Archaic and Classical Greece

Suk Fong (Theodora) Jim, St. Antony's College, Oxford
Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Ancient History
Hilary Term, 2011

This study is about one of the most ubiquitous and yet little studied aspects of ancient Greek religion, the offering of so-called 'first-fruits' (*aparchai*) and tithes (*dekatai*) in Archaic and Classical Greece (c.700-300 B.C.). A widespread and traditional custom all over Greece and the Greek Mediterranean, the offering of 'first-fruits' and tithes entailed using a portion of the proceeds from a diversity of human activities (such as craft-work, fishing, trade, military expeditions) to present something to the gods. I look at the different kinds of *aparchai* and *dekatai* offered to the Greek gods by individuals and states under various circumstances, the various contexts in which the language and practice of making such offerings were used, the deployment of this religious custom in politics, and the transformation of a voluntary practice into a religious obligation.

Ultimately, however, my major concern is with questions of religious psychology: why people should bring *aparchai* and *dekatai* to the gods, and what motivations and expectations they might have had. Because it was such a commonplace practice, the custom has been taken simply as a given in both ancient and modern scholarship; and no attempt has been made to explain its religious significance. By drawing on current anthropological studies of gift-giving, I argue that that *aparchai* and *dekatai* do not merely give to the gods, but give back to the gods some of the benefits granted by the divinities in the first place, reflecting first and foremost a sense of dependence on the divine. I suggest that the offering of *aparchai* and *dekatai* may be thought of as a means of settling men's debts to, and thereby maintaining good relations with, the

gods, who were considered the sources of both goods and evils. I challenge the emphasis, common in modern scholarship, on material returns as the central motive behind the act of bringing gifts to the gods. Instead I suggest that the study of gift-giving between humans and the divine should embrace the possibility that psychological feelings of dependence on and gratitude to the gods might also have been involved.

Introduction:

Early Scholarship, Problems, Methods and Sources

An important aspect of Greek religion is 'votive religion': in both normal circumstances and in times of needs, individuals or groups could make a vow to the gods, promising to make an offering if the favours requested of the gods were granted.[1] The English term 'votive offering' is derived from the Latin *votum*, an equivalent of the Greek *εὐχή*. A vow thus established an agreement between humans and the divine: after a request had been received, it was necessary for individuals to perform the obligation as vowed. This did not, however, constitute a contractual relation between humans and the divine: a vow did not bind the gods to grant the favour; it was only binding on the human actor to reciprocate in the event of a request being fulfilled, and vow fulfillment could take the form of sacrifices or dedications. This is normally indicated by the words *εὐχωλή*, *εὐχή* or *εὔχεσθαι* in dedicatory inscriptions.[2] Vows, sacrifice and votive offerings were therefore closely related as means of human interaction with the gods. Nevertheless, prominent though the idea of 'votive religion' may be, sacrifices and dedications were not necessarily connected to a vow. Individuals could make an offering even if no promise had been made beforehand; indeed, the vast majority of dedications that have come down to us do not mention a vow, or a vow was involved but was simply not mentioned. Therefore the majority of what modern historians call 'votive offerings' were in fact not demonstrably 'vowed' or 'votives'; they might have been offered to the gods spontaneously without any prior promises made. When it came to making a gift to the gods, the possibilities were many: a gift could take the form of a blood or bloodless

[1] On 'votive religion', see e.g. Burkert (1987), 13-29, Van Straten (1992), Bremer (1998), Parker (1998), Keesling (2003), 4-6.
[2] These formulae are studied in Lazzarini (1976), 98-101.

sacrifice, or more often people preferred a tangible and durable dedication. These gifts are variously described: *anathema*, *agalma*, *doron* etc. What interests me here is a particular kind of gift to the gods, namely *aparchai*, *dekatai* and related offerings in Archaic and Classical Greece.

Offering of *ἀπαρχαί*, usually translated as 'first-fruits' in English, was a pervasive practice in the religious life of the ancient Greeks. The custom is widely attested in different parts of the Greek world and practised at different levels of society. Etymologically the word *aparche* is a combination of *ἀπό* ('from') and *ἄρχω* ('to begin'); so an *ἀπαρχή* may literally be understood as 'a preliminary offering from a greater whole'. It could be dedicated from a wide variety of sources: from work, military victories, agricultural produce, trade, or any other human enterprise. An *aparche* could be a 'raw' offering, an existing item normally intended for other usages (such as some crops or a tool of trade), or a 'converted' dedication specially commissioned for the specific purpose of dedication.[3] The related word *δεκάτη*, on the other hand, is literally a tenth. The essential difference between the two lies in their proportion: an *ἀπαρχή* is normally a random, unspecified, proportion, whereas a *δεκάτη* is literally a tenth, though we do not know whether every instance of a *δεκάτη* was necessarily a real tenth. Alongside *ἀπαρχή* and *δεκάτη*, there exist other synonyms such as *ἀκροθίνιον*, *ἀπάργματα*, and *κατάργματα*, which are complementary and similar in meaning to 'first-fruits' offerings. I have placed 'first-fruits' in inverted commas because, as will become apparent later on, there is such a great variety of offerings and circumstances of dedication that the English

[3] On 'raw' and 'converted' offerings, see Snodgrass (1989-90), 291.

word is potentially misleading because of its agricultural connotation. In what follows I shall refer to *aparchai*, *dekatai* and related offerings collectively as 'first offerings'.

I. Existing Scholarship

Although the phenomenon of first offerings was touched upon in one way or another in scholarship in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, there has been no systematic and up-to-date study of first offerings to my knowledge. Piecemeal remarks on *aparchai*, *dekatai* and the like may be found in two major kinds of scholarship: a) anthropological studies and b) general historical studies of Greek religion. Among anthropologists, there are two main lines of thoughts: i) the evolutionary approach, adopted by Robertson Smith, Frazer and Harrison, treated the offering of first-fruits as a 'magical' rite practised by the 'primitive' people as opposed to religion, whereas ii) the social-functional approach, adopted by Gluckman and Forde, focused on the functions of first-fruits ceremonies in affirming social order in the community concerned. It should be noted that the expression 'first-fruits' or first offerings is applied in anthropological literature to a wide variety of phenomena that are not necessarily identical with each other or with the ancient Greek practices. This diversity will emerge in the subsequent discussion. By assembling anthropological literature on 'first-fruits' practices, I am not committing myself to the view that there exists one global phenomenon or one concept of 'first-fruits'. Rather the diversity of materials collected below is intended to suggest possibilities for understanding the Greek practices. I will revert to questions of the comparability between 'first-fruits' in other cultures and the Greek *aparchai* and *dekatai* later.[4]

[4] See p. 16, 22-23 below.

a) Anthropological Works

i. Evolutionary Approach

William Robertson Smith

Robertson Smith provided one of the earliest theoretical treatments of first offerings. In his *Religion of the Semites* (1889), he pointed out that there were two major types of sacrifice in Semitic religion, namely animal sacrifice and cereal offerings, following the Hebrew distinction of *zebah uminha*, or blood and bloodless oblation. According to this categorization, first-fruits were a kind of *minha*: 'there is no doubt that in ancient times the ordinary source of the *minha* was the offering of first-fruits – that is, of a small but choice portion of the annual produce of the ground, which in fact is the only cereal oblation prescribed in the oldest laws.'[5] Of the two types of sacrifice, he considered cereal offerings as having a secondary place in Semitic ritual compared to animal victims because of the significance he attached to the sacrificial feast following an animal sacrifice: vegetarian offerings were 'a tribute paid by the worshipper to his god', whereas animal sacrifice was 'not a mere payment of tribute but an act of social fellowship between the deity and his worshippers'.[6] Through his study of the Semitic ritual of sacrificing and consuming what he understood to be a totem animal, a sacred animal thought to be a divine ancestor of a kinship group, he developed a 'communion theory' of sacrifice: animal sacrifice was a communion between men and god as well as between members of the group by joint participation in the flesh and blood of a sacred victim. His idea of communion between members of a group was a central tenet of what later emerged as the sociological approach to religion.

---

[5] Robertson Smith (1889), 222.
[6] Robertson Smith (1889), 205-7, at 207.

In his lecture entitled 'First-fruits, tithes, and sacrificial meals',[7] he made a distinction between first-fruits and tithes: both were cereal oblations and 'tributes' to the gods, but the former was a private and free-will offering made by individuals, whereas the latter was a public payment imposed by royal authorities on the land's produce for the maintenance of public religion. This tithe was not necessarily a tenth, but could be any other fixed portion: 'in antiquity tithe and tribute are practically identical, nor is the name of tithe strictly limited to tributes of one-tenth, the term being used to cover any impost paid in kind upon a fixed scale'.[8] In Hebrew societies, therefore, tithes were akin to a regulated political-religious payment exacted by the authorities, the most important use of which, to Robertson Smith, was the financing of public sacrifices and sacrificial feasts.

James Frazer

Like Tylor[9] and Robertson Smith, James Frazer adopted the well-known evolutionary framework which saw magic as the earliest stage of development, which then gave way to religion, and later to science. The original purpose of *The Golden Bough* was to explain the obscure custom of the priesthood of Diana at Nemi in the town of Aricia in Italy, according to which each new successor to the office must slay the priest after plucking a bough from a sacred oak in the sanctuary; if successful, he would preside over the sanctuary and bear the title 'King of the Wood'. This endeavor to explain the Arician practice led Frazer far afield in his study of primitive customs. As he said in the preface to the abridged edition, 'it is no longer possible to regard the rule of succession to the priesthood of Diana at Aricia as exceptional; it clearly

[7] Robertson Smith (1889), 226ff.
[8] Robertson Smith (1889), 227.
[9] E. Tylor's *Primitive Cultures* (1871) was not concerned with first offerings specifically and therefore will not be discussed here; but its central tenets (namely its theory of sacrifice, its evolutionary approach and the distinction between magic and religion) were adopted by subsequent scholars.

exemplifies a widespread institution'.[10] Drawing on Robertson Smith's idea of the ritual sacrifice of the divine totem and the German folklorist Wilhelm Mannhardt's vegetation spirits,[11] Frazer developed a universal theory. Throughout the world, Frazer noted, there existed an in-dwelling vegetation spirit in the animal or human victim in sacrifice; underlying all rituals was an enactment of the death and resurrection of this spirit or divine figure upon whom the fertility of the land and the community's well-being depended. It was to sustain the divine king's power that the 'aged' king was killed and supplanted by a new vigorous successor. Frazer indiscriminately applied his ideas to materials collected from many disparate cultures and traditions that he thought could exemplify his contention, with the result that *The Golden Bough* expanded from two volumes in the first edition to twelve volumes in the third.[12]

First-fruits practices served as an exemplification of Frazer's grand theory. Three basic propositions about them may be identified. First, first-fruits were offered to some god or deity before human consumption of the rest as the produce was thought to belong to the deity; any failure to do so was believed to incur undesirable consequences. Once the deity had enjoyed his share, the taboo on food would be lifted and people would be free to enjoy the rest.[13] Second, these offerings were considered as necessary for the subsistence of the deity; they were offered to enable the deity's survival and thereby further his benefactions:[14] 'for how could he expect to reap wheat and barley and to gather grapes next year if he suffered the spirits of the corn and of the vine to perish of famine in the meantime? This train of thought may

[10] Frazer (1922), vi.
[11] Mannhardt (1877). On Mannhardt's work and influence on Frazer, see Frazer (1911-15), vol. 1, xii-xiii.
[12] Frazer (1911-15), vols. 1-12, 3rd ed.
[13] E.g. Frazer (1911-15), vol. 3, 5, 102, vol. 4, 101-2, vol. 8, 56-8.
[14] E.g. Frazer (1911-15), vol. 7, 232-5, vol. 8, 109.

possibly explain the widespread custom of offering the first-fruits of the crops to gods or spirits. Such offerings may have been originally not so much an expression of gratitude for benefits received as a means of enabling the benefactors to continue their benefactions in time to come.'[15] Third, first-fruits were some kind of sacred food believed to contain the body of a corn-spirit. By collecting the new corn, making it into a cake and consuming it, members of a community were 'partaking in the body of the corn-spirit'; Frazer called this 'the sacrament of first-fruits'.[16] Originally, according to Frazer, the presentation of first-fruits to some deity was perhaps combined with the sacramental eating of the corn-spirit's body; but the latter gradually lost its importance and the presentation alone came to be considered as a sufficient preparation for eating the new crop.[17] At the same time, what was once considered as necessary for the divinities' subsistence came to be regarded as a symbolic offering from man, who wanted 'to express his gratitude and homage to his divine benefactors by returning to them a portion of their bounty';[18] first-fruits thus became 'a tribute or a mark of homage rendered by man to the gods for the good gifts they have bestowed on him'.[19] As this quotation shows, although Frazer occasionally mentioned homage and gratitude in passing,[20] he seemed to consider them as a later development and a secondary motive. Frazer also mentioned offerings of first-fruits to kings as tributes, to ancestral spirits or the dead, and to the priests as priestly payments.[21]

[15] Frazer (1911-5), vol. 7, 235.
[16] Frazer (1911-15), vol. 8, 48-86.
[17] Frazer (1911-15), vol. 8, 85-6.
[18] Frazer (1911-15), vol. 8, 86.
[19] Frazer (1911-15), vol. 8, 109.
[20] See also Frazer (1911-15), vol. 5, 27, vol. 7, 46.
[21] To kings: Frazer (1911-15), vol. 8, 109, 116, 122; to the dead: vol. 8, 109, 115-6, 111, 121-4; to priests: vol. 8, 125.

Jane Harrison

Although *The Golden Bough* was not primarily concerned with myth and rituals, Frazer's theory formed the basis for what is called the 'myth and ritual school';[22] one of its most influential members was Jane Harrison. Her two major studies, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (1903) and *Themis* (1912), attempted to root the origins of Greek myths and drama in the ancient fertility rites of the dying and rising god-king described by Frazer.[23] She began her *Prolegomena* by establishing that two kinds of rituals existed among the Greeks, Olympian and Chthonian, which she characterized by two distinct formulae: *do ut des* ('I give so that you may give')[24] and *do ut abeas* ('I give that you may go away'). The essential difference is that the former was the ritual of hope and worship, directed towards the gods who were beneficent to mankind and received in return worshippers' 'cheerful attendance' ($\theta\varepsilon\rho\alpha\pi\varepsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$), whereas Chthonian rituals were directed towards the underground powers considered as sources of mischief to avert evil ($\grave{\alpha}\pi\sigma\tau\rho\sigma\pi\acute{\eta}$).

It was not Harrison's concern to provide a coherent explanation of first-fruits, nor is it always easy to follow her sequence of ideas. Throughout both studies, she seemed to regard first-fruits offering as a ritual which, under her schema of things, can fall into both the Olympian and Chthonic framework depending on the context. For example, she saw the dishes of grain and seeds offered to Hermes Chthonios in the Athenian festival *Anthesteria* as first-fruits. It is unclear, however, whether the supposed first-fruits in the *Anthesteria* constituted an Olympian or Chthonian ritual

[22] On Frazer's connection to the myth and ritual school, see Ackerman (1975), 115-34. The contentions of the myth and ritual school are summarized by Versnel (1993), 20-36 and Bell (1997), 5-8; see also Csapo (2005). On the Cambridge ritualists, see also R. Parker (2007).
[23] A useful list of reviews of her works can be found in Arlen (1990), 28-32.
[24] The idea of *do ut des* was already advanced by Tylor (1871) in his 'gift theory' and it continued to influence many subsequent discussions on reciprocity between humans and the divine.

since they were addressed to the chthonic deities but carried the expectation of *do ut des*. In the case of the *Thargelia*, she regarded the *thargelos* and *eiresione* as an Olympian ritual performed with the idea of *do ut des*: it is 'an instance of the service of tendance (θεραπεία), the primitive sacrifice that embodies the very essence of *do ut des*, a gift given to the god to "smooth his face", a gift that necessarily supposes the existence of a god with a face to be smoothed'.[25] Like Frazer, she also related first-fruits to taboos on food: a taboo was placed upon the fruits harvested until they were ripe; such fruits were 'sacred, forbidden, dangerous' because primitive man envisaged an anthropomorphic god who was jealous.[26] To Harrison, first-fruits were thus a means of breaking the taboo and an aversion of evil influence.

First-fruits also featured in Harrison's 'gift theory of sacrifice'. She argued that in the primitive stage sacrifice was not a gift, it involved no god and no giving up. Instead it was simply about 'handling, manipulating *mana*',[27] an in-dwelling force which would be passed to the eater when the animal was eaten. And first-fruits were considered to contain this *mana*. This idea of *mana* is a concept imported directly from Polynesian culture and not supported by evidence in our Greek sources. It was probably influenced by R.R. Marett and was reminiscent of Frazer's idea of an in-dwelling force in non-human objects.[28]

[25] Harrison (1903), 82.
[26] Harrison (1903), 83.
[27] Harrison (1912), 136-7.
[28] Marett (1914).

Henri Hubert and Marcel Mauss

Hubert and Mauss' influential work *Sacrifice, Its Nature and Function* (1964 [1898]) was concerned primarily with sacrifice but it also briefly mentioned the offering of first-fruits. According to their theory of sacrifice, underlying all forms of sacrifices were two basic processes: sacralization and desacralization. Sacralization induced a state of sanctity into a profane object so that it could serve as an intermediary between the worshipper and the god. By contrast, desacralization dispelled the state of sanctity and reestablished the distinction between the worlds of humans and the divine.[29] According to Hubert and Mauss, some objects were in a state of such great sanctity that they became unusable or dangerous and would need the 'sacrifice of desacralization', and this was especially the case with products of the earth: 'each species of fruit, cereal and other products is sacred in its entirety, forbidden, so long as a rite, often of a sacrificial nature, has not rid it of the prohibition which protects it. To effect this there is concentrated in one portion of the species of the fruit all the power contained in the others. Then this part is sacrificed, and by virtue of this alone, the others are released'.[30] In other words, Hubert and Mauss saw in the offering of first-fruits an exemplification of the desacralization function of sacrifice. They were clearly building on Frazer's notion of taboo,[31] but only differed by developing a theory of the mechanism which the first-fruits underwent and the function it served. It is disappointing that the French anthropologists failed to provide significantly new insights different from their English contemporaries. As is acknowledged in the introduction to the 1964 edition, Hubert and Mauss owed many of their ideas to Tylor, Robertson Smith and Frazer.[32]

[29] Hubert and Mauss (1964 [1898]), 50-60.
[30] Hubert and Mauss (1964 [1898]), 57; see also 66-7 on agrarian sacrifice.
[31] Hubert and Mauss (1964 [1898]), 57 n. 347, acknowledged Frazer's influence.
[32] Hubert and Mauss (1964 [1898]), 1-5.

ii. Sociological Approach

Max Gluckman, Hilda Kuper

In the twentieth century, under the influence of Émile Durkheim,[33] some anthropologists shifted their attention from origins and evolution to study instead the basic functions religion served in human societies. The first anthropologist to adopt a sociological approach in the study of first-fruits ceremonies was perhaps Max Gluckman.

Gluckman examined first-fruits ceremonies in South-eastern Africa in two studies.[34] His first study, in 1938, made use of first-fruits ceremonies in Bantu to demonstrate how agricultural festivals served to affirm the social status quo by channeling conflicts and reinforcing the social bond between the participants. He argued that people were prone to conflicts on occasions of dearth and harvest, when different families' crops ripened at different times. Hence prohibitions on eating before the successful performance of the relevant rites in the ceremony could ensure that people consumed the new crop at the same time and thereby avoided quarrels and socially disruptive forces. The hospitality of the chief in providing meat, and the prescribed order in which the fruits and meat could be taken, all had the effect of reinforcing the hierarchical roles of different social groups while at the same time integrating them.

However, Gluckman's work went beyond a simple social solidarity model. He criticized Durkheim for over-emphasizing the degree of social solidarity and ignoring the elements of conflict and individual variations; and he changed the way ceremonies were analyzed by introducing the notion of 'ritual of rebellion', according to which

[33] Durkheim (2001 [1912]).
[34] Gluckman (1938), Gluckman (1963 [1954]).

authority and social order were reinforced through the temporary and controlled release of tension during festivals.[35] He owed this idea to Kuper's notion of 'drama of kingship'.[36] Kuper argued that the *Incwala* ceremony (a first-fruits ceremony among the Swazi) was first and foremost geared towards the strengthening of kingship: it symbolized the rejuvenation of the king, which was in turn closely linked to the well-being of the people. It also served as an 'economic weapon' of kingship by means of which the king could put a curb on eating the new food and make manifest the economic dependence of the people upon the ruler.[37] Gluckman developed this interpretation of the *Incwala* into his idea of 'ritual of rebellion', which formed his main line of argument in his second study of African first-fruits festivals. He drew attention to elements of rivalry, most notably the chanting of songs which expressed hatred and rejection of the king.[38] This hostility towards the king was also acted out in other rites during the ceremony, while at the same time there were other rites which reaffirmed the king's authority. The expression of tension, to Gluckman, ultimately reaffirmed social unity and the status quo remained unchallenged.

Significantly, therefore, Gluckman's work shifted the perspective of enquiry away from that traditionally adopted since Frazer. Nevertheless, this sociological approach reduced a vast and complex ceremonial to a major social function, namely that of maintaining social and political unity, and led to the neglect, if not exclusion, of other aspects of the phenomenon. It is unclear what precisely the role of first-fruits was in his studies; and there seems to be nothing intrinsic in first-fruits to make them an agent for social solidarity. First-fruits ceremonies were probably included in his

[35] A good summary of Gluckman's theory can be found in Bell (1997), 38-40, 52-55.
[36] The influence of Kuper (1947) is explicitly acknowledged in the introduction to Gluckman (1963 [1954]), 18.
[37] Kuper (1947). See also Kuper (1952), 45-7.
[38] Gluckman (1963), 120-2.

study of rituals of rebellion only incidentally because of the pseudo-rebellious elements he identified in them. Yet the idea of 'rituals of rebellion' is not applicable to all first-fruits ceremonies; on the other hand, it can be applied to many festivals that do not involve first-fruits. His theory also raises the question of the relation between first-fruits and restrictions on consumption, to which I will return below.

Daryll Forde

Forde's study of first-fruits ceremonies in the African tribe Yako likewise focuses on their functions of reinforcing communal values and social relations.[39] According to Forde, the Yako people had a highly complicated social structure consisting of numerous but overlapping corporations of diviners and cult personnel. By assigning different duties and rituals to different religious officials, Forde argues, first-fruits festivals had the effect of integrating these groups while at the same time reinforcing their different roles. Like Gluckman's studies, it is unclear what the role of first-fruits was in Forde's analysis. As Forde himself admitted, several other agricultural festivals (not involving first-fruits) in the Yako community also served similar social functions.

iii. More Recent Anthropological Treatments

The second half of the twentieth century saw further anthropological studies of first-fruits rituals in different cultures. Instead of Frazer's breaking of taboo and Gluckman's social integration, scholars shifted their attention to other aspects of the festivals, including the political, economic and military. It is impossible to give an exhaustive treatment of all the works to date; I shall here mention the major studies known to me.

[39] Forde (1949).

Hammond-Tooke's article on the annual first-fruits ceremonies in the African tribe Baca emphasized their military significance.[40] He argued that although the original function of the rituals might have been agricultural, this was overshadowed by political and military functions over time. He saw in the rituals a primary concern with strengthening the army. For example, he interpreted the ritual killing of the bull as an enactment of military combats with the tribe's enemies. He explained the unequal restrictions (stricter for men but more lax for women and children) on consumption of agricultural produce before the ceremony in terms of its implications for the army: the society's military strength would be at stake if the taboo was broken by male members of the community.[41] Before Hammond-Tooke, the military significance of first-fruits ceremonies in the African communities of the Bantu and the Swazi respectively had been mentioned by Wilson and Marwick, albeit only briefly.[42]

Savary studies the first-fruits festivals of yam in several western African tribes and envisages a diversity of reasons for their performance. They are aimed at ensuring agricultural success by propitiating the natural or supernatural forces upon which men depend. They are motivated in part by the risks and anxieties faced by farmers in their everyday experience, reflecting a need to propitiate the divine powers: 'lorsque les premiers fruits de leurs efforts apparaissent, les hommes s'empressent-ils de les offrir aux divinités pour qu'elles ne puissent logiquement pas se les approprier et donc ruiner l'attente des cultivateurs'.[43] Agricultural concerns aside, he also considers other dimensions of the festivals, such as their role in providing a rare opportunity for entertainment and relaxation in the otherwise monotonous village life, in enhancing social solidarity, and in protecting the yam by prohibiting the harvest and

[40] Hammond-Tooke (1953).
[41] Yet Hammond-Tooke did not explain why breaking the taboo would affect the army.
[42] Wilson (1936), 404-6, Marwick (1940a), 192.
[43] Savary (1991-2), 141-2.

consumption of premature crops.[44]

More recently Snedegar analyzes the astronomical elements in the *eshwama* (first-fruits celebrations among the Nguni peoples) in southeastern Africa. He notes that the performance of certain rites coincided with the cycle of the moon. The king embodied the lunar mystery for his people and ensured the proper growth of crops in his land.[45] During the festival he spat at the sun, a ritual for assuring people's good fortune and a share of 'solar potency'. However, first-fruits festivals are not necessarily associated with celestial phenomena. Snedegar seems to be primarily concerned with African ethnoastronomy and his interest in first-fruits is only incidental.

Apart from Africa, Polynesian societies have also been the subject of several anthropological studies involving first-fruits. According to Firth, although yam was not as economically important as other crops in Tikopia, it was given the greatest ritual attention and formed the focus of first-fruits rituals because of its religious significance: yam was considered by the indigenous people as a sacred food representing the body of the principal deity; the partaking of yam in first-fruits festivals was considered as an act of communion with the god in commemoration of the god's work. In Tikopia the first-fruits rituals of yam formed part of the ritual cycle which Firth called 'the Work of Gods', which constituted a traditional means of maintaining contact with the deities and securing their favours.[46] It is along similar lines that the first-fruits rituals of yam in Fuji are interpreted by Turner: first-fruits of yam are presented to ancestral deities incarnate in the person of the chief as an act of thanksgiving and propitiation of the ancestral deities, who are thought to be

[44] Savary (1991-2), 142-4.
[45] Snedegar (1998).
[46] Firth (1967), ch. 4.

responsible for agricultural fertility and the health and well-being of the community. After the presentation, people also eat the yams. Turner compares the first-fruits ceremonies in Fuji and in Tikopia, and thinks that although in Fuji there is not the identification between the yam and the deity's flesh that there is in Tikopia, the eating of the yam is also a form of communion.[47] Several other anthropologists also mention first-fruits festivals in Polynesian societies, emphasizing in particular their manipulation by the Polynesian chiefs as an instrument of political and economic power.[48]

In the last few decades, therefore, some useful advances in anthropological studies of first-fruits have been made. Instead of Frazer's breaking of taboo, some anthropologists emphasize the effect of first-fruits rituals on social relations between members of the community, others on the relations between the ruling class and the subjects, and some others on human-divine relations. The economic and military significance of the customs have also been explored. There seem to be various kinds of crops offered as 'first-fruits' and various first-fruits festivals in different parts of Africa and Polynesia; therefore there was no single object of study in the anthropological literature surveyed above. The fact that various festivals involving 'first-fruits' in a given culture can be interpreted so differently by anthropologists seems to suggest that there is no single or overarching explanation for the phenomena, and that the practices are multi-faceted enough for everyone to find in them their own satisfaction.[49] It also points to the important fact that the *etic* point of view may differ from the *emic* one: it is unclear to what extent some modern interpretations of the customs represent the participants' point of view.

---

[47] Turner (1984), esp. 141. But it is not clear if his interpretation represents the *emic* point of view.
[48] Goode (1951), esp. 108-9, Goldman (1970), esp. 485, 509-11, Kirk (1984), 161ff, 230ff. See Chapter Seven.
[49] I borrow the words of Veyne (2000), 22.

b) Historical Studies in Greek Religion

Although dedicatory practices have been investigated by historians of Greek religion, there has been no systematic study of first offerings since the early twentieth century. The only detailed study of *aparchai* and related offerings in ancient Greece is the unpublished German dissertation *Ἀπαρχή und verwandte Ausdrücke in griechischen Weihinschriften* by Beer in 1914. Despite being a systemic linguistic analysis of the different terminologies (*aparche*, *dekate*, *euche*, *charisterion*) and their application in dedicatory inscriptions, this study is now out of date and occasionally inaccurate. Like Frazer, Beer was preoccupied with the origin and the evolutionary development of the practice: he saw first-fruits as originating from agricultural practices and later coming to be applied to other human activities; and he took the divine recipient as having evolved from in-dwelling vegetation spirits to external anthropomorphic gods.[50] The most misleading claim of all is that first offerings were primarily a magical means of maintaining the fertility of the fields by preserving the corn spirit (dwelling in the last stalks) and taking it into the fields in the following sowing season.[51] Beer made little attempt to differentiate between the different kinds of first offerings and the circumstances in which they were made; nor did he go beyond mere descriptions to seek to understand the motivations (apart from agricultural concern) and ideology underlying the phenomenon. In short, Beer's study reiterated many of Frazer's ideas and made no substantial contribution to our understanding of the religious practice.

The only major Anglophone treatment of first offerings is by Rouse in 1902.[52]

[50] Beer (1914), 28.
[51] Beer (1914), esp. 25-7.
[52] Rouse (1902).

Unlike Beer, Rouse was not concerned with the practice's origin or development, but with the form and iconography of offerings and the groups of people who offered them. He collected miscellaneous materials on 'first-fruits' and related offerings without any attempt to differentiate between them, nor did he tackle the questions of intents and motivations. A condensed version of more or less the same analysis is given by Rouse in his entries on 'First-fruits (Greek)' and 'Tithes (Greek)' in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (1908-26).[53]

Nilsson's interpretations of first offerings reflect a strong influence of Frazer and Harrison. He saw magic as some primitive and 'pre-deistic' rites practised before men learnt to pray to the gods but which nevertheless continued to exist alongside religious cults.[54] The offering of first-fruits, to Nilsson, was one such magical practice which survived in Greek religion: it was one of the agricultural rites which belonged to 'an old religious stratum and which have a magical character'.[55] 'First fruits,' he wrote, 'are commonly considered as a thank offering to the gods... but like most of the rites and customs discussed here, the offering of first fruits is pre-deistic and older than the cult of the gods. Its origin is to be found in magic'.[56] His discussion of agricultural first-fruits in *A History of Greek Religion* (1925) reiterated many notions of Frazer and Harrison, contributing little or no new insight. To summarize his ideas briefly, he too interpreted the offering of first-fruits as a ritual for lifting the taboo on eating and for transferring the in-dwelling 'power' within the new crop to the people who ate it and to the land; it was a medium through which men entered into communication or communion with the supernatural powers. The idea of 'votive offerings' to the gods as a means of expressing gratitude or winning favour was considered by Nilsson as a

[53] Rouse (1908-26a), (1908-26b).
[54] Nilsson (1925), 88-9.
[55] Nilsson (1940), 24.
[56] Nilsson (1940), 28-9.

later development.[57] His position about agricultural first-fruits was largely the same in his *Greek Popular Religion* (1940).

In his unpublished dissertation *Offerings at Meals. Its Place in Greek Sacrifice* (1949), Jameson studied the practice of offering some basic foodstuffs to the gods at the beginning of daily meals in ancient Greek households. This is the only available discussion of this little-known type of first offering to my knowledge. Nevertheless, its primary objective was to contrast the nature of offerings at meals with offerings at a *thusia* in order to illuminate what Jameson considered as the 'real nature' of sacrifice: a *thusia* offered the whole animal to the gods, whereas meal offerings were 'part offerings'.[58] Jameson's concern was not with first offerings in general.

In most general studies of Greek religion, first offerings are subsumed within the framework of 'votive offerings' or 'dedications'. Van Straten's chapter 'Gifts for the Gods' provides a careful analysis of dedications in general.[59] However, the breadth of his subject precludes systematic treatment of individual types of offerings, with the result that first offerings are assigned no more than two pages, grouped misguidedly under the subheading 'work' as if they were specifically a work-related phenomenon. Van Straten's other article 'votive and votaries' focuses primarily on the form and iconography of votive offerings as well as the gender and social status of the dedicators; the subject of first offerings is passed over with no comment.[60] Neither Burkert's nor Rudhardt's general studies devote more than a few pages to *aparchai*.[61]

Burkert's *Creation of the Sacred* (1996) has a chapter 'Escape and Offering' on

[57] Nilsson (1925), 92-7.
[58] Jameson (1949).
[59] Van Straten (1981).
[60] Van Straten (1992).
[61] Burkert (1979), 52-4, Burkert (1985), 66-8, Rudhardt (1992), 219-22.

the offering of 'part for the whole' in the natural world, a phenomenon akin to making first offerings though not termed as such. It is a natural instinct, Burkert observes, in humans and animals to avert danger by giving up some of what seems to be the most precious in order to save the rest.[62] Thus a lizard will cut off its tail to escape when pursued by predators. In some societies worshippers might cut off one of their fingers to procure recovery of their health; in myths a community might sacrifice one of its members for the salvation of all when catastrophes strike. Burkert's theory implies that it was primarily for the sake of saving the rest from danger that a manageable loss was made. His idea is useful in understanding the *apotropaic* aspect of first offerings. Yet there is no reason to suppose that every first offering was motivated by imminent danger.

More recently Keesling's introductory chapter to *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis* (2003) has a short but useful section on '*aparche* and *dekate*'. Keesling is perhaps the first to tackle the question of the possible difference between the two terms; yet the scope of her study necessarily means that material from outside Athens is left out and consequently her discussion is far from exhaustive.[63] Parker, in *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum* (2004), provides a useful introduction to the subject accompanied by a collection of some of the material.[64] Kearns' recent sourcebook on Greek religion discusses 'first-fruits' and tithes briefly in the context of dedications.[65] Nevertheless, despite these occasional discussions of first offerings, many questions remain unanswered and many aspects of the phenomenon have yet to be examined.

---

62 Burkert (1996a).
63 Keesling (2003), 6-10.
64 Parker (2004a), 275-9.
65 Kearns (2010), 265, 267-8.

c) Problems of Existing Scholarship

The contentions and methodology of many of the early discussions of first-fruits surveyed above are now considered problematic and out-dated. In the first half of the twentieth century, many scholars were caught up in the quest for the historical origin of religion. Their interest in what they called 'primitive' cultures was accompanied by the assumption that studies of the 'primitive' peoples could provide a means of explaining a wide spectrum of phenomena in other cultures across time. The works of Frazer and Harrison in particular were essentially an agglomeration of data collected from different traditions to support their preconceived ideas. This indiscriminate application of the comparative method has long been discredited as inappropriate: it is a misguided attempt to seek to bring the multiplicity of comparable practices within the unity of one universal explanation when there is no single explanation or simple origin of religion. Their tendency to find in different cultures what they were looking for also raises the question of whether the participants themselves ever had such a view or whether it was projected onto the situation by the outsider.

With the exception of Rouse and Beer, early scholars' interest in first-fruits was only peripheral. Frazer, Harrison and Nilsson were interested in first-fruits only insofar as they seemed to embody some 'primitive' beliefs and rites concerning fertility of the earth, which they were arguing for in their studies. Despite their varying emphases, they all shared the basic assumption that the offering of first-fruits was but some 'primitive' rite of the 'savages' concerned with human survival and practical needs. Few early studies (except Rouse and Beer) discuss first-fruits in the context of 'votive' offerings and dedications, as if these were conceptions appropriate only for 'higher' modes of religion and therefore irrelevant to the 'primitive' people. More generally, the relation between ritual, sacrifice, offering and dedication

remained elusive and ill-defined, with the result that first-fruits sometimes shift imperceptibly from one to another.

To return to the question raised earlier about the compatibility of 'first-fruits' in ancient Greece and elsewhere, there are several important differences between the 'first-fruits' practices in other cultures and in ancient Greece. In all the anthropological studies in African and Polynesian societies surveyed above, the offering of first-fruits was essentially an agricultural phenomenon: the kinds of crops involved might vary; yet almost always we find an agricultural community celebrating a festival after harvest. By contrast, in ancient Greece, despite having an agricultural aspect too, 'first-fruits' might be dedicated in a variety of contexts and from various human activities: fishing, craft-work, seafaring, athletic victory, trade and so on.

A second crucial difference concerns taboos on food. The vast majority of anthropological studies (such as that of Frazer, Harrison, Gluckman, Hammond-Tooke, and Savary) mention restrictions on the consumption of new crops before the first-fruits were symbolically offered to the divinities and/or their earthly representatives (the king or the chiefs); and it was considered dangerous in one way or another to break the taboos. While taboos on consumption may apply to some cultures,[66] as far as ancient Greece is concerned there is no evidence for prohibitions on eating before agricultural first-fruits were offered.[67] Yet similar notions continue to be expressed in recent works on Greek religion,[68] though scholars now take care to avoid using the word 'taboo'.

Almost all the anthropological literature surveyed above, from Robertson Smith

[66] See e.g. Lang (1901), ch. 14, Webster (1942), esp. 342-3, Steiner (1956).
[67] Though there might have been possible restrictions on drinking new wine before the ritualized wine-opening on the *Pithoigia* (see Chapter Three).
[68] E.g. Rudhardt (1992), 222, Jameson (1994), 38, Zaidman (2005b), 38.

through Gluckman to Savary, studies the offering of first-fruits as a communal rather than a private practice. This emphasis on the social aspect risks reducing first-fruits ceremonies to a fundamentally social institution; it also neglects the diversity of attitudes that might exist among participants on the same occasion. While a communal dimension to the offering of 'first-fruits' certainly exists in ancient Greece, this was a pervasive practice in individuals' religious life too. Yet the role of first offerings in the religious life of the individual worshipper, both in Greece and in other cultures, has not received sufficient attention. Where individual concerns are mentioned, early scholarship tends to focus on the worshippers' practical concerns, such as protection from disaster and productivity of the fields. This emphasis on utilitarian motives renders the 'primitive' men incapable of less pragmatic sentiments such as gratitude and thanksgiving, which according to the well-known evolutionary paradigm of Tylor and Frazer seem to be the preserve of more 'advanced' developments.

As far as historical studies of Greek religion are concerned, there exists no comprehensive and up-to-date study of first offerings in ancient Greece; existing discussions tend to focus narrowly on a particular kind of first offerings without discussing other aspects of the practice. Thus Nilsson was interested in agricultural first-fruits, Jameson focused on first offerings at meals, and other historians make brief mention of first offerings as 'votive' dedications. No attempt has ever been made to study systematically the different kinds of first offerings, the various contexts in which they appeared, and how they relate to each other. In short, the piecemeal study of a single aspect of the practice in isolation fails to significantly enhance our understanding of the religious phenomenon.

II. Methods and Sources

This study concerns the offering of *aparchai*, *dekatai* and related offerings in Archaic and Classical Greece; where it seems helpful I will also draw on materials outside this period. For an object to be identified as a first offering, we rely on the survival or restoration of the whole or part of the word *aparche* or its synonyms in inscriptions, or their descriptions as such by ancient authors in literary sources. This is admittedly not entirely satisfactory as smaller objects that were not inscribed, or were inscribed and yet the word has not survived, but were nevertheless intended as first offerings, will inevitably escape our attention. Nevertheless, since ancient and modern understandings of what 'first-fruits' offerings were may differ, in order to avoid imposing our conception of first offerings onto the ancients or neglecting what the ancients regarded as first offerings and yet do not appear to us as such, it is more reliable to base our identification on the ancient usage of the words *aparche*, *dekate* and the like in the epigraphic and literary sources. There probably existed no single definition and consensus among the ancient worshippers of what constituted first offerings either: some of them might have regarded some offerings as such, whereas others might not. To complicate things further, some individuals might have used the word *aparche* or *dekate* loosely to signify an 'offering' or *anathema*, especially when there is no specification of the source of the *aparche* or *dekate* by a qualifying genitive. On the other hand, it is also possible that some *anathemata* might have been intended as first offerings but were not explicitly described as such. Therefore we have to accept that we do not possess complete knowledge of which offerings were first offerings. What were considered by some ancients as first offerings but have not survived under that description in our sources will unfortunately but unavoidably elude us. In view of this, I will also take into account offerings which appear to

contain the idea of first offering although they are not specified as such. Identification will be based on the presence of the two essential characteristics of first offerings: a portion of a greater whole, and a preliminary offering expressing the priority of the gods. For example, a *lex sacra* from Thebes at Mycale in the mid-fourth century requires goatherds to offer a kid from each herd, and shepherds a lamb if there were five new-born, as *koureia* ('shearing offerings') to Hermes.[69] The term *aparchai* is not used, but the young animals may be considered as such since they represented both a portion of the herds and a preliminary offering for the gods at shearing time.

It is impossible and unimportant to trace when and where the custom of making first offerings came from; what is certain is that it was a long-standing practice performed according to tradition by individuals and communities. Some of the first offerings, especially those collectively dedicated, appear to have been socially prescribed: it was customary for agricultural communities to offer some of their seasonal produce to the gods in agricultural festivals at regular times of the year; it also appears to be an established practice for states to set aside for the gods a portion (usually a tithe) of the spoils acquired in military victories. In animal sacrifices, it was customary to cut some of the sacrificial animal's hair (and sometimes bits of flesh) as a first offering to the gods by the act of *aparchesthai*. In the vast majority of cases, however, the offering of *aparchai* or *dekatai* was a personal religious act left to the worshipper or worshipping community to decide. With the exception of some special cases,[70] there were no regulations stipulating the making of first offerings, the amount to be offered, or when to offer them. Instead, everyone who felt moved to do so could bring a portion of what they had to the gods as they saw fit. Unlike in other

[69] *Inscr. Prien.* 362 = *LSAM* 39.

[70] E.g. *a/eparchai* in cult finance (see Chapter Eight), the *aparche* (1/60th) of allied tribute to Athena, Eleusinian first-fruits (ML 73), *aparchai* from certain Milesian colonies (*Milet* I.3, no. 141), all of which are anomalies vis-à-vis the usual practice.

religions such as Judaism and Christianity where the offering of 'first-fruits' and tithes was laid down in the Scriptures as a religious duty,[71] in ancient Greece this was a matter of personal choice and no provisions were made to instruct or regulate its performance.

I mentioned earlier the possible discrepancies between ancient and modern conceptions of what first offerings are. The 'first-fruits' most familiar to us are perhaps the portions of agricultural produce presented to the gods at harvest time, as well as the fruits of other kinds of human labour. Nevertheless, if we adhere to the principle established above that the identification of first offerings is to be based on the ancient usages of the terms, we will find that the Greek vocabulary of 'first offerings' was applied to practices that we may not consider as such. Three different types of first offerings may be identified in ancient Greece, namely i) dedications, ii) sacrificial offerings, and iii) certain cult payments. While dedications constitute the most common first offerings, the act of *ἀπάρχεσθαι* could also apply to animal sacrifice, but with rather different forces. As we shall see in Chapter One, in sacrifice the word *aparchesthai* refers to the sacrificial rite of taking some of the animal's hair or flesh as a preliminary portion for the gods.[72] These preliminary portions of hair and flesh anticipate and symbolize the offering of the whole animal to the gods. This is markedly different from dedicatory practices, where *aparchesthai* expresses the gods' portion and this preliminary portion had no effect on the whole, with the rest being retained for human utilization. And yet in both contexts the acts were regarded as 'making first offerings' by the Greeks, and both acts express the precedence

[71] The Old Testament has plenty of references to the obligatory offerings of first-fruits (*bikkurim* in Hebrew) and tithes (*ma'ser* in Hebrew) and their ritual prescriptions, e.g. *Ex*. 23.16, *Lev*. 2.14, 23.10-11, 23.15-17, 27.30-33, *Nu*. 18.12-13, 28.26, *Dt*. 14.22-29, 26.5-10, 26.13-15, *Pr*. 3.9.
[72] E.g. Hom. *Od*. 3 446, 14.422, Hdt. 4.188, *LSAM* 50.23-5.

accorded to the gods over men. Both sacrificial and dedicatory practices will be discussed in this study; but because of the over-concentration of evidence on dedications, the latter will inevitably be given greater prominence.

The third context in which the vocabulary of first offerings appears is cult finance. In the Classical and Hellenistic periods, some religious contributions required of individuals or groups were termed *aparchai* or *eparchai*, such as cult fees payable for sacrificing and healing, and obligatory contributions imposed on shipowners and office-holders etc. Unlike the vast majority of first offerings which were voluntary gifts to the gods, these *a/eparchai* were obligatory contributions imposed like a fee or tax as a means of increasing sacred revenue. Since these *a/eparchai* are rather different in nature from the traditional cult practice and since they form only a small proportion of all evidence for *aparchai*, they will be held back to the last chapter. In this study my major concern is with first offerings in sacrificial and dedicatory contexts.

There is yet another context in which first offerings feature: in foundation myths of several Greek colonies[73] is the motif of some citizens being dedicated as first offerings to Apollo in Delphi, from where they were sent out on colonizing expeditions on oracular advice. However, since they belong to the realm of the legendary and since their nature is markedly different from the traditional and historical first offerings, mythical human first offerings will not be discussed.[74]

I mentioned earlier the two essential characteristics of first offerings: a part offering and a preliminary offering for the gods. While the connotation of 'a portion'

[73] Rhegium, Asine, Colophon, the Macedonian Bottiaeans, Magnesia on the Maeander, Tanagra, and possibly Cyrene.
[74] See Malkin (1987), 31-42, 60-9, Mari (1999).

is easily comprehensible, the sense of the 'first' in 'first offerings' is more elusive and may vary from context to context. In the majority of cases it denotes the precedence accorded to the gods over men, sometimes it also carries a qualitative sense of 'the choicest, the best', and in some cases both. Thus the bits of food and drink offered at the beginning of a meal are examples of the 'first' expressing a temporal priority: the gods are given precedence before human consumption of the rest.[75] However, as for the *aparchai* and *dekatai* made at retirement using the remaining of a lifetime's earnings, there was nothing that prevented the individuals from using the money before rendering a part to the gods; these appear to be simply 'part offerings' with a weakened sense of the preliminary. Military first offerings of spoils, usually termed *akrothinia* or *dekatai*, are examples where the 'first' expresses both the priority enjoyed by the divine as well as the best portion, since etymologically the word *akrothinia* is derived from *ἄκρος* ('topmost') and *θίς* ('heap'), indicating a choice-offering from the top of a heap. However, first offerings were not necessarily choice offerings. Thus the first offerings of a sacrificial animal, comprised of some of its hair and sometimes bits of flesh, are just 'preliminary portions' but not the finest or best portions. In other words, the quality of being the 'choicest' or 'finest' is a supplementary but not necessary characteristic of first offerings. In some cases, however, the notions of the 'first' and the 'portion' are absent altogether: the above-mentioned cult payments are simply 'offerings' rather than 'first part offerings'. Despite the varying emphasis of the 'first', what is certain is that the 'first' does not denote 'once' only: there is evidence to suggest that an individual could make repeated dedications of first offerings in his/her lifetime.[76] The diversity of first offerings and how their values and connotations overlap with or diverge from one

[75] See Chapter Four.
[76] E.g. *IG* I^3 699, 926-932 (see Chapter Five).

another will emerge in the subsequent chapters.

This study is about the ubiquitous and customary practice all over Greece and the Greek Mediterranean of offering *aparchai*, *dekatai* and the like to the gods. It examines the different kinds of first offerings offered to the Greek gods under various circumstances, the role of first offerings in the Greeks' religious life and everyday experience, and their place in human-divine relationships. My main focus is on the religious attitudes of the ancient Greeks in bringing first offerings; in other words, why worshippers should feel the need to bring such offerings, and what expectations and concerns they might have had. Contrary to the tendency of the vast majority of studies of Greek religion in the last century to give primacy to ritual over the participants' state of mind,[77] it is the worshippers' thoughts and attitudes which interest me here. It has become almost a cliché that Greek religion is about doing rather than believing, but the fact remains that rituals cannot be entirely divorced from thoughts. First offerings demonstrate the many opportunities for individuals to exercise active choice in the Greek religious system: worshippers and worshipping communities could decide whether to bring a first offering, and if so, when and where to bring it, of what proportion, in what form, and what to inscribe on it. But because this was such a commonplace practice, the custom has been taken simply as a given in both ancient and modern scholarship, with the result that its significance in the religious life of the Greeks is left unexplained. Yet this lack of conscious statements or reflections by the Greeks themselves need not deter us; instead it presents one of the greatest interests and challenges to a study of this kind to explain the self-evident.

It is not the aim of this study to provide a single explanation for the custom of

[77] E.g. Deubner (1932), Nilsson (1948), Burkert (1985), Bremmer (1994), Kowalzig (2007). This tendency has also been observed by Versnel (1993), 26-7, Harrison (2000), 18.

making first offerings. Instead, it investigates the range of different motivations underlying the practice, and whether any general trends and tenets of religious ideology may be identified. By situating the Greek practice in a comparative religious context and in current anthropological studies of gift-giving, I will argue that first offerings (as compared to other offerings in general) do not merely give to the gods, but give *back* to the gods some of the benefits granted by the divinities in the first place. As such, first offerings are akin to thank-offerings, and may be thought of as a means of settling men's debts to, and thereby maintaining good relations with, the divine. They reflect first and foremost a sense of dependence on the gods, who were considered the sources of both goods and evils amid the uncertainties of everyday life.

Ultimately, therefore, this study bears on the important issue of the nature of gift-giving between humans and the divine. It raises questions about the nature of the *charis* relations that exist between men and gods, and the extent to which first offerings might be considered as an economic exchange between humans and the divine. It will be demonstrated that traditional interpretations of gift-giving in human-divine relations in terms of *do ut des* and and *da ut dem*, while certainly relevant, cannot sufficiently account for first offerings or encapsulate the human-divine *charis* relations.

Sources

Our knowledge of *aparchai*, *dekatai* and the like comes from a combination of epigraphic, literary and archaeological evidence. As far as epigraphical sources are concerned, surviving material is most abundant in the fifth century, dwindles in the fourth century and continues into the Hellenistic period and later. I have gathered for this study some 330 private and public dedicatory inscriptions of the Archaic and Classical periods from different parts of the Greek world. A large proportion of

epigraphic material on *aparchai* comes from the Athenian acropolis and a small cluster from Rhodes. By contrast, *dekatai* are more frequently attested and more widely diffused. First offerings' geographical distribution is closely related to their nature: those publically dedicated by cities were predominantly though not exclusively found in the Panhellenic sanctuaries of Olympia and Delphi; by contrast, most first offerings from private individuals were dedicated in local shrines. Our knowledge of dedicators and their dedications depends largely on information preserved in dedicatory inscriptions. Most dedicatory formulae are a combination of one or more of the following components: the dedicator's name, the recipient divinity or divinities, the verb of dedication, the kind of dedication (*aparche*/*dekate*), the object dedicated, the sculptor, and occasionally the reason for dedication.[78] Sometimes they may also mention a vow previously made and/or pray for divine favours. Unfortunately, however, most dedicatory inscriptions are unhelpfully brief and fragmentary: rarely do they give all the above elements; instead, they tend to give the minimum information, as if alluding to a frequent practice immediately familiar to the ancients and their gods. They seldom make explicit the dedicator's intents and motivations. Most dedicators, apart from giving their names, revealed nothing about themselves and the circumstances of dedications. Our understanding of the materials is further hampered by the fact that few of the objects accompanying the inscription have survived; thus many first offerings are divorced from their material context. There is also an over-representation of inscriptions on statue bases of marble or, less often, bronze monuments, whereas more humble non-monumental objects not inscribed or inscribed on perishable materials that have not survived will inevitably escape our attention. Therefore we do not have a full spectrum of evidence pertaining

[78] On the formulae and components in dedicatory inscriptions, see Lazzarini (1976), Jacquemin (1995), 141-57, Parker (2004a), 274-5, Keesling (2003), 22-35.

to what were offered as first offerings The surviving evidence represents only a small fraction; in reality the practice of dedicating first offerings must have been far more widespread than is presented here.

Dedicatory inscriptions pertaining to first offerings may be supplemented by epigrams. The so-called *Anthologia Palatina*, a fifteen-book anthology produced in the tenth century A.D., is a collection of epigrams comprising the earlier works compiled by several epigram anthologists of different dates.[79] Book six of the *Anth. Pal.*, on dedicatory epigrams (*anathematica*), contains genuine inscriptions copied from stones along with literary imitations of them, some of which are first offerings.[80] They tend to be more informative regarding the dedicators' background and the contexts of dedication. Yet their dates and authorship are not always clear: scholars have attempted to attribute them to their original authors,[81] but the ascription and provenance of many of them remain uncertain. Most of these epigrams are literary exercises not accompanying any actual dedications; and it is often impossible (for both ancient and modern readers) to distinguish between literary imitations and genuine inscriptions.[82] Since poetic exercise and real dedications could mutually influence each other and since their mixture is sometimes almost inseparable, I have included them in the present study without trying to distinguish between the two.

---

[79] Namely the *Garland* (*Στέφανος*) of Meleager in c. 100 B.C., the *Garland* of Philip in c. 40 A.D., the *Cycle* (*Κυκλός*) of Agathias in the mid-sixth century A.D. On epigrams, see e.g. Cameron (1993), Bing and Bruss (2007), Livingstone and Nisbet (2010).

[80] E.g. *Anth. Pal.* 6.196, 225, 238, 285, 288, 343.

[81] E.g. Gow-Page, *HE*, assemble epigrams between 323 B.C. and c.100 B.C. collected in Meleager's *Garland*, whereas Gow-Page, *GP*, collect epigrams between 100 B.C. and 40 A.D. in Philip's *Garland* and some contemporary epigrams. Page, *FGE*, contains epigrams down to 50 A.D. from the *Anth. Pal.* and other sources. I refer throughout to the author and source identified by Gow-Page, *HE* and *GP* (where they are included) as well as the number in Book six of *Anth. Pal*.

[82] According to Bettenworth (2007), 73-4, a commonly-used criterion for distinguishing between them is the surplus of information given in the texts: epigrams accompanied by real objects often give a minimum of details, whereas literary epigrams without a monumental context often include information about the situation in which they are to be imagined: the objects, their setting, and circumstances of dedication etc. But he warns us that there are exceptions to this rule. See also Livingstone and Nisbet (2010), 52: the distinction does not really matter.

Another kind of epigraphic material is temple inventories.[83] Temple inventory lists which mention first offerings are those at Delos, Didyma, and Lindos. The inscribed temple inventories on Delos, which belong to a period between around 430 and 130 B.C., record the annual rendering of accounts by boards of administrators turning over the treasury to the succeeding officials. They mention vessels called *phialai* dedicated by Greek cities as *aparchai*.[84] *Aparchai* in the form of *phialai* are also recorded in the inventory lists of the temple of Apollo at Didyma in the Hellenistic period; they came mainly from the Milesian colonies Kios and Kyzikos.[85] We also have several instances of *aparchai*, *dekatai* and *akrothinia* in the Lindian Chronicle, inscribed in 99 B.C. to record the dedications that had supposedly once been in the temple of Athena which was destroyed by fire in 392/1 B.C. It cannot be regarded as a reliable historical document as it contains elements of invented tradition.[86] These first offerings, real or imagined, are also considered in this study as they offer valuable glimpses into how societies legitimised certain visions of local history by means of dedications. Apart from temple inventories, our information comes from *leges sacrae*, especially for first offerings in the contexts of sacrifice and cult finance.

Literary sources that mention first offerings are various. Homer refers to the act of *aparchesthai* in the context of animal sacrifice but not dedication.[87] It is not until Herodotus that the noun *aparchai* is first used for dedications. Sometimes Herodotus

[83] A useful discussion of the Delian temple inventories is provided by Hamilton (2000).
[84] E.g. *Inscr. Délos* nos. 298.A.14, 313.AB. 11, 75, 314.B.83, 320.B.42, 58, 338.C.48 (supplemented), 372.B.22, 379.12, 442.B.114, 443.B.38; *IG* XI.2 161.B.74, 184.6 (supplemented), 199.B.7, 244.10, 287.B.42.
[85] E.g. *Didyma* nos. 427.6-7, 432.6, 433.7, 444.3, 452.3-4, 453.5-6, 463.17-18, 464.10-11, 468.8-9, 471.8-9, 475.17-18.
[86] *Lindos* II, no. 2. A full commentary is provided by Higbie (2003). The element of invention in the Chronicle is discussed in Higbie (2001) and (2003).
[87] E.g. Hom. *Il*. 19.254, *Ody*. 3.446, 14.422, 14.426.

mentions acts of *aparchesthai* in other societies by way of comparing religious customs in Greek and other cultures;[88] he also makes occasional references to *aparchai* and *dekatai* from well-known figures.[89] First offerings appear in Thucydides only three times in the context of inter-state relations.[90] Comedies and tragedies also have occasional references to *aparchai* and *dekatai*. Post-Classical authors such as Plutarch, Pausanias, Diodorus Siculus and others also mention first offerings. Although some of these late references are also included in this study, we need to be aware that their vocabulary may not reflect Classical usage of the words. The post-Classical source with the most abundant references to first offerings is Pausanias, who describes some of the monuments, including *aparchai* and *dekatai*, which he saw on his travels in Greece. These literary sources are complementary to epigraphical and archaeological evidence: various objects have been identified and their inscriptions restored based on the testimonies of Herodotus and Pausanias (especially Books five, six and ten), who report some of the monuments they saw in their time with or without recording the inscriptions they read. Unfortunately, however, Herodotus, Pausanias and other ancient historians tend to focus attention on publicly dedicated first offerings, mostly of spoils, or those from well-known figures. They rarely record dedications from ordinary individuals; for these, we depend on the surviving dedicatory inscriptions accompanying the objects dedicated.

By contrast, ancient texts that illustrate or comment on dedicatory practices in general – not necessarily first offerings specifically – are piecemeal and uncommon. Gift-giving between humans and the divine appears to be taken for granted and few

[88] E.g. Hdt. 3.24 (Ethiopian rituals for the dead), 4.61.2 (Scythian sacrificial rites), 4.188 (Libyan sacrifice).
[89] E.g. Hdt. 1.92 (Croesus), 2.135 (the Thracian courtesan Rhodopis), 4.88 (the Samian architect Mandrocles).
[90] Thuc. 1.25.4, 3.58.4, 6.20.4.

would pause to reflect on the phenomenon. Where ancient comments do exist, they mainly belong to philosophical discussions, such as Theophrastus and Plato, which may or may not be representative of the ordinary Greeks' opinion. More conventional than philosophers' views is perhaps that of Xenophon, whose work is particularly valuable for popular religious views in the Classical period: his narratives are permeated with frequent references to the gods and religious practices. Most relevant to first offerings is Xenophon's idea that 'the gods come first', a recurrent idea borne out more or less consistently in his heroes' dealings with the gods: in Agesilaus, Cyrus, Socrates and Xenophon himself. However, Xenophon might have imposed the religious attitudes that he considered important on his characters, and his attitude may represent a pious ideal which may or may not be typical of the average Greek.[91] A further kind of material comes from comedy and tragedy, which often contain passages pertaining to ritual practices and the nature of the gods. Although they are not necessarily faithful reflections of reality, their representation of attitudes and practices must have had some resonance for their audience. The relative freedom of speech in the theatre also allows sentiments to be played out that are considered inappropriate in civic contexts or philosophical traditions, and as such they may allow us to come closer to the popular religious sentiment of the ancient worshippers.[92]

This study will also draw on anthropological studies of comparable practices in other societies. The potential danger of misusing comparative materials is obvious: historians (such as Frazer and Harrison) sometimes risk projecting ideas from one society onto another without fully considering their relevance or irrelevance in another culture. Nevertheless, with such cautions in mind, comparative studies may

[91] On the religious dimension in Xenophon's works, see e.g. Anderson (1974), 34-40, Gera (1993), 50ff, Parker (2004d),

[92] The value of tragedy as a source for understanding the religious practices, perceptions and beliefs in lived religion has been recognized by Parker (1997) and Sourvinou-Inwood (1997a).

enhance our understanding of the Greek practice. As was seen above, the custom of offering 'first-fruits' is widespread in many cultures, such as in African, Polynesian, Egyptian, Jewish and Christian societies. It is impossible and it is not my aim to survey all 'first-fruit' practices in different cultures; but selected anthropological parallels will be drawn to suggest possibilities for the Greek practice. Apart from ethnographic material, this study will also draw on anthropological insights on gift exchange and reciprocities in human societies to shed light on gift-giving between men and gods.[93]

In what follows I examine in Chapter One the various religious applications of the words *aparchai*, *aparchesthai* and other related terms in the contexts of animal sacrifice, bringing dedications, and cult finance, and how the value(s) attached to these terms overlap with or diverge from each other in different usages. After a semantic survey of the vocabularies, in Chapter Two I tackle questions of religious mentality and ideologies, the possible concerns and expectations underlying the religious practice.

Each of the subsequent four chapters discusses a different type of first offerings. Chapter Three looks at agricultural first-fruits variously termed *thargelos*, *eiresione*, and *thalusia* presented to the gods during agricultural festivals at certain times of the year. Other first-fruits brought by farmers outside festivals will also be discussed. Closely related to agricultural first-fruits are first offerings of simple (and mainly vegetarian) foodstuffs offered to the gods at the beginning of daily meals in private households, which will be the subject of Chapter Four. Chapter Five moves on to first offerings made using the proceeds from a diversity of human activities by individuals

[93] E.g. Mauss (1990[1925]), Sahlins (1974), Godelier (1999).

in Attica and elsewhere, focusing particularly on dedicators' social background, reasons for dedication, and objects dedicated. Chapter Six examines first offerings of spoils dedicated collectively by Greek cities after military campaigns and on a much larger scale than private dedications: they could be worth dozens of talents and presented the dedicating cities with much room for ostentatious display and inter-state competition.

After considering first offerings deposited in local shrines by individuals as well as those set up by cities predominantly in the Panhellenic sanctuaries, in Chapter Seven I turn to the wider network of theoric activities criss-crossing the Greek world, by which first offerings were dispatched to distant sanctuaries through official delegations known as *theoroi*. It explores how the bringing of first offerings, traditionally a form of human-divine interaction, was exploited as a way of maintaining inter-state, most notably metropolis-colonies, relations. The final Chapter considers the third and last context in which the language of first offerings is used, namely the sphere of cult finance, where some cult fees, taxes and contributions are termed *a/eparchai*, and how they relate to or differ from the traditional first offerings.

Chapter I

The Various Religious Applications of *Aparche, Aparchesthai,* and Related Terms

This chapter aims to give a semantic analysis of the words *aparche*, *aparchesthai* and etymologically related terms in Archaic and Classical Greece.[94] Alongside *aparchai*, there are offerings termed *dekatai* and *akrothinia*, which are similar to *aparchai* in their usage. I am here interested in the various religious applications of these words in different contexts, namely in animal sacrifice, dedications, and sacred finance, and the ways in which their usages coincide with or diverge from each other. Since some of the Homeric uses of the terms differ from later ones, Homeric and post-Homeric usages will be treated separately. Secular and metaphoric applications of the words will not be discussed;[95] and post-Classical usages may be mentioned where it seems fit. Words applied to agricultural first offerings, namely *thargelos*, *eiresione*, and *thalusia* will be treated in Chapter Three.

I. Homeric Usages

The term *aparche* does not appear in Homer. Homer uses the verbs *aparchesthai*, *katarchesthai*, and the noun *argmata*. All of them appear in sacrificial rather than dedicatory contexts.

a) ἀπάρχεσθαι

The word *aparchesthai* is first attested in Homeric sacrifices to refer to the opening sacrificial rite of cutting some of the sacrificial animal's hair as a first offering to be burnt in the fire to a god. It appears twice in Homer in the sacrifices by

[94] Part of this chapter (Part I, Part II (a) – (d), (i), Part IV) has been accepted for publication in *Kernos* 24 (forthcoming 2011).

[95] E.g. Eur. *Andr*. 149-50 (*οὐ τῶν Ἀχιλλέως οὐδὲ Πηλέως ἀπὸ δόμων ἀπαρχὰς*), Pl. *Prt*. 343b (*ἀπαρχὴ σοφίας*), Diod. Sic. 9.10.1 (*ἀπαρχαὶ τῆς ἰδίας συνέσεως*).

Nestor and Eumaeus respectively.[96] When Nestor realizes that it was Athena who accompanied Telemachus, he propitiates the goddess by sacrificing a heifer. Nestor begins the opening rites of hand-washing and sprinkling barley grains on the victim's head. He prays to Athena, cuts some hair from the victim's head and casts it into the fire, and this act is described by the participle *ἀπαρχόμενος* (*γέρων δ' ἱππηλάτα Νέστωρ χέρνιβά τ' οὐλοχύτας τε κατήρχετο, πολλὰ δ' Ἀθήνῃ εὔχετ' ἀπαρχόμενος, κεφαλῆς τρίχας ἐν πυρὶ βάλλων*).[97] I will return to the other verb *katarchesthai* in this passage later. Similar rituals, described in more or less the same formula, are found in Eumaeus' sacrifice. A five-year old boar is brought in to honour his guest (Odysseus in disguise); Eumaeus brings it to the hearth, cuts off some of its hair, and casts it into the fire (*ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἀπαρχόμενος κεφαλῆς τρίχας ἐν πυρὶ βάλλεν ἀργιόδοντος ὑός*), praying to all the gods for the safe return of his master.[98] In both passages *aparchesthai* refers to the preliminary ritual of cutting some of the animal's hair, to be cast in the fire, before it is slaughtered. Again in Book 19 of the *Iliad*, when Agamemnon swears to Zeus that he never laid hand on the girl Briseïs, he cuts some of the sacrificial boar's hair as a first offering (*κάπρου ἀπὸ τρίχας ἀρξάμενος*).[99] Here we find the verb *archesthai* modified by *apo* used adverbially. There is no mention of the hair's treatment, and we do not know whether it is cast in the fire or distributed to the participants as has been suggested by some scholars.[100]

[96] Hom. *Od*. 3.446, 14.422.
[97] Hom. *Od*. 3.443-65.
[98] Hom. *Od*. 14.414-24.
[99] Hom. *Il.* 19.252-5.
[100] Cf. Hom. *Il*. 3.273-4, an oath sacrifice where the hair was portioned out to the participants but not burnt; here the practice of cutting the hair of the animal is still attested although the term *aparchesthai* is not used. Kirk (1985-93), vol. 5, 265, suggests that the hair in Hom. *Il*. 19.252ff might have been treated in the same way as in Hom. *Il*. 3.273-4. On Hom. *Il*. 3.273-4, see commentary in Leaf (1900-02),

In one instance Homer uses the word *archesthai* without *apo* in the same religious sense as *aparchesthai*. It applies to the cutting of bits of raw flesh (instead of hair) from the sacrificial animal as first offerings to the gods. To continue with Eumaeus' sacrifice, after casting the boar's hair into the fire and saying a prayer, Eumaeus slaughters and quarters the animal with the help of the others. Then he takes bits of raw meat from all the limbs and lays them in rich fat (*ὁ δ' ὠμοθετεῖτο συβώτης, πάντων ἀρχόμενος μελέων, ἐς πίονα δημόν*), sprinkles them with barley-meal and casts them into the fire (*καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐν πυρὶ βάλλε, παλύνας ἀλφίτου ἀκτῇ*).[101] *Archesthai* here expresses the act of 'offering part of a whole (the limbs)', whereas *omothetein* is used of laying the raw pieces resulting from this *archesthai* on rich fat.[102] This passage shows that first offerings can also be taken from the animal's flesh in Homeric sacrifices. Whether the act applies to the animal's hair or flesh, in both usages the word *(ap-)archesthai* carries the same idea of offering 'part of the whole' to the gods.

b) *ἄργματα*

It is important to note that the victim's hair and portions of its flesh for the gods were never expressed by the noun *aparche/ai* in Homer. In one passage where the

---

vol. 1, 139, Kirk (1985-93), vol.1, 303-4. But Kirk goes on to say that 'if there *is* a fire, then burning the ritual hairs is an obvious means of disposing of them, and that might sometime have been regarded as an additional symbolic offering to the gods'. On how oath sacrifices differ from ordinary sacrifices, see Burkert (1985 [1977]), 250-4, Parker (2011), 156-8.

[101] Hom. *Od*. 14.427-9.

[102] On the word *omothetein*, see LSJ s.v. *ὠμοθετέω*, Lupu (2003), 74. Etymologically it is derived from *ὠμός* (raw) and *τίθημι*; but Eust. 134.35 says that some derived the word from *ὦμος* (shoulder). In other Homeric sacrifices (e.g. Hom. *Il*. 1.461, 2.424, *Od*. 3.458, 12.361) it expresses the act of laying the pieces of raw meat that have been cut off from the victim's limbs on thigh bones wrapped in fat, but here the thigh bones are not mentioned. On the absence of thigh bones, an important anomaly which marks Eumaeus' ritual actions as unusual in Homeric and later sacrifices, see Meuli (1975), vol. 2, 937, n. 3, who suggested that pigs probably received special treatments different from those of other victims. Meuli's view is now supported by osteological evidence studied by Ekroth (2009), esp. 137-8, 143-6. On the similarity between the Homeric *omothetein* and the placing of *maschalismata* in *SEG* XXXV 113.15-17 (=*SEG* XXXVI 206.15-17, *NGSL* 3.15-17), see Parker (1984), Van Straten (1995), 127.

preliminary offerings of the meat are referred to, Homer uses a different but related word *ἄργματα*. This is a cognate noun of *ἄρχω* and a synonym of *apargmata* and *aparchai* in later Greek; and lexicographers are more or less consistent in equating *argmata* with *aparchai*.[103] However, in Homer the word appears only once in Eumaeus' sacrifice and the reference is uncertain: after bits of raw meat are taken from the limbs and burnt in the fire, the rest of the meat is sliced up, roasted on spits, and divided into seven portions, one portion being set aside for the Nymphs and Hermes with a prayer and the rest is distributed to each person (*τὴν μὲν ἴαν Νύμφῃσι καὶ Ἑρμῇ, Μαιάδος υἱεῖ, θῆκεν ἐπευξάμενος,*[104] *τὰς δ' ἄλλας νεῖμεν ἑκάστῳ*).[105] In distributing the cooked portions to everyone, Eumaeus honours Odysseus with the chine of the boar; then he sacrifices *ἄργματα* to the everlasting gods and makes libations: *καὶ ἄργματα θῦσε θεοῖσ' αἰειγενέτῃσι, σπείσας δ' αἴθοπα οἶνον Ὀδυσσῆϊ πτολιπόρθῳ ἐν χείρεσσιν ἔθηκεν*. Much controversy centers on the word *ἄργματα* in line 446: it is uncertain whether they refer to the preliminary portions of flesh from the limbs burnt in the fire (line 428) or the share for the Nymphs and Hermes (lines 435-6) or something else.[106] It seems to

[103] Hesh. s.v. *ἄργματα*: *ἀπαρχαί*; *Etym. Magn.* s.v. *ἄργμα*: *Ἡ ἀπαρχή. Παρὰ τὸ ἄρχω, ἄργμα, ὡς παρὰ τὸ ἦρμαι, ἅρμα* ('The *aparche*. From *ἄρχω* comes *ἄργμα*, just as from *ἦρμαι* comes *ἅρμα*'); *Etym. Magn.* s.v. *ἀπάργματα: αἱ μεγάλαι ἀπαρχαὶ τῶν θυσιῶν τῶν τελείων. Παρὰ τὸ ἄρχω ἀπάρχω, ἄργμα καὶ ἄπαργμα* ('the great *aparchai* of perfect sacrifices (?). From *ἄρχω* comes *ἀπάρχω, ἄργμα* and *ἄπαργμα*). LSJ s.v. *ἄργμα: ἄργματα = ἀπάργματα*.

[104] Some manuscripts read *ἐπαρξάμενος* instead of *ἐπευξάμενος* in line 436: e.g. Bérard (1946); and this is adopted by Stengel (1894), 2667. Cf. Jameson (1949), 127-8: 'here we cannot be sure' which word is right. The word *ἐπευξάμενος* is more widely accepted here and *ἐπαρξάμενος* is unlikely to be used in this context as the word *eparchesthai* in Home always refers to a specific drink ritual (see below) and is never a variant of *aparchesthai* as in post-Homeric usage.

[105] Hom. *Od*. 14.435-6. I understand *θῆκεν (τίθημι)* as 'set aside' as most commentators do. But note that Petropoulou (1987), 141-3, argues at length against the translation of *θῆκεν* as 'set aside', suggesting instead 'serve before' or 'serve up' (*παρατίθημι*).

[106] Monro (1901), vol. 2, 40, Dawe (1993), think that they refer to the flesh of the limbs in line 428; but then the acts in 428 and 446 would seem to duplicate each other. Some scholars think that the share in lines 435-6 is meant: e.g. Stanford (1958-9 [1947-8]), vol. 2, 234, Jameson (1949), 126-9, Casabona

me, following the natural sequence of the procedures, that the portion in line 435 is more likely to be meant since the portion in 428 has already been burnt. There is nothing that prevents the portion deposited (*θῆκεν*, line 435) on the table from being burnt in the fire (*ἄργματα θῦσε*, line 466) subsequently. Whatever they might be, the word *argmata* is evidently a synonym of *aparchai* (not used in Homer), referring to the first portions of sacrificial flesh for the gods.

It is noteworthy that more than one set of first offerings are made in different stages of Eumaeus' actions using different parts of the victim and described in slightly different terminologies: the first portion of the victim's hair (*aparchesthai*), first portions of raw flesh from all its limbs (*archesthai*), and first portions (*argmata*) of cooked meat. All of them, regardless of the different portions involved, share the same meaning of a preliminary portion of the whole.

c) *κατάρχεσθαι*

From Homer onwards the compound word *κατάρχεσθαι* refers to the various preliminary rituals at the beginning of an animal sacrifice, meaning to 'begin the sacrificial ceremonies'.[107] The term appears only once in Homer: in the passage cited earlier, Nestor begins the opening rites with the lustral water and barley grains for sprinkling (on the victim's head); he prays to Athena, while cutting some hair from the

(1966), 70, 122, and Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989), vol. 2, 224-5. See also Gill (1974), 134, who assumes that the portion in line 435 is placed at the house table at which Eumaeus and his guests are eating as a form of *trapezomata* but does not comment on the word *argmata*. Meuli (1975), vol. 2, 938, n. 3, suggested that the *argmata* are the regular offerings cast in to the fire before a meal begins, disagreeing with Stengel (1894), 2667, who thought that the portion in lines 435-6 is meant. Kadletz (1984) suggests that the *argmata* consist not of solid food but first drops of wine poured by Eumaeus as libation in line 447. Petropoulou (1987), esp. 138-9, argues that neither the share in line 428 or 435 is meant, but bits of roasted meat taken from the portions already distributed by Eumaeus to his companions and himself. The B and Q scholia on Hom. *Od.* 14.446 put it vaguely: *ἄργματα θῦσε: τὰς ἀπαρχὰς τῶν μερίδων, ἢ τὰ ἀπομερισθέντα τοῖς θεοῖς* ('he sacrificed *argmata*: the *aparchai* of the sacrificial portions, or the things set aside for the gods').

[107] LSJ s.v. *κατάρχω*. II.2

victim's head as a first offering and casting it into the fire.[108] Homer seems to distinguish between *katarchesthai* and *aparchesthai*, using the former with respect to the rites of hand-washing and sprinkling of barley and the latter for cutting the victim's hair.[109] As will become apparent in the next section, in post-Homeric usages it is not always clear what procedures are comprised in *katarchesthai*. However, as far as the present (and only) Homeric passage is concerned, the term is restricted to the use of lustral water (*χέρνιψ*) and barley grains (*οὐλοχύται* or *οὐλαί*) but not the cutting of the lock.

II. Post-Homeric Usages

a) *ἀπάρχεσθαι*

After Homer, *aparchesthai* continued to denote the sacrificial rite of taking some of the animal's hair or flesh as first portions for the gods.[110] But it is worth noting that the act of *aparchesthai* can also apply to the animal's entrails.[111] This is how Herodotus describes the Scythian sacrificial rites: since there was no wood in Scythia with which to make a fire, the Scythians strangled and skinned the animal; then they made a fire by using its bones and they boiled the flesh in the animal's paunch. When the meat was cooked, the person who sacrificed took portions of the flesh and entrails of the animal and threw them in front (*ὁ θύσας τῶν κρεῶν καὶ τῶν σπλάγχνων ἀπαρξάμενος ῥίπτει ἐς τὸ ἔμπροσθε*). Here the scene is Scythian but the terminology is Greek; and the act of *aparchesthai* applies to both the flesh and the

[108] Hom. *Od.* 3.444-6.
[109] See also Stanford (1958-9[1947-8]), vol. 1, 264-5.
[110] E.g. *LSAM* 50.23-5 (*ἀπὸ τῶν ἀριστερῶν ἀπαρξάμενοι*), Hdt. 4.188 (*τοῦ ὠτὸς ἀπάρξωνται τοῦ κτήνεος*), Eur. *El.* 810-2 (the term *aparchesthai* is not used but the rite is attested).
[111] On the usual treatment of the *splanchna* in Greek sacrifice, see e.g. Van Straten (1995), 131-3.

splanchna.[112] A fourth-century sacrificial calendar in Cos also has a possible but uncertain reference to first offerings of entrails. Side D of the stone contains the following regulations concerning the sacrificial portions for Asia:

[- - - - - - - - - - - θ]ύοντι δὲ δύο θυώνας ποιήσαντε[ς]
[ἴσας τῶν τε κρεῶν] κ̣αὶ τῶν σπλάγχνων, καὶ τὰς θυ-
[ώνας τίθεντι ἐπὶ β]ω̣μοῦ· ὅπει δὲ τᾶι Ἀσίαι ἐπιτίθεν̣[τι]
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]ρ̣ξάμενοι καὶ τῶν σπλάγχνω[ν]
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -] κ̣αὶ τοῦ λίθου τοῦ ἐν ταῖς ἐλα̣[ίαις]
[ἁψάμενοι ὄμνυντι· - -][113]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - They [sa]crifice when they have made two
[equal] sacrificial portions [of meat] and of entrails, and they
[place] the sacri[ficial portions on the a]ltar. Where they plac[e] to Asia
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - [having made fi]rst offerings of the entrails
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - they also [touch] the stone in the oli[ves]
[as they take the oath].

Unfortunately the fragmentary nature of the text makes it difficult to ascertain the construction of lines 11-13 which concern us here. Line 12 is supplemented by Herzog and the recently published *IG* XII.4 as *ἐπα]ρ̣ξάμενοι καὶ τῶν σπλάγχνω[ν].*[114] This is untenable as the words *eparchai* and *eparchesthai* never apply to sacrificial practices in Classical usages on the evidence presently available (see below). More recently Pirenne-Delforge has suggested *κατα]ρξάμενοι* instead of *ἐπα]ρ̣ξάμενοι*; yet the difficulty is that *katarchesthai* always refers to the pre-killing stage in animal sacrifices (see below) and therefore cannot apply to entrails.[115] If it is correct to take *τῶν σπλάγχνω[ν]* as being governed by the preceding verb ending in *-ρ̣ξάμενοι*, the most likely supplement would be *ἀπα]ρ̣ξάμενοι*. The Herodotean passage and possibly the Coan calendar demonstrate

[112] Hdt. 4.61.2.
[113] *LSCG* 151D.11-13, RO 62.D.11-13, *IG* XII.4 275.11-13. Some of the supplements in Herzog (1928) , RO 62 and *IG* XII.4 are different; here I follow the supplements given in *IG* XII.4, but I have omitted those in lines 12-13 because of textual uncertainties (adapted from RO's translation).
[114] Herzog (1928), 12-14, adopted in *LSCG* 151.D.12, RO 62.D.12 and *IG* XII.4 275.12.
[115] Pirenne-Delforge (1996), 210-1 and n. 103.

that, despite the difference in the part (hair, flesh, or *splanchna*) of the victim from which the first offerings were taken, the act of *aparchesthai* continued to refer to offering 'part of a whole' in sacrificial rites as it did in Homer.

The offering of hair by humans on various occasions is also referred to by the term *aparchesthai*.[116] In rituals of mourning, it was customary to cut a lock(s) of hair and place it upon the corpse or the grave; this act is referred to by the word *aparchesthai*. Electra, for example, sheds tears and cuts some hair (*δάκρυά τ' ἔδωκα καὶ κόμης ἀπηρξάμην*) at Agamemnon's tomb in mourning for him.[117] The custom is already attested in the *Iliad*, but Homer does not use the term.[118] Funeral hair-cutting aside, the word also applies to hair-offering in rites of maturation: on attaining manhood or womanhood boys and girls would cut a lock(s) of their hair and dedicate it to some deity or a river.[119] The offering of hair by humans in both contexts intersects with the practice of cutting a sacrificial animal's hair before killing the victim, as if cutting the hair of humans is an act of *aparchesthai* of the self. However, in contrast to animal sacrifice, where the cutting of hair anticipates the slaughter and the offering of the whole animal, in hair-offering by humans the person is not sacrificed. The hair offered may be considered as a token offering, symbolizing or replacing the offering of the whole person.[120]

---

[116] On the custom of human hair-offering see Burkert (1985 [1977]), 70, 374 n. 29, Leitao (2003).
[117] Eur. *El*. 91. Similar rituals but not described with the term *aparchesthai* are found in e.g. Eur. *IA* 1437, Eur. *Supp*. 97, Aesch. *Cho*. 168.
[118] E.g. Hom. *Il*. 23.135-52.
[119] E.g. Callim. *Hymn* 4, 296-9, Plut. *Thes*. 5.1, Paus. 1.43.4. There is no Classical usage of the word *aparchesthai* in adolescent hair-offering to my knowledge; the practice is attested in Classical sources without using the term, e.g. Hdt. 4.34, Eur. *Hipp*. 1425ff, Theophr. *Char*. 21.3.
[120] The ritual has been variously interpreted and there is no authoritative explanation: e.g. Pearson (1909), 190 on Eur. *Phoen*. 1524-5: 'an act of symbolism, by which the survivor devoted himself to the service of the dead. The act is then a substitute for a more primitive self-immolation'; Leaf (1900-02), vol. 2, 481 on Hom. *Il*. 23.135: 'a part cut straight from the living body represents the whole man, who thus offers himself as an escort to the shades'; Jameson (1949), 59: 'by cutting off a living part of himself and presenting it to a god or a dead relative, a man in effect dedicates himself'; West (1987), 187 on Eur. *Or*. 96: a form of self-mutilation.

It is worth mentioning that Theophrastus' usage of the word *aparchesthai* in the *De Pietate*, later quoted in Book two of Porphyry's *De Abstinentia*, differs from ordinary Greek usages.[121] In several cases Theophrastus uses *aparchesthai* to express the whole act of sacrifice in general without reference to any specific preliminary sacrificial procedures, so that there is a blurring of meaning between *aparchesthai* and *thuein*.[122] For example, he says that offerings should be made to the gods by reason of honour, gratitude and for want of good things, so that *καὶ τῶν ζῴων, εἰ ἀπαρκτέον αὐτὰ θεοῖς, τούτων τινὸς ἕνεκα θυτέον*. Here *ἀπάρχεσθαι τῶν ζῴων* is essentially the same as *θύειν τὰ ζῷα*, meaning 'even with animals, if they should be offered to the gods, they should be sacrificed for one of these reasons'.[123] When he condemns human sacrifice, he speaks of *σφῶν αὐτῶν ἀπήρξαντο τοῖς θεοῖς*, meaning not 'making first offerings of themselves' but 'making sacrifice from among themselves'.[124] This identification of *aparchesthai* with *thuein* is perhaps deliberate, since Porphyry deplores animal sacrifice as unholy and elevates agricultural first-fruits and bloodless offerings above animal sacrifice.

b) *ἀπαρχή*

The earliest literary attestation of the noun *aparche* is in Herodotus, who uses *aparche/ai* three times in dedicatory contexts.[125] Etymologically speaking an *aparche*

[121] Also noted by Jameson (1949), 75.
[122] E.g. Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 12.43-49, 13.15-22, 19.3-7 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.24.1, 27.1, 32.1. These passages are taken by scholars, e.g. Pötscher (1964), Fortenbaugh et al. (1992), as quoted by Porphyry from Theophrastus and can reasonably safely be regarded as Theophrastus' use of the word *aparchesthai*, though it is unclear whether Porphyry was quoting from Theophrastus *verbatim*.
[123] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 12.43-49 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.24.1 (adapted from the translation in Fortenbaugh et al.).
[124] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 13.15-22 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.27.1 (adapted from the translation in Fortenbaugh et al.).
[125] Hdt. 1.92, 4.71, 4.88.

(*ap-arche*) is related to the verb *ἄρχω*, meaning a preliminary offering from a greater whole.[126] Although the word *aparchai* has often been translated by modern commentators as 'first-fruits' in English,[127] etymologically it has no reference to agriculture and is more appropriately understood as 'first offerings' instead. *Aparchai* might be dedicated of agricultural produces,[128] of hunting and (sale of) animals,[129] of hair,[130] of booty,[131] of earnings from work,[132] of wealth,[133] and of proceeds from any other enterprises. Its cognate verb *aparchesthai*, apart from sacrificial usages discussed above, is also used in dedicatory practices to refer to the act of making first offerings to the gods using a part of a greater whole. It may be accompanied by a qualifying genitive expressing the source from which the dedications were made;[134] but the word may also be used absolutely without any indication of the source.[135]

Although *aparche* is most commonly used for dedications, in isolated instances the word also applies to sacrifice. In Euripides' lost play *Meleager*, whose subject is the fate of Oeneus' first wife Althaea and their son Meleager resulting from Oeneus' failure to offer *aparchai* of his harvest to Artemis, his action to the gods (save Artemis) is described as *θύειν ἀπαρχὰς*: 'Oeneus once took an abundant harvest from the land, and in sacrificing the first fruits...' (*Οἰνεύς ποτ' ἐκ γῆς πολύμετρον λαβὼν στάχυν θύων ἀπαρχάς...*). In this fragment the offering of *aparchai* is closely

[126] Parker (2004a), 275.
[127] E.g. LSJ s.v. *ἀπαρχή*, 2: 'firstlings for sacrifice or offering, first-fruits'.
[128] E.g. Eur. *Meleager*, fr. 516.
[129] E.g. *IG* I^3 828 (*ἀπαρχὴ ἄγρας*), Arr. *Cyn*. 33 (*ἀπαρχαὶ τῶν ἁλισκομένων*), *Anth. Pal*. 6. 196 (*ἀπαρχὴ ἄγρας*); cf. *SEG* XLVII 346 (*δεκάταν αἰγῶν*).
[130] E.g. Eur. *Or*. 96 (*ἀπαρχαὶ κόμης*), Eur. *Phoen*. 1525 (*χαίτας ἀπαρχαί*).
[131] E.g. Soph. *Trach*. 183 (*μάχης ἀπαρχαί*), 761 (*λείας ἀπαρχή*).
[132] E.g. *IG* I^3 628 (*ἔργον ἀπαρχή*), 695 (*ἔργον ἀπαρχή*).
[133] E.g. *IG* I^3 647 (*ἀπαρχὴ κτ[εά]νον*), *IG* II^2 3846 (*χρήμ[ατα] ἀπαρχή*), 4904 (*χρημ[άτων] ἀπαρχή*).
[134] E.g. *IG* I^3 730 (*κτεάνον μοῖραν ἀπαρσάμενος*), *IG* II^2 4320 (*[τέχνης] οἰκέας ἔρνος ἀπαρξάμ[ενος]*), 4334 (*μοῖραν ἀπαρξαμένη κτεάνων*), Hdt. 3.24.4 (*πάντων ἀπαρχόμενοι*).
[135] E.g. Theoph. *Char*. 10.3; see n. 49.

related to sacrifice.[136] In Soph. *Trach*., Heracles offers a literal hecatomb to the gods, a grand sacrifice of a hundred victims consisting of a mixed herd, of which twelve bulls are killed first as an *ἀπαρχὴ λείας*. We are told that 'he killed first his bulls, twelve perfect victims, the pick of the booty; then he brought the number to one hundred, driving a mixed herd to the altar' (*ταυροκτονεῖ μὲν δώδεκ' ἐντελεῖς ἔχων λείας ἀπαρχὴν βοῦς: ἀτὰρ τὰ πάνθ' ὁμοῦ ἑκατὸν προσῆγεσυμμιγῆ βοσκήματα*).[137] The word *aparche* may be understood in two senses here: the twelve bulls are the choicest and the first ones to be sacrificed to the gods among the one hundred animals; they also represent a portion of the revenue derived from Heracles' military enterprise. In both the Euripidean and Sophoclean passages, the word *aparche* refers to the sacrifice offered using part of a greater source of revenue, but not the part of the victims offered to the gods. There is no Classical example of *aparche* expressing the preliminary portion of sacrificial victims offered to the gods. The only available example in which the word *aparche* possibly refers to a portion of sacrificial flesh is a newly published *lex sacra* from the city of Patara in Lycia in the Hellenistic period, which requires worshippers who sacrifice to make an *aparche* from each animal to the priest: 'those who sacrifice to Zeus of Labraunda or to any of the gods in the precinct are to give to the priest an *aparche* from each victim *πλάτα ἴσον*' (*τοὺς θύοντας | Διὶ Λαβραύνδωι| ἢ τῶν ἐντεμενίων θεῶν τινι| διδόναι τῶι ἱερεῖ ἀπαρχήν| ἀφ' ἑκάστου ἱερε<ί>ου πλάτα ἴσον*).[138] However, it is

[136] Eur. *Meleager*, fr. 516 (tr. Collard and Cropp). It is unclear from this Euripidean fragment alone whether a blood or bloodless sacrifice is involved. But Hom. *Il*. 9.533-6 tells us that all other gods save Artemis enjoyed a hecatomb, which suggests that Oeneus' first offerings most probably consisted of animal sacrifices financed by the proceeds of his harvest.
[137] Soph. *Trach*. 760-2 (tr. Jameson).
[138] Engelmann ap. Schuler (2007), 134-5.

uncertain what the obscure phrase *πλάτα ἴσον* means.[139] The inscription is post Classical and its usage of the word *aparche* is untypical. In any case, the practice in question is different from the customary practice of taking a preliminary portion of hair or flesh to the gods denoted by the act of *aparchesthai*, as this Hellenistic *lex sacra* concerns priestly perquisites rather than the traditional portion for the gods.[140] The use of the word *aparche* in relation to cult payments is a different application in another phenomenon to which I will revert later; meanwhile it should be reiterated that there is no Classical example of the word *aparchai* being used to describe the first portion of sacrificial victims offered to the gods.

In some cases where there is no specification of the origin of an *aparche* (or its synonyms) by a qualifying genitive, the idea of a portion is less obvious and the word may resemble an 'offering' or *anathemata*. A fourth-century *aparche* dedicated by one Bacchios for being 'crowned by the members of his association' seems to be simply a dedication: *B]άχχιος τῆι Ἀθην[ᾶι] | τεῖ Ὀργάνηι ἀπαρχὴν | ἀνέθηκεν στεφανω-|θεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν θιασωτῶν* ('Bacchios dedicated an *aparche* to Athena Organe having been crowned by the members of his association').[141] There are many other examples where the word *aparche* is used without a genitive.[142] However, in the lack of contextual information (unlike in Bacchios' case), it is difficult to know whether the *aparche* is a first offering or simply an offering without a partial sense; and we cannot rule out the possibility that a genitive is implied and not made explicit.

[139] The suggestion in Engelmann ap. Schuler (2007), 135, 'die glatte Flache am Unterleib der Tiere' is far from certain.
[140] See n. 60.
[141] *IG* II^2 2939 = 4339; Parker (2004a), 275.
[142] E.g. *IG* I^3 526, 531, 547, 559, 566, 680, 696, 702, 731, 740, 834, 848, 872.

c) *ἀπάργματα*

While Homer uses *argmata*, in the Classical period we find *apargmata* instead of *argmata*. The word *apargmata* is used mostly in the plural[143] in the same sense as, but much less frequently than, *aparchai*. We have seen that Homer uses the word *argmata* in sacrifice only, but in Classical usages *apargmata* can be used in connection with both sacrificial and dedicatory practices. An example of the former can be found in the fifth-century *lex sacra* from Selinus. The inscription stipulates that, for the pure Tritopatores, a table and a couch are laid on which are placed olive wreaths, honey mixture in new cups, cakes, and meat. First portions are taken (presumably from the cakes and meat on the table) and burnt, and anointment is performed after the cups are placed (*κἀπαρξάμενοι κατακαάντο καὶ καταλινάντο τ̣ὰς ποτερίδας ἐνθέντες*) (lines 15-6). For Zeus Meilichios, worshippers are to take out the public *hiara*,[144] set out a table, and burn the thigh, the *apargmata* from the table, and the bones of a ram (*καὶ ϙολέαν καὶ τἀπὸ τᾶς τραπέζας : ἀπάργματα καὶ τὸστέα κα[τα]κᾶαι*) (lines 19-20).[145] We have here a *theoxenia* where food and drinks are set on a table before images of the divine. The act of *aparchesthai* in lines 15-16 and that of taking *apargmata* in line 19 are very likely to be related; and both rituals seem to involve taking samplings of the food on the table[146] and burning them as first offerings to the gods before the rest is consumed.[147]

---

[143] The singular *apargma* is used in e.g. *I. Histriae* 101 (see n. 62).
[144] On the public *hiara*, see Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski (1993), 21-23: public sacred objects, specifically public images; Lupu in *NGSL* 27, p. 378.
[145] *IGASMG* I^2 no. 53bis, *SEG* XLIII 630, *NGSL* 27.A. A full commentary is provided by Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski (1993), Dimartino (2003), Dubois (2003).
[146] On *trapezomata*, see Gill (1974).
[147] Here I follow Lupu's interpretation of the rituals in *NGSL* 27. On the act of *aparchesthai* here, see also Dubois (2003), 116: 'de ces aliments sera prélevée une partie à titre de prémices qui seront offerts en holocauste (*κἀπαρξάμενοι κατακαάντο*)'. Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski (1993) do not comment

The only appearance of the word in Classical literature is in Aristophanes' *Pax*. After Trygaeus has rescued the goddess Peace and a sacrifice is being prepared, the *chresmologos* Hierocles comes uninvited to claim a share: 'come now separate the first share and then give it to me' (*Ἄγε νυν ἀπάρχου κᾆτα δὸς τἀπάργματα*).[148] What the *apargmata* would have consisted of in this case is a matter of conjecture: they could have been a portion of the sacrificial flesh by analogy with the *argmata* in Eumaeus' sacrifice seen earlier, or they might have been a portion of the *splanchna* and the tongue which Hierocles shows much interest in.[149] The scholia on Ar. *Pax.* 1056 reports that *ἀπάργματα* are 'the *aparchai* which the priests are accustomed to take' (*τὰς ἀπαρχὰς, ἃς εἰώθασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς λαμβάνειν*).[150] Perhaps influenced by this view, Sommerstein and Olson explain that *apargmata* were offered to the gods and passed on to the priests.[151] However, as far as the Classical period is concerned, there is no evidence that *ἀπαρχαί* or *ἀπάργματα* for the gods would be passed on to the priests or diviners who officiated at the sacrifice. Where priests were allowed the portions intended for the gods, priestly perquisites were variously termed *ἱερεώσυνα, τραπεζώματα* and *γέρα*,[152] but never *ἀπάργματα* or *ἀπαρχαί* in the Classical period.[153] When Hierocles claims a share by saying *ἄγε νυν*

---

on what actions are involved in *aparchesthai* (lines 15-6) and taking *apargmata* (line 19).

[148] Ar. *Pax*. 1056 (tr. Sommerstein).

[149] Hom. *Od*. 14.446; Olson (1998), 270, thinks that the *apargmata* involve 'the god's share of the *splanchna* and the tongue, which were dedicated to the divinity and then passed on to his or her servant'.

[150] *Σ*^{VΓ}Ar. *Pax*. 1056.

[151] Sommerstein (1985), 183, Olson (1998), 270. See also Van Straten (1995), 122: '[Herokles] shows a particular interest in those parts of the victim that, at a sacrifice where a priest officiated, would normally fall to the priest'; but Van Straten does not say whether the *apargmata* in line 1056 are supposed to be priestly portions or not.

[152] E.g. *IG* II^2 1356, 1359, 1363, *LSAM* 24A, *IG* V.1 1390, *IG* XII.7 237, *SEG* XXXV 113, *SEG* LIV 214. On priestly prerogatives, see Gill (1974), p. 127-33, Le Guen-Pollet (1991), Van Straten (1995), 154-5.

[153] The only available piece of evidence which possibly speaks of first portions of sacrificial victims

ἀπάρχου κᾆτα δὸς τἀπάργματα, the comic effect is to dramatize his greed: the *chresmologoi* were a particular subject for ridicule in Aristophanes. Later in the same scene Hierocles is shown as trying to beg and then snatch unsuccessfully a portion of the wine, the *splanchna*, and the tongue.[154] Therefore the passage cannot be taken as evidence for a regular practice of giving *apargmata* or *aparchai* to religious officials. It is just another instance where Aristophanes makes a mockery of the greed of *chresmologoi* as *apargmata* were reserved for the gods alone: both *aparchesthai* and *apargmata* in Ar. *Pax*. 1056 refer to the god's share which should *not* go to religious officials.

There are a few attested instances of the word *apargma* in dedicatory inscriptions. A fragmentary roof tile discovered in Histria in Scythia Minor, dedicated to Aphrodite in the sixth century, is inscribed with the word *apargma*.[155] This is probably the earliest epigraphical attestation of the word; and it shows that the word is by no means confined to sacrificial uses. Two Attic vessels found in Ialysos on Rhodes are also inscribed with the word; and Martellin thinks that this word, rarely used elsewhere, may denote some local variant of the more common *aparche*.[156] We also have a fragmentary fifth-century dedicatory inscription on the Athenian acropolis that has been supplemented with the word *[ἄρ]γ̣ματα* or *[ἀπάρ]γ̣ματα*.[157]

---

given to the priests is the Hellenistic *lex sacra* in Engelmann ap. Schuler (2007), 134-5; but there are difficulties in using this text as discussed above.

[154] Ar. *Pax* 1099-1121. See also Ar. *Av*. 975-6, where another *chresmologos* desires the *splanchna*.

[155] *I. Histriae* 101, amended by Moretti (1983), 55-7 (=*SEG* XXXIII 582), *SEG* L 685, Bîrzescu (2005), 418, no. G8, *Kernos* 22 (2009), 217 no. 13. Moretti's interpretation of *apargma* as equivalent to *ἔργων ἀπαρχή*, an offering consisting of a part of the artisan's earnings ('offerta fatta con parte del guadagno che un artigiano ricava col suo lavoro') is problematic; in his footnote he quotes Lazzarini (1976), 88 (on the phrase *ἔργων ἀπαρχή*), but Lazzarini does not give such an explanation of *apargma*.

[156] *SEG* XXXVIII, 783d *(Ἀθαναίας ἄπαργμα Πείσιος ἀνέθεκε)*, f (*Βωλάκριτος ☒Ἀθαναίαι ☒ ἄπαργμα*); Martellin (1988), 114. Also quoted in Herda (2006), 244, n. 1739.

[157] *IG* I^3 703, *DAA* no. 284. Note that *IG* I^3 703 supplements *[ἄρ]γ̣ματα*, whereas *DAA* no. 284 has *[ἀπάρ]γ̣ματα*.

d) *κατάρχεσθαι*[158]

We saw earlier, in Nestor's sacrifice, that the act of *katarchesthai* involves hand-washing and sprinkling barley grains on the animal; the word is used with *χέρνιψ* and *οὐλοχύται* in the accusative.[159] However, in later Greek uses the word is more often followed by a genitive object,[160] meaning 'to begin a sacrifice' or more precisely 'to begin sacrificing (a particular victim)'. In post-Homeric usages it is not always clear what ritual procedures are comprised in *katarchesthai*, especially when the word is used absolutely without any qualifying objects. For example, Herodotus notes that the Scythian custom of sacrifice involves no rite of *katarchesthai*: the person performing the sacrifice throws the animal down by pulling the end of a rope, invokes the god, strangles the animal by twisting a rope around its neck; then he skins it and sets about cooking it. There is 'no fire nor preliminary rites of sacrifice nor libation' (*οὔτε πῦρ ἀνακαύσας οὔτε καταρξάμενος οὔτ' ἐπισπείσας*).[161] It is the absence of ritual beginning (*katarchesthai*) that Herodotus is remarking on when he compares Scythian and Greek sacrifices, but it is unclear what preliminary rites Herodotus has in mind.[162] The same ambiguity is found in other absolute usages of the word, where we can only tell that it means 'to begin a sacrifice' vaguely without knowing what precisely is involved.[163]

---

[158] The etymologically related word *προκατάρχεσθαι*, attested uniquely in the religious sense in Thuc. 1.25.4 and of disputed meaning, will not be discussed here.

[159] Hom. *Od.* 3.444-6.

[160] E.g. Hdt. 2.45 (*αὐτοῦ κατάρχεσθαι*), Ar. *Av.* 959 (*μὴ κατάρξῃ τοῦ τράγου*), Eur. *Phoen.* 573 (*κατάρχεσθαι θυμάτων*), Dem. 21.114 (*κατάρχεσθαι τῶν ἱερῶν*).

[161] Hdt. 4.60.

[162] Macan (1895-1908), 41, put it vaguely: 'no beginning with consecration'; How and Wells (1928), vol. 1, 326: burning of hair; Asheri, Lloyd and Corcella (2007), 626: 'the sprinkling of lustral water and scattering of barley-grains to consecrate the victim'.

[163] Absolute usages: e.g. Hdt. 4.103 (*καταρξάμενοι ῥοπάλῳ παίουσι τὴν κεφαλήν*); Asheri, Lloyd and Corcella (2007) do not comment on this word; Eur. *Heracl.* 529 (*στεμματοῦτε καὶ †κατάρχεσθ' εἰ δοκεῖ†*); And. 1.126 (*ἐκέλευον κατάρξασθαι τὸν Καλλίαν*); Ath. fr. 1.40-43

While the above Homeric usage of *katarchesthai* excludes the cutting of the hair, in Classical Greek literature there is one instance in which the word is applied explicitly to hair-offering. When Thanatos is about to take Alcestis to Hades, he thus explains his actions: 'I am going to her so as to begin the rites with the sword. The person is dedicated to the gods below the earth, [anyone] the hair of whose head this blade hallows' (*στείχω δ' ἐπ' αὐτὴν ὡς κατάρξωμαι ξίφει: ἱερὸς γὰρ οὗτος τῶν κατὰ χθονὸς θεῶν ὅτου τόδ' ἔγχος κρατὸς ἁγνίσῃ τρίχα*).[164] Here *katarchesthai*, followed by the instrumental dative *ξίφει*, obviously refers to the opening rite of cutting some hair using the sword.[165] However, in another Euripidean passage, a different preliminary rite is referred to. The word used for Iphigenia's priestly duty in Euripides' *Iphigenia Taurica* is *katarchesthai*: she is to perform the opening sacrificial rites of the ship-wrecked victims, but others perform the slaughtering.[166] By inference from her sacrificial role described elsewhere in the play, we know that *katarchesthai* involves the sprinkling of lustral water and possibly barley grains on the victim's head.[167] This coincides with the Homeric use of the

---

K.-A.: (*καταρχόμεθ' ἡμεῖς οἱ μάγειροι, θύομεν, σπονδὰς ποιοῦμεν*); Malay and Ricl (2009), p. 40, no. I.42-43 (*κατάρξετ[αι] ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ*).

[164] Eur. *Alc*. 74-6 (tr. L.P.E. Parker).

[165] Stengel (1908) denied that there is any question of a sacrifice here at all; Dale (1954), 58, considers the passage untypical in that the terminology of ordinary sacrificial ceremony is applied to the ceremony of death, with Thanatos as the officiating priest. L.P.E. Parker (2007), 67, translates line 74: 'to begin the rites with the sword'. Cf. LSJ s.v. *κατάρχω*, II.b, who cite this as an example where the word means 'sacrifice' or 'slay' (rather than 'to begin a sacrifice')

[166] The word occurs three times in relation to Iphigenia's priestly duty: Eur. *IT* 40, 56, 1154. On 'beginning the sacrifice' (*katarchesthai*) rather than slaughtering as the main function of the officiating priest, see also *SEG* LIV 214.32-3, *LSS* 19.31-32 = RO 37.31-32, MaCabe, *Teos Inscriptions*, no. 31.13 = Ma (1999), no. 18.13; but in these instances we are not told what preliminary rites precisely are involved in *katarchesthai*.

[167] Sprinkling of water: Eur. *IT* 53-4, 622; Platnauer (1938), 64, Cropp (2000), 175. On *katarchesthai* referring to the sprinkling of water, see also *IG* XII.4 278.32-3 (= *LSCG* 151.A.31-2, RO 62.A.31-2) (*κ[ατ]αρχονται θαλλῶι καὶ δάφναι*): here the opening sacrificial rites involve sprinkling water on the victim with the olive branch and laurel. Eur. *IT* makes no explicit mention of the scattering of barley grains on the victims' head; but the two acts (sprinkling water and scattering barley grains) were customarily performed together in Greek sacrifice: e.g. Hom. *Od*. 3.444-6, Ar. *Pax* 948-62, Ar. *Av*. 850, Eur. *IA* 1568-9, Burkert (1985[1977]), 56, Van Straten (1995), 31-40. Note also the noun *κατάργματα*

word discussed earlier.

These different usages have led to scholarly disputes of what the act of *katarchesthai* entails precisely.[168] It seems to me that the word *katarchesthai* involves no fixed action, and that the preliminary ritual procedure(s) can vary in different sacrificial contexts. Yet the most important distinction between *katarchesthai* and *aparchesthai* is that *aparchesthai* ('taking a portion from a greater whole') can apply to any stage of the sacrifice and any portion (whether hair or flesh, raw or cooked) of the sacrificial victims, whereas *katarchesthai* applies only to the pre-killing stage of the sacrifice and therefore never refers to the sacrificial flesh. Nevertheless, sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between *katarchesthai* and *aparchesthai*. When Aristophanes' Dicaeopolis tells his daughter to put down the basket so that they may begin the sacrifice (*ἵν' ἀπαρξώμεθα*), the word used is *aparchesthai* where we might expect *katarchesthai*.[169] By contrast, Euripides uses *katarchesthai* in connection with the cutting of Alcestis' hair, where we would expect *aparchesthai*.[170] Therefore, when used absolutely in sacrificial contexts, sometimes the words *katarchesthai* and *aparchesthai* seem to intersect or coincide.[171] But when followed

---

in Eur. *IT* 244: *χέρνιβας δὲ καὶ κατάργματα οὐκ ἂν φθάνοις ἂν εὐτρεπῆ ποιουμένη* 'you cannot be too soon preparing your lustrations and consecrations' (tr. Cropp). Here *κατάργματα* seem to refer to barley grain; but this word is otherwise unattested in the Classical period (later in Plut. *Thes*. 22.5) and it is not clear what it signifies precisely. LSJ s.v. *κατάργματα*, explain it as 'first offerings', whereas the commentary in Cropp (2000), 191 takes into account both barley-grain scattering and hair-cutting. Etymologically related to *κατάρχεσθαι* and *κατάργματα* is the noun *καταρχή*, attested in religious use only in the fragmentary *IG* II^2 1359 (= *LSCG* 29), and its meaning remains obscure. LSJ s.v. *καταρχή*. III, explain this as 'the part of the victim first offered'; but the fact that the word is derived from *katarchesthai* (a pre-killing rite) makes it unlikely that the victim's flesh is involved, unless the hair is meant, which is unlikely in this context as a priestly portion.

[168] Hair-cutting: Hsch. s.v. *κατάρξασθαι τοῦ ἱερείου· τῶν τριχῶν ἀποσπάσαι*; LSJ s.v. *κατάρχω*, II.2.a; Parker (2005), 97 n. 25. Lustration and scattering of grains only: Stengel (1908). Hair-cutting, lustration, and scattering of grains: Denniston (1939), 148, Jameson (1949), 56, Dunbar (1995), 541-2, on Ar. *Av*. 959.

[169] Ar. *Ach*. 244.

[170] Eur. *Alc*. 74-6.

[171] Absolute use: *katarchesthai*: e.g. Hdt. 4.60, 103, Andoc. 1.126 (see n. 70); *aparchesthai*: e.g. Ar. *Ach*. 244.

by a genitive object the former usually means to perform an initial act - whatever it may be in the pre-killing stage - to the sacrificial victim,[172] while the latter means to offer a preliminary portion of a greater whole.[173]

e) *ἀκροθίνιον*

The word is not used in Homer; it appears in the Classical period in the singular *ἀκροθίνιον* and more frequently in the plural *ἀκροθίνια*. Etymologically it is derived from *ἄκρος* ('topmost') and *θίς* ('heap'), indicating a choice-offering from the top of a heap. The singular forms *ἀκρόθις* and *ἀκροθίνιον* appear to have the same meaning. The word *ἀκρόθινα* is the accusative singular of *ἀκρόθις*; it is also a variant of *ἀκροθίνια* (the neuter plural of *ἀκροθίνιον*). [174]

Contrary to the scholia on Eur. *Phoen*. 203, which explain the *ἀκροθίνια Λοξίᾳ* as 'properly first-fruits of crops, from the heap, which is the heap of the threshing floor; first offerings of spoils too are wrongly described so' (*ἀκροθίνια Λοξίᾳ: κυρίως αἱ τῶν καρπῶν ἀπαρχαί, παρὰ τὸν θῖνα, ὅ ἐστι τὸν σωρὸν τῆς ἅλωνος· καταχρηστικῶς δὲ οὕτως λέγονται καὶ αἱ ἀπαρχαὶ τῆς λείας*),[175] the word *ἀκροθίνιον* applies predominately to spoils and rarely to agricultural produce. It is frequently used for spoils in military contexts, where it may be understood as 'first offerings of wars' or 'the best of the spoils',[176] whereas the less

[172] *Katarchesthai* with a genitive object: see n. 67.
[173] *Aparchesthai* with a genitive object: e.g. Hdt. 4.61, 4.188, Eur. *El*. 91.
[174] *Ἀκρόθις:* e.g. Pind. *Ol*. 2.4, 10.57; RO no.1.D.47. See also Lazzarini (1976), 93-4; LSJ s.v. *ἀκροθίνια*, s.v. *ἀκρόθις*, Parker (2004a), 275.
[175] Schol. Eur. *Phoen*. 203. Cf. Hsch. s.v. *ἀκροθίνιον*, Phot. s.v. *ἀκροθίνια* (= Suda s.v. *ἀκροθίνια)*, Etym. Magn. s.v. *ἀκροθίνια*, all of which recognize the various applications (agricultural and military) of the word.
[176] E.g. Hdt. 1.86, 1.90, 8.121, 8.122, Thuc. 1.132.

common verb *ἀκροθινιάζομαι* refers to the act of 'taking first offerings from the spoils'.[177] Examples abound of military *ἀκροθίνια*: Pindar describes the Olympic festival as the *ἀκρόθινα πολέμου* established by Herakles.[178] The Athenian treasury at Delphi has a base which bears this inscription: *Ἀθεναῖοι τ[ῶ]ι Ἀπόλλον[ι ἀπὸ Μέδ]ον ἀκ[ροθ]ίνια τες Μαραθ[ῶ]νι μ[άχες]* ('the Athenians to Apollo [from the Med]es as first offerings from the battle of Marathon').[179] The captive Phoenician women describe themselves as *ἀκροθίνια Λοξίαι*, chosen by the city as a most beautiful offering for Loxias.[180] Although taken predominantly from battles, *akrothinia* could also come from other activities. A third-century dedicatory inscription from Elateia describes the offering as *ἐξ ὁσίων ἔργων ἀκροθίν[ιον].*[181] Later Diodorus Siculus speaks of the *akrothinia* of Acteon's hunt (*ἀκροθινίων ἐκ τῶν κυνηγίων*).[182]

Akrothinia may also take the form of sacrifice. A law of the gentilicial group of the Labyadai at Delphi in the fifth or fourth century has a reference to an *ἀκρόθις* to Apollo: 'these are the sacrifices of the Labyadai: in the month Apellaios to Dionysos, at the feast of the Boukatia to Zeus Patroos and the first offering to Apollo' (*ταίδε θυσίαι Λαβυαδᾶν· τὠπελλαίου μηνὸς τῶ<ι> Διονύσωι, Βουκατίοις τῶι Δὶ πατρώιωι καὶ τὠπόλλωνι τὰν ἀκρόθινα*).[183] Here *ἀκρόθις* seems to be used in the general sense of a preliminary offering without reference to spoils, but it is unclear

[177] E.g. Eur. *HF* 476.
[178] Pind. *Ol*. 2.4. cf. Pind. *Ol*. 10.57-8.
[179] *IG* I^3 1463 B, ML 19. Cf. Paus. 10.11.5-6.
[180] Eur. *Phoen*. 202-15, at 203.
[181] *IG* IX.1 131.
[182] Diod. Sic. 4.81.4.
[183] RO no. 1.D.43-47 (adapted from RO's translation, which has 'first-fruits' instead). On sacrificial usage, see also Aes. *Eum*. 834-6 (*τἀκροθίνια θύη*).

what it entails. Following Homolle, Rougemont puts it vaguely as 'les prémices'.[184] If it refers to agricultural offerings as Lazarrini suggests,[185] it would be an interesting instance where it means 'top of a heap (of wheat or barley)' as *Schol*. Eur. Phoen. 203 explains it. The word can also apply to human victims: Croesus is referred to as the *akrothinion* which Cyrus intends to sacrifice to some god either to fulfill a vow or to test if any god would come to Croesus' rescue.[186] In Euripides' *Iphigenia Taurica*, Orestes and Pylades are referred to as *Ἑλλήνων ἀκροθίνια*, probably meaning the choicest offerings from the Greeks.[187]

f) *δεκάτη*

A *δεκάτη* is literally a tithe or a tenth part.[188] In its religious applications the word refers most frequently to a tithe offered voluntarily to the gods; it can also refer to a payment levied on certain activities (such as sacred land use) paid to the gods.[189] The word is also used widely in secular taxations, customs duties and other non-religious payments; but its secular usages do not concern us here.[190] Like *akrothinion*, it is most frequently used for offerings of a military nature;[191] but *dekatai* could also be offered from agricultural produce,[192] (sale of) animals,[193] (profits of) a voyage,[194] work,[195] wealth,[196] and other activities; and they could be in

---

[184] Homolle (1895), 61, Rougemont (1977-), no. 9, p. 82, 85. Homolle thus explained *τὰν ακρόθινα*: 'de dessus du tas, les prémices, et particulièrement la dîme des fruits des récoltes, offerts aux dieux'.
[185] Lazzarini (1976), 93; see also RO no. 1, which translates the word as 'first-fruits'.
[186] Hdt. 1.86.2.
[187] Eur. *IT* 459.
[188] LSJ s.v. *δέκατος* II, Lazzarini (1976), 90-3, Parker (2004a), 275.
[189] See Chapter Eight.
[190] On public finance, see e.g. Boeckh (1828), Andreades (1933), Samons (2000), Bresson (2007-8), vol. 2, ch. 3, Rhodes et al. (forthcoming).
[191] E.g. Hdt. 5.77, 8.27, 9.81, Lys. 20.24, Xen. *Ages*. 1.34.
[192] E.g. *IG* I^3 800 (*δεκάτη χοριόω*), Xen. *An*. 5.3.13.
[193] E.g. *SEG* XXVI.451 (*δεκάτη αἰγῶν*), *IG* IV^2.1 123.24 ([*δεκάτη*] *τᾶς ἐμπολᾶς τῶν ἰχθύων*).
[194] E.g. *TAM* II, 1184 (*ἀπὸ ναυτιλίας δεκάτη*).
[195] E.g. *IG* XIV 643 (*Fέργον δεκάτη*).

kind or in cash.[197] In dedicatory inscriptions the word usually appears in the accusative with a qualifying genitive indicating the source from which the tithe was taken; but in isolated examples we also find *dekate* expressed in the genitive. A sixth-century dedication from Thebes reads: *Μάντικλός μ'ανέθεκε Ϝεκαβόλοι ἀργυροτόξσοι τᾶς {δ}δε⁞κάτας· τὺ δέ, Φοῖβε, δίδοι χερίϜεττᾰν ἀμοιβ[άν]* ('Mantiklos dedicated me to the Far-Shooter, the Silver-Bowed one, from his tithe; do you, Phoibos, give him a gracious return').[198] The dedicator probably wanted to express the fact that the object was made from a tithe. The word occurs predominantly in dedicatory rather than sacrificial contexts. Contrary to Chantraine's explanation that the word is 'employé notamment à l'occasion de sacrifices ou en matière fiscale',[199] *dekatai* is never used to describe sacrificial victims or parts of the victims offered to the gods, although sacrifices might be performed using a tithe of the proceeds from an activity.[200]

g) *δεκατεύειν*

The cognate verb *δεκατεύειν* normally means to offer a tithe from a greater whole. This act usually applies to goods, revenue, booty or agricultural produce.[201] In isolated instances this verb also applies to a city, and in a special usage to a person.

Since the application of the word to cities carries different connotations vis-à-vis

---

[196] E.g. *IG* I^3 698 (*δεκάτη τὰρ{ν}γυρίου*), 779 (*δε[κάτεν ἔργον] καὶ χρεμάτ̣ο̣ν*), Hdt. 4.152.4 (*δεκάτη τῶν ἐπικερδίων*).

[197] E.g. Xen. *Hell*. 4.3.21, Xen. *Ages*. 1.34: in 394 B.C. Agesilaus offered in Delphi a tithe of his booty, an offering of not less than 100 talents (*δεκάτην τῶν ἐκ τῆς λείας τῷ θεῷ ἀπέθυσεν οὐκ ἐλάττω ἑκατὸν ταλάντων*). The large sum makes it likely that the offering was in the form of money rather than a sacrifice. Pritchett (1974-), vol. 1, 96, takes this tithe as a sum of money. Cf. LSJ s.v. *ἀποθύω*: 'offer up as a votive sacrifice'.

[198] *CEG* 326, Lazzarini (1976), no. 795, Parker (2004a), 277, no. 30 (tr. Parker). See also *IG* VII, 2456 = Lazzarini (1976), no. 684.

[199] Chantraine (1968-80), vol. 1, 259 s.v. *δεκάτη*.

[200] E.g. Xen. *An*. 5.3.13 (*δεκάτην καταθύειν*).

[201] LSJ s.v. *δεκατεύω*. I. 'exact tithe from'; e.g. Hdt. 1.89, Xen. *An*. 5.3.9.

its usual usages, it deserves some attention here. According to Herodotus, the Greeks swore an oath before Thermopylae during the Persian Wars, 'to tithe all the Greeks who had surrendered to the Persians without compulsion to the god in Delphi after the successful conclusion of the war' (*ὅσοι τῷ Πέρσῃ ἔδοσαν σφέας αὐτοὺς Ἕλληνες ἐόντες, μὴ ἀναγκασθέντες, καταστάντων σφι εὖ τῶν πρηγμάτων, τούτους δεκατεῦσαι τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖσι θεῷ*).[202] Some commentators understand *dekateuein* as the usual practice of dedicating a tenth of the goods or property to the god with no further penalty exacted.[203] However, normal tithing of property is considered by others as too mild in this context. By analogy of the treatment of traitors or the defeated in other historical accounts,[204] How and Wells argued that a graver consequence must have been involved: the total destruction of the cities with the sale of the population into slavery and the confiscation of all goods and lands, and from all the proceeds a tenth would be dedicated to the god.[205] On this view, the word still retains the usual meaning of giving the gods a tenth of a greater whole; yet the act of tithing implies the total destruction and confiscation - but not total dedication - of the cities. The difficulties in defining what the 'tithing' of a city involves are illustrated well in a late source: Livy tells us that Camillus vowed to Apollo a tithe of the spoils in the event of successfully taking the city of Veii. However, not only were the people reluctant to discharge their obligation, there were also disagreements in the senate as

[202] Hdt. 7.132 (adapted from Waterfield's translation); cf. Lycurg. *Leoc*. 81.6, Diod. Sic. 11.3, 11.29. There are uncertainties concerning the time, the terms, and the historicity of this Hellenic oath; summarized in Walbank (1957-79), vol. 2, 180-2, on Polyb. 9.39.5.

[203] Rawlinson (1862), vol. 4, 92: 'take a tithe of their goods'; Godley (1926-38), vol. 3, 435, put it vaguely: 'dedicate to the god of Delphi the possessions of all Greeks'; Waterfield (1998), 448: 'to have a tenth of their property made over to the god of Delphi'; LSJ s.v. *δεκατεύω*. I, quoting Hdt. 7.132: 'make them pay a tithe to Apollo', but LSJ do not explain what this tithe involves.

[204] E.g. Hdt. 1.89 (Cyrus' capture of Sardis), Xen. *Hell*. 1.7.10, 20 (Athenian generals after Arginusae), Liv. 5.21, 23, 25 (Camillus' capture of Veii).

[205] How and Wells (1928), vol. 2, 178. This view was already expressed by Macan (1895-1908): wholesale destruction and spoliation from which a tenth is given to the god and the nine-tenths are retained.

to whether the tithe should be of movables only, or of the captured city and its territory.[206] Regardless of the precise treatment of the medizing cities in this Hellenic oath, in both interpretations the word *dekateuein* still means the taking of a tenth of whatever profits that were derived while the rest was retained.

That δεκατεύειν might be synonymous with 'to destroy' by the fourth century has been argued at length by Parke. Xenophon twice uses the word δεκατευθῆναι in connection with Thebes: in the renewal of the peace in 371B.C., the Athenians hoped that the Thebans would be subject to δεκατευθῆναι. Again in 369 B.C., the Spartan ambassadors suggested that Thebes could δεκατευθῆναι should Athens and Sparta collaborate; and the suggestion revived in the Athenian assembly the memory of the Theban proposal to destroy Athens in 404 B.C.[207] These two passages seem to hint at some rather savage treatment of the Thebans. Instead of simply 'taking a tithe from' Thebes, Parke argues that the city itself would have been treated as a tithe and 'consecrated' to the gods in its entirety through its total destruction.[208] Accordingly, *dekateuein* would effectively signify 'to destroy' or 'to decimate' completely without its usual partial connotation. Parke does not discuss the treatment of the spoils following the destruction. It is possible that in penal tithing the word has a more serious connotation of total devastation. The rhetoric of 'tithing' a city illustrates how a religious pretext might be sought for a secular act of vengeance.

There is an interesting extension of the word δεκατεύειν to female rites of maturation: a fragment of Harpocration adduces a lost speech of Demosthenes *Against Medon* (a case which seems to have concerned an heiress) as mentioning *οὐ*

[206] Liv. 5.21.1, 23.8-12, 25.4-13.
[207] Xen. *Hell*. 6.3.20, 6.5.35, cf. Polyb. 9.39.5.
[208] Parke (1948), *passim*.

δεκατεῦσαι ταύτην οὐδὲ μυῆσαι, literally 'not to tithe her nor to initiate her'. Harpocration then cites Didymus as saying that *δεκατεύειν* is equivalent to *ἀρκτεύειν* ('to serve as a bear').[209] The ritual in question is a female rite of passage at the cult of Artemis at Brauron and Mounichia, in which Attic girls imitated the bear (*ἀρκτεύειν*) before marriage and were said to be consecrated to Artemis.[210] Accordingly *dekateuein* here probably means 'to consecrate her [to serve as a bear] as a tithe'. But in what sense may *arkteuein* be considered as analogous to *dekateuesthai*? Hesychius and the *Etym. Magn.* similarly explain *dekateuein* as a female ritual related to Artemis, performed when maidens were about ten years old: 'they also called *arkteuein dekateuein*, since maidens who were around the age of ten performed it' (*ἔλεγον δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀρκτεύειν δεκατεύειν, ἐπεὶ ἔπρασσον αὐτὸ αἱ παρθένοι περὶ τὸν δεκαετῆ χρόνον οὖσαι*).[211] Yet this association between *dekateuein* and *dekatos chronos* is misleading: there is evidence which suggests that maidens who underwent this rite came from a wide age-range.[212] In fact the use of the word *dekateuein* has no relation to the age of ten. A possible way of seeing *arkteuein* as equivalent to *dekateuesthai* is that both cases involve a chosen portion. Although most sources imply that no Athenian girl might marry before she had become a bear in Artemis' service, it is by now generally agreed that only selected girls could participate.[213] It is possible that the girls chosen for the *arkteia* represented all the maidens. In this special usage, as in its normal applications, the act of *dekateuein*

[209] Didymus ap. Harp. s.v. *δεκατεύειν*; LSJ s.v. *δεκατεύω*. III. '= *ἀρκτεω*'; Parker (2005), 233 and n. 71.
[210] On the *arkteia*, see Cole (1984a), 238ff, Brulé (1987), ch. 2, Faraone (2003), Parker (2005), 228-48.
[211] Hsch. s.v. *δεκατεύειν*; see similarly *Etym. Magn*. s.v. *δεκατεύειν*: *Λέγεται δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀρκτεύειν· ἐπειδὴ ἐθεράπευον τὴν Ἄρτεμιν αἱ παρθένοι περὶ τὸν δέκατον χρόνον* ('[*dekateuein*] is also called *arkteuein*; since maidens served Artemis around the age of ten').
[212] Parker (2005), esp. 234-5.
[213] Vidal-Naquet (1986), 146, Sourvinou-Inwood (1988b), 116, Parker (2005), esp. 233-4, Parker (2011), 204.

involves a part of a greater whole.

h) *δέκατος*

The Cyrene Cathartic Law in the late fourth century has a special usage of the adjective *dekatos*. As is characteristic of most *leges sacrae*, it assumes prior knowledge about the cult practice in question which we do not possess. The law contains a series of clauses about individuals or property which are *dekatoi*. There are recurrent references to purification required of a person or property and of the shrine, valuation of the person or property, a penalty sacrifice, followed by the sacrifice of the tithe itself. The adjective *dekatos* here may be understood as 'subject to payment of a tithe';[214] yet what the nature of these tithes was and under what circumstance they were acquired is extremely obscure. These tithes appear to be closely related to pollution and penalties; but it is uncertain whether a tithe was a consequence of pollution, or whether failure to pay a tithe resulted in pollution.[215] What seems likely is that we have here not the normal tithes voluntarily offered to the gods, but obligations or punishments incurred under particular circumstances.

[214] LSJ s.v. *δεκατος, ή, όν*: 'tithed, i.e. subject to payment of one-tenth of one's substance'.

[215] *SEG* IX 72, *LSS* 115. See commentary and bibliography in Parker (1983), 332-51, RO no. 97. Recently, by comparison with mythical traditions of marginal groups sent on colonizing expedition by Delphic Apollo, Robertson (2010), ch. 20, argues that pollution results from intermarriage with newcomers from Libya, and that pollution is the cause (not result) of being tithed. His position is tenuous as it does not explain why property could be *dekatos* and why a boy could be voluntarily or involuntarily polluted. Nor is it the case that all 'tithed' people sent to found colonies were social outcasts.

i) *ἐπάρχεσθαι* and *ἐπαρχή*

Homer uses the word *eparchesthai* in connection with preliminary rituals of drinking;[216] after Homer, the word *eparchesthai* and its cognate verb *eparche* were used in another context with very different connotations. In the Classical and Hellenistic periods, the words *eparche* and *eparchesthai*, along with *aparche* and *aparchesthai*, were used in cult finance to signify 'a religious payment' (often in cash, occasionally in kind) and 'to make a religious payment' to the gods. In *leges sacrae* the words may be used in connection with cult fees, taxes, and contributions required of individuals or groups to increase sacred revenue. As we shall see in Chapter Eight, there were two major types of *a/eparchai*: first, cult fees payable for the use of cult utilities and services such as for sacrificing and healing;[217] and second, obligatory contributions imposed on certain groups of individuals such as office-holders and land-holders.[218] It is in the first context, that of cult fees for religious service, that the word *aparche* is used in the above-mentioned Hellenistic *lex sacra* from Patara in Lycia: apparently it refers to a portion of sacrificial flesh payable by those who sacrifice to the priest as a payment, but not to the customary preliminary portions set aside for the gods.[219] As far as cult fees and taxes are concerned, both forms

---

[216] In Homeric drinking rituals, the word *ἐπάρχεσθαι* means 'to pour the first drops (into the cups) before a libation'. The word is used seven times in Homer and always appears in the formula *ἐπάρχεσθαι δεπάεσσιν*, an expression not found in later Greek literature. The rituals seem to be that a wine-pourer would pour the first drops into the cup of each participant (*ἐπάρχεσθαι*), to be poured out again as a libation (*σπένδειν*) to the gods before each cup was filled a second time for drinking (*πίνειν*). A partial sense is present in the Homeric *eparchesthai*, as it signifies the offering of a first portion of a greater whole (of wine). See Hom. *Il.* 1.471, 9.176, *Od*. 3.340, 7.183, 18.418, 21.263, 21.272. See also LSJ s.v. *ἐπάρχεσθαι* II.1.

[217] Sacrifice: e.g. Engelmann ap. Schuler (2007), 134-5 (Hellenistic), *LSCG* 88 (c. 230?), Parker and Obbink (2000), no. 1.10-12 (c. 125?) (= *SEG* L 766), Parker and Obbink (2001), no. 4A (1st century) (=*SEG* LI 1066), *LSS* 72 (1st century). Healing: Petrakos (1997), nos. 276 (= *LSS* 35), 277 (= RO 27).

[218] E.g. *SEG* XVI 182 (early 4th century, women getting married), Xen. *An*. 5.3.13.(4th century, tenants of sacred land), *LSCG* 134 = *IG* XII.3 436 (4th century, possibly tenants of sacred land), *IG* II^2 1215 (early 3rd century, office-holders), Parker and Obbink (2000), no.1 (c.125?, freedmen, fishermen, shipowners) (= *SEG* L 766), Parker and Obbink (2001), no. 6.85-88 (early 2nd century, contractors) (=*SEG* LI 1062).

[219] Engelmann ap. Schuler (2007), 134-5.

aparche/aparchesthai and *eparche/eparchesthai* are used; and in some instances both forms appear concurrently in the same text.[220] But it is only in the context of cult finance, and never in sacrificial or dedicatory practices, that the forms *eparchai* and *eparchesthai* appear. The confusion between the similar-sounding *aparchai*/*aparchesthai* and *eparchai*/*eparchesthai* may be facilitated by the presence of the word *eparchesthai* in Homer, where it is used in connection with a very different ritual, namely that of drinking, which is not relevant to us here.[221]

I mentioned in the introductory chapter that the words *aparche* and *aparchesthai* carry two connotations: a portion of a greater whole, and a preliminary offering expressing the priority of the gods. We have seen that the two notions are present in both sacrificial and dedicatory applications of the words, that is, except in some cases where *aparche* is used without a qualifying genitive and has a general sense of *anathema* or offering'. It is only in the last usage, in the sphere of sacred finance, that notions both of the 'preliminary' and the 'portion' are absent altogether in the words *a/eparche* and *a/eparchesthai*. These *a/eparchai* and acts of *a/eparchesthai* are markedly different from the traditional *aparchai* and *aparchesthai* in two respects: most of them are obligatory payments rather than occasional voluntary gifts to the gods;[222] they are simply 'offerings' or 'cult payments' rather than 'first part offerings', with a much weakened connotation of 'first portion'. There seems to be a diminished awareness of the partial connotation of the word over time, as reflected in the replacement of the prefix *apo* with *epi*. Nevertheless the word *a/eparche* still retains its religious character in cult finance: unlike *dekate*, which may signify a secular

[220] E.g. *IG* I^3 130.7 (*aparche*), 18 (*eparche*), *IG* II^2 1672.182 (*eparche*), 263 (*eparche*), 288 (*eparche*), 297 (*aparche*).
[221] See n. 123.
[222] Not all payments of *a/eparchai* are compulsory: e.g. the *eparchai* in *CID* II 1, 3, 4 are voluntary contributions for re-building the temple of Apollo in Delphi (see Chapter Eight).

payment, the word *a/eparche* is used invariably with a religious significance.

III. *Aparchai* and *Dekatai*

Although I shall refer to both *aparchai* and *dekatai* (and related offerings such as *apargmata* and *akrothinia*) as 'first offerings' throughout this study, I should point out several identifiable differences between the two words. While both *aparchai* and *dekatai* are part offerings that may be taken from a variety of sources, *dekate* is used predominantly (but not exclusively) of first offerings of spoils, whereas only rarely does *aparche* apply to military offerings.[223] Compared to *dekate*, the word *aparche* carries a greater sense of beginning or priority because of its root *ἄρχω*. More importantly, *dekate* is often used in a purely secular sense, such as in relation to taxation and other non-religious payments, whereas *aparche* is used invariably with a religious significance: not even in the context of sacred finance does it lose its religious character.

The most important distinction between *aparchai* and *dekatai* lies in their proportion: an *aparche* is a random proportion not normally specified, whereas a *dekate* is literally a tenth, though we do not know if every instance of a *dekate* was necessarily a real tenth. A joint dedication on the Athenian acropolis in the late sixth century is illuminating in this respect. The monument consists of two statues of difference sizes on the same rectangular marble base, representing an *aparche* and a *dekate* dedicated by Lysias and Euarchis respectively. The statue base is thus inscribed: *Λυσίας ἀνέθεκεν Ἀθεναίαι | ἀπαρχέν. Εὐάρχις ἀνέθεκεν | δεκάτεν Ἀθεναίαι* ('Lysias dedicated to Athena an *aparche*. Euarchis dedicated a *dekate* to

[223] E.g. Soph. *Trach*. 183 (*μάχης ἀπαρχαί*), 761 (*λείας ἀπαρχή*).

Athena').[224] On top of the base are two round cuttings for two marble statues. It is generally agreed that the under-life-size *kore* Acr. no. 683 once stood in the larger cutting on the viewer's right-hand-side, whereas the cutting on the left, with its diameter just over half of that of the other cutting, most probably held another much smaller *kore* which is now lost.[225] Following Keesling, if we view both the inscription and the statues from left to right, it would seem that the smaller *kore* on the left represents the *aparche* by Lysias, and the bigger one on the right represents the *dekate* by Euarchis. The pair of statues appear to have been arranged in a way that would encourage the viewer to compare their different sizes. Keesling suggests plausibly that Lysias and Euarchis might have commissioned their offering from the same source but in different amounts and proportions, with Lysias' *aparche* constituting a smaller sum and percentage than Euarchis' tithe.

In most cases *aparchai* denote an unspecified and perhaps random portion; but there are several examples where an *aparche* appears to be a tenth. We have a sixth-century dedication in Didyma, by which a dedicator 'made a first-offering of a tenth of the spoil to Ap[ollo]' (*[--]ης ἀπήρ{σ}ξατο ληίης δεκάτην τõι Ἀπ[όλλωνι]*).[226] Here the verb *aparchesthai* is an equivalent of *dekateuein* and refers to the act of offering a tenth. A dedication in Delos in the late third or early second century is thus inscribed: *βασιλεῖ Ὀσείριδι | Κτησίας Ἀπο<λ>λοδώρου | Τήνιος ἀπαρχὴν | ἀπὸ τῆς ἐργασίας δεκάτην* ('to King Osiris Ktesias son of

[224] *IG* I^3 644, *DAA* no. 292; Payne (1936), pl. 59.1-3, Raubitschek (1939-40), 24-5, Holtzmann (2003), 60, Keesling (2003), 9-10, 106.
[225] This would also explain the inverse gesture of the *kore* Acr. no. 683: it had her right foot stepping forward instead of her left, the inverse of the normal pose of *korai* on the Athenian acropolis. It was most probably a mirror image of the smaller *kore* to its right, which was probably in the normal pose. The gesture of Acr. no. 683 is discussed in Holtzmann (2003), 60, Keesling (2003), 106.
[226] Tuchelt (1970), 56, 117 K 9 bis fig. 24 pl. 14, Jeffery, *LSAG*^{2}, 473, Lazzarini (1976), no. 692.

Apollodoros from Tinos (dedicated) an *aparche* and a *dekate* from his work').[227] This *aparche* probably happened to be a tenth, hence the *phiale* was simultaneously identified as an *aparche* and a *dekate*. This also seems to be the case with a (probably fabricated) *phiale* which was described in the Lindian Chronicle as both a *dekate* and an *aparche*: *[Σολεῖς] Ἀθάναι Λινδί[αι] δεκάταν καὶ ἀπαρχὰν λαίας* ('[Soloians] to Athena Lindi[a] a tenth and an *aparche* of booty').[228]

In some cases at least, there is information that a *dekate* was a literal tenth. In Demosthenes' *Against Timocrates*, the speaker attacked a law introduced by Timocrates that sought to protect the Athenian ambassadors who held onto the plunder of a merchant ship captured off the Egyptian coast. He claimed that this law would deprive the gods of the *dekate* due to Athena and the *pentekoste* (fiftieth) to the other gods. As the word *dekate* is used in juxtaposition to *pentekoste*, it must represent a real tenth of the value of the plunder.[229] We also have a rare example of an *εἰκοστή* (a twentieth) to Apollo Delphinios in c. 500 B.C.: a black-glazed *kylix* in Olbia has the graffito *[Ἀπόλλωνι Δε]λφινίωι εἰκοστή*.[230] Interestingly enough, in Republican Rome two individuals dedicated a twentieth part of Apollo: *M. Mindios L. fi.,* ׀ *P. Condetios Va. fi.,* ׀ *aidiles, vicesma parti* ׀ *Apolones dederi*.[231] Nevertheless, where the word *dekate* is used in dedicatory inscriptions, we do not know if the offering necessarily involved a literal tenth in all instances. We cannot rule out the possibility that some individuals might have used the word *dekate* to signify a part offering without entailing a tenth part exactly measured.

---

227 *IG* XI.4 1248.
228 *Lindos* II, no. 2.C.77 (adapted from Higbie's translation).
229 Dem. 24.120, 129. See also Justin, *Epit*. 20.3, where Croton and Locri vowed a (real) tenth and a ninth of the spoils respectively to Apollo in the event of a military victory (see Chapter Six).
230 Lazzirini (1976), no. 703, Dubois (1996), no. 64, Parker (2004a), 275.
231 *ILLRP* 51, *ILS* 3216.

Finally it is worth mentioning an interesting example, a fragmentary fifth-century dedicatory inscription on the Athenian acropolis: *[--------14--------]ος Ἀθεναίαι τόδ' ἀπαρχὲν / [εὐχσάμενος δεκά]τεν παιδὶ Διὸς μεγάλο* ('[----------]os to Athena this as an *aparche*, [having vowed a *deka*]*te* to the child of Great Zeus').[232] If the supplement is correct, the individual was dedicating an *aparche* after having vowed a tithe to Athena. This might be similar to the dedications at Delo and Didyma discussed above, where the dedicator used the word *aparche/aparchesthai* (which happened to involve a tenth) as an equivalent of *dekate/dekateuein*. Alternatively, one wonders whether the dedicator here could not after all afford the tenth part promised and offered instead a random, and perhaps smaller, portion. If this is the case, it raises the possibility that not every offering made in fulfillment of a vow to give a *dekate* would necessarily be a literal tenth; and in the absence of contextual information, only the dedicator would have knowledge of whether his *dekate* was a real tenth or not.

IV. Sacrificial and Dedicatory Applications of the Terms

This semantic survey of the use of *aparchai*, *aparchesthai* and related terms shows that the vocabularies of 'first offerings' could be used in relation to sacrifice, dedications, hair-offerings from humans, and sacred finance. Particularly interesting and noteworthy is the fact that the word *aparchesthai* can apply to both sacrificial and dedicatory practices to denote two seemingly different acts: the act of offering sacrificial portions and of bringing first offerings as dedications to the gods. I hope it has become apparent by now that the two are not as entirely unrelated as they may appear to be at first sight: both acts set aside a portion as a symbolic offering, both express the precedence accorded to the gods over men. And yet it is with rather

[232] *IG* I^3 862.

different forces that the word *aparchesthai* is used in these two contexts: in animal sacrifice the act of *aparchesthai*, whether applied to the hair or the flesh, anticipates the offering of the whole victim to the gods. The preliminary portions of hair and flesh may be seen as symbolizing, but are by no means identical to, the gods' portion, since the gods were subsequently presented with the whole sacrificial animal rather than just locks of hair and bits of meat. By contrast, in dedicatory practices *aparchesthai* and *aparchai* refer to the portions assigned to the gods and the rest is retained for human utilization. The offering of a part has no effect on the whole in this case. The claim that the part offered renders the rest of the food or objects 'holy', 'safe' or 'permissible' for human consumption by lifting the 'taboo' is a misconception indiscriminately applied to Greek religion from other cultures by some scholars.[233] However, unlike the hair-offering from a sacrificial animal, the offering of a lock of hair by humans in funeral rites or rites of maturation had no effect on the rest of the individual despite the intersection of the two practices. The hair offered may be considered as a token of the whole person, who is not sacrificed.

It may be argued that, as with dedications, in animal sacrifices the gods received only the first portions while most of the edible meat was consumed by men; accordingly, in both sacrifices and dedications, the gods' share was limited to the preliminary portion only. The unequal division of the sacrificial animal between gods and men is explained in the *aition* told by Hesiod: at Mekone Prometheus offers Zeus the ox's white bones wrapped in gleaming fat to make them appear appetizing. Ever since then men are to burn the *ὀστέα λευκὰ*, generally taken to refer to the thigh

[233] On the notion of 'taboo' on food, see e.g. Frazer (1911-15), vol. 3, 5, 102, vol. 4, 101-2, vol. 8, 56-8, Harrison (1903), 83, Nilsson (1940), 28.

bones, for the gods.[234] This convention of animal sacrifice was exploited by comic poets to criticize men's meanness to the divine.[235] However, we should distinguish more clearly between the reality and ideology of sacrifice: although in practice we see only small portions set aside for the gods, ideologically the gods were presented with the whole animal. When the Greeks describe a sacrifice, they speak of sacrificing an animal (the whole), not its thigh-bones or other portions, to the gods. It is precisely because the preliminary portions represented the whole animal(s) that it was considered more pleasing to the gods to receive greater numbers of and finer animals but not a larger share of the same animal(s). Thus Theophrastus' character suspends on his front door, not the portion for the god, but the skull of the ox to signify the magnitude of his offering.[236] Reliefs and statues of sacrificial animals represent the entire animals, not portions of them. This nature of the *thusia* has been argued at length by Jameson: a *thusia* offered the whole sacrificial animal(s) to the gods, as opposed to first portions of food at daily meals (see Chapter Four) (or any other kinds of first offerings) which were 'part offerings' in nature.[237] Yet the question of how the gods received and enjoyed the whole animal(s) must remain a mystery to us: it can only be answered by the Greek gods themselves.

I hope to have shown that the vocabularies of 'first offerings' relate, intersect with, and diverge from each other in different contexts. One way of expressing the

[234] Hes. *Theog*. 535-57; cf. Hes. *Op*. 47-53. On this myth, see also Rudhardt (1970), Vernant (1980), Vernant (1989). However, in a real sacrifice, the gods often received more than just the inedible thigh-bones: a portion of the *splanchna*, possibly bits of flesh (raw or cooked), and sometimes table offerings might also be offered. Scullion (2000) has collected attestations of the burning of more than the usual portions of thigh-bone and fat; he also coins the term 'moirocaust' for the burning of a substantial portion; summarized in Scullion (2009), 164-5. On the gods' portions in Greek sacrifice, see also Van Straten (1988), Reese (1989), esp. 64, Van Straten (1995), 115ff, Berthiaume (2005), Ekroth (2009). On table offerings, see Gill (1974).

[235] E.g. Pherecrate, *Automoloi* fr. 28. K.-A., Eubulus, fr. 94 K.-A., Men. *Dys*. 447-55, Adesp. fr. *142 K.-A.

[236] Theophr. *Char*. 21.7.

[237] Jameson (1949), *passim*. See also Jameson (1988b), esp. 976.

complex relation between these terms is to see *aparchesthai* as poised midway between *katarchesthai* and *aparche*: the verb *katarchesthai* features only in sacrificial procedures but never dedications, whereas the noun *aparchai* is used predominantly in dedications and very rarely with reference to animal sacrifice. On the other hand, *aparchesthai* can apply to both sacrificial and dedicatory practices; so too can the noun *apargmata* though the latter is used much less frequently. Nevertheless, despite these general trends, sometimes there is a degree of imprecision in the usage of these terms. As its various usages overlap and the difference between them is sometimes elusive, the notion of *aparchesthai* is sufficiently fluid to allow the Greeks to use the word with varying emphases in different contexts. Thus Theophrastus uses *aparchesthai* interchangeably with *thuein*, deliberately blurring the distinction between the two in his attempt to elevate bloodless offerings above animal sacrifice. The fluidity of the notion of *aparchesthai* allowed Theophrastus to conflate *aparchesthai* with *thuein* for his purpose. It was its imprecision or malleability which gave the concept religious potency.

While all first offerings in Homer concern animal sacrifice, in the Archaic and Classical periods the bulk of the evidence pertaining to first offerings concerns dedications, and less often sacrifice. In the following chapters, therefore, my main concern is with first offerings in dedicatory practice and to a lesser extent sacrifice where evidence is available. Since cult payments of *a/eparchai* are distinct in character from the traditional first offerings, and since they form a very small proportion of our available evidence for *aparchai*, they will be treated at the end in Chapter Eight.

Chapter II

Religious Mentality in First Offerings

This chapter tackles the questions of religious mentality, the individual and communal concerns and expectations underlying the offering of *aparchai*, *dekatai* and the like. Contrary to the tendency in the vast majority of studies of Greek religion to focus on ritual performance rather than the participants' thoughts or 'beliefs',[238] I am here interested in the ancient worshipper's state of mind: why people brought first offerings to the gods, and what intentions and concerns they might have had. In Greek religion there were no religious doctrines prescribing the observance of this custom, nor were there any direct testimonies to the intents and motivations of the participants. Rather the practice was so common that it was taken for granted by the ancient Greeks, so that they would seldom pause to think about or feel the need to explain why they did so. This lack of reflection by the Greeks themselves, however, need not deter us. It presents one of the greatest fascinations and challenges to the historian to explain the self-evident, a task which is not impossible as long as we recognize that the *etic* does not necessarily represent the *emic* point of view, and that the possible reasons are highly complex and may vary between individuals.

As first offerings belong to the larger category of offerings, some of the ideas which follow will inevitably be shared by other offerings in general. I will proceed from values most specific to first offerings to more general ones relevant to both first offerings and other gifts to the gods. The motivations behind bringing first offerings are elusive and difficult to pin down; but if pressed, one may try to separate the strands as follows.

I. Possible Motivations behind First Offerings

[238] See p. 29 n. 77 above. The relevance of the word 'belief' in Greek religion is discussed in Harrison (2000), 20-22, Kowalzig and Morgan (forthcoming). On the relation between ritual and belief in Greek religion, see the recent discussion in Parker (2011), 31-4.

a) Indebtedness to the Gods

Most ancient reflections on gift-giving between humans and the divine consist of incidental remarks by Greek philosophers. There fortunately survives one source which discusses *aparchai* specifically at considerable length. In the fourth century B.C., Theophrastus wrote the *De Pietate*, which contains what was arguably the most extensive and detailed account of the origin and development of Greek sacrifice. To defend his thesis that animal sacrifice is inappropriate as a form of religious worship of the gods, he adduces a historical account of the custom's development: the earliest sacrifices were vegetarian in nature, and animals were used only later.[239] The original treatise is now lost, but many of his arguments were borrowed by, and provided the theoretical basis of, Book two of Porphyry's *De Abstinentia* in the third century A.D.[240] Although Theophrastus' work belonged to the intellectual debate about meat-eating and cannot be taken at face value, it is a valuable and unique source expounding a theory on the custom of *aparchai*-offering.

Theophrastus argues that *aparchai* in the form of agricultural produce were the earliest and most pleasing form of sacrifice. According to him, primitive men would sacrifice some grass, tree leaves and fruits gathered from nature to the gods; and when agriculture was developed, men began to offer grain, wheat and cakes made of cultivated produce. Liquid offerings of wine, honey and oil were also offered as *aparchai* later as they became available for human consumption. However, men's

[239] On Theophrastus' view of piety, see e.g. Obbink (1988), Zaidman (2001), chs. 10-11, Fortenbaugh (2003a).

[240] Scholars have tried to distinguish between passages in Porphyry's *De Abstinentia* which were extracted from Theophrastus' *De Pietate*, and those which were Porphyry's own composition. I follow Pötscher (1964) and Fontenbaugh et al. (1992) in their identifications of which passages came from Theophrastus. I refer throughout to the fragment numbers in Pötscher (1964) and the corresponding reference in Porphyry's *De Abstinentia.* There are occasional slight variations in the Greek texts given in Pötscher (1964) and Fortenbaugh et al. (1992); I shall cite the text in Pötscher (1964). Unless otherwise stated, all translations of this text quoted here are that of Fortenbaugh et al. (1992).

misery began when they departed from the offering of these simple and bloodless sacrifices. Starvation in times of war and famine led men to eat and sacrifice humans. Animal sacrifice was at first a substitute for human sacrifice, then a manifestation of human greed: when men's appetite could no longer be satisfied by fruits, they ate animals and gave some of them to the gods also; but these were considered by the gods as inappropriate. The most 'holy' and pleasing offerings to the gods, the argument goes, were *aparchai* of agricultural produce.

Whether the earliest *aparchai* were taken from plants or animals, what emerges from Theophrastus' account is that *aparchai* were customarily returned to the gods from whatever food it might be that was available to mankind. Underlying these portions of food and drink is the idea of returning to the gods a token of what they gave men in the first place. Theophrastus stresses throughout the role of the gods as providers of human sustenance, and thinks that for this reason men should return agricultural *aparchai*. For instance, when he mentions the *aparchai* in the form of liquid offerings, he refers to the divine recipients as 'the gods responsible (for them)' (*ἀπήρχοντο καὶ τούτων τοῖς αἰτίοις θεοῖς*).[241] In his criticism of the Thoes in Thrace who made no *aparchai* (see below), Theophrastus twice describes it as 'right' (*ᾗ θέμις ἀθανάτοις*) and 'just' (*καθάπερ ἦν δίκαιον*) for men to render these offerings to the immortals, making explicit that gods had a rightful claim to *aparchai*.[242] He further compares the reciprocal relation between gods and men to that between human benefactors and beneficiaries:

> *ἔπειτα τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν τὰς ἀμοιβὰς καὶ τὰς χάριτας ἄλλοις μὲν ἄλλας ἀποδοτέον κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τῆς εὐποιίας, τοῖς δὲ εἰς τὰ μέγιστα ἡμᾶς εὖ πεποιηκόσιν τὰς μεγίστας καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν*

[241] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 2.42-3 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.6.4.
[242] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 3.8-18 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.8.1-2.

> *τιμιωτάτων, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ αὐτοὶ εἶεν τούτων πάροχοι. κάλλιστα δὲ καὶ τιμιώτατα, ὧν ἡμᾶς οἱ θεοὶ εὖ ποιοῦσιν, οἱ καρποί· διὰ γὰρ τούτων ἡμᾶς σῴζουσιν καὶ νομίμως ζῆν παρέχουσιν· ὥστε ἀπὸ τούτων αὐτοὺς τιμητέον.*[243]
> 'Next, in the case of kindness one ought to make returns and do favours differently to different people in accordance with the value of the good deed. To those who have done us good deeds to a superlative degree, (our returns should be) the greatest and from the most honourable sources, especially if they be the providers of these things. The finest and most honorable of the things with which the gods do us good deeds are fruits. For through these they preserve us and provide a regulated life. As a result one ought to honor them with these'

Theophrastus emphasizes that the gods deserve honour in return for their provisions: because the gods have provided the greatest goods to mankind, men should honour them with the greatest and most honourable gifts in the form of agricultural *aparchai*.

In short, Theophrastus summarizes the reasons for offering *aparchai* to the gods as follows:

> *ἢ γὰρ διὰ τιμὴν ἢ διὰ χάριν ἢ διὰ χρείαν τῶν ἀγαθῶν. καθάπερ γὰρ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν, οὕτω κἀκείνοις ἡγούμεθα δεῖν ποιεῖσθαι τὰς ἀπαρχάς. τιμῶμεν δὲ τοὺς θεοὺς ἢ κακῶν μὲν ἀποτροπήν, ἀγαθῶν δὲ παρασκευὴν ἡμῖν γενέσθαι ζητοῦντες, ἢ προπεπονθότες εὖ, οὐχ ἵνα τύχωμεν ὠφελείας τινός,*[244] *ἢ κατὰ ψιλὴν τὴν τῆς ἀγαθῆς αὐτῶν ἕξεως ἐκτίμησιν.*[245]
> 'either on account of honour or on account of gratitude or on account of a want of good things. For just as with good men, so also with these (the gods) we think that offerings of first-fruits should be made to them. We honour the gods either because we seek to deflect evils or to acquire goods for ourselves, or because we have first been treated well or simply to do great honour to their good character.'

This conception of *aparchai*-offering, though far from being exhaustive and though it risks reducing complex human motivations to a neat schema,[246] is a rare explicit

[243] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 7.4-10 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.12.2.
[244] Here I cite the Greek text in Pötscher (1964). But nearly all manuscripts have *ἢ ἵνα τύχωμεν ὠφελείας τινὸς* ('or in order that we may obtain some benefit'); this clause is deleted by Reiske and subsequent editors, and is omitted in the translation by Fortenbaugh et al. (1992).
[245] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 12.43-48 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.24.1. See also the discussion in Fortenbaugh (2003a), 186-8.
[246] Van Straten (1981), 66-7, criticizes Theophrastus' explanation as simplistic.

explanation for offering *aparchai*. Admittedly we are presented here with a pious ideal of the ancient philosopher which may or may not represent popular Greek opinion; nevertheless Theophrastus' explanation provides a useful way into the problem: honour, gratitude, hope for further benefits, and aversion of evils are all important elements underlying first offerings and I will discuss each of them later. For now I want to focus on Theophrastus' central idea that from the outset men are indebted to the divinities for the goods they bestowed on mankind. Men's debt to the gods, I believe, is the starting point for understanding *aparchai*.

Current anthropological studies of gift-giving shed interesting light on men's debt to the gods and the circulation of gifts between humans and the divine. Long ago in his classic work *The Gift* (1990 [1925]), Mauss argued famously for men's three obligations to give, to receive and to reciprocate. Less well-known, however, is the only mentioned briefly fourth obligation, namely men's obligation in relation to the gods and their representatives: Mauss considered it most necessary to exchange, and most dangerous not to exchange, with the dead and the gods, who are 'the true owners of the things and possessions of this world'.[247] I will return to other contentions in *The Gift* later; here it suffices to note that Mauss' fourth obligation was further developed by Godelier in *The Enigma of the Gift* (1999). Godelier argues that in religious cultures where the gods are believed to provide life and the conditions of existence, a primordial debt to the gods is created from the outset. Nothing would seem to be sufficient to settle a debt of this kind and men are therefore laid under a perpetual debt to the divine powers. In his view, this asymmetrical relation of gift-giving between humans and the divine - in which men remain debtors despite their counter-gifts to their divine benefactors - provides a potent paradigm for creating

[247] Mauss (1990 [1925]), 14-17.

and maintaining social hierarchies between the dominant class and the dominated in some societies. Thus the Pharaoh in Egypt and the chiefs in Polynesian societies, through whom divine blessings were thought to be channelled to the people, could present themselves almost as gods and justify the continuous flow of material resources from their people, who were perpetually in debt to them.[248] Godelier is interested in the original debt men owe to the gods insofar as it provides a model exploited by the ruling class for the creation of social differences. Although Godelier uses this notion of 'debt' for an entirely different purpose from ours, it provides useful insights for understanding first offerings in ancient Greece.

The conceptualization of men as debtors in their relations with the divine is very common in different religious cultures, such as in Judaism, Christianity and Hinduism.[249] Although it is nowhere described explicitly in such terms in our Greek sources, the idea of men's debt to the gods is not entirely unfamiliar to the ancient Greeks. As was seen above, it is already implied in Theophrastus' account of sacrificial practices. Elsewhere the most detailed discussion of men's original debt to the gods is found in two passages in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*. Some caution is needed here as they are part of an apologetic agenda intended to attest a certain religious outlook for Socrates; and it is unclear how representative these views are of ordinary worshippers. In Xen. *Mem*. I.4, Socrates argues with one Aristodemus, who pays no heed to the gods and thinks that the gods pay no heed to men either. To argue that the gods exist and care for mankind, Socrates gives as evidence men's natural endowments, such as the design of the human body, the intellect, the soul and

[248] Godelier (1999), esp. 29-31, 186-7, 193-8. Godelier's notion of the perpetual debt resembles to a certain extent Sahlins' 'generalized reciprocity', in which the unbalanced exchange places the recipient under 'the shadow of indebtedness'. See Sahlins (1974), esp. 207-8.
[249] See Godelier (1999), 194-8.

life-preserving instincts.[250] In response to the gods' gracious provisions, Socrates considers it right that men should honour them: 'the more splendidly it deigns to serve you, the more honour it demands of you' (*ὅσῳ μεγαλοπρεπέστερον ἀξιοῖ σε θεραπεύειν, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον τιμητέον αὐτό*).[251] Later, in another conversation with Euthydemus on gods' services to mankind, Socrates moves the focus to features of the natural environment: gods furnish men with the succession of day and night, the cycle of seasons, abundance of food, water and livestock to feed on. In short, he argues, one must see the gods at work in the world although they are invisible. So many are the gods' provisions for men that Euthydemus is perplexed that 'no man can ever render due thanks to the gods for their benefits' (*ἐκεῖνο δὲ ἀθυμῶ, ὅτι μοι δοκεῖ τὰς τῶν θεῶν εὐεργεσίας οὐδ' ἂν εἷς ποτε ἀνθρώπων ἀξίαις χάρισιν ἀμείβεσθαι*).[252] These two passages provide one of the earliest literary references to, or forerunner of, the 'argument from design' in antiquity, in other words the argument for the existence of the god(s) based on evidence of the works of nature which are arranged to suit man's needs.

This teleological way of thinking is widely present among ancient philosophers.[253] However, such ideas are by no means confined to the philosophical traditions; they must have been quite common to average Greeks already in the Classical period or earlier. Incidental allusions to similar ideas are found in Herodotus, Euripides, and other authors.[254] And perhaps because of their *philanthropia* the Greek

[250] Xen. *Mem*. 1.4.2ff. Summarized and discussed in Parker (1992), Sedley (2007), 78-86. In Xen. *Mem*. 1.1.19, Xenophon also says that Socrates considered the gods heedful to mankind.
[251] Xen. *Mem*. 1.4.10 (adapted from Marchant's ranslation).
[252] Xen. *Mem*. 4.3.2ff (tr. Marchant).
[253] See Sedley (2007), *passim*.
[254] E.g. Hdt. 3.108, Eur. *Supp*. 195-215, Eur. fr. 593, 1059, Ar. *Thesm*. 13-18. These passages are collected in Parker (1992), 87-8. For other passages, see also Parker (2011), 3-6.

gods are repeatedly described as 'givers of good things' (*δωτῆρες/δῶτορ ἑάων*) in literature.[255] It is impossible and unimportant to trace the origins of these ideas;[256] what is significant is that we have here a way of imagining the relations between gods and men which is useful for understanding *aparchai* and *dekatai*. Doubtless first offerings were induced in part by a sense of indebtedness to and dependence on the gods, from whom all human provisions came in the first place. In the words of the Neoplatonist Sallustius, 'since everything we have comes from the gods, and it is just to offer to the givers first fruits of what is given, we offer first fruits of our possessions in the form of votive offerings, of our bodies in the form of hair, of our life in the form of sacrifices' (*Πρῶτον μὲν ἐπειδὴ πάντα παρὰ Θεῶν ἔχομεν, δίκαιον δὲ τοῖς διδοῦσι τῶν διδομένων ἀπάρχεσθαι· χρημάτων μὲν δι' ἀναθημάτων, σωμάτων δὲ διὰ κόμης, ζωῆς δὲ διὰ θυσιῶν ἀπαρχόμεθα*).[257] Following this interpretation, first offerings might be understood as expressions of gratitude and indebtedness, intended to honour the gods especially for their role as givers of all things. This relationship of mankind to their divine benefactors is analogous to that between men and their parents to a certain extent. As Plato puts it, 'because it is right for one owing one's first and greatest debts, the most important of all debts, to pay them back and to think that whatever he possesses and has all belong to those who begot and raised him. He is to provide these things in subordinate's service to his parents to the utmost of his ability, beginning with property, secondly the things of the body, and thirdly the things of the soul' (*ὡς θέμις ὀφείλοντα ἀποτίνειν τὰ πρῶτά τε καὶ μέγιστα ὀφειλήματα, χρεῶν πάντων πρεσβύτατα,*

[255] E.g. Hom. *Od*. 8.325, 335, *Hymn. Hom.* 18.12, 29.8, Hes. *Theog*. 46, 111. The word *ἑάων* first appears in Hom. *Il*. 24.528. See also the commentary in Kirk (1985-93) vol. 6, 331 on Hom. *Il*. 24.527-33.
[256] Parker (1992), esp. 94.
[257] Sallust. *De deis et mundo* 16.1 (tr. Nock (1926)).

νομίζειν δέ, ἃ κέκτηται καὶ ἔχει, πάντα εἶναι τῶν γεννησάντων καὶ θρεψαμένων πρὸς τὸ παρέχειν αὐτὰ εἰς ὑπηρεσίαν ἐκείνοις κατὰ δύναμιν πᾶσαν, ἀρχόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς οὐσίας, δεύτερα τὰ τοῦ σώματος, τρίτα τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς).[258] In both sets of relations, an original and greatest debt was created from the outset; and *charis* is owed to the gods and parents in return for the many goods they provided.

Godelier is concerned mainly with the 'original debt'. However, we can further distinguish between two kinds of debt: first, an 'original debt' stemming from the fact that the gods provided all conditions of human existence. For example, first-fruits in agricultural festivals and the gods' share of food in meals might have been given with such an attitude. As these first offerings can never fully settle the debt, they are 'temporary discharges of a persisting obligation that is reciprocal between gods and men'.[259] Second, debts occasioned by particular situations: a debt is created and felt every time an individual comes off well in an enterprise with divine assistance. This might motivate first offerings made on an ad hoc basis, such as *aparchai* of unexpected profits made in a voyage and *dekatai* of spoils after a successful campaign. Nevertheless, the distinction thus made between the two kinds of debt can be blurred or slippery in some cases: first-fruits of agricultural produce may be thought of as settling an 'original debt' to the gods for their provision, while at the same time they repaid an 'occasional debt' incurred when a community reaped a plentiful harvest. As we shall see later in Chapter Seven, the idea of 'debt', both the original and occasional, was exploited by Athens to justify Panhellenic contributions of Eleusinian *aparchai*.

[258] Pl. *Leg*. 4.717b6-c3 (tr. Mikalson (2010), 38). On the asymmetrical *charis* relations between men and gods/parents, see also Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 8.1163b13-18.
[259] Redfield's expression in Redfield (1941), 115.

Among all kinds of first offerings, agricultural first-fruits demonstrate most clearly the basic idea of returning a portion of what comes from the gods in the first place. In Theocritus' *Idyll* VII, two Coans were holding a harvest festival and giving first-fruits of their abundance to Demeter, 'for in full rich measure has the goddess piled their threshing-floor with barley' (*ἁ δ' ὁδὸς ἅδε θαλυσιάς· ἦ γὰρ ἑταῖροι / ἀνέρες εὐπέπλῳ Δαμάτερι δαῖτα τελεῦντι / ὄλβῳ ἀπαρχόμενοι· μάλα γάρ σφισι πίονι μέτρῳ / ἁ δαίμων εὔκριθον ἀνεπλήρωσεν ἀλωάν* /).[260] This is a rare explicit statement outside philosophical traditions explaining why individuals brought *aparchai* to the gods: the two individuals owed their bountiful harvest to Demeter; and it was in gratitude for the goddess' gift of barley that they honoured her with first-fruits of their abundance. That *aparchai* and *dekatai* involve 'giving back' to the gods can also be illustrated by an *agalma* on the Athenian acropolis: if Wilhelm's plausible supplement is correct, a family jointly dedicated to Athena Ergane a *dekate* 'of your [the goddess'] gifts' (*[σῶν δεκάτην δ]ώρων*) in fulfillment of a vow:

> *[Ἀθηναίαι Ἐργά]νηι Πολιάδι ἀνέθηκε*
> *[Δεινομένης? Λυ?]κίνο καὶ ἡ γυνὴ καὶ οἱ παῖδες.*
> *[σῶν δεκάτην δ]ώρων, θεὰ Ἐργάνη, εὐ[ξ]άμενός σοι*
> *[καλὸν Δεινομέ?]νης στῆσεν ἄγαλμα τόδε.*[261]
> Dedicated to Athena Ergane Polias
> by [Deinomenes? son of Ly?]kinos, his wife and his children.
> Having vowed to you, goddess Ergane, [a tithe of your g]ifts,
> [Deinome?]nes set up this [beautiful] *agalma*.

It is interesting that the dedicators should speak of their possessions as belonging to the goddess. This is comparable to another dedication, probably from a fisherman, who speaks of his gift as an *aparche* of his catch provided by Poseidon: *[τέ]νδε*

[260] Theoc. *Idyll* 7.31-34 (tr. Gow).

[261] *IG* II^2 4318; cf. Hansen's supplements in *CEG* 759: *[-∪∪- δ]ώρων θεὰ Ἐργάνη, εὐ[ξ]άμενός σοι* (line 3).

κόρεν ἀ[ν]έθεκεν ἀπαρχὲν / [Ναύ(?)]λοχος ἄγρας ☒ ἓν οἱ ποντομέδ[ον χρ]υ̣σοτρία[ι]ν′ ἔπορεν ('[Nau?]lochos dedicated this *kore* as an *aparche* of the catch which the lord of the sea with the golden trident provided for him').[262] Both inscriptions make explicit that the individuals were returning a portion of what the gods granted them. To sum up using Redfield's words, first offerings return 'in part and in symbol what is essentially the property of the gods'.[263]

b) First Offerings as Thank-Offerings

In the early twentieth century there was a tendency to consider thanksgiving as irrelevant to the religion of 'primitive' peoples. In *The Golden Bough*, for example, Frazer saw first-fruits as not so much an expression of gratitude for benefits received as a means of preserving the worshipper's own interest. According to Frazer, 'the Greek offering of first-fruits [to Demeter] was prompted not so much by gratitude for past favours as by a shrewd eye to favours to come... the bucolic mind, which is more apt to be moved by considerations of profit than by sentiment'.[264] Likewise Hewitt considered thank-offerings as a later and more 'advanced' development: 'it need scarcely be said that the thank-offering is the result of an evolution... Apparently the thank-offering is far from a primitive form of sacrifice. Nor is gratitude, its emotional basis, a primitive emotion. It has often been pointed out that savages are to a remarkable degree lacking in gratitude, and that, in moral development of the race, gratitude enters only late.'[265] Such generalizing statements are based on the assumption that values in 'higher' religions did not or could not have existed in 'primitive' cultures. While few historians now would make similar overstatements, the

[262] *IG* I^3 828, *DAA* 229.
[263] Redfield (1941), 116.
[264] Frazer (1911-15), vol. 7, 49. The idea that offerings to the gods were appropriate only for 'higher' religion was already present in the 'abnegation theory' of sacrifice in Tylor (1871), vol. 2, 359-61.
[265] Hewitt (1914), 77. Similar views are also expressed in Hewitt (1912).

role of first offerings as thank-offerings has not received sufficient attention in modern scholarship.

In ancient Greek there are various expressions for 'thank-offerings', such as *χαριστήρια*, *σωτήρια*, *εὐαγγέλια* and *νικητήρια*.[266] Although few first offerings and their accompanying inscriptions use these terms explicitly, the idea of 'thank-offerings' is by no means absent. We have a few first offerings which use *χάρις* or related words in their inscriptions.[267] Some of the vessels inscribed with the name Onesagoras son of Philonios at Kafizin in Cyprus in the late third century B.C., which might have been tithes of some sort, were described as *χαριστήρια* for a Nymph.[268] No other first offering of those collected in this study was described as a *χαριστήριον*, and reasonably so since the word is attested in epigraphic evidence only from the second half of the third century B.C. onwards.[269] The late appearance of the word *χαριστήριον/α* has led some scholars to think that gratitude is conspicuously lacking or emerged rather late in the relations of the Greeks with their gods.[270] However, such claims neglect the possibility that gratitude was implied

[266] The terminologies for 'thanks' and 'thank-offerings' in Greek have been studied in detail by e.g. Hewitt (1912), (1914), (1927), Quincey (1966), Versnel (1981a), 42-62, Bremer (1998), esp. 128-30.

[267] E.g. *CEG* 326 (*χαρίϝετταν ἀμοιβ[άν]*) (700-650 B.C.), *IG* I^3 647 (*τει δὲ θεῖι χαρίεν*) (c. 510-500 B.C.), 711 (*[χά]ριν ἀντι[δίδο]*) (c. 500-480 B.C.), 872 (*σοὶ χάριν ἀντ[ιδιδός], τῶνδε χάρ[ιν*) (c. 450 B.C.?), *IG* II^2 4334 (*τιμῶσα χάριν σήν*) (after c. 450 B.C.).

[268] Mitford (1980), nos. 119, 124 (partially supplemented), 139, 147 (partially supplemented), 193 (partially supplemented), 206 (partially supplemented), 229 (partially supplemented), 253 (partially supplemented). See also Schol. Ar. *Eq*. 729, Schol. Ar. *Plut*. 1054f on the aetiology of the *Proerosia*: the scholia describe the *aparchai* of crops sent by the Greeks to the Athenians as *χαριστήρια* in gratitude for the Athenian performance of a sacrifice on behalf of all to avert a mythical plague or famine (*καὶ οὕτως ὥσπερ χαριστήριον οἱ πανταχόθεν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐξέπεμπον τῶν καρπῶν ἁπάντων τὰς ἀπαρχάς*).

[269] The words *χαριστήριον* and *χαριστήρια* are also used in victory dedications of the Attalids: e.g. *OGIS* 269, 273, 280, 328. In literary sources, on the other hand, *χαριστήρια* appear from Xenophon onwards. The late appearance of the word in Greek dedicatory inscriptions has been observed by Hewitt (1912), Beer (1914), 118-31.

[270] E.g. Hewitt (1912), Beer (1914), esp. 125, 133, Hewitt (1914).

rather than expressed.[271] An individual might content himself with making an offering without specifying that it was a *χαριστήριον* or the like, as gratitude was implicit in the act of dedication itself. In the sixth century, for instance, a *dekate* dedicated by an Olympic victor in his home city Sybaris is thus inscribed: *Δο· Κλεόμροτος ὁ Δεξιλάϝο̄· ἀνέθεκ̄′ Ὀλυνπίαι νικάσας ϝίσο(μ) μᾶκός τε πάχος τε τἀθάναι ἀϝέθλοῑ εὐξάμενος δεκάταν* ('Kleomrotos son of Dexilaos, having won at Olympia, dedicated (this), equal in length and breath, having vowed to Athena a tithe of his prizes').[272] This is evidently a *νικητήριον* or *εὐαγγέλιον* even if the term is not used. The same may be said for the numerous *dekatai* and *akrothinia* dedicated by Greek cities after military victories (see Chapter Six).[273] Therefore, despite the rarity of the Greek terms for 'thanks' and 'thank-offerings' in dedicatory inscriptions in the Archaic and Classical periods, we should not underestimate the sentiment of gratitude among the ancient worshippers.

A Hellenistic decree illustrates well the relationship between gratitude and first offerings. In the late third or early second century B.C.,[274] the Ionian city of Teos issued a decree for the Seleukid king Antiochus III, in which he was granted certain civic honours. The most striking provision is the offering of *aparchai* of trees before the king's cult statue every year; and the reason given is Antiochus III's benefactions to the Teians in bringing peace, alleviating taxes and enhancing agricultural production:

> *ἐπειδὴ οὐ μόνον εἰρήνην ἡμῖν ὁ βασιλεὺς παρέσχεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ [τῶν] βαρέων καὶ σκληρῶν ἐκ<κ>ούφισιν εἰς τὸ μετὰ ταῦτα τελῶν παραλύ-*

[271] This has also been suggested by Bremer (1998), esp. 130-3.
[272] *IGASMG* IV no. 2 (to be discussed in Chapter Five).
[273] See Chapter Six.
[274] The date is disputed: Ma (1999), 260ff, prefers c.203 B.C. to 197 B.C.

> *[σας] τῶν συντάξεων καὶ λυσιτελεῖς τὰς ἐν τῇ χώραι μετ᾽ ἀσφαλεί-*
> *[ας π]εποίηκεν ἐργασίας καὶ τὰς καρπείας, τιθέναι πρὸς τὸ ἄγαλμα*
> *[τοῦ] βασιλέως ἀπαρχὰς καθ᾽ ἕκαστον ἔτος τοὺς πρώτους ἐν τῇ*
> *[χώρ]αι ξυλίνους φανέντας καρπούς·*[275]
> 'Since the king brought us not only peace, but also an alleviation of the heavy and harsh taxes for the future, by releasing us from the syntaxeis, and made the working and harvesting in the land profitable and safe, (it seemed good) to place before the cult-image of the king the first produce from trees that appear each year in the land, as first-fruit offerings.'

The ruler cult in question was modelled on the traditional practice of *aparchai*-offering to the gods. In the Archaic and Classical periods *aparchai* were offered primarily to the gods and less commonly the dead, but never a living human. What is particularly noteworthy here is that the rite was couched in the language of thanksgiving and reciprocity: the offering of *aparchai* and several other honours are expressly said to be given in gratitude for the king's benefactions; and *chari-* words recur throughout the decree.[276] It is also interesting that Antiochos III should be given no other kind of *aparchai* than the regular offering of agricultural produce, as if to emphasize the king's benefactions in agriculture and the permanence of the city's gratitude. By making Antiochos III the recipient of divine honours, the Teian decree demonstrates the close correspondence between the acts of thanksgiving towards benefactors, human and divine. It makes manifest the sentiment of gratitude which is otherwise only implied but rarely made explicit in dealings between men and gods.

Gratitude can be seen most clearly in cases where one offered more than the value vowed, or when a preliminary share was assigned to the gods even if no vow had been made beforehand. An example of the former is found in Xenophon, who tells us that 'Agesilaus judged it wrong not only not to return favours, but also not to

[275] MaCabe, *Teos Inscriptions*, no. 31.50-55, *SEG* XLI 1003, Herrmann (1965), Ma (1999), 311-17, no. 18 (tr. Ma).
[276] E.g. lines 40-1 (*χάρ[ιτα]ς ἀποδ[ο]ῦναι*), 42 (*χάρις*), 65 (*χ[άριν] ἔχουσαι*), 68 *(εὐχαριστία*), 108 (*εὐχαριστία*); see also line 98 (*εὐεργεσία*).

return much greater favours if one had greater means' (*Ἀγησίλαος δὲ οὐ μόνον τὸ μὴ ἀποδιδόναι χάριτας ἄδικον ἔκρινεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ μὴ πολὺ μείζους τὸν μείζω δυνάμενον*), and that 'he sacrificed more when confident than he had vowed when in doubt' (*καὶ θαρρῶν πλείονα ἔθυεν ἢ ὀκνῶν ηὔχετο*).[277] Although Xenophon's view may be said to represent a religious ideal, in actual practice we do have a few historical examples where the Greeks gave the gods far more than their dues.[278] On the other hand, even if no vow was involved, an individual could still spontaneously return part of the benefits received to the gods. For instance, in Phaselis two individuals dedicated a *dekate* from a voyage (*ἀπὸ ναυτιλίας δεκάταν*) to Athena Polias before the fourth century B.C without mentioning a vow.[279] Doubtless these individuals felt that they owed their safe return and perhaps their profit to divine assistance. First offerings which were not demonstrably 'vowed' or 'votives' may be considered as free-will contributions in which each dedicator gave a variable proportion as he felt moved to. This brings us back to one of Theophrastus' three reasons for offering *aparchai* to the gods, namely to give thanks to the gods (*ἢ γὰρ διὰ τιμὴν ἢ διὰ χάριν ἢ διὰ χρείαν τῶν ἀγαθῶν*).[280] In Bremer's words, we must recognize that 'these gifts, however small, were monuments of gratitude'.[281]

c) Honour and Priority of the Divine

Compared with other *anathemata*, *aparchai* have a much stronger emphasis on

[277] Xen. *Ages*. 4.2, 11.2.
[278] E.g. 1) Hdt. 6.117, Xen. *An*. 3.2.12: the Athenians continued to sacrifice sheep to Artemis several hundred years later even when the vow at Marathon must have been fulfilled. But these are not first offerings. 2) Hdt. 9.80-1, Plut. *Vit. Aristid*. 20.3, Plut. *Mor*. 873: after the battle of Plataea, the gods were given an extra 80 talents in addition to their customary tithe from the spoils (to be discussed in Chapter Six).
[279] *TAM* II, no. 1184.
[280] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 12.43-48 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.24.1.
[281] Bremer (1998), 133.

the priority of the divine. Etymologically *ap-arche* is related to the verb *ἀρχω* ('to begin', 'to be the first'); underlying the term is therefore the notion of priority – precedence should be accorded to the gods over men.[282] The idea that 'the gods come first' is best exemplified in Xenophon's characters. When asked to give an account of his principles in life, Ischomachus says that 'I begin by cultivating the goodwill of the gods' (*οὕτω δὴ ἐγὼ ἄρχομαι μὲν τοὺς θεοὺς θεραπεύων*),[283] referring not only to his estate-management but to all aspects of life. Before beginning his meal Cyrus would first offer a portion of food (*ἀπαρξάμενος*) to the gods.[284] Great care was taken by Cyrus to 'take out' (*ἐξαιρέω*) the gods' portion in the allocation of booty before the rest was distributed among men.[285] There seems to be a concern, from activities as trivial as daily meals, to large-scale enterprises like military campaigns, that the gods be given their share before men enjoyed the rest.

Although all gifts to the gods can be said to confer honour, first offerings, because of their emphasis on the precedence of the divine recipient, might have particular potential for establishing the gods' *timai*. The motif of divine wrath in the event of neglected first offerings is best understood in this light. Theophrastus tells us that when the Thoes offered no *aparchai* to the gods, they were snatched from the earth.[286] In myths, when king Oeneus sacrificed *aparchai* of his harvest to all divinities except Artemis, the goddess took offence and sent a boar to ravage the fields

[282] If we accept that *aparchai* and *dekatai* were similar in nature except in their proportion, the idea of priority may also be extended to *dekatai*.
[283] Xen. *Oec*. 11.8 (tr. Pomeroy).
[284] Xen. *Cyr*. 7.1.1.
[285] E.g. Xen. *Cyr*. 4.1.2, 5.3.2, 5.3.4, 7.3.1, 7.5.35. Only in the last passage is the word *akrothinia* used for the god's portion of spoils; but the other instances may also be considered as such.
[286] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 3.8-18 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.8.1-2. For other instances of human misfortune attributed to divine resentment of neglected offerings, see e.g. Hom. *Il*. 7.446-63, 9.533f, 23.862-5, *Od*. 4.351-3, Soph. *Aj*. 176-8, Eur. *Hipp*. 145-50, Paus. 10.11.2.

in Calydon.[287] The divinities' grudge against those who made no *aparchai* confirms the point made earlier that the gods had, or were thought to have, a claim to first offerings of the goods they provided; and it was considered offensive not to render to the gods their due. We have one interesting example in the fifth century where one Mikythos dedicated a monument in Olympia possibly as an *aparche* to 'all the gods and goddesses' (*[θεοῖς πᾶσι]ν καὶ θεαῖς πάσαις*).[288] Although it was rare in the Classical period to address all the divinities comprehensively,[289] this example nevertheless hints at an ideal that all the gods deserve honour. Euripides' Aphrodite puts it well that 'there is joy in the heart of a god also when honoured by men' (*ἔνεστι γὰρ δὴ κἀν θεῶν γένει τόδε: τιμώμενοι χαίρουσιν ἀνθρώπων ὕπο*).[290] The goddess is essentially saying, by the use of the word *kai*, that the same holds true for gods as well as for men. It is evident from these passages that like mortals, the Greek gods too took delight, or were thought to take delight, in being thanked and honoured for their service to mankind.

In comic fantasies the gods are sometimes presented as hungry for mortals' offerings;[291] but any sustenance which men provide to the divine powers is in terms of honour and prestige for the cult, more than the physical and material well-being of the gods. The fact that offerings concern their honour rather than their physical sustenance is not a startling one; but I will reproduce here some passages to stress this basic truth. Theophrastus and Porphyry argue that the gods need nothing material and

[287] Hom. *Il*. 9.534, Eur. *Meleager*, fr. 516, Ar. *Ranae.* 1242, Apoll. *Biblio*. 1.66. See also *Bacchyl.* 5.97-102: Oeneus tried to redeem his fault with prayer and sacrifice in vain.
[288] *SEG* XXVIII 431; the word *aparche* is supplemented.
[289] Most first offerings collected in this study were addressed to one god. See also Parker (2011), 66, 87, who notes that 'offerings were made to particular gods, not to the gods as a collectivity'.
[290] Eur. *Hipp*. 7-8 (tr. Grene).
[291] Ar. *Av*. 1515-24. cf. *Hom. Hymn.* 2.305ff.

external, but pure thoughts and moderate offerings alone are appropriate sacrifices.[292] In their view, men's attitude is far more important than the value of the gifts;[293] and the small offering of food as an *aparche* in one's daily meals confers above all great honour on the gods.[294] The idea of honour recurs many times in Theophrastus as a reason why first-fruits were offered to the divinities.[295] As Euthyphro explains, what the gods get from men's gifts is not so much practical benefits as 'honour, recognition and gratitude' (*τὰ παρ' ἡμιν δῶρα τοῖς θεοῖς τιμή τε καὶ γὲρα καὶ ... χάρις*).[296] This overlaps with Theophrastus' reasons for making sacrifices to the gods mentioned earlier: to honour them, to give thanks, or to seek good things (*ἢ γὰρ διὰ τιμὴν ἢ διὰ χάριν ἢ διὰ χρείαν τῶν ἀγαθῶν*).[297] Gift-giving therefore invokes complex relations of mutual interdependence between humans and the divine.

d) Reciprocity and Materialism

In Plato's *Euthyphro*, one of the definitions given for 'piety' (*ὁσιότης*)[298] is a kind of science of 'sacrifice and prayer' (*θύειν τε καὶ εὔχεσθαι*), which in turn means giving gifts to the gods and requesting gifts from them (*οὐκοῦν τὸ θύειν δωρεῖσθαί ἐστι τοῖς θεοῖς, τὸ δ' εὔχεσθαι αἰτεῖν τοὺς θεούς;*). Considering that

[292] Porph. *Abst*. 2.34.1, 37.1 (not identified as Theophrastus' fragments); Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 8.20-21 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.61.1. Cf. Sallust. *De deis et mundo*, 14, 15: Sallustius also argues that the gods are free from needs, but he differs from Theophrastus and Porphyry by suggesting that the honour paid to gods through gifts and offerings does not benefit the gods but men themselves, namely that men can gain union with the divine.

[293] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 7.33-36, 7.45-46, 7.46-54, 8.8-11 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.13.4, 14.3, 15.1-3, 60.1-2; Porph. *Abst*. 2.16, 17 (not identified as Theophrastus' fragments).

[294] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 9.12-15 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.20.1.

[295] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 2.7-14, 3.12-18, 12.34-38, 12.43-54 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.5.2, 8.2, 23.1, 24.1-2.

[296] Pl. *Euthphr*. 14E-15A.

[297] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 12.43-48 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.24.1. Fortenbaugh (2003a), 187, with n. 41, suggests that Theophrastus seems to imply, by putting honour first among the three reasons, that he places the highest value on this motive for making offerings.

[298] On the meaning and translation of *ὁσιότης*, *ὅσιος* and related terms, see e.g. Connor (1988), Rudhardt (1992), 22ff, Mikalson (2010), 6-7, ch. 4.

man is to ask what he needs from the gods and to present to the gods what they need from man, Socrates suggests a definition of piety as a skill of trading (*ἐμπορικὴ τέχνη*) between humans and the divine.[299] The idea of mutual gift exchange between gods and men is illustrative of the fundamental value of reciprocity in Greek religion. As reciprocity in Greek religion has been much discussed and is not specific to *aparchai* and *dekatai*, I do not intend to dwell on it here.[300] The central idea is that gifts could be given to the Greek gods in order to attain, or in return for having obtained, *χάρις* or a pleasing return. This constituted a cycle of gifts and counter-gifts between the worshipper or worshipping community and the divine; and it is not always clear which side initiated the process first. In dedicatory inscriptions we frequently find explicit statements asking the gods to 'grant another'. For instance, an epigram ascribed to Apollonides, probably in the first century A.D., shows a vine grower Euphron apologizing for the humble gift (perhaps a few grapes or some wine) he has to offer and asking the divinity to give him more so that the god might in turn receive first offerings of his plentiful harvest: *εἰ δὲ διδοίης πλείονα, καὶ πολλῶν, δαῖμον, ἀπαρξόμεθα* ('but if you gave more, *daimon*, we shall offer first-fruits from many').[301] Like any gifts to the gods, *aparchai* and *dekatai* were also concerned with the cycle of *χάρις* between humans and the divine.

Our sources give an abundance of testimony to the acceptance of the principles historians of religion usually call *do ut des* ('I give so that you may give') and *da ut*

[299] Pl. *Euthphr*. 14C; cf. Pl. *Plt*. 290c-d.

[300] On reciprocity, see Bremer (1998), Parker (1998). See also Festugière (1976) on the formula *ἄνθ' ὧν* in Hellenistic Greek prayers.

[301] Gow-Page, *GP*, I.128-9, II. 149, no. 2, *Anth. Pal.* 6.238 (adapted from Gow-Page's translation). The divine recipient is simply called *daimon*; some scholars have supplied the name of Hermes: see the discussion in Gow-Page, *GP*, II. 149, no. 2.

dem ('give so that I may give'),[302] apparently confirming the suggestion in Plato's *Euthyphro* that gift-giving is a way of making bargains with the gods. This mercantile sense of human-divine relations is often brought to the fore in comedy. Aristophanes' *Ploutos* depicts human-divine interaction as a practical economic arrangement from the outset. Zeus is said to rule over the gods because he has the most silver; and people sacrifice to him in the hope of sharing it.[303] The allegiance of worshippers, his priests as well as other gods, is said to depend entirely on Zeus' wealth. Accordingly when Ploutos recovers his sight and effects a universal enrichment of everyone, it is just natural that they are no longer dependent on Zeus and other Olympian gods, who then come to suffer the same fate as the gods in *Birds* do: deprivation of their accustomed offerings and starvation.[304] We are presented here with a bleak picture of human-divine relations based purely on material interests. Menander, in a playful critique of the meagerness of offerings given in the hope of a substantial return, depicts a man calculating whether he will receive benefits proportionate to his spending: he reckons that he may gain an equal return of the ten *drachmai* spent on the small sacrificial sheep, but the immense expenses of the feast will far outweigh this amount.[305] The character's careful calculation of gain and loss brings out rather crudely the value of reciprocity in Greek religion. That a gift was intertwined with the hope for an equal or greater return, though it may seem 'irreligious' to us using a modern Christian standard, was not considered problematic by the ancient worshippers. In fact the nature of Greek religion is precisely that of a 'practical

[302] *Do ut des*: e.g. Hom. *Il*. 10.291-4, Ar. *Pax* 390-98, Ar. *Plut*. 133-4; *da ut dem*: e.g. Hom. *Il.* 7.81-3, *IG* I^3 728, Ar. *Pax*, 392-9, 416-24, *Herod*. 4.85ff. Such notions are widely accepted in modern scholarship, whether the formulae are used explicitly or not: e.g. Harrison (1903), Festugière (1976), *passim*, Burkert (1979), 54, Van Straten (1981), 73, Pulleyn (1997), ch. 2, Parker (1998), esp. 107-8, 111-14, Bremer (1998), 130-1, Kearns (2010), 89-90.
[303] Ar. *Plut*. 130ff.
[304] Cf. Ar. *Av*. 1515-24.
[305] Men. *Methe*, fr. 264.

religion': it was a major source to which people could turn for all kinds of assistance in everyday life.[306] That worshippers should expect a pleasing return only demonstrates tremendous 'faith' – 'faith' in the efficacy of the gods to respond favourably to gifts received. The many dedications on the Athenian acropolis, apart from being the instruments of display and competition they are often considered to be (see below), are also testimonies to the efficacy of dedicatory practices visible to all who visited the sanctuary.

Godelier's idea of 'debt' mentioned earlier yields interesting results when applied to gift-giving between men and gods. When men bring gifts to the gods, they effect not a cancellation of a debt but the creation of a new one and therefore a deepening of the ties between humans and the divine. Any gift given on a particular occasion (whether by god or man first) has the potential of calling for a counter-gift which is supposed to pay back this debt but which at the same time creates a new one. Although in theory - if we follow the 'original debt' model - men are indebted to the gods for everything from the outset, in practice gifts between men and gods create a state of mutual indebtedness, rendering it not entirely clear who is indebted to whom in the complex cycle of gift-giving. Thus we often see worshippers claiming divine help by reminding them of their debt to men created by past offerings.[307] Croesus' famous complaint on the pyre that Apollo should have been ashamed of the gifts received makes explicit his expectation that the god was in his debt because of his valuable gifts.[308] As Godelier puts it, 'the giving of gifts and counter-gifts creates a state of mutual indebtedness and dependence which presents advantages for all parties. To give therefore is to share by creating a debt or, which amounts to the same thing, to

[306] See Burkert (1987a).
[307] E.g. Soph. *El*. 1376ff, Soph. *Trach*. 993-4.
[308] Hdt. 1.87, 90-91. See also Adkins (1975), 134-5.

create a debt by sharing'.[309]

In the Greek imagination of divine behaviour, there seems to be an ideal that the gods ought to respond favourably to gifts received. Examples abound in literature that the Greek gods are thought to take delight in gifts as men do.[310] In Euripides' *Medea*, Medea insists on sending a poisoned robe and diadem to Jason's new wife, justifying her gifts as follows: 'there is a saying that gifts persuade even the gods; and gold is more powerful with mortals than countless words' (*πείθειν δῶρα καὶ θεοὺς λόγος· χρυσὸς δὲ κρείσσων μυρίων λόγων βροτοῖς*),[311] which is a variant of the proverb *δῶρα θεοὺς πείθει, δῶρ' αἰδοίους βασιλῆας* ('gifts persuade the gods, gifts (persuade) reverend kings').[312] In one strand of the Greeks' perception of their dealings with the divine, not only should the gods react favourably to gifts, they were also expected to be persuaded more easily by greater gifts. While many ancient authors are more or less consistent in stressing that the virtue of offerings lies not in their value, but in other factors, such as the individual's moral character and the sincerity with which the dedication was offered,[313] these statements seem to point precisely to the reverse tendency in lived religion. Despite much reiteration of *kata dunamin* by ancient authors,[314] the need for the poor dedicator to apologize for the exiguity of his or her gifts shows that a valuable offering is still preferable.[315] Thus

[309] Godelier (1999), 48.
[310] E.g. Ar. *Pax*, 192, 418-22, Eur. *Hipp*. 88-120.
[311] Eur. *Med*. 964-5.
[312] Hes. fr. 361, quoted in Pl. *Rep*. 390e.
[313] E.g. Arist. *Eth. Nic*. 1163b15-18, Pl. *Leg*. 955e, *Alc*. II.148D-149E,150A, Xen. *Mem*. 1.3.3, 4.3.17, Isoc. 2.20, 7.29-30, Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 7.33-36, 7.52-54, 9.1-9, 8.20-21 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.13.4, 15.3, 19.4, 61.1. Cf. Hippoc. *Aer*. 22, who argues that a Scythian disease cannot be divine because, if it were, it ought to have attacked the poor in particular as the gods are supposed to take delight in men's rich offerings and return the favour.
[314] E.g. Hes. *Op*. 336, Xen. *Mem*. 1.3.3, 4.3.16.
[315] E.g. *Anth. Pal.* 6.25 (attributed to Julianus, Prefect of Egypt), 40 (attributed to Macedonius Consul), 77 (attributed to Eratosthenes Scholasticus). These epigrams are too late to be included in Gow-Page, *HE* and *GP*.

the farmer Euphron we met earlier apologizes for the small gift he has to offer.[316] The women in Herodas' fourth mimiambus ask Asclepius to accept their sacrifice of a cock as they are not well-off.[317] The expectations that gods would respond to gifts, especially greater gifts, presuppose a considerable degree of anthropomorphism.[318] Gift-exchange between individuals and between cities was probably so pervasive a custom in ancient Greek culture that it provided a ready imagery by which the Greeks imagined their relationship with the gods.[319] The ideology of reciprocity, prominent in human interactions, was perhaps extended to dealings between humans and the divine.

This assimilation between human and divine behaviour in relation to gifts is also found in Mauss' influential work *The Gift* already mentioned. Mauss' theory of gift-exchange evolves around the obligations to give, to receive and to reciprocate.[320] The gift, according to Mauss, is imbued with *hau* or the personality of the giver and engages the honour of both parties. Because of the bond between the giver and the gift, he argued, the act of giving creates social ties with an obligation to reciprocate; any failure to do so would be detrimental to one's honour and status. As was discussed earlier, Mauss also mentioned men's gifts to the gods and the dead as a fourth obligation;[321] but these gifts were marginal to his concern: he was essentially using human-divine gift-giving by way of illustrating his theory of gift-exchange in human societies. To Mauss, men's gifts to the gods are capable of compelling their divine recipients to return greater gifts; and he saw sacrifice as 'an act of giving that is

316 Gow-Page, *GP*, I.128-9, II. 149, no. 2, *Anth. Pal.* 6.238.
317 Herod. 4.14-20.
318 On the resemblance between gods and men in Homer, see Griffin (1980), 82ff, 167-70.
319 On parallels drawn between human and divine behaviour, see also Gould (1985), esp. 15-16. On reciprocity between Greek cities, see e.g. Mitchell (1997), Low (2007), 36-76.
320 On the intellectual context in which it was written, see Douglas' foreword in Mauss (1990 [1925]), vii-xviii, Geary (2003).
321 Mauss (1990 [1925]), 14-17.

necessarily reciprocated'.[322] However, *The Gift* has overstated the magnitude of the 'binding' power which a gift can create for its recipients, human or divine. Mauss has overlooked the important fact that the reciprocal relationship between men and gods is far more unpredictable than in human gift-exchange. In fact, one of the most salient features of interaction with the divine is uncertainty; but Mauss' theory lacks the capacity sufficiently to account for the elements of the unpredictable and irrational.

The reciprocal relation between god and man is never a straightforward matter of give-and-take. As Sahlins demonstrated convincingly in an important corrective to Mauss' thesis, there exists a spectrum of reciprocities ranging from what he called 'generalized', via 'balanced', to 'negative' reciprocity: exchange may range from altruistic acts involving no clear expectation of return, to equivalent exchanges without delay of return, to self-interested acts which hope to get something in return for nothing.[323] The Greeks' dealings with their gods are likely to have involved a spectrum of reciprocities. While there are examples in which the gods felt compelled to give favour because of the gifts received,[324] there are also plenty of counter-examples which show that the Greek gods did not necessarily respond favourably to gifts received and that their workings were most unpredictable.[325] Contrary to philosophical traditions which stress more or less consistently the gods' benevolent nature, Greek tragedy is full of complaints that the gods are ungrateful. In Euripides' *Troades*, the surviving Trojan women repeatedly lament that the city has sacrificed to the gods in vain.[326] In a fragment of Euripides, the speaker complains about the unfair prosperity of the irreligious at the expense of the pious: it is the

[322] Mauss (1990 [1925]), 16.
[323] Sahlins (1974).
[324] E.g. Hom. *Il*. 4.48-9, 22.169-172, *Od*. 1.64-7.
[325] E.g. Hom. *Il*. 6.305-311, 21.130-5, Hes. *Op*. 483-4, Aesch. *Ag*. 69-71, Eur. *Alc*. 132-5, Eur. *Tro*. 1242, Pl. *Alc*. II.138B, 148C-149E, 150A, Xen. *Cyr*. 1.6.46.
[326] E.g. Eur. *Tro*. 1060-80, 1242, 1280-1; discussed in Parker (1997), 154-5.

impious, tyrants and perjurers who are better off than the pious, whereas the later are subjected to the former despite all their worship of the gods.[327] These complaints illustrate the disappointment in lived religion that, despite the expectation of a reciprocal relationship between men and god, the Greek gods could choose to return or not and in whatever way and value they liked. Reciprocity therefore represents a religious ideal; in practice it remains impossible for men fully to discover the principles (if any) behind divine operation. Yunis describes this reciprocal relation well: 'the belief that the gods react to men on the basis of some form of a reciprocal relationship does not at all exclude the irrational element from the divine, or make the gods easily intelligible or entirely predictable. It rather excludes the possibility that the gods are utterly irrational, unintelligible, or unpredictable. The relationship of reciprocity may be uneven, unequal, or uncertain, but for the worshipper it must fundamentally exist'.[328] The unpredictable, inconsistent, and often unequal nature of reciprocity between men and the gods suggests that return could only be hoped for but not guaranteed. What is striking is not that people should offer gifts in the expectation of a return, but why people should continue to bring gifts to the gods when requital is not guaranteed.

Common though the idea of reciprocity may be, the hope for material returns did not necessarily provide the major motivating factor for every *aparche* or *dekate*. A skillful mother in Athens, who dedicated a marble object late in her life using her earnings from (perhaps) handicraft work, must have spent a substantial part of her lifetime's savings. Her *aparche* was more likely to be a thank-offering for past fortunes rather than an investment for further material returns.[329] The same may be

[327] Eu. *Beller*. fr. 286
[328] Yunis (1988), 53.
[329] *IG* II^2 4334.

said of the dedication of one's tool of trade at retirement as a *dekate*.[330] These retirement offerings are likely to be dedicated without further specific motives (see Chapter Five). They suggest that the study of Greek piety should go beyond the currently-accepted formulae of *do ut des* and *da ut dem* in modern scholarship, to embrace the possibility that psychological feelings of dependence on and gratitude to the gods might also have been involved. As is suggested in the Theophrastean passage quoted earlier, Theophrastus considers it possible for one to make offerings to the gods 'simply to do great honour to their good character' (*κατὰ ψιλὴν τὴν τῆς ἀγαθῆς αὐτῶν ἕξεως ἐκτίμησιν*).[331] The qualifier 'simply' (*κατὰ ψιλὴν*) emphasizes that it is possible to honour the gods without further motives for a pleasing return.[332]

e) First Offerings as *Apotropaic* Offerings

It is the very uncertainty of return which makes it inadequate to regard gift-giving between men and gods as an *ἐμπορικὴ τέχνη*, and which points to the need to understand the phenomenon not simply in terms of material benefits, but more fundamentally in terms of the psychological needs of the ancient worshippers. I have mentioned at the beginning the kindness of the Greek gods in caring for the wellbeing of mankind. Nevertheless, the Greek gods had a malignant as well as a benevolent side. There was a tendency in Greek literature to attribute ill-fortune and the inexplicable to the gods; and hence we find the idea of 'god-sent misfortunes'. Aeschylus twice uses the phrase *θεῶν διδόντων* to qualify the character's

[330] E.g. *IGASMG* IV no. 15: a bronze axe dedicated perhaps by a sacrificial butcher as a *dekate* of his work.
[331] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 12.43-48 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.24.1.
[332] This is also noted by Fortenbaugh (2003a), 187 with n.40.

troubles.[333] At the end of the *Iliad*, Achilles consoles Priam with these words: 'There are two urns that stand on the door-sill of Zeus. They are unlike for the gifts they bestow: an urn of evils, an urn of blessings. If Zeus who delights in thunder mingles these and bestows them on man, he shifts, and moves now in evil, again in good fortune' (*δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθοι κατακείαται ἐν Διὸς οὔδει δώρων οἷα δίδωσι κακῶν, ἕτερος δὲ ἑάων· ᾧ μέν κ' ἀμμίξας δώῃ Ζεὺς τερπικέραννος, ἄλλοτε μέν τε κακῷ ὅ γε κύρεται, ἄλλοτε δ' ἐσθλῷ*).[334] This view of human life as a mixture of good and bad fortune that varied at the whim of the gods is a common motif in comedy and tragedy. Tragedians put in the mouth of their characters repeatedly the idea that all human affairs are subject to rises and falls, and that the gods are responsible for allocating success and failure in an arbitrary manner.[335] The randomness and unpredictability of divine operation is constantly reflected upon by tragic characters.[336] Because of its genre and plots, it is not surprising that Greek tragedy emphasizes the dark and dangerous side of gods. Comedy and tragedy play out doubts and skepticism about the gods which are seldom articulated in other sources: it is hard to imagine the Greeks criticizing the gods in public or expressing such views in their dedicatory inscriptions, even if it was with mixed feelings of gratitude, fear and doubt that they set down their offerings. They offer another way of viewing the nature of the gods in popular Greek thought and imagination, different from that offered by philosophical traditions, which tend to emphasize the philanthropic aspect of the divinities.

[333] Aesch. *Pers*. 294, *Sept*. 719.
[334] Hom. *Il*. 24.527ff (tr. Lattimore). The dual aspects of the Greek gods is also reflected in *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 189ff. See also the related imagery of Zeus' scales symbolizing an individual's fate, e.g. Hom. *Il*. 8.73-4, 19.221-4, 22.208-13. On the randomness of the gods' actions in Homer, see also Griffin (1980), 130-1, 162.
[335] Tragedy: e.g. Soph. *Aj*. 383, 1077-80, *Eur*. *Hec*. 488-91, 958-60, *Phoen*. 555ff, *Supp*. 550ff, *Tro*. 612-3, *Andr.* fr. 150, 152, *Oedipus* fr. 554, *Telephus* fr. 716. Comedy: e.g. Ar. *Thesm*. 724-5, Men. *Dys*. 272-87, 797, Men. *Epit*. 1091. See also Parker (1997).
[336] E.g. Aesch. *Supp*. 93-5, Aesch. *Pers*. 373, Eur. *HF*, 62., Eur. *IT*, 475-8.

It was perhaps partly owing to their inability to be in control of human affairs that the Greeks turned to their gods; and bringing first offerings might have been a way of propitiating the gods in the uncertainties of their workings. This is suggested by Xenophon's Hermogenes who claims that the gods are most well-disposed towards him, while recognizing their dual aspects: 'it is likewise manifest that we consider them able to work us good or ill; at all events, every one prays [to] the gods to avert evil and grant blessings' (*καὶ μὴν ὅτι νομίζομέν γε δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ εὖ καὶ κακῶς ποιεῖν καὶ τοῦτο σαφές. πάντες γοῦν αἰτοῦνται τοὺς θεοὺς τὰ μὲν φαῦλα ἀποτρέπειν, τἀγαθὰ δὲ διδόναι*). When asked to relate his secret for keeping the gods friendly, Hermogenes explains that he performs 'a very economic service' to the gods, which involves praising them, always restoring to them part of what they give him (*ὧν τε διδόασιν ἀεὶ αὖ παρέχομαι*), and avoiding profanity in speech.[337]

Hermogenes' 'always restoring to them part of what they give him' may be considered as a strategy of maintaining a friendly relationship with the gods and warding off evils. As we have seen above in the fate of the Thoes and king Oeneus, it was probably considered dangerous not to make first offerings to the gods who had a claim to them. In this connection it is worth mentioning a passage in Plato's *Republic*: in the course of a discussion about the usefulness of money, Cephalus tells Socrates that its greatest use is in settling a debt, so that one need not fear owing any sacrifice to a god or money to a person and then go to the other world (*μηδ' αὖ ὀφείλοντα ἢ*

[337] Xen. *Symp*. 4.47-9 (tr. Todd).

θεῷ θυσίας τινὰς ἢ ἀνθρώπῳ χρήματα ἔπειτα ἐκεῖσε ἀπιέναι δεδιότα).[338] This leads Socrates to suggest 'giving back what one has taken' as one of the definitions of justice. The passage brings out the possibility that some first offerings were probably made in fear of being in debt to some god for certain benefits received, and that any outstanding debt could not be erased even by death.

Since a debt was created every time an individual came off well in an enterprise, any failure to discharge it by giving the gods their due honour might trigger divine vengeance. As every reader of tragedy knows, boastfulness about one's achievements and failure to acknowledge divine involvement could arouse divine *phthonos* and even punishment.[339] Moments of success were therefore very often times of anxiety: one might fear whether the present fortune would last and whether some higher powers need to be placated.[340] Given the jealous and vengeful nature of the gods,[341] how human and divine contributions were assigned after any successful human activity could be a delicate matter. The division of the benefits received between gods and men, with a preliminary portion set aside for the gods before human consumption of the rest, recognizes implicitly the role of the divine. Offering first portions to the gods had the effect of demonstrably putting the gods first as the chief author of human achievements while at the same time humbly recognizing that the part of the mortals is secondary.

Human helplessness and insecurity was a permanent feature in agricultural societies, where farmers' livelihoods were vulnerable to climatic changes and natural forces beyond human control (see Chapter Three). In Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, after

[338] Pl. *Resp*. 331b. See also Pl. *Phd*. 118a, according to which Socrates' last words were to ask Crito to repay the debt of a cock owed to Asclepius.
[339] E.g. Soph. *Aj*. 127-33, 758ff.
[340] Also observed by Burkert (1979), 53, Burkert (1996b), 152-6.
[341] On divine envy, see e.g. Walcot (1978), chs. 3-4, esp. 25-6, 46-51.

Socrates has spoken at length about the importance of agriculture and the human labour required for it, Critobulus objects that there are unpredictable elements like hailstorms, frost, droughts and rain which can ruin human schemes and toil however well-planned men are.[342] Xenophon has Socrates say to Critobulus that just as men in war try to propitiate the gods with sacrifice before taking military action, in matters of husbandry it is no less necessary to ask the gods for blessings. He convinces Critobulus into agreeing that 'I think you are right when you bid me try to begin every undertaking with the gods' help, since the gods control the works of peace no less than of war' (*καλῶς μοι δοκεῖς λέγειν κελεύων πειρᾶσθαι σὺν τοῖς θεοῖς ἄρχεσθαι παντὸς ἔργου, ὡς τῶν θεῶν κυρίων ὄντων οὐδὲν ἧττον τῶν εἰρηνικῶν ἢ τῶν πολεμικῶν ἔργων*).[343] There are other passages in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* which similarly illustrate that the Greek gods were considered a source of hazard as well as bounty in the natural world.[344] Giving the gods priority in agricultural matters, most notably by offering them the first-fruits of seasonal produce, might have been a means of propitiating the gods for the purpose of warding off disasters. Agricultural *aparchai*, therefore, apart from being thank-offerings, might also have been a rite of aversion with an *apotropaic* role. The aversion of evil is but the other side of the coin of propitiating the gods for favours.

Yet agriculture represents only one area in which divine help was felt to be indispensable. Xenophon's Ischomachus gives a fairly comprehensive list of those matters in which one needs divine favour: he prays to acquire good health, physical strength, distinction in the city, goodwill among friends, survival with honour in war,

[342] Xen. *Oec*. 5.18.
[343] Xen. *Oec*. 5.19-20, 6.1 (tr. Marchant).
[344] E.g. Xen. *Oec*. 16.3, 17.2-4.

and wealth etc.[345] In Aristophanes, too, Peisetaerus tells how the birds can provide men with success in agriculture, safety at sea, wealth, health and a good old age as gods do.[346] Plato also tells us that the gods are essential for success in every human enterprise, great or small.[347] The range of requests hoped for shows that the Greek gods' influence was seen as pervasive in many aspects of everyday life.[348] Statements abound in literature that men's success in any activity depends on a combination of divine assistance and human effort.[349]

Given the 'ultimate unknowability'[350] of divine operations and the lack of guarantee of requitals, first offerings might have been motivated not so much by the expectation of further benefits as by the psychological need for a 'safe anchor' in life.[351] Returning a portion to the gods might have been a way of coping with the permanent undercurrent of anxiety and uncertainty. For many of the Greeks, first offerings might have served as what Victor Turner called an 'evocative device', a ritual means of responding to difficult situations by channelling negative emotions (such as anxiety and fear) to a higher power.[352] Each of the *aparchai* and *dekatai* dedicated might express the dedicator's anxiety, hope and fear for the future.[353] In this respect the psychology of first offerings resembles to a certain extent that of insurance in the modern world. Like modern insurance, there is no guarantee of recompense on every occasion, but often one would still prefer to have one's life or property insured for the sake of psychological assurance. In the words of Bernstein,

---

345 Xen. *Oec*. 11.7-8.
346 Ar. *Av*. 586ff.
347 Pl. *Ti*. 27c.
348 Limitations of human knowledge and dependence on the divine are stressed by e.g. Eur. *Thyestes* fr. 391, Xen. *Mem*. 4.3.12-16. On perceived areas of divine intervention, see also Mikalson (1983), 18-26.
349 E.g. Eur. fr. 432, Xen. *Oec*. 5.20, 11.7-8, Xen. *Eq. mag.* 5.14, 6.1.
350 Expression of Sourvinou-Inwood (1997a), 173.
351 Expression of Burkert (1987a), 28.
352 Turner (1969), 42-3, argues that ritual symbols are also 'a set of evocative devices for rousing, channelling, and domesticating powerful emotions, such as hate, fear, affection, and grief'.
353 See e.g. Burkert (1996a).

'we buy insurance because we cannot afford to take the risk of losing our home to fire – or our life before our time. That is, we prefer a gamble that has 100% odds on a small loss (the premium we must pay) but a small chance of a large gain (if catastrophe strikes) to a gamble with a certain small gain (saving the cost of the insurance premium) but with uncertain but potentially ruinous consequences for us or our family'.[354] By giving up a small part of the benefits received, first offerings were probably a similar means of managing the risks and uncertainties of everyday life.[355]

f) Communication with the Gods

In addition to honour, gratitude, want of good things and aversion of evils, first offerings also provided a means of communication with the gods.[356] Every time a worshipper presents an offering to the gods (whether a first offering or not), he is, among other things, maintaining his relationship with the divine. Communication between men and the gods, though intangible in dedicatory inscriptions, is sometimes made explicit in 'votive' reliefs. We have, for example, a fifth-century Athenian marble relief depicting a dedicator seated behind a table and handing a small gift, perhaps an *aparche*,[357] to Athena, who has her right hand extended towards him.[358] By depicting the goddess as physically present, it gives us a glimpse of the proximity with the divine that is thought to be possible for individual worshippers. Gift-giving might be thought of as a distinct form of interaction with the divinities: by treating the gods as if they were human guest-friends, the Greeks might be trying to assimilate

354 Bernstein (1996), 203-4.
355 On religious practices as a means of 'risk management', see Eidinow (2007).
356 See also the related point made in Iambl. *Myst*. 5.5, 5.9, who stresses that the most important reason for making offerings to the gods is to create a bond of union (*συναφή*) between humans and the divine. Yet Iamblichus displays a strong neo-Platonist agenda and cannot be taken as representing the opinion of the average Greek.
357 Perdizet (1903), 260-1, interpreted it as representing Athena Ergane receiving an *aparche* from a craftsman. But in the lack of any accompanying inscription, this interpretation remains uncertain.
358 Acr. no. 577; Dickens (1912-21), vol. 1, 117, no. 577; Mitropoulou (1977), 30-1 and no.29, fig 48. Note that Brouskare (1974) seems to have put the wrong object under this number.

human-divine relationship into that between human beings and so bring it within a comprehensible pattern.[359] Making offerings was a means of gaining access to the inaccessible by facilitating the transmission of favours and linking the two spheres. Like sacrifice and other gifts to the gods, first offerings provided a way of creating religious ties with the divine. Paradoxically, however, the division between the two spheres of mortals and gods was at once bridged and reinforced, since implicit in the act of gift-giving is the recognition of the recipient's higher rank and status. This is particularly the case with *aparchai*, which acknowledged that the gods should come first as they were by definition superior and deserved greater honours than men did.

g) Display and Competition

Like all gifts to the gods, some first offerings, especially expensive monumental ones, could serve as instruments of display and self-advertisement. One attribute that gave dedications and their accompanying inscriptions such potential for display is the primacy of the dedicator's name in the inscription. Given the typically brief nature of these texts, the name usually figures prominently to highlight the dedicator's identity.[360] Some first offerings make overt mention of the individual's achievement: athletic victory,[361] manumission,[362] civic rewards[363] and so on (see Chapter Five). By advertising one's name and deeds in the inscriptions, such objects could commemorate the individual's achievement as well as the god's benefactions. Seen thus, the act of offering was not so much giving to the gods as setting up a memorial for one's own deeds.[364] The general preference for physical objects instead of

[359] Parker (1998), esp. 120.
[360] The tendency of the dedicator's name to figure prominently in inscriptions is discussed in Keesling (2003), 22-35.
[361] E.g. *IGASMG* IV no. 2.
[362] E.g. McCabe, *Chios Inscriptions*, no. 154.
[363] E.g. *IG* II^2 2939 (=4339).
[364] Burkert (1987c), 49

sacrificial offerings also reflects a desire to leave behind a tangible and durable memorial. Elements of ostentatious display and competition are most conspicuous in military first offerings: set up predominantly in Panhellenic sanctuaries, these victory offerings and their accompanying inscriptions (which often make explicit the defeated city's name) were exploited as a medium to publicize one's victory and to humiliate one's enemy (see Chapter Six). However, the Greeks seem to have seen no conflict between dedication as an expression of piety and as an act of self-advertisement.[365] Pausanias' distinction between dedications in Olympia for the gods' honour and for the athletes' self-glorification probably represents an exception to the normal Greek attitude.[366] In first offerings, as in other gifts to the gods, gratitude and piety could go hand in hand with the more 'secular' desire for competitive display.[367] As de Polignac puts so aptly, 'offerings to the gods are at the heart of a triangular relation: between dedicator and deity... ; between dedicator and community, since the offering said something about his identity, status and role in this community; and between god and community...'. In other words, material gifts to the gods do not constitute a simple bilateral relation between humans and the divine; they also involve members of the community (and other communities) who would see and admire the objects.[368]

Nevertheless, the use of offerings for displaying wealth, piety and success should not be overemphasized. First offerings were not necessarily expensive marble monuments; they could range from splendid objects like marble statues, to inexpensive ones like pottery, vessels, personal items (see Chapter Five), agricultural produce (see Chapter Three), and specimens of food and drink (see Chapter Four). For

[365] Parker (2004a), 270.
[366] Paus. 5.21.1, 5.25.1.
[367] The impossibility to separate these different elements is also noted by Veyne (1983), 292, 294.
[368] The women in Herod. 4.20-38, 57-77, illustrate this well: while making a thank-offering in a temple of Asclepius, they paused to admire the dedications set up by others.

example, among the inscribed fragments discovered in the temple of Athena in Ialysos on Rhodes, we have fragments of ceramic vessels inscribed with the words *apargma* or *dekate*.[369] These humble objects offer little scope for competitive display and are more appropriately seen as token offerings. It is unfortunate that there is an over-concentration of surviving evidence on expensive marble dedications, whereas humble offerings made of perishable materials are likely to have been lost and will therefore inevitably escape our attention.

II. Conclusion

As is the case with any religious practice, there existed among worshippers and worshipping communities a spectrum of motivations in bringing first offerings to the gods, some of which are more 'religious' and some more 'secular'. Given the complexity of psychology behind each act of offering, it is not always easy to pin down a single reason why a first offering was made, nor can we provide a single explanation that encompasses the whole religious phenomenon. Individuals and communities could have several different motivations concurrently in bringing first offerings to the gods, or they might have no specific motives at all. Attitudes could vary between individuals and within the same individual in different contexts. Amid the unlimited possibilities of why first offerings were given to the gods, I have identified what seem to me to be the most pertinent and yet I do not claim to have been exhaustive.[370] The various strands of motivations suggested above, though treated separately for the purpose of discussion, are in fact closely intertwined. Underlying all of them (with the exception of the last) is a sense of dependence on

[369] *SEG* XXXVIII 783 a-d, f; Martelli (1988), 113-5.
[370] Other possible reasons for making first offerings which are not discussed here for lack of space and for their lack of specificity to first offerings are e.g. social convention and traditionalism, on which see e.g. the anthropological study of Humphrey and Laidlaw (1994).

and the need to maintain good relations with the gods, upon whom all human successes and failures, both past and future, depend. Doubtless first offerings reflect an attempt to secure the worshipper's or the worshipping community's well-being, which was constantly changing and subject to the whim of the divine powers. Seen thus, propitiating one's divine benefactors and averting evil powers are but different ways of dealing with the same forces beyond human control.

I hope to have drawn attention to the fact that traditional interpretations of gifts to the gods in terms of material benefits and self-advertisement are not a sufficient explanation for first offerings. While a mixture of different motivations certainly exists, the religious practice cannot be reduced to mercantile commerce between men and gods or competitive displays among men themselves. Instead, first offerings should be understood at least in part as expressions of the relation of dependence, indebtedness and gratitude that men perceived between themselves and the divine. They reflect a fundamental belief in the workings of the gods in this world, who might be propitiated by restoring to them part of what came from them. Whether the intention was to give thanks and honour, propitiate the gods, achieve communication, or avert evil, the act of returning part of something acknowledged implicitly the gods' involvement in human affairs. Amid the perpetual uncertainties of life, *aparchai* and *dekatai* probably satisfied men's psychological needs as much as, and perhaps even more than, their material needs in this life, and to a greater extent than historians used to think.

Chapter III

Agricultural First Offerings

In a well-known mythical tradition related by Homer and other ancient authors, King Oeneus offered *thalusia* or *aparchai*[1] of his vineyard to all the gods save Artemis, who, in her anger, sent a boar to ravage the fields in Calydon.[2] A related practice is depicted in Theocritus' *Idyll* VII: the narrator sets out with two friends from the town of Cos to attend a harvest festival, in which *thalusia* would be offered to Demeter in return for the goddess' gift of barley.[3] These two passages allude to the customary agricultural practice of offering to the gods some of the land's produce, which probably formed the most basic and simple kind of first offerings. Yet the festival mentioned in Theocritus represents only one of the various occasions on which first-fruits would be made: in ancient Greece the agricultural year was accompanied by a series of festivals, each celebrating a different moment in the cycle of seasons but complementary to each other.[4] Several of them, namely the *Proerosia*, *Thargelia* and *Pyanopsia*, involved the communal offering and possibly consumption of various kinds of festive foods which are associated with *aparchai* in the sources. Outside these festivals, individuals might also offer first-fruits as they saw fit.

This Chapter concerns agricultural first-fruits made by individuals and communities both during and outside festivals. None of the festivals studied here is explicitly termed a 'first-fruits festival' by the ancients. In accordance with the principle set out in the Introduction, identification of *aparchai*-related agrarian festivals is based on the ancient usages of the word *aparchai* and its synonyms in the sources, including both Classical sources and ancient lexicographers, though

[1] The sources vary between *thalusia* (Hom. *Il*. 9.534) and *aparchai* (Eur. *Meleager*, fr. 516, Ar. *Ran.* 1241, Apoll. *Biblio*. 1.8.2).
[2] Hom. *Il*. 9.534, Eur. *Meleager*, fr. 516, Ar. *Ran.* 1241, Apoll. *Biblio*. 1.8.2, Bacchyl. 5.95-102.
[3] Theoc. *Idyll* 7.3, 31-34.
[4] See the useful calendar in Foxhall (1995), 98-9, table 6.1.

admittedly, post-Classical usages of the words may or may not be reliable.[5]

I. Agricultural Festivals Related to First-Fruits

a) *Proerosia*

The *Proerosia* was a pre-ploughing sacrifice or festival attested in five demes of Attica,[6] with varying names, dates and divine honorands attested.[7] We know from one inscription that the *Proerosia* in the deme of Eleusis was proclaimed on the fifth of Pyanopsion in autumn and probably took place on the sixth.[8] This rite at Eleusis was the most prestigious and had probably become a polis festival by the last quarter of the fifth century (see below). One tradition had it that a mythical plague or famine afflicted all the Greeks (or all mankind), in view of which the Athenians duly performed a pre-ploughing sacrifice on behalf of all in accordance with oracular advice. Because of this, *aparchai* of corn were brought to Athens as thank-offerings by all the Greeks.[9] However, another tradition, based on Demeter's gift of corn, justifies *aparchai* to the Athenians in terms of the mission of Triptolemus: it was at Eleusis that corn first appeared and was distributed by Triptolemus to the rest of mankind.[10] Both traditions stress the benevolence of Athens and the gratitude and

[5] On this principle, the *Chytroi* (the third day of the *Anthesteria*) and the Eleusinian Mysteries (which have been associated with cult vessels called *kernoi*) cannot be justifiably regarded as first-fruits festivals and therefore will not be discussed here. Early scholarship which has (mis-)taken them as such are e.g. Harrison (1903), 158-60, 518-35, 549, 559, Xanthoudides (1905-6), Harrison (1912), 292-4, Persson (1942), 79; doubts have been expressed by e.g. Pollitt (1979), 230-1, Clinton (2009).

[6] On the Attic demes celebrating this festival, see Mikalson (1975), 68, Parker (1987), 141, Parker (2005), 196, n. 14.

[7] On the *Proerosia*, see Mikalson (1979), 434, Brumfield (1981), 54-69, Whitehead (1986), 196-7, Parker (1987), esp. 141, Parker (2005), 196, 330-2, 479.

[8] *LSCG* 7.1-7 (= *IG* II^2 1363); Dow and Healey (1965), 15-16. Cf. Brumfield (1981), 58-9, Foxhall (1995), 102, who think that the *Proerosia* was 'moveable': the fact that it had to be announced suggests that it was not a regular annual festival.

[9] The myth is related in Lycu. fr. XIV.4-5 Conomis (fr. XIV.4 = Suda π 2420 s.v. *Προηροσίαι*), Aristid. *Or.* 1. 399, Phot. s.v. *Proerosia*, Suda. *α* 18 s.v. *Ἄβαρις*, Schol. Aristid. p. 55.33-56.5 Dindorf, Schol. Ar. *Eq*. 729 Dübner, Schol. Ar. *Plut*. 1054 Dübner; collected in Parker (2005), 330 n. 14. Our sources differ on the nature of the calamity (plague (*λοιμός*) or famine (*λιμός*)), the god of the oracle (Apollo or Zeus) and the date (*νγ'*, *κα'* or †ες *Ὀλυμπιάδι'*).

[10] The tradition is related in e.g. Xen. *Hell*. 6.3.6, Isoc. *Paneg*. 28-31, Aristid. *Or.* 1.36-37, Aristid. *Or.* 22.3-4. See also Parker (1991), Parker (1996), 143, n. 85, Parker (2005), 331.

offerings owed to the Athenians by the Greeks.

Two kinds of offerings are therefore associated with the *Proerosia*, namely a pre-ploughing sacrifice and *aparchai* of crops. Photius refers to the *proerosia* as 'the sacrifice performed by the Athenians for the crops in obedience to the oracle at Elis' (*ἡ ὑπερ τῶν καρπῶν θυσία γιγομένη ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων κατὰ μαντείαν ἐν Ἤλιδι*);[11] and the Suda explains it more fully as 'sacrifices taking place before ploughing for the future crops, that they may be brought to maturity; performed by the Athenians on behalf of all the Greeks in the 56th Olympiad' (*αἱ πρὸ τοῦ ἀρότρου γινόμεναι θυσίαι περὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἔσεσθαι καρπῶν, ὥστε τελεσφορεῖσθαι· ἐγίνετο δὲ ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ὑπὲρ πάντων Ἑλλήνων ϟεϛ' Ὀλυμπιάδι*).[12] It was in gratitude for this sacrifice performed on behalf of all that *aparchai* of crops were sent to the Athenians by all the Greeks. The scholia to two Aristophanic passages thus explain the tradition with similar wordings: 'and so as thank-offerings the Greeks from all directions sent *aparchai* of all crops to the Athenians' (*καὶ οὕτως ὥσπερ χαριστήριον οἱ πανταχόθεν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐξέπεμπον τῶν καρπῶν ἁπάντων τὰς ἀπαρχάς*).[13] According to the scholia, the *aparchai* were primarily *χαριστήρια* to the Athenians rather than to the gods.

While the two kinds of offerings are certainly related in myth, in practice it is less clear whether there would necessarily be *aparchai* of crops whenever the *Proerosia* was celebrated. In other words, in historic times it is unclear if the offering

[11] Phot. s.v. *Proerosia*. The phrase *ἐν Ἤλιδι* seems to refer to an oracle of Zeus in Olympia; this is the sole source attributing the oracle to Zeus, whereas other sources refer to Delphic Apollo (see n. 9).
[12] Lycu. fr. XIV.4 Conomis (= Suda π 2420 s.v. *Προηροσίαι*).
[13] Schol. Ar. *Eq*. 729 Jones and Wilson; see similarly Schol. Ar. *Plut*. 1054f Chantry.

of *aparchai* was a regular custom associated with the *Proerosia*. It is possible that a pre-ploughing sacrifice was performed without *aparchai* being involved: epigraphic evidence (admittedly all piecemeal) only attests to sacrifices in various Attic demes without any explicit reference to *aparchai*.[14] However, a mid-fifth century decree of the deme Paiania has an ambiguous reference to 'pre-ploughing barley' (*προεροσιάδες κριθαί*).[15] If it is correct to think that this barley is *aparchai*, worshippers probably brought *aparchai* of agricultural produce to the local *Proerosia*. But even so, what we have here seems to concern a communal custom within Attica to bring *aparchai*; there is no evidence for Panhellenic contributions of *aparchai* to Athens or Eleusis during the *Proerosia*, that is, unless we assume that the *aparchai* requested in the famous Eleusinian first-fruits decree in the fifth century were dispatched to Eleusis on the occasion of the *Proerosia*.[16] As we shall see in greater details in Chapter Seven, the decree required the Athenians and their allies, and invited the other Greeks at large, to send *aparchai* of wheat and barley to the two goddesses at Eleusis on an unidentified occasion. At this point I am concerned only with the decree's similarities to, and possible links with, the *Proerosia*: ideologically it shares the same myth (of Triptolemus' mission) with the *Proerosia*; and in rituals it too involves a sacrifice financed by the *aparchai* of wheat and barley sent from other Greek cities.

According to the Eleusinian first-fruits decree, the practice was *κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὲν μαντείαν τὲν ἐγ Δελφῶν*, implying that it had been a practice of

[14] Sacrifices are attested in four Attic demes: *IG* I^3 250 (=*LSS* 18) (Paiania), *SEG* XXXIII 147 (Thorikos), *IG* II^2 1183 (= RO 63) (Myrrhinus or Hagnous), *IG* II^2 1363 (= *LSCG* 7) (Eleusis). A fifth deme, Piraeus, is also known to have celebrated the *Proerosia*, but its inscription *IG* II^2 1177 does not mention a sacrifice.
[15] *IG* I^3 250 A22, B4; Parker (2005), 331.
[16] *IG* I^3 78.

old to dispatch *aparchai* to Eleusis.[17] It is not made explicit what the 'ancestral customs' are exactly. Might the decree be drawing on the pre-ploughing *Proerosia*, originally celebrated locally in various Attic demes but which probably later became a polis festival bound up with Eleusis? The beginning of Euripides' *Supplices* shows Theseus' mother 'making preliminary sacrifice for the ploughing of the land' (*τυγχάνω δ' ὑπὲρ χθονὸς ἀρότου προθύουσ'*) at the sanctuary at Eleusis where the first corn appeared.[18] The occasion is generally agreed to be the *Proerosia*; and the scene suggests the possibility that by the 420s, when the play was produced, the Eleusinian *Proerosia* might have acquired the status of a state festival. Some scholars have postulated that the Eleusinian first-fruits decree probably took up an existing association between agricultural *aparchai* and the Eleusinian *Proerosia* and attempted to extend it to Greece at large. On this view, an existing practice in Attica was probably expanded to a Panhellenic religious obligation; and the *Proerosia* was the occasion, in reality as well as in myth, for the collection of the *aparchai* as well as the performance of the sacrifices funded by their proceeds.[19] However, these scholars have neglected the important fact that the Eleusinian *aparchai* were only *aetiologically* connected to the *Proerosia* in the sources. There is no evidence for a Panhellenic dimension to the *Proerosia* in real practice; and we have no reason to assume that *theoriai* from other Greek cities bringing *aparchai* of harvest certainly came to Eleusis during the *Proerosia*. The precise relations between the two remain elusive and difficult to pin down; what is important for us here is that the decree provides fifth-century attestations for the offering of agricultural first-fruits as a traditional and required practice within Attica, and for possible attempts to extend an

[17] *IG* I^3 78.4-5, 25-26, 34.
[18] Eur. *Supp*. 1-41, esp. 28-31; with commentary and bibliography in Morwood (2007), 147.
[19] Robertson (1996), 319-25, Parker (1996), 143 with n. 85, Parker (2005), 330-2.

Attic practice to the other Greeks at large. Yet the actual mechanism by which this might be achieved remain largely obscure: it is unclear how the decree could be enforced in Attica and elsewhere; and the occasion(s) for the dispatch of the *aparchai* and the sacrifices remain(s) unidentifiable.[20]

To return to the *Proerosia*, its varying dates and names and lack of 'centralization' (until perhaps the last quarter of the fifth century) may be due to variations in the right moment for sowing from one area to another or from year to year.[21] As Xenophon's Ischomachus tells us, 'the god does not regulate the year by a fixed pattern; but in one year it is best to sow early, in another at mid-season, in another very late' (*καὶ ὁ θεός, ἔφην ἐγώ, οὐ τεταγμένως τὸ ἔτος ἄγει, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν τῷ πρωίμῳ κάλλιστα, τὸ δὲ τῷ μέσῳ, τὸ δὲ τῷ ὀψιμωτάτῳ*).[22] The aims and intentions of pre-ploughing ceremonies might be glimpsed from the Suda's words quoted earlier: 'sacrifices taking place before ploughing for the future crops, that they may be brought to maturity'.[23] Performed before sowing, the sacrifices were made to win the gods' blessings for the successful growth of the crops in the new season. Certainly the *Proerosia* was not the only rite performed to propitiate the gods: after the *Proerosia*, there followed other rites performed at different stages of the agricultural cycle to foster the process of growth and to appeal to divine protection for the crops.

---

[20] This question has been much disputed and no candidate proposed is entirely satisfactory. The Eleusinian Mysteries: Smarczyk (1990), 184-216, esp. 196, Larson (2007), 75, cf. Parker (2005), 331, n. 19. The *Proerosia*: Robertson (1996), esp. 319-30, Parker (2005), 330, n. 16. The *Eleusinia*: ML 78, followed by Fornara (1977), no. 140, n. 11, Simms (1975), 272 (based on *IG* I^3 5 (= *I. Eleusis* 13)), cf. Clinton (1979), 8, n. 29, Parker (2005), 328, n. 6, Clinton's commentary on *I. Eleusis* II 13, p. 33. The *Synoikia*: McGregor (1938), 161-2, cf. Clinton in *I. Eleusis* II 45, p.65-66. No specific festival: *I. Eleusis* II, p. 6-7, Clinton (2010), esp. 4-10.

[21] On the suitable time for ploughing and sowing, see Foxhall (2005), 80-1.

[22] Xen. *Oec*. 17.4 (adapted from Marchant's translation).

[23] Lycu. fr. XIV.4 Conomis (= Suda π 2420 s.v. *Προηρόσιαι*).

b) *Thargelia*

The *Thargelia* was a festival of Apollo[24] celebrated at Athens on the seventh of Thargelion at the beginning of the summer; it was also celebrated in some Ionian cities and their colonies.[25] It is not entirely clear what the festive food *thargelos* (which gave the festival its name) was; but some lexicographers regard it as an *aparche*, a vegetarian foodstuff prepared in a pot using the first harvest collected. Hesychius speaks of *αἱ ἀπαρχαί τῶν φαινομένων* and *χύτρα ἀνάπλεως σπερμάτων*; Photius explains the *thargelos* as 'a pot full of seeds for the sacred boiled meal. They boiled in it *aparchai* of the crops that had appeared for the god' (*ὁ τῶν σπερμάτων μεστὸς χύτρος ἱεροῦ ἑψήματος. ἥψουν δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ ἀπαρχὰς τῷ θεῷ τῶν πεφηνότων καρπῶν*). While both Hesychius and Photius mention a pot full of seeds, Athenaeus quotes Krates as saying that the *thargelos* is the first bread made from the harvest: *Κράτης δ' ἐν β' Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου θάργηλον καλεῖσθαι τὸν ἐκ τῆς συγκομιδῆς πρῶτον γινόμενον ἄρτον*.[26] Whatever its form and content, the *thargelos* was displayed and carried in a procession and was probably consumed later.[27] There are confusions as to whether the *eiresione* was carried in this festival; and the most recent view is that it was specific to the *Pyanopsia* (see below) and not the *Thargelia*.[28] At Athens the ceremony probably

[24] Apollo Pythios or Apollo Delios: see Bremmer (1983), 319, Parker (1996), 96, n. 120, Parker (2005), 203.

[25] On the *Thargelia* and the *thargelos*, see Ath. 3.114 a, Hesych. *θ* 104 s.v. *θαργήλια*, *θ* 106 s.v. *θάργηλος*, Phot. *θ* 22. s.v. *θαργήλια* (= Suda. *θ* 49), *Etym. Magn.* 443.19; Brumfield (1981), 147-55, Bruit (1990), 168-9, Parker (2005), 185, 203-4, 376 n. 26, 481-3. There survives no mythical explanation for the offering of *thargelos* in this festival.

[26] Krates, *FGrH* 362 F 6 ap. Ath. 3.114a.

[27] There are doubts about whether the procession at the *Thargelia* mentioned in Arist. *Ath. Pol*. 56.5 is the same as the 'procession for the Sun and the Seasons' in Porph. *Abst*. 2.7.1; this is discussed in Parker (2005), 203-4, n. 52-3. On whether the *θάργηλος* was consumed by human participants, see Parker (2005), 185, cf. Bruit (1990) 168-9.

[28] Parker (2005), 204-5.

also involved a sacrifice to Demeter Chloe.[29] The *Thargelia* is also a festival of purification involving the ritual expulsion of the *pharmakos* or scapegoat, but this aspect does not concern us here.[30]

Dedicated at the beginning of the harvest, the *thargelos* was first-fruits in a double sense – a preliminary portion of the earliest-grown crops, as if the choicest of the crops had to be enjoyed by the gods first. The *thargelos* from the earliest-growing cereals was perhaps intended, on the one hand, to thank the gods for the earliest crops just collected, and on the other hand, to propitiate the gods in the hope of a favourable outcome for the rest of the harvest.[31] It was not unusual to offer *aparchai* before the entire harvest was collected. Theophrastus notes a comparable practice in Egypt: although the barley ripened a month earlier in Egypt than that in Greece, only what was required for the *aparche* would be gathered at such an early date (*οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ ἐκεῖ τό γε πᾶν πλῆθος οὕτως, ἀλλ' ὅσον εἰς ἀπαρχήν*).[32]

c) *Pyanopsia*

In contrast to the *Thargelia* held at the beginning of the harvest, the *Pyanopsia* was a post-harvest festival celebrated at Athens on the seventh of Pyanopsion in autumn.[33] The honorand was probably Apollo Delphinios.[34] Like the *Proerosia*, the custom is associated aetiologically with an ancient famine, which was remedied in this case by dedicating a suppliant branch called *eiresione* to Apollo. Lycurgus speaks

[29] Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 61, Schol. Soph. *OC* 1600 de Marco, Parker (2005), 196, n. 15.
[30] On the *pharmakos* rituals, see Den Boer (1979), 129-32, Bremmer (1983), Burkert (1985), 82, Parker (2005), 203, 482-3.
[31] Bruit (1990), 169.
[32] Theophr. *Hist. pl.* 8.2.7.
[33] *LSCG* 7.9-19 (= *IG* II^2 1363). On the *Pyanopsia*, the main sources are Lycurg. fr. XIV.2a-3 Conomis, Plut. *Thes*. 22, Paus. Att. *ε* 17 Erbse (= Suda *ει* 184 s.v. *εἰρεσιώνη*). See also Burkert (1979), 134, Calame (1990), 150-3, 290-324, Parker (2005), 185, 204-6, 480.
[34] Apollo Delphinios: Graf, (1979), 13-19, Calame (1990), 229, 319-22, Parker (2005), 203, n. 50, 436, n. 75.

of a large olive branch decorated 'with everything that the seasons produce at that time' (*καὶ θαλλὸν μέγαν κοσμήσαντας ἁπάντων, ὧν κατ᾽ ἐκείνους τοὺς καιροὺς αἱ ὧραι φέρουσιν*), intended as 'first-fruit offerings of all the products of the earth, because the suppliant branch placed with Apollo ended the famine of our land' (*ἀπαρχὰς ποιησαμένους τῶν γιγνομένων πάντων ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι τὴν ἀφορίαν ἡμῶν τῆς χώρας ἱκετηρία ἡ παρὰ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τεθεῖσα ἔπαυσεν*). It is unclear what 'everything' entails, but Lycurgus seems to refer to raw natural produce only.[35]

However, Plutarch links the practice to the myth of Theseus:[36] after their safe return from Crete, the youths cooked the remainder of their provisions in a pot to make what is sometimes called the *panspermia* (literally 'all-seed').[37] This was probably similar in content to the *thargelos* in the *Thargelia*; and it was feasted upon by the participants. In their procession the youths carried the *eiresione*, a suppliant olive branch hung with wool and all sorts of first-fruits (the word used by Plutarch is *κατάργματα*[38]) to signify the end of scarcity. According to their song, quoted by Plutarch, the *eiresione* brought figs, rich loaves, honey and oil. An *eiresione* was publicly dedicated in front of the temple of Apollo.[39] There were also private *eiresionai* attached to the door of individual households, where they probably

[35] Lycurg. fr. XIV.2a-3 Conomis (tr. Parker (2005), 205). Cf. Menekles of Barka, *FGrH* 270 F 8 (cakes), Schol. Ar. *Eq*. 729a Dübner (*akrodrua*), *Eymn. Magn*. 303.18-20 (*akrodrua*); Parker (2005), 205, n. 59.

[36] In addition to these two traditions, there is a third *aition*: Plut. *Thes*. 22 reports that some people connect the rites with the hospitality accorded by the Athenians to the Heracleidae.

[37] Lexicographers explain *πανσπερμία* as *παγκαρπία* (literally 'all-fruits') but not *aparchai*: e.g. Hesych. π 18 s.v. *παγκαρπία*, Phot. s.v. *πανσπερμία*, Suda π 216 s.v. *πανσπερμία*. Note that the *panspermia* was not exclusive to the *Pyanopsia*, but also appeared in funeral rites and other contexts.

[38] On the word *κατάργματα*, see Chapter One, n. 74.

[39] In the Roman period the person who carried this official *eiresione* was called *εἰρεσιώνης*. Several suviving decrees honouring these people are collected in Follet (1974), 30-2.

remained until they were replaced the following year.[40]

Whatever the contents of the *eiresione*, the emphasis is on the diversity of produce symbolic of abundance and basic to human nourishment. If the pre-ploughing *Proerosia* looks forward to the next season, the *Pyanopsia* probably looks back over the old season and gives thanks and honour to the gods for all the crops successfully collected over the summer.

d) *Thalusia*

So far we have seen agricultural first-fruits practices in Attica; similar practices are also attested in other parts of Greece. The *thalusia* mentioned at the very beginning of this chapter were first offerings of harvest attested outside Attica and were not specific to any divinities. Two scholia speak of the *Thalusia* as a festival;[41] but other sources refer to offerings from the produce harvested. Homer tells us that Artemis took offence at Oeneus' lack of *thalusia* for her whereas the other gods enjoyed a hecatomb.[42] The reference to a hecatomb suggests that the *thalusia* here consist of animal sacrifices funded by the proceeds of the harvest collected. This is supported by a scholion which speaks of the *thalusia* as '*thusiai* given for the blooming and fertility of the crops after their gathering, to Demeter and other gods' (*τὰς ὑπὲρ εὐθαλείας καὶ εὐφορίας τῶν καρπῶν διδομένας θυσίας, μετὰ τὴν συγκομιδὴν τῶν καρπῶν, τοῖς τε ἄλλοις καὶ τῇ Δήμητρι*).[43] In Theocritus' *Idyll* VII, the narrator sets out to the farms of Phrasidamus and Antigenes; the reason given is that 'Phrasidamus and Antigenes were making harvest-offerings to Demeter' (*τᾷ*

[40] *Eiresionai* placed at the door: Lycurg. fr. XIV.2a Conomis, Ar. *Eq*. 729, *Plut*. 1054, *Vesp*. 399.
[41] Schol. Hom. *Il*. 9.534b Erbse: *ἑορτή, ἐν ᾗ τὰς ἀπαρχὰς τοῖς θεοῖς ἐπιθύουσι τῶν καρπῶν* (a festival in which they sacrifice the *aparchai* of the crops to the gods); Schol. Theoc. *Idyll* 7.3 c Wendel: *Δήμητρος ἑορτή μετὰ τὴν συλλογὴν τῶν καρπῶν* (a festival of Demeter after the collection of the crops).
[42] Hom. *Il*. 9.533-6.
[43] Schol. Hom. *Il*. 9.534 Dindorf (= *Etym. Magn*. 442.13)

Δηοῖ γὰρ ἔτευξε θαλύσια καὶ Φρασίδαμος κἀντιγένης).[44] The *thalusia* here seem to consist of sheaves of corn and poppies (*δράγματα καὶ μάκωνες*) dedicated at the image of Demeter by the threshing floor of Phrasidamus and Antigenes (see below).[45] However, the Athenaeus passage mentioned earlier identifies *thalusios* with *thargelos*: '*...τὸν θάργηλον, ὅν τινες καλοῦσι θαλύσιον*'.[46] In these passages *thalusia* refer to the offerings but not a festival. It is likely that some scholia might have attributed the name of the offering to the festival in which they were made.

What is reasonably certain is that *thalusia* are harvest offerings, used as a synonym of *aparchai* of crops. Hesychius refers to *thalusia* as *αἱ τῶν καρπῶν ἀπαρχαί*.[47] While Homer uses the word *thalusia*, Aristophanes, Euripides and Apollodorus use *aparchai* for Oeneus' offering in myth,[48] which suggests that the two terms are interchangeable or regarded as the same by some classical authors. In Theocritus, the act of offering *thalusia* is expressed by the verb *aparchesthai* when the narrator explains that his comrades are holding a feast for Demeter to offer first-fruits of their abundance, since the goddess has richly piled their threshing-floor with barley (*ἁ δ' ὁδὸς ἅδε θαλυσιάς· ἦ γὰρ ἑταῖροι / ἀνέρες εὐπέπλῳ Δαμάτερι δαῖτα τελεῦντι / ὄλβῳ ἀπαρχόμενοι· μάλα γάρ σφισι πίονι μέτρῳ /*

[44] Theoc. *Idyll* 7.3 (adapted from Gow's translation). The verb *τεύχω* seems to go less well with the name of a festival than an offering.
[45] Theoc. *Idyll* 7.157.
[46] Ath. 3.114a.
[47] Hesych. *θ* 65 s.v. *θαλύσια*. The association between *Thalusia* (taken as a festival) and *aparchai* is also made in Schol. Hom. *Il*. 9.534 Erbse (see n. 41 above). See also a late source Eust. *Il*. 9.534 p. 791 Van der Valk, which describes *thalusia* as 'first offerings, that is, those given to the god after the collection of the crops to ensure that the fields flourish in future too. Some orators call them "bringing together" offerings' (*Θαλύσια δὲ αἱ ἀπαρχαί, ὡς πρὸ ὀλίγων εἴρηται, ἤγουν αἱ μετὰ συλλογὴν τῶν καρπῶν διδόμεναι θεῷ ὑπὲρ τοῦ καὶ εἰς ἔπειτα θάλλειν τὰς ἀρούρας. Τινὲς δὲ τῶν ῥητόρων καὶ συγκομιστήρια ταῦτα καλοῦσιν*) (tr. Parker (2011), 198).
[48] See n. 1.

ἁ δαίμων εὔκριθον ἀνεπλήρωσεν ἀλωάν /).[49] The *aparchai* or *thalusia* here, offered in gratitude for the goddess' gifts, must therefore follow a rich harvest of barley, though precisely when the celebration in question took place is difficult to pin down.[50]

e) *Pithoigia*

The *Anthesteria* was a three-day festival (11-13 Anthesterion) at Athens in honour of Dionysus.[51] The major elements involved rites of wine-opening on the first day, called the *Pithoigia* (literally 'Jar-Opening'), followed by a drinking competition on the second. On the third and last day, called the *Chytroi* (or 'Pots'), grains of all kinds were boiled together in a pot with honey.[52] What concerns us here is the first day. On the day of the *Pithoigia*, *pithoi* of the previous summer's vintage were taken to the sanctuary of Dionysus where they were opened, offered to the gods and sampled. Apparently participants did not partake of the wine until the god had been given his share: Phanodemus says that the Athenians would 'mix it for the god, then sample it themselves' (τῷ θεῷ κιρνάναι, εἶτ' αὑτοῖς προσφέρεσθαι); likewise Plutarch mentions that 'in the past, it seems, they used to pour a libation before tasting the wine' (καὶ πάλαι γ' ὡς ἔοικεν εὔχοντο, τοῦ οἴνου πρὶν ἢ πιεῖν ἀποσπένδοντες).[53] When describing the *Pithoigia* at Athens, Plutarch uses the word *katarchesthai*: 'they make first offerings from the new wine at Athens on the eleventh of the month Anthesterion, calling the day "Pot-opening"' (τοῦ νέου οἴνου Ἀθήνησι

[49] Theoc. *Idyll* 7.31-34.
[50] Gow (1950), vol. 2, 127, 164, postulated July or August, the months for the stripping of the vines. Dover (1971) and Hunter (1999) do not comment on this.
[51] The main source is Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F 347 (a) and (b). On the *Anthesteria*, see Parker (2005), ch. 14, esp. 291-3 on the *Pythoigia*.
[52] The association between the *Chytroi* and first-fruits is problematic (see n. 5) and will not be discussed here.
[53] Phanodemus *FGrH* 325 F 12 ap. Ath. 465a; Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 3.7.1, 655e (tr. Parker (2005), 291-2).

μὲν ἑνδεκάτῃ μηνὸς Ἀνθεστηριῶνος κατάρχονται, Πιθοίγια τὴν ἡμέραν καλοῦντες), though admittedly his usage of the word is not typical of Classical usages.[54] Based on these passages, it is tempting to think that the ritualized wine-opening on the *Pithoigia* might have involved making first offerings of wine. Just as a portion of the seasonal produce of the fields would be offered to the gods in agricultural festivals, a portion of the new wine was very likely poured for the gods before participants tasted it.

In the *Thargelia*, *Pyanopsia* and *Thalusia*, first-fruits variously termed *thargelos*, *eiresione* and *thalusia* were presented to the gods on a communal or domestic basis using a random portion of the seasonal produce. They were probably a specimen of different kinds of raw natural produce available and accessible to every household. The *Pithoigia*, on the other hand, probably involved a preliminary offering of the new wine. The pre-ploughing sacrifice in the *Proerosia* was not, strictly speaking, an agricultural first offering in itself: it was connected to *aparchai* in myth; but in real practice we do not know if *aparchai* were necessarily offered whenever the *Proerosia* was celebrated. On none of the above occasions was a fixed portion specified as first-fruits; a fixed proportion of agricultural produce was stipulated only in two contexts: first, the *aparchai* of wheat and barley in the Eleusinian first-fruits decree (see Chapter Seven); and second, payment of land rent, which might be a *dekate* of the land's produce or the proceeds from its sale (see Chapter Eight).

[54] Plut. *Quaest. conv*. 3.7.1, 655e (adapted from the translation in Parker (2005), 291); see also Fuhrmann's translation: 'Les Athéniens offrent les prémices du vin nouveau...'. In Classical literature the word *katarchesthai* normally refers to opening sacrificial rituals (see Chapter One).

II. Farmers' First Offerings Outside Festivals

In the festivals discussed above, first-fruits were dedicated more or less regularly at certain points in the agricultural year. Outside these festivals, individuals might also make agricultural first offerings to the gods as they saw fit. Regarding these, a distinction may be made between 'raw' and 'converted' offerings: vegetarian offerings in their original form, and more durable dedication specially commissioned for dedication using the proceeds from the land's produce.[55]

Perishable vegetarian offerings have left few traces in archaeological and epigraphical evidence; but dedicatory epigrams provide us with a few valuable examples (perhaps literary imitations) of them. A third-century epigram attributed to Nicaenetus shows one Philetis dedicating sheaves and garlands of straws as the *dekate* of his/her threshing:

> Ἡρῷσσαι Λιβύων ὄρος ἄκριτον αἵτε νέμεσθε
> αἰγίδι καὶ στρεπτοῖς ζωσάμεναι θυσάνοις,
> τέκνα θεῶν, δέξασθε Φιλήτιδος ἱερὰ ταῦτα
> δράγματα καὶ χλωροὺς ἐκ καλάμης στεφάνους,
> ἅσσ' ἀπὸ λικμητοῦ δεκατεύεται· ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτως
> Ἡρῷσσαι Λιβύων χαίρετε δεσπότιδες.[56]
> 'Libyan Heroines, you who dwell in this continuous mountain-range,
> girded with goatskin with tangled tufts,
> daughters of the gods, accept from Philetis[57] these sacred
> sheaves and fresh garlands of straw,
> offered as a tithe of his/her winnowing; yet even so
> Heroines and mistresses of the Libyans, take delight.'

It was probably common for individuals to dedicate a few sheaves (*δράγματα*) as first-fruits, though the few sheaves and straws are unlikely to represent a real tenth of a farmer's threshing. *Dragmata* also feature in Theocritus' *Idyll* VII: it concludes with

[55] Snodgrass (1989-90).
[56] Gow-Page, *HE*, I, 145-6, II, 418-9, no. 1, *Anth. Pal.* 6.225.
[57] Philetis (in Paton's translation in the Loeb edition) is a rare name recorded only once in *LGPN*. Gow-Page, *HE*, II, 418, notes that Philetis can be a male or a female name depending on where it is accented.

the narrator expressing the wish to repeat the ritual: 'on her [Demeter's] heap may I plant again the great winnowing-shovel while she smiles on us with sheaves and poppies in either hand' (*ἆς ἐπὶ σωρῷ / αὖτις ἐγὼ πάξαιμι μέγα πτύον, ἃ δὲ γελάσσαι / δράγματα καὶ μάκωνας ἐν ἀμφοτέραισιν ἔχοισα /*).[58] By the threshing-floor of Phrasidamus and Antigenes (who were holding the festival) must have been a statue or figure of Demeter, into whose hands the participants would put sheaves and poppies. The planting of the *μέγα πτύον*, on the other hand, apparently refers to the placing of the winnowing-shovel in the heap of the winnowed corn to mark the end of the winnowing.[59]

Also of interest is an epigram by Apollonides (probably late first century B.C. to early first century A.D.): a grower of vines makes a humble offering (perhaps some grapes, grape juice or wine) from his vineyard and asks the divinity to grant him more so that he can offer *aparchai* more generously in return. The epigram ends with these words: 'may there be a small return from small possessions; but if you gave more, *daimon*, we shall offer first-fruits from many' (*εἴη δ' ἐξ ὀλίγων ὀλίγη χάρις· εἰ δὲ διδοίης / πλείονα, καὶ πολλῶν, δαῖμον, ἀπαρξόμεθα*).[60] Another planter of vines is the subject of an epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum in the third century B.C.: one Heronax offers to the Satyrs and Bacchus three casks filled with fresh wine, one from each of his three vineyards, as first-fruits:

Γλευκοπόταις Σατύροισι καὶ ἀμπελοφύτορι Βάκχῳ
Ἡρῶναξ πρώτης δράγματα φυταλιῆς
τρισσῶν οἰνοπέδων τρισσοὺς ἱερώσατο τούσδε
ἐμπλήσας οἴνου πρωτοχύτοιο κάδους·
ὧν ἡμεῖς σπείσαντες, ὅσον θέμις, οἴνοπι Βάκχῳ

[58] Theoc. *Idyll* 7.155-7 (tr. Gow).
[59] Gow (1950), vol. 2, 169, Hunter (1999), 199.
[60] Gow-Page, *GP*, I, 129, II, 149, no. 2, *Anth. Pal*. 6.238 (adapted from Gow-Page's translation).

καὶ Σατύροις, Σατύρων πλείονα πιόμεθα.[61]
'To the Satyrs the drinkers of new wine and to Bacchus the wine-planter,
Heronax, as first-fruits of his first vine,
from his three vineyards offered these three
casks after filling them with first-flowing wine;
having poured a libation from them, as much as is right, to ruddy-faced
Bacchus and the Satyrs, we will drink more than the Satyrs.'

Probably then, he has recently planted three vineyards and is offering the first produce (οἶνος πρωτοχύτος, literally 'first-flowing wine') collected from them to the gods. The word δράγματα here does not denote 'sheaves', but is probably used as an equivalent of *aparchai*.[62] We have here *aparchai* proportional to one's number of fields - one from each field – when normally agricultural *aparchai* appear to be a random portion. The fact that the gods' share is smaller than that retained for human consumption is expressed playfully by the phrase Σατύρων πλείονα πιόμεθα. There are further epigrams showing farmers dedicating produce of their fields to the gods; but they are not referred to as *aparchai*, *dekatai* or the like.[63]

These 'raw' offerings of natural produce, in such forms as a few sheaves or some wine, were probably placed on the household altar (or an image of the god if available) at the end of a day's labour. Such first-fruits were readily available to the farmers and within an average farmer's capacity to make. 'Converted' offerings such as expensive marble dedications, on the other hand, were made on very different scales. We have several marble dedications possibly made by farmers. A fifth-century inscription on a marble pillar from the Athenian acropolis concerns a *dekate* (of the produce) of land (δεκάτη χοριόω) for Athena: τἀθηναίαι | δεκάτην| χοριόω| Ἀθμονόθεν|

[61] Gow-Page, *HE*, I, 137, II, 391-2, no. 94, *Anth. Pal*. 6.44.
[62] Such is the explanation of Suda δ 1490 s.v δράγματα: ἀπαρχαί (quoting this epigram) and Gow-Page, *HE*, II, 391-2, no. 94.
[63] E.g. Nicarchus no. 4 in Gow-Page, *HE*, Apollonides no. 3, and Philip no. 9 in Gow-Page, *GP*; *Anth. Pal*. 6.31, 36, 239.

Χαιρεδέμο Φιλέα. Its dedicator(s), from the deme Athmon, might have been farmers or tenants; and the offering was probably funded by the sale of agricultural produce.[64] Another fifth-century Athenian inscription on a marble pillar has been restored as follows: *[Δι]ο̣<φ>άνες μ′ ἀνέθεκεν Ἀθεναία[ι τόδ′ ἄγαλμα] / [χο]ρίο δεκάτεν τõ τέκνο εὐχ[σαμένο]* ('[Di]ophanes dedicated me, this *agalma*, to Athena, as a tithe (of the produce) of [la]nd', his child having made a vow'). If Raubitschek's supplement *[χο]ρίο δεκάτεν* is correct, this may be another *dekate* of the produce of land.[65] A mid-fourth century fragmentary verse inscription of a *dekate* mentions *[κοι]ν̣ωνὸν δὲ πό[νων]* and *[Δήμητρ]ος καρποφό[ρου]*; it may also be an offering from farmers.[66]

It is important to realize the actual number of first-offerings from farmers must have been much greater than can be identified here. Many more farmers' first offerings must have escaped our attention because of the lack of information in the dedicatory inscriptions. In none of the first-offerings inscriptions collected in this study does the dedicator call himself/herself *γεωργός*; and only in a few instances can we infer from expressions like *δεκάτη χοριόω* that the individuals might be farmers. Considering that the population of Attica consisted largely of farmers, a lot more inscriptions without such identifications might also have been made by farmers: it was probably considered unnecessary to identify themselves as such since most people worked the land in agrarian societies.

---

[64] *IG* I^3 800, *DAA* no. 191. Raubitschek noted that it is unclear if *Χαιρεδέμο Φιλέα* should read as two dedicants or one dedicant with his patronymic given. *LGPN* II s.v.*Φίλεια* (2) takes *Φίλεα* as the daughter of *Χαιρέδημος*.
[65] *IG* I^3 735, *DAA* no. 283. Yet Raubitschek's supplement does not appear in *IG* I^3 735.
[66] *IG* II^2 4587, *CEG* 752.

III. Risks and Hazards in Agricultural Societies

In the early twentieth century, a notion widely shared by many historians was that preliminary portions of harvest or of food in general were offered to the gods to break taboos on eating: the Greeks had to seek the gods' permission for the consumption of the land's produce; failure to do so was thought to incur undesirable consequences.[67] Although historians now take care to avoid the word 'taboo', similar notions continue to be expressed in more modern scholarship. Rudhardt considered that 'après ce sacrifice, il peut consommer le reste de ses richesses ou l'employer à son gré: l'*ἀπαρχή* les a affranchies'. In a similar vein, Jameson suggested that 'a portion of the food to be eaten by men was given to the gods and thereby made the rest of the food usable or safe'. More recently, according to Zaidman, 'prémices... autorisent la consommation, en désacralisant les nourritures dont une part symbolique a été abandonnée aux dieux'.[68] There is, in ancient Greece, no evidence for prohibitions on eating before first-fruits were offered. The notion that the gods must receive their share first is wrongly applied to Greece from other cultures.[69] The only possible restriction on consumption before offering the gods' share perhaps applies to new wine before the ritualized wine-opening on the *Pithoigia*; but even here the evidence for restriction is not explicit. Another view explains the need for first-fruits in terms of the maintenance of natural equilibrium: *aparchai* returned to nature a portion of natural produce as if to conserve and compensate for what was taken away for human consumption. In Rudhardt's view, 'l'*ἀπαρχή* restitue au monde l'énergie

[67] E.g. Rouse (1902), 41, Frazer (1911-15), vol. 3, 5, 102, vol. 4, 101-2, vol. 8, 56-8, Harrison (1912), 291ff, Nilsson (1940), 28.
[68] Rudhardt (1992), 222, Jameson (1994), 38, Zaidman (2005b), 38.
[69] On taboos in other cultures, see Webster (1942), Steiner (1956). On dietary choices in antiquity, see the recent study by Beer (2009); but none of what Beer calls 'taboos' constitutes any restriction on eating before first-fruits were offered.

qu'ils vont consommer et leur permet d'esperer de nouvelles récoltes'.[70] Yet this is not supported by evidence either.

It is difficult to pin down a single reason or immediately perceived goal behind the offering of first-fruits; and the farmers would seldom reflect on the significance of this traditional practice. But if pressed, an important factor underlying the offering of first-fruits is perhaps the great uncertainties involved in agriculture. I have already briefly touched upon farmers' anxiety and psychology in Chapter Two; here I will cite some further passages to reinforce this basic truth. In Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, Socrates says that all farmers look anxiously to the gods and wait to see when they will send rain on the earth; and there are no fixed laws by which the gods regulate the years.[71] A passage in Aristotle attests to the high variability in climate from one area to the next and from one year to another.[72] These views are confirmed by Osborne's study, which demonstrates a high level of inter-annual climatic variability on the Greek mainland, with rainfall varying by more than 60 per cent from year to year.[73] Hanson, himself a raisin farmer in modern California, gives a vivid description of the uncertainties in cultivation practices and the constant apprehensions inherent in farming.[74] Menander's *Dyscolus* shows a life of hard agricultural labour on rocky hillsides; this is perhaps closer to reality than the fantasy of utopian abundance and effortless provision of food in old comedy.[75] Under such conditions there were frequent associations between the success (or failure) of agriculture and divine action in Greek imagination; and the gods' role in creating and averting risks in agriculture was recognized as paramount. Offering the first-fruits of the fields to the gods was

[70] Rudhardt (1992), 219-22.
[71] Xen. *Oec*. 17.2-4.
[72] Arist. *Mete*. 360b4-12.
[73] Osborne (1987), 33.
[74] Hanson (1995), ch. 4, esp. 135-67.
[75] Men. *Dys*. See the comic passages collected and discussed in Wilkins (2001), 107-15.

probably a way to express thanks for the produce available on the one hand, and to propitiate the gods for further blessings on the other. It is perhaps both in gratitude to, and in fear of, the gods that the Greeks brought the first-fruits of their fields to the divinities. The custom puts into practice Xenophon's advice that men should propitiate the gods in matters of agriculture no less than in other matters, and that sensible men would cultivate the gods 'for the good of their fruits and crops and cattle and horses and sheep and indeed for all their possessions' (*οἱ σώφρονες καὶ ὑπὲρ ὑγρῶν καὶ ξηρῶν καρπῶν καὶ βοῶν καὶ ἵππων καὶ προβάτων καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων γε δὴ τῶν κτημάτων τοὺς θεοὺς θεραπεύουσιν*).[76]

Men's dependence on the gods in agriculture can further be illustrated by oracular consultations. Many of the oracular questions private individuals put to the gods at Dodona were closely related to farming. We have a question which simply reads 'concerning the fruits of the land' (*Πὲρ καρποῦ τᾶ̣[ς] γείας;*). Similarly another one reads 'concerning the fruits (of the land) of Demeter and Dionysus' (*Περὶ Δαματρίω̣ καὶ Διονυσίω καρπ̣[ῶ]*).[77] A fragmentary enquiry containing the word *πανκα<ρ>[πίας(?)]* was possibly made by a farmer concerning his fields (*Πὲρ τᾶς πανκα<ρ>[πίας(?)---] ὲ ΚΛΕΟΓΕΝΑΙ̣[---]*).[78] Another consultation, also made by one who worked the land, unfortunately does not preserve the divine favour he was asking for: 'Zeus Naios and Dione and the gods in the same temple, [I ask y]ou with good fortune to give me who works the land and...' (*Ζεῦ Ναῖε καὶ Διώνη καὶ σύννα[οι, αἰτῶ ὑ]μᾶς ἀγαθεῖ τύχει δοῦναι ἐ[μοὶ τὰν] γᾶν ἐργαζομένωι καὶ*

[76] Xen. *Oec*. 5.19-20. (tr. Pomeroy).
[77] Lhôte (2006), 169-72, nos. 77-78.
[78] Lhôte (2006), 172, no. 79 a.

EN ……EIΛ).[79] In the fourth century the Corcyreans and Oricians enquired of the gods as follows: 'God. The Corcyreans and the Oricians enquire of Zeus Naios and Dione, by sacrificing and praying to which of the gods or heroes may they best govern their city and most securely, and have a good and abundant harvest, as well as profit of all their good harvest' (*[Θ]εός. ἐπικοινῶνται τοὶ Κορκυραῖοι καὶ τοὶ Ὠρίκιοι τῶι Διὶ τῶι Ναίωι καὶ τᾶι Διώναι τίνι κα θεῶν ἢ ἡρώων θύοντες καὶ εὐχόμενοι τὰν̣ πόλιν κ̣άλλιστα οἰκεῦεγ καὶ ἀσφαλέστατα καὶ εὐκαρπία σφιν καὶ πολυκαρπία τελέθοι καὶ κατόνασις παντὸς τὠγαθοῦ καρποῦ*).[80] That individuals and states should seek oracular advice about farm-work and harvest suggests that agriculture was a matter of great concern. Eidinow has argued that oracular consultation was a means by which individuals managed uncertainty and risks in everyday life.[81] It is tempting to see agricultural first-fruits as having similar potentials: in an attempt to minimize risks and seek help, farmers turned to the gods with first-fruits in the hope of divine favour and protection.

IV. First-Fruits Festivals and Social Functions

First-fruits festivals held in honour of the gods were also occasions for social gatherings. They provided not only leisure and entertainment to break the mundane routine of agrarian life, but also an opportunity to interact with other members of the community. Harvest celebrations in particular were occasions for both religious worship and collective relaxation. Their dual role is recognized in a passage in Aristotle, according to which sacrifices and gatherings were held to 'pay honor to the gods and to provide relaxation with pleasure for themselves' (*θυσίας τε ποιοῦντες*

[79] Lhôte (2006), 168, no. 76.
[80] Lhôte (2006), 31-3, no. 2.
[81] Eidinow (2007), 4.

καὶ περὶ ταύτας συνόδους, τιμάς <τε> ἀπονέμοντες τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ αὑτοῖς ἀναπαύσεις πορίζοντες μεθ' ἡδονῆς). Aristotle further explains that 'sacrifices and gatherings of old appear to take place after the harvest of crops as a kind of first-fruits, because this was the time when people had the most leisure' (*αἱ γὰρ ἀρχαῖαι θυσίαι καὶ σύνοδοι φαίνονται γίνεσθαι μετὰ τὰς τῶν καρπῶν συγκομιδὰς οἷον ἀπαρχαί· μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν τούτοις ἐσχόλαζον τοῖς καιροῖς*).[82] That the offering of first-fruits and festivity often went hand in hand is also reflected in Socrates' comment about agriculture: 'what other art yields more seemly first-fruits for the gods, or gives occasion for more ample festivals?' (*τίς δὲ ἄλλη θεοῖς ἀπαρχὰς πρεπωδεστέρας παρέχει ἢ ἑορτὰς πληρεστέρας ἀποδεικνύει;*)[83]

We can imagine that such occasions made possible the enjoyment of food and wine; it also provided an opportunity for members of the community to demonstrate their generosity and hospitality to the group by holding a banquet or sharing the produce of their fields. Thus in Theocritus, two Coans of noble lineage were holding a feast for Demeter, to which the narrator and his friends were being invited.[84] Unlike occasions of luxurious eating, in these communal celebrations what was consumed was probably simple festival food accessible to anyone.[85] By turning the individual consumption of the newly available crops into a collective activity, such gatherings had the effect of maintaining social relations and fostering social harmony.

The fact that first-fruits festivals could enhance social cohesion is not unique to

[82] Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1160a (adapted from Irwin's translation). See also Ath. 8.363d.
[83] Xen. *Oec*. 5. 10 (adapted from Marchant's translation).
[84] Theoc. *Idyll*. 7.31-33.
[85] Parker (2005), 186.

ancient Greece: similar festivals in other cultures have been shown to serve comparable functions. As was seen in Chapter One, Gluckman identified in first-fruits ceremonies among the Bantu the functions of channeling dissension among participants and affirmations of the status quo. He argued that people were likely to have conflicts in times of dearth and harvest; and by imposing prohibitions on eating before the performance of the relevant rites in the ceremony, people would consume the new crop together and therefore avoid quarrels.[86] Nevertheless, Gluckman's model has limited explanatory value for agricultural first-fruits in ancient Greece, where there is no evidence for restriction on eating before agricultural *aparchai* were offered. As noted earlier, even at the communal new wine opening on the *Pithoigia*, the evidence for prohibition is only inferred rather than made explicit in the sources.

Social elements should not undermine the religious significance of first-fruits festivals, since any religious festival may be said to be an occasion for social gathering and feasting. A primary concern of first-fruits festivals was certainly to cultivate the gods' favour in matters of agriculture. It was a traditional practice in agrarian societies, the well-being of which hinged on fertility and productivity of the fields. No important phase of the agricultural cycle - from ploughing, the beginning of harvest, to after the harvest - would go without invoking divine protection with first-fruits of some sort. Among all kinds of first offerings, agricultural first-fruits demonstrate most clearly the basic idea of returning a portion of what came from the gods in the first place. A related practice with similar concerns is the offering of some food and drink to the gods at the start of a meal in individual households, which will be the subject of the next Chapter.

[86] Gluckman (1938).

Chapter IV

First Offerings at Meals

In his treatise *De Pietate*, to defend his thesis that the gods take delight in simple vegetarian offerings rather than expensive animal sacrifice, Theophrastus adduces the following argument: 'that god is not delighted with the large bulk of sacrifices but with what is ordinary, is evident from the fact that before enjoying one's daily food, whatever it may be that is served, everyone makes a small offering from it as first-fruits, but by this small (offering) there is above all (shown) a great honour' (*ὅτι δὲ οὐ τῷ εὐόγκῳ χαίρει ὁ θεὸς τῶν θυσιῶν, ἀλλὰ τῷ τυχόντι, δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ τῆς καθ' ἡμέραν τροφῆς, κἂν ὁποία τις οὖν αὕτη παρατεθῇ, ταύτης πρὸ τῶν ἀπολαύσεων πάντας ἀπάρχεσθαι μικρὸν μέν, ἀλλὰ τῷ μικρῷ τούτῳ παντὸς μᾶλλον μεγάλη τίς ἐστι τιμή*).[1] What Theophrastus is alluding to this passage is a common and yet little studied preliminary meal ritual: it was a customary domestic practice to offer some food and/or drink to the gods before the Greeks partook of their meals; and both the concept and vocabulary of *aparchai* and *aparchesthai* are applied to this practice in our sources.

Apart from the various kinds of festival food presented to the gods as first-fruits in agricultural festivals seen in the last Chapter, there existed in Greek religion a full range of foodstuffs offered to the gods in different forms and in different contexts, ranging from the most conspicuous burning of raw (primarily inedible) parts of sacrificial animals on an altar, the serving of a meal on tables set for the gods in what is called *theoxenia*, the simple deposition of unburnt meat or vegetarian offerings on

[1] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 9.12-15 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.20.1.

cult tables, to the humble offering of some food at meals in individual households.[2] What interests me in this chapter is the offering of (mainly vegetarian) foodstuffs to the gods at the beginning of meals in ordinary Greek households, though meals in semi-formal settings such as banquets will also be mentioned. Because of its simple, informal and private character, this ritual rarely features in epigraphic and literary records, and perhaps for this reason has been accorded little attention by historians.[3] Nevertheless, this neglected aspect of Greek religion is particularly worthy of our attention: it is perhaps the most regular act of making first offerings, a ritual performed in every household and whose regularity and simplicity is almost unparalleled in Greek religion.

I. Offerings of Food and Drink: the Sources

The earliest available literary references to the practice of making first offerings at meals are found in Homer, though Homer does not use the terms *aparche* or *aparchesthai* specifically. In Book nine of the *Iliad*, Odysseus and Aias are sent as representatives to Achilles' quarters to reconcile him with Agamemnon and are received with hospitality. Achilles orders Patrocles to prepare wine and he himself cuts the meat of parts of a sheep, a goat and a hog, roasts it and serves it to his guests. When the food and drink are prepared and all are ready to eat, Achilles tells Patroclus to offer sacrifice to the gods; Patroclus casts *thuelai* into the fire (*θεοῖσι δὲ θῦσαι ἀνώγει Πάτροκλον ὃν ἑταῖρον· ὃ δ' ἐν πυρὶ βάλλε θυηλάς*).[4] Only then do they

[2] The diversity of food offerings and the different methods of offering them to the gods are discussed in Jameson (1994), 37-9, Zaidman (2005b).
[3] The only detailed account to my knowledge is the unpublished dissertation by M.H. Jameson, *Offerings at Meals. Its Place in Greek Sacrifice* (1949). Beyond this there are only passing remarks in general studies of Greek religion, e.g. Nilsson (1940), 71-3, Jameson (1988b), 966, Rudhardt (1992), 219, Jameson (1994), 38, Parker (2005), 13. Recent studies of Greek domestic religious practices e.g. Bodel and Olyan (2008), Boedeker (2008), Faraone (2008), Morgan (2010), ch. 6, do not discuss this custom.
[4] Hom. *Il*. 9.219-20.

set their hands on the food. The term *thuelai*, etymologically related to *thuein* and usually used in the plural, refers to the part of a sacrificial animal offered in a burnt sacrifice.[5] Here they consist of the roasted meat about to be consumed by Achilles and his company. The word *thuelai* is considered by some lexicographers and scholia as an equivalent of *aparchai*;[6] the A and bT scholia further equate the verb *thuein* with *aparchesthai*.[7]

However, there are difficulties in using this passage for our purpose. Since the ordinary Greek diet was primarily vegetarian in nature,[8] the meat-involving meal prepared by Achilles cannot be taken as typical of everyday meals in ancient Greece. A further complication is the degree of ambiguity as to whether *thuelai* are sacrificial offerings or first offerings at meals: in sacrificial rituals the distinction between 'the god's sacrificial portion' and 'the first portion of food' is difficult to draw. This can be said of the above passage and other passages involving the gods' portions in animal sacrifices.[9] Jameson, who made extensive use of sacrificial scenes in Homer in his study of meal offerings, resolved this problem by seeing meal-preparation as a separate and second stage after the sacrifice, and by regarding meal ritual as a minor sacrifice, and sacrifice as a major meal ritual.[10]

A scene in Book nine of the *Odyssey* resembles more closely, albeit not exactly, the offering of simple vegetarian foodstuffs in ordinary meals. Having entered the

---

[5] LSJ, s.v. *θυηλή*. Casabona (1966), 121-2, sees *θυηλαί* as closely associated with *θύω*, explaining them as offerings to the gods by means by fire, in other words 'the burnt portions' or the 'portions which one *θύει*'.

[6] Hesych. *θ* 837 s.v. *θυηλάς*: *ἀπαρχάς*; *Etym. Magn*. 457.32-36 s.v. *θυηλαί: ἀπαρχαὶ τῶν θυσιῶν*; Schol. Hom. *Il*. 9.219 b Erbse: *τὰς ἐπιθυομένας ἀπαρχάς*. Jameson (1949), 139, followed Hesychius' explanation but pointed out that *θυηλαί* was a neutral term which could refer to both flesh and vegetable offerings. Kirk et al. (1985-93) comment on neither the word nor the practice here.

[7] Schol. Hom. *Il*. 9.219 c, d Erbse.

[8] On the centrality of wheat and barley in ancient Greek diet, see Foxhall and Forbes (1982), Sallares (1991), Garnsey (1999), ch.1, Beer (2009), 17-27.

[9] E.g. Home. *Od*. 14.414ff (Eumaeus' sacrifice, discussed in Chapter One).

[10] Jameson (1949), 167-8.

Cyclops' cave while he is herding his flocks and taken his cheeses, Odysseus and his companions light a fire to make offerings, presumably of the cheeses, before they take them for themselves (*ἔνθα δὲ πῦρ κήαντες ἐθύσαμεν ἠδὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ τυρῶν αἰνύμενοι φάγομεν*).[11] The phrase *καὶ αὐτοὶ* ('ourselves also [ate]') suggests that the gods are thought to partake of the burnt cheeses as they themselves do.[12] The insistence that the gods be given their share first despite their desperate situation shows that it was customary for the Greeks to make first offerings to the gods before eating. Such is the explanation of the T scholia on this passage: 'when about to eat we first made offerings' (*μέλλοντες ἐσθίειν πρότερον ἐθύσαμεν*), and also of the H scholia: 'we made offerings from the cheeses, for making an offering from *aparchai* was a custom of old' (*ἐθύσαμεν ἀπὸ τῶν τυρῶν. παλαιὸν γὰρ ἔθος τὸ τῶν ἀπαρχῶν θύειν*).[13] Nevertheless, it is unclear how realistic Homer's description is: one wonders whether it was typical for the Greeks to light a fire to offer some cheese to the gods every time they partook of some themselves. The word *thuein* in line 231, used most commonly (but not exclusively) for burnt offerings of meat, may suggest that the burning of cheeses is an adaptation of the meat-offering ritual often depicted in Homer.

These two Homeric passages are cited by Athenaeus in the *Deipnosophistae* to illustrate one of the proprieties of dining, namely offering *aparchai* of food to the gods. He regards Homer as the authority prescribing this practice: 'moreover Homer teaches us what we ought to do before we feast, which is to offer the gods first fruits of the food' (*καὶ πρὸ τοῦ θοινᾶσθαι δὲ ἃ δεῖ ποιεῖν ἡμᾶς διδάσκει πάλιν*

[11] Hom. *Od*. 9.231-2.
[12] Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989), vol. 2, 27, Dawe (1993), 369.
[13] Schol. Hom. *Od*. 9.231 Dindorf.

Ὅμηρος, ἀπαρχάς τῶν βρωμάτων νέμειν τοῖς θεοῖς);[14] yet the usage of the term *aparchai* is post-Homeric and wrongly ascribed to Homer.[15] It is probable that *ἀπαρχαὶ τῶν βρωμάτων* were still made at banquets in Athenaeus' days; and the neglect of such rites was seen as unseemly, hence his criticism of the lack of libation and *aparchai* in Epicurus (*παρὰ δ' Ἐπικούρῳ οὐ σπονδή, οὐκ ἀπαρχὴ θεοῖς)*.[16]

In Classical literature, Xenophon provides us with two references to this preliminary meal ritual. At the beginning of Book seven of the *Cyropaedia*, Cyrus and his staff are engaged in a sacrifice before battle when their attendants set food and drink before them. Cyrus remains standing and offers a share to the gods before he partakes of the meal (*ὁ δὲ Κῦρος ὥσπερ εἶχεν ἑστηκὼς ἀπαρξάμενος ἠρίστα*).[17] In the conversation between Hiero and Simonides on the advantages enjoyed by private citizens over the rulers, Xenophon makes Hiero say that tyrants have so little trust in others that, for fear of being poisoned, they have their servants taste their food and drink (*σιτία καὶ ποτά*) before making first offerings to the gods (*πρὶν ἀπάρχεσθαι τοῖς θεοῖς*), which implies that the tyrant performs the rite of *aparchesthai* every time he eats or drinks. As these two passages demonstrate, the connection between meals and offerings to the gods is held by Xenophon to be habitual.[18]

That liquid as well as solid food could be set aside as first offerings is made explicit by Theophrastus, who tells us that when mankind discovered for their use divine drops of wine, honey and oil, they offered first-fruits also of these – in addition

[14] Ath. 5.179b-c (tr. Olson).
[15] See Chapter One.
[16] Epicurus p.115 Usener, Ath. 5.179d.
[17] Xen. *Cyr*. 7.1.1 (tr. Miller).
[18] Xen. *Hier.* 4.2.

to first offerings of ground meal, cakes and other things he mentions[19] – to the gods who made them available (*θείας ἑτέρας σταγόνας οἴνου καὶ μέλιτος ἔτι δ' ἐλαίου ταῖς χρείαις ἀνευρίσκοντες ἀπήρχοντο καὶ τούτων τοῖς αἰτίοις θεοῖς*).[20] Nevertheless, although the concept of offering 'part of a greater whole' is certainly present in libations (of wine, milk, honey, oil, water etc.), libations are most commonly referred to as *σπονδή*, *λοιβή*, *χοή* (or by their cognate verbs), but rarely *ἀπαρχή* or *ἀπάρχεσθαι*.[21] Libation is a vast subject which requires an independent study of its own.[22] Following Rudhardt, I shall consider libations as 'un cas particulier de la consécration des prémices'[23] and I shall confine myself as far as possible to the few cases of libation where the vocabulary of first offerings is used, though drink offerings before ordinary eating and/or drinking without the vocabulary of first offerings will also be mentioned.

The close relation between liquid and solid food offering at meals, seen already in Xenophon's passages earlier, can be further illustrated by another source. Plutarch tells us that Gaius Marius was honoured like a god after a major military triumph: the Romans made first offerings of food and drink (probably wine) to Marius and to the gods alike when they celebrated in their households (*εὐθυμούμενοί τε μετὰ παίδων καὶ γυναικῶν ἕκαστοι κατ' οἶκον ἅμα τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ Μαρίῳ δείπνου*

[19] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 2.29-36 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.6.2.
[20] Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 2.39-43 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.6.4.
[21] The isolated examples are Theophr. *Char*. 10.3 (*aparchesthai*), Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 2.39-43 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.6.4 (*aparchesthai*), Plut. *Mar*. 27.5 (*aparchesthai*), Plut. *Quaest. conv*. 3.7.1, 655e (*katarchesthai*, discussed in Chapter Three on the *Pithoigia*). We have already seen the Homeric formula *ἐπάρχεσθαι δεπάεσσιν* in Chapter One, by which is meant the pouring of a few drops of wine into each participant's cup so that each could pour them out to make his own libations (*σπένδειν*), before the cup was filled again for drinking (Hom. *Il*. 1.471, 9.176, *Od*. 3.340, 7.183, 18.418, 21.263, 21.272). Yet this phrase applies specifically to wine-drinking in Homeric banquets and does not relate to ordinary meal rituals in everyday meals.
[22] On libations, see Tolles (1943), Burkert (1985), 70-3, Lissarrague (1990), 209-21, Rudhardt (1992), 240-5, Patton (2009), 27-56.
[23] Rudhardt (1992), 243.

καὶ λοιβῆς ἀπήρχοντο).[24] Here the act of *aparchesthai* evidently applies to both δεῖπον and λοιβή. However, in some cases it is hard to tell whether a libation formed part of the first offering at meals, or whether it was a different but related preliminary meal ritual. As mentioned earlier, Athenaeus criticizes Epicurus for neglecting σπονδή and ἀπαρχὴ θεοῖς (παρὰ δ' Ἐπικούρῳ οὐ σπονδή, οὐκ ἀπαρχὴ θεοῖς).[25] When Athenaeus describes banquets as a compromise between human pleasure and piety, he says that the gods are imagined as coming ἐπὶ τὰς ἀπαρχὰς καὶ τὰς σπονδάς.[26] That ἀπαρχή and σπονδή should be mentioned together using two different terms in these two passages may imply that the two were customarily made together (or on the same occasion), and that the two were considered (at least by Athenaeus) as related but different offerings.

First offerings of drink could accompany offerings of food in daily meals but could also be autonomous rituals of their own. Theophrastus' character *Mikrologias* is said to count how many cups each has drunk when sharing a dinner; and among his companions he makes the smallest first offering, presumably of wine,[27] to Artemis, (καὶ συσσιτῶν ἀριθμεῖν τὰς κύλικας, πόσας ἕκαστος πέπωκε, ἀπάρχεσθαι ἐλάχιστον τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι τῶν συνδειπνούντων).[28] In Book 10 of the *Iliad*, after defeating Rhesus and his company, Odysseus and Diomedes bath themselves, sit down to eat and pour a libation of wine to Athena: 'after they had bathed and anointed themselves with olive oil they sat down to dine, and from the full mixing-bowl

[24] Plut. *Mar.* 27.5.
[25] Ath. 5. 179d.
[26] Ath. 8.363d; but the contexts here are public banquets rather than daily meals.
[27] Steinmetz (1960-2), 133, and Cunningham, Knox and Rusten (1993), 91, note d, think that a libation of wine is meant. But we cannot rule out the possibility that food offerings might also have been involved here.
[28] Theophr. *Char*. 10.3. Ussher (1960), 105, thinks that a huntsman's banquet for Artemis is depicted here; but he does not comment on the religious practice.

drawing the honey-sweet wine poured out an offering to Athena' (*τὼ δὲ λοεσσαμένω καὶ ἀλειψαμένω λίπ' ἐλαίῳ δείπνῳ ἐφιζανέτην, ἀπὸ δὲ κρητῆρος Ἀθήνῃ πλείου ἀφυσσόμενοι λεῖβον μελιηδέα οἶνον*).[29] Apparently the offering here consists of some wine only. It is perhaps to give thanks to Athena for their success and safe return, as it was to the goddess that they appealed for help earlier.[30] Athenaeus quotes Pyrgio as saying of the Cretans in their common messes: 'after they pour a libation to the gods in silence, they give everyone a share of the food that has been served' (*μετ' εὐφημίας σπείσαντες τοῖς θεοῖς μερίζουσι τῶν παρατιθεμένων ἅπασι*).[31] Although the last two passages do not describe the libation as a first offering, they demonstrate that a meal could be preceded by a drink offering alone, without solid food: in some cases a drink offering could replace the first offering of food and was probably considered by some Greeks as a sufficient offering to the gods.

II. Regularity and Practicalities

Unlike ritual acts and behaviour in festivals and other public contexts which might be prescribed by *leges sacrae*, what took place at meals in the private domain must have been fairly flexible and varied from household to household. The practicalities of what specimens of food and drink to offer, the regularity of offering, how they were offered and by whom, were likely to vary according to, among other factors, the circumstances, means, and dispositions of individual worshippers. As far as the kinds of offerings are concerned, they must have been predominantly vegetarian offerings, and rarely meat (raw or cooked), or they could be a

[29] Hom. *Il*. 10. 578-60 (adapted from Lattimore's translation).
[30] See Hom. *Il*. 10. 460ff; Kirk (1985-93), vol. 3, 210.
[31] Pyrgio *FGrH* 467 F 1, Ath. 4.143 e-f (tr. Olson).

representative offering of all that was on the table. If wine or other kinds of drink were available, they might accompany and sometimes replace first portions of food. The ancients must have been free to choose whatever food and/or drink and portions they felt appropriate for the gods; and the value of the offering probably did not matter so much as the performance of the ritual itself. Yet meager offerings were not desirable in all contexts, hence Theophrastus' earlier mockery of his character *Mikrologias*, who displays the same stinginess towards the gods and towards his companions at meals.[32]

We are rarely told how first portions of food and/or drink were offered in practice, yet we may envisage several methods of offering: the gods' portion might have been burnt in the fire in the hearth[33] or on household altars, or deposited unburnt on household altars or on the tables at which the Greeks themselves ate, while a few drops of drink might have been simply be poured on the ground or on household altars.[34] Where the first offerings were made by deposition, we do not know whether the gods' portions would be consumed by individuals later, or whether they were discarded or subsequently burnt, and when they would be replaced. That two modes of offering *aparchai* were available can be illustrated by a passage in Porphyry, who tells us that Clearchus was careful to offer *aparchai* of all the seasonal produce to the gods, offering some by deposition, and others by burning: *σπουδάζειν μέντοι ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν περιγιγνομένων καρπῶν καὶ τῶν ὡραίων ἃ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαμβάνεται, τοῖς θεοῖς τὰς ἀπαρχὰς ἀπονέμειν· καὶ τὰ μὲν παρατιθέναι, τὰ*

[32] Theophr. *Char*. 10.3.
[33] On the religious importance of household hearths, see Nilsson (1940), 72, Parker (2005), 13-15; however, the rarity of the household hearth in archaeological evidence of Greek houses in the Classical period was stressed by Jameson (1990a), 98, 105, Jameson (1990b), 193, Morgan (2010), 149-52.
[34] Jameson (1990a), 105.

δὲ καθαγίζειν αὐτοῖς.[35] Although this passage does not concern a meal, the two modalities can also apply to offerings at meals. There are frequent literary references to altars in households.[36] Archaeological evidence has further shown that some full-sized altars in houses were suitable for serving an actual sacrifice, while smaller ones, categorized as *arulae*, might have been used for taking token offerings and libations without burning.[37] Where a house altar was not available or was not used, one might deposit the first offerings simply on a table as a form of *trapezomata*.[38] This simple act must have been performed by members of the household themselves.

Although we cannot prove that every meal was necessarily accompanied by the offering of some food and drink to the gods, from what we know of this preliminary meal ritual in the passages discussed above, the practice seems to have been fairly common. It is owing to its domestic and routine nature that it was taken for granted by ancient historians and literary authors and therefore seldom features in our sources. One piece of Hesiod's advice seems to concern the regularity of its performance:

> κὰδ δύναμιν δ' ἔρδειν ἱέρ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν
> ἁγνῶς καὶ καθαρῶς, ἐπὶ δ' ἀγλαὰ μηρία καίειν:
> ἄλλοτε δὲ σπονδῆσι θύεσσί τε ἱλάσκεσθαι,
> ἠμὲν ὅτ' εὐνάζῃ καὶ ὅτ' ἂν φάος ἱερὸν ἔλθῃ.[39]
> 'According to your capability, make holy sacrifice to the immortal gods in a hallowed and pure manner, and burn splendid thigh-pieces; at other times, seek propitiation with libations and burnt-offerings, both when you go to bed and when the holy light comes.'

The meaning of the word θύος in line 338 is uncertain.[40] If it is correct to think that

[35] Porph. *Abst*. 2.16.4 (this is not identified as Theophrastus' fragment).
[36] E.g. Ar. *Pax*. 938, Xen. *Mem*. 1.1.2, Pl. *Leg* 10.909d-910d, Isoc. 5.117. See Mare (1962), 59-64, 86-9, 141-51.
[37] Yavis (1949), esp. 171-2, 175-6. See also Morgan (2010), 153-7, at 155, she notes that some miniature domestic altars in Classical Olynthus had burnt areas, while others had shallow depressions that might have held pots or liquid offerings.
[38] On *trapezomata*, see Gill (1974).
[39] Hes. *Op*. 336-9 (adapted from Most's translation)
[40] Jameson (1949), 158-9, considered θύος as some form of breadstuff; Casabona (1966), 111,

by the words *θύος* and *σπονδή* Hesiod is referring to offerings of food and drink at daily meals, what is recommended here is that one should make offerings at meals both in the mornings and evenings.[41] Jameson used this passage to demonstrate the possible routine nature of this practice, arguing that dawn and sunset were appropriate times when the Greeks normally had their meals.[42] Nevertheless, what Hesiod recommends as a twice-daily ritual here probably represents more an ideal than reality. While the practice seems to have been sufficiently common, how frequently and invariably the rite was performed by individuals is difficult to know. Its actual observance might have depended on many factors, such as the disposition of the individual, the circumstances in which he found himself, his need to communicate with the gods, and in whose company he was eating.[43] For example, on a particular day when an individual had a particular need to appeal to the gods, he might have been more motivated to remember the gods' share at his meals or might have given the gods a bigger portion than usual.

To offer some food and drink to the gods, and to suppose that the gods would partake of them (as implied in Hom. *Od*. 9. 231-2), involves a considerable degree of anthropomorphism. Certainly it is impossible, and irrelevant to us, to trace the 'origins' of this preliminary meal ritual. Yet it is attractive to think that the traditional value attached to *xenia* or ritualized friendship in Greek societies might have provided

---

understands the action in line 338 as throwing into the fire 'quelques gouttes de liquide et quelques *grains de parfum*' (his italics)' rather than vegetarian offerings. West (1978), 241, understands it as 'minor burnt-offerings like cakes and incense'; Rudhardt (1992), 244, n. 10, thought that the word designates vegetable offerings here since the Greeks were not rich enough to make an animal sacrifice every day; LSJ supp. s.v. *θύος*: I. 1. 'a substance producing a fragrant smell when burnt, incense, or sim.', 2. = *θυμιάματα*, II: a cake.

[41] Such is the interpretation of Jameson (1949), 151-62. West (1978), 241, does not express a view on what custom is referred to here; but he cites Greek and non-Greek practices of making prostrations, prayers and burning incense at the rising and setting of the sun.

[42] Jameson (1949), 151-62.

[43] The question of frequency is also discussed in Jameson (1949), 124.

a framework for imagining the relationship between humans and the divine. The sharing of food is the simplest act of sharing among human beings and the most basic expression of hospitality; and hence probably why food, among other things, was offered to the gods. But unlike in *theoxenia* where the gods' presence was made manifest by images and tables expressly set, we do not know if the Greeks would imagine the gods' presence in their daily meals. Nor do we know what ancient worshippers had in mind when they offered some of their food to the gods. Some individuals might have performed the rite as a habitual action more or less without thought. For some others, it might have been a gesture of respect, and for some people a mere formality. In fact it is unclear if the ancients necessarily understood or ever reflected upon the religious significance of this ritual any more than we do.

Some of the modern interpretations of rituals related to agricultural produce, especially the misconceived notion that first-fruits were offered to break taboos on food, has already been discussed in the last chapter and will not be repeated here. The 'breaking of taboo' aside, it is sometimes thought that the part offered to the gods could render the rest of the food and drink 'holy'. Nilsson described the offering at meals as in some way sacralizing the whole meal; likewise, Rudhardt thought that the whole drink might be 'consecrated' by the part of the liquid poured in a libation.[44] Yet the evidence for 'sacralization of the whole' is lacking for offerings at meals, apart from a fragment in Plutarch:

> *Θυσίαν ταύτην ὁ Πλούταρχος πρόχειρον καὶ καθημερινὴν εἶπεν ὀρθῶς,*[45] *ἀφ' ὧν μέλλομεν ἐσθίειν ἱερὰ πάντα ποιοῦντας διὰ τοῦ*

[44] Nilsson (1967-74), vol. 1, 135, Rudhardt (1992), 245.

[45] At Hes. *Op*. 748-9, one piece of advice is 'do not take from undedicated cauldrons to eat or wash yourself, since upon these things too there is punishment' (tr. Most) (*μηδ' ἀπὸ χυτροπόδων ἀνεπιρρέκτων ἀνελόντα ἔσθειν μηδὲ λόεσθαι, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῖς ἔνι ποινή*). Plutarch is here equating the rite *ἐπιρρέζειν χυτρόποδι* in Hesiod with the daily ritual of offering *aparchai* of food before meals, an association which is made also in Plut. *Quaest conv.* 703 D and followed by Jameson

> ἀπάρξασθαι. καὶ γὰρ αἱ τῶν ἱερῶν τραπεζώσεις τοῦτο εἶχον· ἀπαρξάμενοι γὰρ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐδαίνυντο.[46]
> 'Plutarch rightly calls this an easy and daily sacrifice, making holy all that we are going to eat through the offering of first-fruits from it. For the setting of offerings upon the table had this function; since they ate from them after having made first offerings.'

It is suggested here that by setting aside first offerings from the food one was going to eat, the whole substance would be rendered *hieron*. Yet it is doubtful if this view can be taken as reliable or representative of the view of ordinary Greeks. As Jameson argued at length, this effect of a part consecrating the whole only applied to animal sacrifice but not first offerings at meals or any other kinds of first offerings.[47] This notion, reminiscent of the 'sacralization' and 'desacralization' of Hubert and Mauss,[48] might have been extended by some scholars from sacrifice to meal offerings.

It seems to me that first offerings at meals express the same general sentiments as other kinds of first offerings. Theophrastus' account of the development of sacrifice, already discussed in Chapter Two, presents to us an evolutionary process by which men's diet changed, thereby changing the nature of the food offered as *aparchai* to the gods.[49] What we can see is a close relationship between human provisions and food offerings to the gods. The relationship between food for men and food offerings to the gods is also alluded to in a passage in Plutarch's *Moralia*, where Cleodorus defends the custom of eating against Solon's claim that the greatest good is to require no food at all. In the course of his arguments, he points out that without food and agriculture, there will be nothing to be thankful for and nothing to offer as sacrifice or libation,

---

(1949), 143-50, esp. 150, 177 n.2. Yet Plutarch and Jameson can hardly be right in equating what are essentially two different rites. What is probably meant in Hes. *Op*. 748-9 is that there should be a sacrifice for purification before a new pot was used; this is the interpretation or translation preferred by most commentators e.g. Mazon (1928), 113, Sinclair (1932), 77, Casabona (1966), 63-4, West (1978), 341, West (1988), 59, Most (2006-7), vol. 1. 147.

[46] Plut. fr. 95 Sandbach.

[47] Jameson (1949), esp. 63-4.

[48] Hubert and Mauss (1964 [1898]), *passim*.

[49] Esp. Theophr. *Piet*. fr. 2.26-43 Pötscher = Porph. *Abst*. 2.6.1-4.

hence no honour will be paid to the gods:

> *ὀμβρίῳ δὲ Διὶ καὶ προηροσίᾳ Δήμητρι καὶ φυταλμίῳ Ποσειδῶνι ποῦ βωμός ἐστι, ποῦ δὲ θυσία; πῶς δὲ χαριδότης ὁ Διόνυσος, εἰ δεησόμεθα μηδενὸς ὧν δίδωσι; τί δὲ θύσομεν ἢ σπείσομεν; τίνος δ' ἀπαρξόμεθα;*[50]
> 'Where will there be an altar or where a sacrifice offered to Zeus who sends the rain, or to Demeter who initiates the ploughing, or to Poseidon who watches over the tender crops? How shall Dionysus be the giver of delights, if we shall require none of the gifts which he gives? What shall we offer as a sacrifice or libation, and what shall we dedicate as first-fruits?'

Although the emphasis is on the table fellowship made possible by men's need for food, the implication seems to be that food offerings to the gods were motivated by, and depended primarily on, divine provision of all the conditions that made food available for human sustenance in the first place, a point discussed earlier in Chapter Two. It would therefore seem legitimate that a portion of daily food was returned to the gods in acknowledgement of the role of the divine. As is the case with agricultural first offerings such as the *thalusia*, *thargelos* and *eiresione* seen in the last chapter, instead of any prohibition on eating, it is the favour of the gods and the dependence of the worshippers on the divine which should be stressed.

If anything is unusual or unparalleled about these offerings, it is the simplicity and regularity with which they were made. They provide one of the few examples in the study of *aparchai* or indeed in the whole of Greek religion where, outside communal festivals, outside any personal need to ask for or return a divine favour, an individual would offer something to the gods.[51] The humble and unpretentious nature of food offerings means that they were more readily available to ordinary individuals in average households than other forms of religious expression such as animal sacrifice and monumental dedications: everyone was able to offer something to the

[50] Plut. *Conv. Sept. sap.* 158 C-F (tr. Babbitt).
[51] Also noted in Jameson (1949), 151-2.

gods from whatever was available for their meals. This preliminary meal ritual is reminiscent of the Christian practice of saying Grace: both start off a meal, both serve as a gesture of respect for and acknowledgement of the divine powers responsible for the food. But while Christian piety is expressed mainly in words and prayers, the piety of the ancient Greeks found expression in non-verbal performance.

Chapter V

Private Dedications

In Isaeus 5.42, the witnesses claim that their ancestors, among other services for the city, adorned the acropolis with many bronze and marble statues as *aparchai* of their private wealth: *ἔτι δ' ἐν ἀκροπόλει ἀπαρχὰς τῶν ὄντων ἀναθέντες πολλοῖς, ὡς ἀπὸ ἰδίας κτήσεως, ἀγάλμασι χαλκοῖς καὶ λιθίνοις κεκοσμήκασι τὸ ἱερόν*.[1] *Aparchai*-dedication is cited here as the expression of the rich of their wealth, social status and benevolence to the city and its gods. In reality, however, *aparchai* and *dekatai* were not limited to bronze and marble monuments, nor were they the preserve of members of the upper classes; a range of objects could be dedicated as first offerings by individuals of different social standings for a variety of reasons. It is the lack of any direct correlation between the nature of the dedication and the dedicator's background that we shall see in what follows.

This chapter concerns first offerings made by private individuals using the proceeds from a variety of human activities. By 'private dedications' I refer to offerings made by ordinary individuals or groups, irrespective of their number and social status, as opposed to those dedicated collectively by Greek cities or by monarchs on behalf of their people (see Chapter Six). About 280 privately dedicated first offerings,[2] dated between c. 700-300 B.C., have been collected for this study

[1] Isae. 5.42.

[2] These include 93 *aparchai*, 180 *dekatai*, 4 *apargmata*, and 3 *akrothinia*. This is based on the survival of part or the whole of the words in the inscriptions or the supplements provided in the corpuses. For the sole purpose of statistics, I have accepted supplemented texts on the ground that the supplements may often be right; but in the actual text of this chapter, I do not include supplements without discussion. Where a joint dedication designates both an *aparche* and a *dekate* (*IG* I^3 644), or two *aparchai* (*IG* I^3 695), it is counted as two instances of first offerings. However, where the words *aparche* and *dekate* appear alongside each other in an inscription to express that the *aparche* was of the value of a tenth (or vice versa), it is considered as one first offering: e.g. *IG* I^3 862, Lindos II 41, 44, *IG* XI.4 1248, Tuchelt (1970), 56, 117 K 9 bis.

from epigraphic evidence in Attica and elsewhere;[3] and these are supplemented by a few examples in epigrams.[4] Attica alone amounts to about half (142 instances) of all the materials.[5] Outside Attica, first offerings are also widely attested in different parts of the Greek world: they are most abundant in Cyrene[6] and Rhodes,[7] and isolated instances are scattered in Delphi and Epidaurus in mainland Greece, Delos and other islands in the Aegean, Asia Minor to the east, and Italy and Sicily to the west. The vast majority of them were found in local sanctuaries rather than Panhellenic shrines. They were predominantly referred to as *aparchai* and *dekatai*,[8] and rarely *akrothinia*[9] and *apargmata*.[10]

Since it is impossible to give an exhaustive treatment of all the examples I have gathered for this study, and since few private dedicatory inscriptions offer more information about the dedicators other than their names, I shall discuss the more revealing ones only, paying particular attention to i) the dedicators' background and ii) the reason or occasion for dedication where information is available. The materials in

---

[3] Outside the chronological and geographical limits of this study, similar practices are also attested but will not be discussed. E.g. in southern Gaul, a dossier of fourteen inscriptions in Gallo-Greek dated to the second to the first centuries B.C. contains the formula *ΔΕΔΕΒΡΑΤΟΥΔΕΚΑΝΤΕΝ* (or similar); this is translated loosely as 'X dedicated a tithe in gratitude/on account of favour'. See *RIG* I G-27, 28, 64, 65, 66, 148, 183, 184, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 214; collected in Mullen (2008), 251-4, Mullen (forthcoming). In Roman religion, a dozen Latin inscriptions attest to privately dedicated *decumae* to Hercules (and rarely Apollo) in different parts of Italy. See *AnnEpigr* (2000), no. 283, 289, *CIL* I^2 632, 1482, 1531, 1698, 1805, 2645, 3284, VI 29, IX 4071a, X 3956. Both practices are strikingly similar to, and are likely to have been influenced by, the Greek practice.

[4] E.g. *Anth. Pal.* 6. 196, 225, 238, 285, 288 (a few of these concern farmers' first offerings which were already discussed in Chapter Three).

[5] Attica: 77 *aparchai*, 63 *dekatai*, and one *apargma*. These first offerings make up about 34 per cent of all the surviving private dedications inscribed on stone in Attica up to 403 B.C. (some 422 of them in *IG* I^3 526-947).

[6] Some 43 first offerings are attested in Cyrene, all of which are *dekatai*: *SEG* IX 76, 78, 80, 84, 87, 88, 100, 303-4, 307, 309-12 and *ASAA* n.s. 23-4 (1961-2), 219-375, nos. 35-41, 49, 132-5, 137-42, 151-2, 248-52, *SEG* XXXVIII no. 1870, and *SEG* XLIV 1541, nos. 6, 7, 8; most of these are collected in Parker (1983), 341.

[7] Rhodes provides 38 surviving first offerings, including 11 *aparchai*, 25 *dekatai*, and 2 *apargmata*. Only published materials are included here. Unfortunately, the vast majority of the some 200 inscribed pottery fragments discovered in the temple of Athena at Ialysos on Rhodes remain unpublished; among them may be more *dekatai* and *apargmata* than we presently have knowledge of.

[8] The cognate verb *aparchesthai* is also used: *IG* I^3 730, *IG* II^2 1388.69, 4320, 4334; but the verb *dekateuein* does not appear in the any private dedicatory inscription.

[9] *Akrothinia*: *IG* IX.1 131, Daux (1939), 145-6.

[10] *Apargmata*: *I. Histriae* 101, *IG* I^3 703, *SEG* XXXVIII 783, d, f.

Attica will be treated separately from those found elsewhere in order to compare the dedicatory practices between Attica and other parts of Greece. After examining the evidence, I shall discuss the question of the relationship between the background of dedicators and their dedications at the end.

I. 'Occupational' Designations[11]

a) Attica

In Attica, at least three craftsmen, a craftswoman, a washerwoman, two farmers, a fisherman, and two fullers can be more or less securely identified by the information in their dedicatory inscriptions and by prosopography.

Craftsmen

Four dedications on the Athenian acropolis preserve part or the whole of the word *κεραμεύς* ('potter'),[12] of which three were first offerings.[13] These were dedicated by Nearchos, Peikon and Euphronios respectively. I shall discuss them one by one.

The most frequently disputed first offering from potters is Nearchos' *aparche* in

[11] I use the terms 'occupation' and 'occupational designation' here for want of better words but with reservations, as these modern categories do not correspond exactly to ancient conceptions of work. On the differences between ancient and modern notions of 'work', see Vernant (1983c); on *πόνος*, see Loraux (1982).

[12] Vickers (1985), 124-5, Gill and Vickers (1990), 7-8, argue that the word *κεραμεύς* designates the demotic and not trade. In his view these are dedications not by potters but by people from the deme of Kerameis. His proposition cannot be sustained for the following reasons: 1) the use of demotics was only officially encouraged after Kleisthenes' reform in 508 B.C., and before the end of the sixth century deme names were slow to gain popularity; 2) it would be a striking coincidence if a considerable number of people from only one Attic deme identified themselves by their demotic; 3) the correspondences between the names of some dedicators e.g. Nearchos, Euphronios, Mnesiades, and Andokides (see the following note) and known potters increase the likelihood that the word *κεραμεύς* designates 'occupation'. Johnston (1987), 135-6, Wagner (2000), have also argued against Vickers' interpretation.

[13] These are *IG* I^3 628 (Nearchos), 633 (Peikon), 824 (Euphronios). There is a fourth acropolis dedication *IG* I^3 620 (not a first offering) inscribed with the word *κεραμεύς* (*[M]νεσιάδες κεραμεύς με καὶ Ἀνδοκίδες ἀνέθεκεν*); the word orders seems to suggest that only Mnesiades is a potter, whereas his joint dedicator Andokides has been identified as a potter in the late sixth century (*ARV*^{2}, 1-6) by prosopographic links. On potter's dedications in general, see Beazley (1944), esp. 21-5.

the late sixth century. On the capital of a marble pillar is the inscription *Νέαρχος ἀνέθεκεν̣ [ὁ κεραμε]|ὺς ἔργον ἀπαρχὲν τ̣ᾷθ[εναίαι]. |Ἀντένορ ἐπ[οίεσεν] | ὁ Εὐμάρος τ[ὸ ἄγαλμα]* ('Nearchos [the pott]er dedicated an *aparche* of his works to Ath[ena]. Antenor son of Eumares ma[de the *agalma*]').[14] It is generally agreed that the over-life-size *kore* Acr. no. 681 bearing the signature Antenor belongs to this inscribed base.[15] Antenor son of Eumares is the celebrated sculptor to whom the pedimental sculptures of the Temple of Apollo in Delphi and the statues of the tyrannicides have been attributed, which suggests that Nearchos must have been sufficiently prosperous to be able to commission him. This dedication is normally assigned the date c. 525-510 B.C. based on the inscription's letter forms and the style of Acr. no. 681; and Raubitschek identified the dedicator with the known Attic black figure potter/painter of the same name in the sixth century.[16] Nevertheless, this identification presents a chronological problem: the vases signed by the Attic black figure potter/painter Nearchos are dated to the second quarter of the six century (c. 570-555 B.C.),[17] thus leaving a gap of about 30 to 45 years between the potter's career and the earliest stylistic date normally considered for Nearchos' dedication. Raubitschek reconciled this discrepancy in dates by suggesting that the potter Nearchos lived long and offered his statue after retirement. But others suppose that

[14] *IG* I^3 628. The restoration *[ο κεραμε]ύς*, accepted in *IG* I^3, was considered almost certain by Beazley (1944), 21, and Raubitschek (1949); but Johnston (1987), 135, suggests *[τοῦ δεῖνα hυ]ύς*. Keesling (2003), 58, considers the restoration *[κεραμε]ύς* plausible but recognizes that alternative restorations would also fit the space available.

[15] The *kore*: Acr. no. 681; Dickins et al. (1912-21), vol. 1, 228, Payne and Young (1936), vol. 2, pl. 51-3, 124, Holtzmann (2003), 62. The association between the *kore* and the base is accepted by most scholars: Richter (1937), 162, Raubitschek (1939), 711, and Keesling (2003), 56-9, 213; cf. Payne and Young (1936), vol. 1, 31-2.

[16] *DAA* no. 197, p. 233. But some scholars have doubts about this identification, e.g. Beazley (1944), 21, Johnston (1987), 135, Gill and Vickers (1990), 7.

[17] On the works of the potter/painter Nearchos, see *ABV*^{2}, 82-3, Boardman (1974), 35, Immerwahr (1990), 26-8.

the dedicator was a homonymous son or grandson of the potter Nearchos.[18] In light of the fact that Nearchos was a rare name in Archaic and Classical Athens, our dedicator Nearchos and the known potter/painter of the same name could well be the same person;[19] and if so, Raubitschek's suggestion that the *aparche* was made late in the potter's life is a plausible explanation.

Interestingly enough, the *dekate* of the second κεραμεύς Euphronios presents similar chronological problems.[20] The marble pillar upon which a statue probably once stood bears the fragmentary inscription *[E]ὐφρόνιος [⁝ἀνέθεκε]ν [⁝---c.7---]|*

κεραμεὺς ⁝[τὰθεναί]αι δε[κάτεν] ('[E]uphronios the potter [dedicated] a ti[the to Athen]a').[21] Boardman dated the work of the red figure potter/painter Euphronios between c. 520 and c. 505 B.C.,[22] whereas Raubitschek dated the acropolis dedication to shortly after 480 B.C. based on inscription's letter forms and its find-spot,[23] thus leaving a 25 to 40 year gap if the two Euphronios were the same person.[24] To explain the discrepancy, Raubitschek again suggested that potters/painters tended to make their acropolis dedications at the end of their career.[25] The last line of Euphronios' inscription (*IG* I^3 824 B) contains the word *[h]υγίεια[ν]*, indicating perhaps a prayer for the health of the dedicator and/or that of his pots.

---

[18] E.g. Beazley (1944), 21, Webster (1972), 10, Keesling (2003), 58.

[19] *LGPN* II s.v. *Νέαρχος* records only two individuals with this name in the sixth century; and the editors think that Nearchos (1) (potter/painter) and Nearchos (2) (the dedicator in *IG* I^3 628) might or might not be the same person.

[20] *IG* I^3 824, *DAA* no. 225.

[21] *IG* I^3 824 A. 824 B is too fragmentary to be quoted.

[22] On the works of the potter/painter Euphronios, see *ARV*^{2}, 13-19, with addenda in Beazley (1989), 404, Boardman (1975b), 32-3, Pasquier and Denoyelle (1990), Denoyelle (1992), Robertson (1992), 43-50.

[23] *DAA* no. 225, p. 258.

[24] *LGPN* II s.v. *Εὐφρόνιος* (2) identifies the dedicator in *IG* I^3 824 with the known potter/painter in *ARV*^{2}, 13-19.

[25] *DAA* no. 225, p. 258; followed by Wagner (2000), 384.

Based on the fact that Euphronios' changed his career from being a painter to a potter, Maxmin postulates that this change was necessitated by his deteriorating vision: in her view, the dedication was made to appeal for divine treatment of his failing health.[26] Williams, on the other hand, prefers to see the offering as 'l'expression de la gratitude d'un vieil homme pour une vie prospère et pour une bonne santé'.[27] If it is correct to identify the dedicator Euphronios with the potter/painter of the same name active in the last quarter of the sixth century, the suggestion of a retirement offering is the most plausible, and is corroborated by other first offerings possibly made at the end of the dedicator's career which we shall see below.

Little is known about the dedication and career of the third κεραμεύς Peikon. His *dekate* was made in fulfillment of a vow (*Πείκον εὐχσά/μενος κερα/μεὺς δεκάτεν/ ἀνέθεκεν/ τἀθεναίαι*) and consisted of a marble column that might have held a small seated statue.[28] The potter Peikon is otherwise unknown.

In addition to the above three individuals who explicitly called themselves κεραμεύς in their inscriptions, Onesimos son of Smikythos has also been identified as a potter/painter. He alone accounts for seven basins (*perirrhanteria*) of island marble, each carrying the word *aparche* (some by supplements), to Athena between 485 and 480 B.C.[29] He also dedicated a pillar monument as an *aparche* jointly with his son Theodoros in more or less the same period (c. 500-480 B.C.).[30] Raubitschek associated this Onesimos with the red-figure vase painter of the same name whose

[26] Maxmin (1974), 178-80; cf. Williams (1990), 34, who notes that the dedication was made well after Euphronios' change of career.
[27] Williams (1990), 36.
[28] *IG* I^3 633, *DAA* no. 44. *LGPN* II, s.v. *Πείκων* (1).
[29] *IG* I^3 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932. The word *aparche* is supplemented in some cases.
[30] *IG* I^3 699, *DAA* no. 217. Keesling (2005), 401-3, suggests that Theodoros' inscription and object were added later to his father's original dedication.

career dated from the late sixth century to c. 480 B.C.,[31] conjecturing that his son Theodoros might likewise have been a potter/painter. Nevertheless, since the vase painter Onesimos' patronymic is not preserved, and Onesimos was a common name among citizens and foreign residents in Attica,[32] the two persons cannot be securely taken as identical. Based on name matches (often without patronymics or demotics) and other problematic criteria, Raubitschek identified many other dedicators also as potters or artisans.[33] Many of his identifications have already been questioned or rejected;[34] I list in the footnote below only those concerned with first offerings and insecurely associated with potters.[35]

Finally, it is worth mentioning two reliefs probably dedicated by potters. A slab of pentelic marble from the Athenian acropolis, dated to the end of the sixth century, bears a relief depicting a potter seated on a *diphros* and holding two *kylikes* in his left hand. The inscription along its margin is incomplete; but the dedicator's name appears to end in *–αι̯ος*, and the words *ἀνέθεκεν* and *δεκάτεν* are preserved.[36] This is generally thought to be a representation of the dedicating potter, or perhaps a metal-worker,[37] holding two pieces of his own wares ('Acrocups'); and this is sometimes known as the 'Potter relief'. The relief was not fashioned by the dedicating

[31] On the vase painter Onesimos, see *LGPN* II, s.v. *Ὀνήσιμος* (3); Robertson (1992), 43-50, 117-18. Raubitschek's identification is accepted by Keesling (2005), 401-2; but *LGPN* II does not identify the dedicator *Ὀνήσιμος* (2) with the vase painter *Ὀνήσιμος* (3).

[32] *LGPN* II s.v. *Ὀνήσιμος* records 157 instances in Attica in all periods; *LGPN* IIA online (updated April 2007) (http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/publications/vol2a/topm_u.html) lists *Ὀνήσιμος* as one of the most frequently attested male Greek names. Osborne and Byrne (1996) records 15 foreign residents at Athens with this name.

[33] *DAA*, p. 457-8, 465.

[34] E.g. Keesling (2003), 72-3, Keesling (2005), 415ff.

[35] These are *IG* I^3 631 (=*DAA* no. 48), 647 (=*DAA* no. 290), 695 (=*DAA* no. 210), 696 (=*DAA* no. 291), 766 (=*DAA* no. 224), 779 (=*DAA* no. 184).

[36] *IG* I^3 764, *DAA* no. 70, Athens, AM 1332; Dickins et al. (1912-21), vol.1, 272, Payne and Young (1950), pl.129-30.

[37] Wagner (2000), 385, Keesling (2003), 73 (with bibliography), suggests that perhaps a metal-worker rather than a potter is depicted.

potter or metal-worker himself, but was probably a work by the artisan Endoios.[38] Another relief in c. 460 B.C. shows Athena standing on the left with her right hand extended towards a man, who sits on a chair with his right arm extended towards Athena as if offering her a small object.[39] This has been taken by some scholars as representing Athena Ergane receiving an *aparche* from a craftsman of some kind.[40] However, in the absence of any accompanying inscription, there is no sufficient evidence to suggest that the relief and/or the gift depicted in it was an *aparche* or that the dedicator was a potter.

Apart from the monumental dedications from a few potters or painters, some craftsmen might have dedicated less expensive objects as first offerings but the surviving evidence is scant and uncertain.[41] A sixth-century black-figure *hydria* was presented as an *aparche* to Athena by a dedicator whose name is lost. It was incised with *ΑΝΕΘΕΚΕ]Ν: ΑΠΑΡΧΕΝ:* and *Η]ΙΕΡΔΕ[ΙΜ]Ι: ΤΕΣΑΘΕ[ΝΑΙΑΣ]*. There is no indication from the fragmentary inscription that the dedicator was himself a potter, though some scholars have taken him as such.[42] Simliar identification problems also arose in relation to another dedicator: in the sixth or fifth century one Sosimos, a potter according to Luschey and Beazley, dedicated a *phiale* as an *aparche* to Demeter at Eleusis and perhaps also a cup at Athens as an *aparche*. The two vessels were

[38] Raubitschek (1942), restored the artist's signature as *Ἔν[δοιος ἐποίεσ]εν*; accepted in *IG* I^3 764 but disputed by Viviers (1992), 90-6.
[39] Acr. no. 577; Dickins et al. (1912-21), vol. 1, 117; Brouskare (1974) has either left this out or got the number wrong; Mitropoulou (1977), 30-1 and no. 29, fig 48, Van Straten (1981), 93, fig. 32.
[40] Perdrizet (1903), 260-1, Van Straten (1993), 250.
[41] Some of the smaller dedications (not specifically first offerings) by potters are collected and discussed in Webster (1972), 4.
[42] Acr. no. 601, Graef and Langlot et al. (1925-33), vol.1, 67, no. 601a, pl. 28, *ABV*^{2}, 80 no.1. Beazley (1927), 226: 'The name of the dedicator has perished; but he uses the expression *ergon aparchen*, and that he was a potter or vase-painter is quite possible'. Following Beazley, Webster (1972), 4, says that this *hydria* is dedicated by a potter or painter as 'the first-fruits of his works'. However, the word *ergon* is not attested. Even if the word *ergon* was inscribed, it does not constitute sufficient prove that the dedicator was a potter. Williams (1995), 141, Wagner (1997), 90, and Wagner (2000), 385, all assume that the *hydria* was dedicated by the painter himself as a peice of his own work.

incised respectively with *[Σ]ΟΣΙΜ[ΟΣ ΑΝΕΘΕΚΕΝ] ΤΕΙ ΔΕΜ[ΕΤΡΙ ΑΠΑΡ]ΧΕΝ*, and *...]ΟΣ ΑΝΕΘΕΚΕΝ ΑΠΑΡΧΕΝ*. Again no information in the inscription indicates craftsmanship; and Beazley thought that 'he does not say that he was the potter, but it almost follows from the wording of the inscription'.[43] Neither of Beazley's identifications of the two (or three?) dedicators as potters or painters is certain. In all three cases he seems to have been led by 'the wording of the inscription', the word *aparche*, to think that a potter was dedicating a masterpiece of his own works. Yet it is equally plausible that the vessels were dedicated by someone else: there was nothing that prevented an individual from buying a vessel for dedication and having his own name inscribed on it without mentioning the fabricating potter/painter. Although there are isolated instances of first offerings dedicated probably by artisans using a piece of their own craft-work,[44] and although we cannot rule out the possibility that more craftsmen might have done so than is attested epigraphically, the fact remains that Beazley's identification of the above two (or three?) dedicators as potters/painters is not supported by the evidence available.

---

[43] *ABV*[2], 350, Luschey (1939), 109, n. 616. Based on the simiar techniques used in the two vessels, Luschey attributed the cup at Athens (Acr. ii no. 1078) to Sosimos and restored *[ΣΟΣΙΜ]ΟΣ ΑΝΕΘΕΚΕΝ ΑΠΑΡΧΕΝ*; but this identification seems uncertain to me. *LGPN* II s.v. *Σώσιμος* (1), perhaps following Beazley, indicate that this Sosimos was a potter.

[44] The only possible example in Attica to my knowledge is *IG* I[3] 766, *DAA* no. 224: a fifth-century pillar monument made of island marble on the Athenian acropolis is inscribed with this verse inscription *[ἐσθλὸν] τοῖσι σοφοῖσι σο[φ]ίζεσθ[αι κ]ατ[ὰ τέχνεν] / [ὃς γὰρ] ἓ̃χει τέχνεν λõι[ο]ν′ ἓ̃χ[ει βίοτον]. [—c.4-5?—]ε Ἀθεναίαι δεκάτ[εν — — —]* ([It is good] for the wise to devise skilfully accord[ing to their skill], [for he who] has a skill has a better [life] .....a tithe to Athena). The dedicator dwelled on his *σοφία* and *τέχνη*; he was probably a craftsman dedicating a piece of his own work as a *dekate*. For an isolated example outside Attica, see *SEG* XXV 463, Lazzarini 819: in fifth-century Olympia was a bronze strigil dedicated to Zeus and made by the dedicator himself, who was perhaps a metal worker, as 'a gift from [his work]'. Although this is described as a *doron* and not an *aparche* or a *dekate*, the partial sense expressed by *ἀπό* makes it very similar to a first offering (*[τέν]δε Δίκον Διὶ δõρον ἀπ′ [ἐργασί]ας ἀνέθεκεν / αὐτὸς ποιέ[σ]ας . . . . . ε.ει σοφίαν*) (see below).[44]

Craftswoman

A fourth-century rectangular marble base is thus inscribed:

χερσί τε καὶ τέχ[ν]αις ἔργων	By her hands and skill in her work
τόλμαις τε δικαίαις	and honest courage
θρεψαμένη τέκνων γεν[εὰ]ν	having nursed her generation of children
ἀνέθηκε Μέλιννα	Melinna dedicated
σοὶ τήνδε μνήμην, θεὰ Ἐργάνη,	this memorial of her labour to you, goddess Ergane,
ὧν ἐπόνησεν	offering a portion of her possessions as an *aparche*,
μοῖραν ἀπαρξαμένη κτεάνων,	honouring your favour.
τιμῶσα χάριν σήν.[45]	

What strikes the reader is the inscription's emphasis on the dedicator's skills and labour, with which she brought up her children, an achievement which she evidently prided herself on. The recipient goddess Athena Ergane presided over crafts including weaving and pottery.[46] We can therefore infer from Athena's epithet and the expression *χερσί τε καὶ τέχ[ν]αις ἔργων* that Melinna most probably brought up her children by some handicraft work.[47] Might Melinna be like the widow in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*, who lost her husband in Cyprus and had to support her five children by selling wreaths in the market?[48] The aorist participle *θρεψαμένη* may suggest that the *aparche* was made after her children had grown up. Probably then, what we have here is a thank-offering dedicated late in her life with her savings when she looked retrospectively to the past. The motif of retirement offering is sometimes made explicit in literary sources and in dedicatory epigrams in Book six of the *Anthologia Palatina*;[49] but in epigraphic evidence we can only infer that retirement was the occasion for dedication.

---

[45] *IG* II^2 4334.

[46] There are three first offerings dedicated to Athena Ergane: *IG* II^2 2939 (=4339), 4318, 4334, but only *IG* II^2 4334 has some indication of the dedicator's connection to craft.

[47] Vernant (1983c), 248-53, suggested that the Greek word *τέχνη* presupposes specialized knowledge and apprenticeship including craft-work but excluding agriculture.

[48] Ar. *Thesm*. 443-58. On the labour of women in Classical Athens, see Brock (1994).

[49] E.g. Eur. *Erectheus* fr. 369, *Anth. Pal.* 6. 4, 25-30, 90, 95, 104, 289 (these are not first offerings). On retirement offerings, see also Veyne (1983), 293.

Washerwoman

In perhaps the early fifth century, a washerwoman (*πλύντρια*) Smikythe dedicated a fully preserved pedestal base on which a marble basin would have rested. The *dekate* of her income, from washing clothes, presumably paid for the dedication.[50] This seems to be extraordinary expenditure for a washerwoman, a theme to which I will return later. The name Smikythe also appears in another dedication *IG* I^3 700 (not a first offering); but in the lack of the patronymic we do not know if this is the same Smikythe.[51]

Farmers and Fishermen

We have already come across in Chapter Three two private dedications bearing part or the whole of the expression *δεκάτη χοριόω*, dedicated most probably by farmers.[52] Apart from farmers, at least one fisherman also features in our sources: in the fifth century an individual dedicated an *aparche* (of the proceeds) of a catch (*ἄγρα*) to Poseidon. The marble pillar, probably once supporting the statue of a *kore*, is inscribed with this verse inscription: *[τέ]νδε κόρεν ἀ[ν]έθεκεν ἀπαρχὲν [Ναύ(?)]λοχος ἄγρας ☒/ ἓν οἱ ποντομέδ[ον χρ]υσοτρία[ι]ν′ ἔπορεν* ('[Nau?]lochos dedicated this *kore* as an *aparche* of the catch which the lord of the sea with the golden trident provided for him'). The dedicator did not indicate his

[50] *IG* I^3 794, *DAA* no. 380 and p. 465; Ridgway (1987), 402, Kron (1996), 162-3, 165, Kaltsas and Shapiro (2008), 51, no. 10. On other dedications (not specifically first offerings) by washerwomen, see e.g. *IG* II^2 2934, McClees (1920), 16-17, Kron (1996), 162-3. Two other women (of unkonwn 'occupation') also dedicated marble basins as *aparchai*: *IG* I^3 921, 934; both were made of expensive island marble.

[51] *LGPN* II s.v. *Σμικύθη* records 7 individuals in Attica in the Classical period who had this name. Dillon (2001), 15, entertains the posibility that they might be the same person; but *LGPN* II does not identify them as such.

[52] *IG* I^3 800, *DAA* no. 191, and possibly *IG* I^3 735, *DAA* no. 283. .

'profession' but was mostly likely a fisherman.[53]

Fullers

In the late sixth century two fullers (*κναφεύς*) dedicated an island marble column and an island marble basin as a *dekate* and an *aparche* respectively.[54] Their inscriptions explicitly identify them as fullers: *Σίμον ⁝ἀν[έθεκε — —] ⁝ο κναφεὺς [vacat?] δεκάτεν* ('Simon the fuller de[dicated] a tithe') (*IG* I^3 616); *Πολύχσενος ⁝ο Μνέσονος ⁝τõ [κνα]φ̣έος ⁝ἀνέθ[εκεν] ⁝απ̣α̣[ρ]χὲν [τἀθεναίαι]* (Polyxenos son of Mneson, the [ful]ler, dedi[cated] an *apa*[*r*]*che* [to Athena]) (*IG* I^3 905).

Upper-Class 'Occupations'

While some individuals openly advertised their trade as craftsmen and fullers, few members of the upper classes can be identified from the available dedicatory inscriptions. It is only by prosopography that (perhaps) an Athenian treasurer has been tentatively identified: it has been proposed to identify Menandros son of Demetrios from the deme Aigilia, the dedicator of an *aparche* (a marble pillar monument inscribed with a verse inscription) in the mid-fifth century, with the Athenian treasurer of the same name who was in office in 440/39 B.C.; yet the identification is uncertain in the absence of the latter's patronymic or demotic.[55] Another dedicator of an *aparche* (a marble statue base), Hermolykos son of Dietrephes, was by name-matching probably a relative of the known fifth- or fourth-century *strategos*; but

[53] *IG* I^3 828, *DAA* no. 229, *ThesCRA*, vol. 1, 277-8, no. 42. Cf. Paus. 10.9.4: Corcyra dedicated a bronze bull in Delphi as a thank-offering for a large catch of tunnies. Cf. also Gow–Page, *GP*, I, 422, II, 452, no. 2, *Anth. Pal.* 6. 196: an epigram attributed to Statilius Flaccus records a crab dedicated by a fisherman to Pan as *ἀπαρχὴ ἄγρας*; but this is likely to be a literary exercise.

[54] *IG* I^3 616, 905, *DAA* nos. 49b, 342.

[55] *IG* I^3 872, *DAA* no. 218, *ThesCRA*, vol.1, 278, no. 44; cf. *IG* I^3 458a.11. Raubitschek did not give the source for this suggestion; he endorsed this view on the tenuous ground that the dedicator 'appears to have been comparatively wealthy'. *LGPN* II take them as two different persons Menandros (4) and Menandros (30).

his 'profession', if any, remains unknown.[56] There might also be a victorious athlete (see below) among the dedicators of first offerings, who might be a member of the upper class.[57]

No other elite 'occupation' has been identified as far as known dedicators of first offerings are concerned. This is not to say that members of the upper classes did not make first offerings, but that they rarely stated their 'occupation' (if any). We should remember that, in ancient societies, the leisured class did not work for a living; thus it was natural that the upper classes did not state their 'occupation' when they had none. Harris' survey on 'occupational' designations in Classical and early Hellenistic Athens has demonstrated that work-oriented classifications did not apply to the affluent strata of Athenian society: the vast majority of the 'occupations' collected in his study belonged to the lower working classes (see below).[58]

b) Outside Attica

In other parts of Greece, dedicatory inscriptions of first offerings rarely give details about their dedicators. I shall list all the different 'occupations' identified here before singling out a few for discussion. We have a butcher (*ἄρταμος*) in Calabria,[59] a merchant (*ἐμπορος*) in Halikarnassos,[60] and a Thracian courtesan.[61] In the mid-fourth century in the town of Old Epidauros, a certain Timainetos dedicated a small limestone altar as a *dekate* 'of goats' to the Anakes (*Τιμαίνετος ἀνέθηκε*

[56] *IG* I^3 883, *DAA* no. 132. There are difficult chronological problems in associating this inscribed base with the statue of Dieitrephes described in Paus. 1.23.3; the precise relation between this dedicator and the known *strategos* remains uncertain. The problems are treated in detail in Keesling (2003), 195, n. 88 (with bibliography), and will not be discussed here.
[57] *IG* I^3 542. Athletes' social status in ancient Greece is disputed, see e.g. *Isoc.* 16.32-4, Young (1984), cf. Kyle (1993).
[58] Harris (2001).
[59] *IGASMG* IV no. 15.
[60] McCabe, *Halikarnassos Inscriptions*, no.121.
[61] Hdt. 2.135.

Ἀνάκοιν δεκάταν αἰγῶν); he was probably a farmer or goat-keeper.[62] A fish-carrier's *dekate* to Asclepius is mentioned in an inscription set up at the Asclepieum at Epidaurus; but this is unlikely to have been genuine.[63] Two Hellenistic epigrams record first offerings from a fisherman[64] and several weavers respectively;[65] but these appear to be literary exercises rather than genuine offerings. Artisans also feature but less prominently than they do at Athens. A *dekate* at Lindos was from a copper-smith.[66] The Lindian Chronicle also records an interesting instance of a *κροσός* (Rhodian dialect for *κρωσσός*, a water-pail or pitcher) offered by the Telchines, who were legendary craftsmen, as a *δεκάτη τῶν ἔργων* to Athena Polias and Zeus. This illustrates the idea of craftsmen's *dekate* although it is undoubtedly imaginary.[67] We also have at least one *dekate* of spoils (*δεκατὴ ληίης*) in Didyma in the six century dedicated perhaps by a soldier after military service.[68] First offering of booty from individuals will be discussed in the next chapter.

Merchant

In the fourth or third century in Halikarnassos an individual called Phaeinos dedicated an *aparche* to Aphrodite Cypria in gratitude for his wealth as a merchant. The marble statue base bears this inscription in elegiacs:

Ἀφροδίτηι
Φάεινος
Ζηνοδώρου
[Φαῖνο]ς σοὶ τόδε, Κύπρι, καλὸγ καλῆι εἶσεν ἄγαλ[μα]

---

62 *SEG* XXVI 451, *SEG* XLVII 346; Jameson, Runnels and van Andel (1994), 604.
63 *IG* IV^2.1,123.21-29, *SEG* XLII 293.
64 See n. 53.
65 Gow-Page, *HE*, I, 120, II, 350-2, no. 41, *Anth. Pal.* 6. 288; Gow-Page, *HE*, I, 148, II, 426-7, no. 2, *Anth. Pal.* 6.285.
66 *Lindos* II, no. 119 (but this is a rather late example: 225 B.C.)
67 *Lindos* II, no. 2.B.9-14; Higbie (2003), 68-70. Cf. Paus.1.27.1: Pausanias reports on a stool dedicated by Daedalus, who was also a legendary craftsman; but it was not a first offering.
68 Tuchelt (1970), 56, 117-8 K 9 bis fig. 24 pl. 14, Jeffery, *LSAG*^{2}, 473 H, Lazzarini (1976), no. 692.

> *[πλήρ]εσιν ἐξ ἔργων χερσὶν ἀπαρξάμενος,*
> *[ἦ γὰρ] ἐπεί ποτέ νιμ μέγαν ἔμπορον εἰς ἅλα ἔβησα[ς]*
> *[ἐ]ξ ὁσίων ὅσιος δῶμα συνέσχεν ἀνήρ.*[69]
> To Aphrodite, Phaeinos son of Zenodoros, [Phaeino]s set up this beautiful *agalma* to you, beautiful Cypria, having made a first offering from his work with filled hands, since you once sent him as a great merchant to sea, from pious acts as a pious man he kept together his household.

The word *ἔργα* here seems to refer to trading, when it usually refers to something more concrete, such as pottery and handicraft work. By emphasizing that the dedicator was 'a great merchant' and 'a pious man', this *aparche* demonstrates well the dual roles of dedications in advertising one's wealth as well as piety.

Courtesan

According to Herodotus, after the Thracian slave Rhodopis became a freedwoman, she made a fortune in Egypt as a courtesan and sent a quantity of ox-sized iron spits to Delphi using a tithe of her earnings (*τῆς ὦν δεκάτης τῶν χρημάτων ποιησαμένη ὀβελοὺς βουπόρους*).[70] Herodotus asserts that it was Rhodopis' ambition to leave a memorial of herself in Greece by offering what no other had thought of dedicating; but in fact dedications of iron spits were by no means unparalleled.[71] The historicity of Rhodopis' dedication appears to be confirmed by epigraphic and archaeological evidence: a fragmentary inscription on an inscribed base dated to the mid-sixth century in Delphi was restored by Mastrokostas as *[- - -*

[69] McCabe, *Halikarnassos Inscriptions*, no. 121, *SEG* XXVIII 838. On Aphrodite's association with the sea, see Parker (2002), 146-52, Demetriou (2010).
[70] Hdt. 2.135, Athenaeus, 13.596c; Asheri, Lloyd and Corcella (2007), 338. Rhodopis' dedication is discussed in Jeffery (1990), *LSAG*^{2}, 102-3, 123-4, pl. 12.7, Kurke (1999), 220-4, *ThesCRA*, vol. 1, 315, no. 208, Keesling (2006), 61-3. For other examples of dedications (not specifically first offerings) by prostitutes, see e.g. *Anth. Pal.* 6. 1, 133, 208.
[71] On dedications of iron spits elsewhere, see e.g. Jeffery (1990), *LSAG*^{2}, 123-4, Strom (1992), von Reden (1997), 173-4.

ἀνέθε]κε Ϝοδ[οπις; and the restoration is accepted by Jeffery and Keesling.[72] This is one of the very few examples where individuals with sufficient means chose to set up their first offerings in Panhellenic sanctuaries rather than local shrines.[73]

Butcher

A particularly interesting work-related *dekate* is a bronze axe discovered in Calabria at S. Agata Dell'Esaro, lying inland some way from Laos and near Sybaris. Dated to the first quarter of the sixth century,[74] the inscription declares the axe as the *Ϝέργῶν δεκάταν* dedicated by an *ἄρταμος* ('butcher' or 'cook')[75] named Kyniskos: *τᾶς hέρας hιαρός | εμι τᾶς ἐν πεδί| οι. Ϙυνίσϙο|ς με ἀνέθε|κε ὅρταμο|ς Ϝέργον| δεκάταν* ('I am sacred to Hera, the one in the plain, Kyniskos the butcher dedicated me as a tithe of his work').[76] We do not know the location of the sanctuary of 'Hera in the plain';[77] the nearest known cult of Hera in this region is the Heraion at Foce del Sele.[78] It is easy to (mis-)interpret this at first glance as an ordinary butcher's tool of trade dedicated probably upon his retirement; but its elaborate decorations suggest that it was not intended for everyday use. Callaway suggested that the dedicator might have been a professional butcher who dedicated the tool of his job.[79] While Guarducci agreed with this interpretation, she pointed out that the object was not really an axe with which to cut the meat, but a double hammer ('un martello

[72] Mastrokostas (1953), 635-42.
[73] Other isolated instances are e.g. *Inscr. Délos* nos. 17, 54.
[74] Jeffery (1990), *LSAG*^{2}, 250, 260, no. 8; cf. Guarducci (1968-9), 49, who dated it to the middle of the sixth century.
[75] Guarducci (1968-9), 51, noted that this is the earliest attestation of the word *ἄρταμος* in inscriptions.
[76] *IG* XIV 643, *IGASMG* IV no. 15, *SGDI* vol. 2, no. 1653, British Museum catalogue no. 252; Robert (1887-1905), part i, no. 306, Jeffery (1990), *LSAG*^{2}, 253, 260 no. 8, pl. 50, Lazarrini (1976), no. 701, Pugliese Carratelli (1996), 496, 690 no. 131, *ThesCRA*, vol. 1, 310, no. 181.
[77] Guarducci (1968-9), 49, did not comment on where this sanctuary of 'Hera in the plain' was , but thought that the expression must be intended to distinguish this Hera from another Hera whose sanctuary was higher up on a hill.
[78] On this sanctuary, see e.g. van Keuren (1989), 23-44.
[79] Callaway (1950), 49-50.

doppio') used to strike the sacrificial animal at the beginning of a blood sacrifice.[80] Probably then, this was dedicated by the sacrificial slaughterer serving in the cult of Hera. Unlike Nearchos, Euphronios and Melinna we met earlier, who apparently used a portion of their savings to commission a monument for the gods at retirement, the sacrificial slaughter dedicated his tool of trade. The axe seemed to be a token offering and its value was unlikely to represent a real tenth of his personal earnings. This dedication is of interest for another reason: it was written in archaic Achaean script used in various Achaean colonies in Italy, the Achaean colony nearest to the find-spot being Sybaris.[81] This led Johnston to think that it was perhaps dedicated by Achaean colonists at Sybaris, who might have 'imported' the cult of Hera to this region.[82]

Fish-carrier

Our information comes from a cure inscription, iama 47, recorded on one of the four stelai set up in the late fourth century at the Asclepieum at Epidaurus, which record acts of miraculous healings attributed to Asclepius and Apollo. The story goes that a fish-carrier called Amphimnastos, while carrying fish to Arcadia, vowed to give a tenth of the proceeds from his sale of fish to Asclepius;[83] but he failed to fulfill his vow. Later while selling fish at Tegea, he was attacked by gnats or fish[84] suddenly appearing from everywhere; the spectacle attracted a large crowd and he confessed his deceit to the god. Upon his entreaties the god relieved him of the attack; and

[80] Guarducci (1968-9), 50. Tools used by sacrificial slaughterers are briefly discussed in Robert (1978), 344.
[81] On Sybaris as an Achaean colony, see e.g. Arist. *Pol*. 1303a, Dunbabin (1848), 355ff, Jeffery (1990), *LSAG*^{2}, 251-2.
[82] A. Johnston's lecture on epigraphical habits in Archaic Greece on 24 June 2009 in the British School at Athens.
[83] It is unclear why a fish-carrier should choose Asclepius as the recipient divinity. Dillon (1994), 253, envisages that he might have incubated in the Asclepium, vowed a *dekate*, and been cured of a certain illness but failed to fulfill the vow. Another possibility is that the *dekate* was vowed to earn favour with the god of healing (although he had not been treated by Asclepius).
[84] 'Gnats' according to von Gaetringen's restoration *ἐξαπίνας [κωνώπια]* (accepted in *IG* IV^2.1, 123); but 'fish' according to Peek's *ἐξαπίνας οἱ ἰχθύες*. Discussed in Dillon (1994), 253, n. 73.

Amphimnastos dedicated a *dekate* (presumably using the proceeds from the sale of the fish) to the god.[85] Whether or not the recorded incident was genuine, it is in keeping with the idea that it was customary for individuals to dedicate a share of their income to the gods.

Weavers

An epigram attributed to Leonidas of Tarentum in the third century B.C. records a first offering related to craft-work. Three sisters, who worked as weavers, jointly dedicated from the tithe of their work (*ἔργων ἐκ δεκάτας*) miscellaneous weaving tools to Athena: their spindle, the weaving-comb, the loom, the spools, and the weaving-blade. In return they prayed that the goddess would give them abundance in their food basket, in other words, prosperity.[86] They stressed their poverty by saying 'as we are poor we offer a small portion of our small possessions as a first offering' (*τὼς δὲ πενιχραὶ ἐξ ὀλίγων ὀλιγην μοῖραν ἀπαρχόμεθα*), as if apologizing for the exiguity of their gifts. This epigram apparently shows that individuals could dedicate humble items associated with their work as first offerings. What is puzzling, however, is how the dedicators could continue to work without their tools.[87] Gow and Page suggest plausibly that what was dedicated was a representation, such as a painting or relief, of the objects mentioned rather than the tools themselves. To my knowledge, this is the only example of individuals dedicating a first offering when hard-pressed in the hope of a change of fortune, when normally *aparchai* and *dekatai* were made retrospectively in view of some benefits already received.

---

[85] *IG* IV^2.1, 123.21-29, *SEG* XLII 293; Dillon (1994), 253, 260.
[86] Gow-Page, *HE*, I, 120, II, 350-2, no. 41, *Anth. Pal.* 6. 288.
[87] Some other dedications (not specifically first offerings) in Book six of *Anth. Pal.* present similar problems: e.g. *Anth. Pal.* 6. 13, 41, 118, 152; Gow (1960), 92. Cf. the female weavers in *Anth. Pal.* 6. 289, who dedicated their implements when they gave up weaving.

II. Reasons or Occasions for Dedication

Epigraphic evidence is mostly uninformative about when and why individuals brought first offerings to the gods: most dedicators revealed nothing about the circumstances of their dedications. The discussion which follows is based on the limited information available; but in reality the occasions and reasons for bringing them must have been much more diverse and numerous than is presented below.

a) Attica

Vow Fulfillment

First offerings might be dedicated in fulfillment of a vow. Of the 142 first offerings in Attica that have come down to us, five *aparchai* (of which two are supplemented)[88] and eleven *dekatai* (including one restoration) mention a vow in their inscriptions.[89] The rest were not demonstrably 'vowed' or 'votives': they might have been offered to the gods spontaneously without any prior promises made; yet it is also possible that a vow was involved but was not made explicit in the inscription.

Wealth and Work

Some individuals indicated the source from which their first offering was made by the words *ἀργύριον*, *χρήματα*, *κτέανον* in the partitive genitive.[90] Some inscriptions refer to *ἔργον* and sometimes *πόνος* and *τέχνη*, as was common for, but certainly not exclusive to, artisans.[91]

---

[88] *Aparchai*: *IG* I^3 632, 673 (supplemented), 862 (supplemented), 872, *IG* II^2 4599.
[89] *Dekatai*: *IG* I^3 570bis e, 608, 617, 631, 633, 638, 667 (supplemented), 735, 857, 885, *IG* II^2 4318.
[90] *ἀργύριον*: *IG* I^3 698; *χρήματα*: *IG* I^3 779, *IG* II^2 3846, 4904; *κτέανον*: *IG* I^3 647, 730, *IG* II^2 4334.
[91] *ἔργον*: *IG* I^2 730, I^3 608 (supplemented), 628, 695; *πόνος: IG* II^2 4587; *τέχνη: IG* I^3 766, *IG* II^2 4320 (supplemented).

Athletic Victory

We have a *dekate* dated to c. 470-460 in the form of a bronze image of an athlete, perhaps a disc-thrower. The inscription does not mention athletic activities: *ἱερὸς : τες Ἀθεναίας. Φιλαίου : δεκάτε* ('sacred to Athena. A tithe from Philaios'); but the iconography suggests that it might have been dedicated by a victorious athlete.[92] It was a common practice for successful athletes to commemorate their victories by setting up statues on the Athenian acropolis.[93] We know that in the Classical period Athens granted cash rewards to Athenian victors in the Panhellenic games (in addition to the honorific garlands they received in the games)[94] and also victors in various categories of games at the Panathenaia.[95] The dedicator Philaios might have won one of these games and received a cash reward, a part of which paid for this dedication.

Other Awards of Honour

In the fourth century, an Athenian dedicated a marble base as an *aparche* to Athena Ergane for being 'crowned by the members of his association (*thiasotai*)': *B]άχχιος τῆι Ἀθην[ᾶι] | τεῖ Ὀργάνηι ἀπαρχὴν | ἀνέθηκεν στεφανω-|θεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν θιασωτῶν* ('Bacchios dedicated an *aparche* to Athena Organe having been crowned by the members of his association').[96] It is unclear why he was crowned, and whether he received any substantial reward, apart from a symbolic wreath, out of which the offering was paid for. This is an example where, as was discussed in Chapter One, the word *aparche* seems to signify simply a 'dedication' rather than a

[92] *IG* I^3 542, Acr. no. 6614; Borbein (1962-), vol. 3, tab. 21.
[93] On commemoration of athletic victory, see Hornblower and Morgan (2007), Fisher (2009); on victory monuments in particular, see Smith (2007).
[94] Plut. *Sol*. 23, Diog. Laert. 1.55, Ath. 12.522a-d.
[95] On prizes in the Panathenaic games, see Kyle (1996), Themelis (2007), Fisher (2009), 529.
[96] *IG* II^2 2939 (=4339). Athena Organe is a variant of Athena Ergane.

'part offering'.

Manumission or Legal Victory?

A dossier of 33 inscriptions in the late fourth century, recording silver *phialai* of 100 *drachmai* by weight, have traditionally been interpreted as concerning the manumission of slaves.[97] Recently, however, Meyer has postulated that these inscriptions were instead inventories recording the dedication of *phialai*, generated as a result of the legal victory of metics in a lawsuit called *graphe aprostasiou*, in which a metic was charged for failure to pay the metic tax (*metoikon*) or to have a *prostates*. The metic who escaped from conviction, she argues, made a dedication (probably to Zeus Soter or Eleutherios) paid for by his unsuccessful prosecutor, who would be fined 1000 *drachmai*, a tenth of which would be used to dedicate a *phiale*.[98] Although victory commemoration is a familiar motif for first offerings,[99] there are no parallels of first offerings dedicated after a legal victory in Attica or elsewhere. It is also difficult to envisage how in practice the victorious party could dedicate a *phiale* paid for by the defeated – an important point not explained by Meyer – since the fine would presumably go to the state and not the victorious metic as his financial gain. The nature of the lawsuit and its associated penalties, the dedicator's identity, the *phiale*'s source of funding, and its divine recipient remain largely obscure. In the absence of further available evidence, Meyer's arguments must remain hypothetical.

[97] The earlier interpretations are summarized in Meyer (2010), 17-28.
[98] Meyer (2010), *passim*.
[99] E.g. athletic victory, military victory (see Chapter Six).

b) Outside Attica

Vow Fulfillment

Outside Attica no surviving *aparche* mentions a vow, and only three *dekatai* were demonstrably vowed.[100]

Work

Seven first offerings state that they were made from the earnings of work (*ἔργον*);[101] but none of the inscriptions carries financial designations such as *ἀργύριον*, *χρήματα, κτέανον* commonly used at Athens. One could also dedicate a first offering from the work of another person. In third-century Kalymnos Nicias son of Thrasymedes dedicated a *dekate* to Apollo: *Νικίας με ἀνέθηκεν Ἀπόλλωνι υἱὸς Θρασυμήδεος, ἔργων ὧν ὁ πατὴρ ἠργάσατο τὴν δεκάτην σοι* ('Nicias son of Thrasymedes dedicated me to Apollo, a tithe for you of the work which his father performed'). Ross thought that Thrasymedes was a sculptor who made a statue at Epidaurus, whereas Segre argued that he was not.[102] Given the wide applications of the word *ἐργάζεσθαι* to different activities,[103] it seems to me more likely that the phrase *ἔργων ὧν ἠργάσατο* simply indicates the money his father earned by working (whatever his work might be) and does not necessarily refer to craftsmanship. Accordingly this might be a tithe made in fulfillment of his father's vow or a tithe of Nicias' inheritance. Might Thrasymedes have vowed part of his profit when hard-pressed, and it was fulfilled by his son after his death?

---

[100] *Inscr. Délos* no. 17, *IGASMG* IV no. 2, *IG* IV^2.1 123.21-29.
[101] *SEG* XXXIV 1189, *Lindos* II no. 2.B.12, McCabe, *Miletus Inscriptions*, no. 243, McCabe, *Halikarnassos Inscriptions*, no. 121, *IGASMG* IV no. 15, *IG* IX.1 131, *ASAA* n.s. 6-7 (1944-5), 146, no. 100.
[102] *ASAA* n.s. 6-7 (1944-45), 146, no. 100. *LGPN* I, s.v. *Θρασυμήδης* (6), s.v. *Νικίας* (110).
[103] LSJ s.v. *ἐργάζομαι*.

Athletic Victory

In the sixth century an Olympic victor from Sybaris apparently dedicated a *dekate* of his prize in his home city in fulfillment of a vow to Athena. A bronze plaque discovered in Sybaris is thus inscribed: *Δο· Κλεόμροτος ὁ Δεξιλάϝο · ἀνέθεκ' Ὀλυνπίαι νικάσας ϝίσο(μ) μᾶκός τε πάχος τε τἀθάναι ἀϝέθλον εὐξάμενος δεκάταν* ('Kleomrotos son of Dexilaos, having won at Olympia, dedicated (this), equal in length and breadth, having vowed to Athena a tithe of his prizes').[104] The puzzling phrase 'equal in length and breadth' has been variously interpreted and no solution is entirely satisfactory.[105] This *dekate* is particularly interesting considering that winners in crown games were only awarded an olive wreath: how would a tithe of a wreath pay for a dedication? Athens aside, we do not know how many cities in this period provided cash rewards for their Panhellenic victors.[106] If Kleombrotos had not received monetary rewards from his home city Sybaris, the *dekate* would have been financed by a source different from that mentioned in the inscription.

Seafaring

We have already met a merchant who dedicated a *dekate* in Harlikarnassos. In Phaselis in the fourth century, two individuals jointly dedicated a *dekate* from sailing (*ἀπὸ ναυτιλίας δεκάτη*) to Athena Polias. The rectangular marble block bears the inscription *Νίκανδρος ὁ Νικίονος | καὶ Πολυαίνετος | ὁ Πολυκάρτεος| τἀθαναίαι τᾶι Πολιάδι| ἀπὸ ναυτιλίας |δεκάταν ἀνέθεκαν* ('Nikandros son of Nikion and Polyainetos son of Polykarteos to Athena Polias dedicated a tithe from a

[104] *IGASMG* IV no. 2. I take *ἀϝέθλον* as a genitive plural; but it can also be an accusative singular. It is unclear what the initial letters *Δο* mean: Hornblower (2007), 334, says that 'they are thought not to be Homeric *δῶ* = *δῶμα* or *δῶρον* = gift, but to refer to a phratry or other kinship group'.

[105] Scholars' interpretations are summarized with bibliography in Young (1984), 131 and Hornblower (2007), 333-4.

[106] On rewards in athletic games, see Young (1984), 115-33, Slater and Suma (2006), 292-8, Fisher (2009), 529-31.

voyage').[107] The individuals were probably partners in trade, who wanted to thank Athena for their safe return and perhaps profits made from a commercial voyage.

The Lindian Chronicle records two *dekatai* related to seafaring but which are of dubious historicity. Aretos and his children are said to have dedicated a ceramic vessel (*ἐχινέα*, probably some vase) as a *dekate* from the ship from Crete (*δεκάτη ναὸς τᾶς ἐκ Κρήτας*).[108] Anther entry mentions a wooden cow and calf, dedicated as a *dekate* by Amphinomos and his children from Sybaris after their ship had been saved (*Ἀμφίνομος καὶ παῖδες ἀπ' εὐρυχόρου Συβάρειος ναὸς σωθείσας τάνδ' ἀνέθεν δεκάταν*).[109] This entry is likely to have been fabricated out of particular Lindian interest to assert links with Sybaris as a Rhodian colony.[110] If we were to take the dedication and inscription at face value, the dedicators were probably engaged in some commercial activities, and their ship perhaps sailed past or was saved near Lindos.[111] It is not clear whether the tenth represented a part of the profit made in the voyage or a part of the value of the cargo that would otherwise have been lost in a potential disaster. Rhodes' location on the trade route to the East probably made the sanctuary of Athena at Lindos a focus of 'pilgrimage' for traders passing by. A parallel can be drawn from Herodotus' narrative of the Samian merchants, whose ship was blown off course to the Pillars of Heracles and met with unexpected good fortune. They used a *dekate* of their profit (*δεκάτη τῶν ἐπικερδίων*), six talents, to dedicate a bronze crater in the temple of Hera at Samos.[112]

---

[107] *TAM* II, no. 1184.
[108] *Lindos* II, no. 2.B.105-6.
[109] *Lindos* II, no. 2.C.15-20.
[110] A tradition in Strab. 6.1.14 says that Sybaris was colonized by Rhodes; but Sybaris is also said to be an Achaean colony in Arist. *Pol*. 1303a, Dunbabin (1948), 355ff, Jeffery (1990), *LSAG*^{2}, 251-2. Higbie (2003), 107-8, does not comment on this dedication's authenticity.
[111] Higbie (2003), 107. On commerce between Rhodes and Sicily, see Dunbabin (1948), 226-40.
[112] Hdt. 4.152.

Manumission

In the late sixth century, a freedman called Philes dedicated a *dekate* in Chios. The inscription on the limestone base seems to suggest that it was 'a tithe of the possessions of Ariston' (*Φιλῆς ἀνέθηκεν δεκάτην τῶν Ἀρίστ̣ωνος ἐξελεύθερος*),[113] who might have been his former master. It was not uncommon for a master to free his slave and to adopt him as his heir,[114] which may help to explain the phrase *δεκάτην τῶν Ἀρίστ̣ωνος*. The *dekate* might have been a thank-offering to the gods for being freed as well as a means of publicizing his manumitted status.[115]

Unknown Occasion

A stone stele erected in the Samian Heraion records the offering of a *dekate* to Hera. No occasion for dedication is mentioned; I have nevertheless included it here since it is particularly interesting.

1	*[..]νίσκος Ξ[εν]-*	--niskos son of Xen-
	[ο]δόκο, Δ̃ημι[ς]	odokos and Demis
	[Π]υθοκλέος ο-	son of Pythokles,
	[ἰ]κήι{ηι}οι? Περ[ί]-	Perinthian kinsmen
5	*νθιοι τ̃ηι Ἥρ-*	(of Samos) (?),
	ηι ἀνέθεσαν	fulfilling their tithe
	δεκάτην ἔρ-	dedicated to Hera
	δοντες γορ-	a gold Gorgon,
	γύρην χρυσ̃η-	a silver Siren,
10	*ν, σερ̃ηνα ἀργ-*	a silver *phiale*,
	ύρεον, φιάλη-	a bronze lampstand,
	ν ἀργυρ̃ην, λυ-	bought all together
	χνίην χαλκ̃η-	for two hundred and
		twelve Samian staters
		along with the stone.

[113] Forrest (1963), 54, no. 3, *SEG* XXII, 509, McCabe, *Chios Inscriptions*, no. 154. I take *τῶν Ἀρίστ̣ωνος* as a partitive genitive qualifying *δεκάτην*, indicating the source from which the tithe was taken. Cf. Forrest (1963), 54, no. 3, who thought that 'strictly speaking *τῶν Ἀρίστ̣ωνος* might be construed with *δεκάτην*, *ἐξελεύθερος* or *Φιλῆς*', envisaging all three possibilities of 'a tithe of the property of Ariston', 'a freedman of the household of Ariston' (his preferred translation) and 'Philes who is a freedman and a member of the unit called *οἱ Ἀρίστωνος*'.

[114] Zelnick-Abramovitz (2005), esp. 162-7.

[115] On the publication of manumission status, see Zelnick-Abramovitz (2005), 184ff.

ν ὀνονημένα
σύνπαντα δ-
[ι]ηκοσίων δυ-
ωδέκων στατ-
ήρων Σαμίω-
ν σὺν τῶι λίθω[ι].[116]

The inscription was dated to c. 600-550 in Klaffenbach's *edito princeps* in 1953, whereas Jeffery dated it to c. 525 based on its Samian lettering.[117] The letters O.KHIHIOI in lines 3-4, engraved in apposition to *Περ[ί]νθιοι* and qualifying the two individuals' names, have been variously interpreted. Unable to make sense of the letters O.KHIHIOI, Klaffenbach suggested that they probably concealed a word for some form of craftsman, and took the offering to be comparable to craftsmen's dedications on the Athenian acropolis.[118] Robert assumed dittography by the stonecutters and proposed reading *οἰκήιοι*, which he understood as referring to the kinship between the two individuals.[119] However, Guarducci argued that the stonecutter might have mistaken ι for τ, so that the otherwise unattested adjective *οἰκητήιοι* should be read, describing the two individuals as Samian colonists (i.e. original settlers) who settled in Perinthus on the Propontis and who, returning to their home-city Samos, offered the *dekate* whether by goodwill or by obligation.[120] Her emendation has been rejected by Robert and Graham on the ground that this adjective, derived from the noun *οἰκητής*, is unattested.

Graham confirms by autopsy that Klaffenbach rendered the letters on the stone correctly. He suggests reading *o[ἰ]κήι{ηι}οι* (as Robert did), which in his view refers

[116] *IG* XII.6 577; McCabe, *Samos Inscriptions*, no. 218, *ThesCRA*, vol. 1, 277, no. 31 (modified from Parker's translation in *ThesCRA*).
[117] Klaffenbach (1953), 15-20 (= *SEG* XII 391), Jeffery (1990), *LSAG*^{2}, 365-6; but we do not know whether the cutter was a Samian or a Perinthian.
[118] Klaffenbach (1953), 15-20.
[119] Robert (1959), *REG* 72, 225, no. 320.
[120] Guarducci (1956) (= *SEG* XV 526).

to kinship between the Perinthian individuals and their mother-city Samos: the meaning of *οἰκεῖος* as 'kin, related'[121] was perhaps extended to colonial relationship; hence the Perinthian colonists called themselves 'kinsmen' (of Samos).[122] In other words, while both Guarducci and Graham agree that the colonial relationship between Perinthos and Samos is concerned,[123] Guarducci regarded the dedicators as Samians who settled in Perinthos and who brought offerings to their home-city, while Graham thinks that they were Perinthian colonists sending offerings to their mother-city.[124] Although it was common for colonies to send first offerings to their mother-city (see Chapter Seven), the lack of indication that the two individuals were Perinthian representatives goes decisively against Graham's view: we would expect the dedication to be made in the name of the dedicating city (rather than in the individuals' own name) if this was a public dedication.

It seems to me more likely that we have here a private dedication offered at their own initiatives by two Perinthians who lived on Samos, with the phrase *ο[ἰ]κήι{ηι}οι Περ[ί]νθιοι* signifying that they were 'Perinthian kinsmen (of Samos)'. Nevertheless, the statement of its exact cost is most unusual: nowhere do we find a 'converted' first offering stating explicitly its monetary value in its inscription. The individuals might have vowed a *dekate* of certain proceeds (the total value of which would be 2120 staters if the *dekate* was a literal tenth), and in fulfillment of their vow they

---

[121] LSJ s.v. *οἰκεῖος* II.1. The vocabulary and idea of kinship (*οἰκειότης, συγγένεια*) was frequently invoked in colonial relations and other interstate dealings; see e.g. Curty (1995), Hornblower (1991-2008), vol.2, 61-80, Jones (1999). Hornblower argues that this was true not only of the Hellenistic period but also of the Classical period.

[122] Graham (1964a), 73-5, Graham (1964b), 162-3. Based on Graham (1964a)'s interpretation, Parker in *ThesCRA*, vol. 1, 277, no. 31, translates 'kinsmen (of Samos) from Perinthos'.

[123] Perinthus was founded as a Samian colony in c. 602 B.C.: Plut. *Mor*. 303 F, Shipley (1987), 51 and n. 18.

[124] Cf. Jeffery (1990), *LSAG*^{2}, 365, no. 35 with n. 4, who, while accepting that *ο[ἰ]κήι{ηι}οι* probably means colonists rather than 'the settlers' (i.e. original colonists from Samos), wonders whether the word *οἰκήιοι* may mean 'Perinthian officials responsible for the gifts stored in a Perinthian *οἶκος* or Treasury in the Samian Heraion, like the *οἶκοι* at Delphi and Olympia'.

scrupulously stated the total value of their offerings so as to indicate that a tenth exactly measured was duly paid to the goddess.

III. First Offerings and their Dedicators: Some Observations

From what we have seen above, there is no substantial difference between dedicatory practices in Attica and other parts of Greece with regard to making first offerings. In both regions dedicators came from a variety of 'occupational' backgrounds; and the reasons or occasions for dedication were very similar, where they were indicated in the inscriptions. In both areas are attested first offerings made in fulfillment of a vow, in gratitude for the profits of work and trade, and in commemoration of athletic victories and retirement. There is an over-concentration of marble monuments on the Athenian acropolis; but we must not neglect that other less expensive objects - vessels (such as *hydriai*, *kalpeis*, *kylikes*, *phialai*, *skyphoi* and vases),[125] personal items,[126] ritual objects,[127] tools of trade,[128] money[129] and other objects[130] - were also presented by individuals in different parts of Greece as first offerings to the gods. Some of these items are presumably rather cheap and humble,[131] presenting to us a very different world from that of the conspicuous bronze and marble statues alluded to in Isaeus 5.42 cited at the beginning of this chapter.

---

[125] *Hydriai*: *IG* I^3 574; *kalpis*, *kylikes*, *skyphos*: *SEG* XXXVIII 783 a-d, f, Martelli (1988), 113-5; *phialai*: *IG* I^3 559, 561bis, 565, 566, 570bis a, c-f; vases: *IG* I^3 554bis, 583j, l; other ceramic fragments: *SEG* XLIV 1541, nos. 6, 7, 8.

[126] E.g. *IG* I^3 548bis (bronze mirror handle), *IG* XIV 644 (small bronze statuette of a *kanephoros*, probably a mirror support).

[127] E.g. *IG* I^3 547, Kaltsas and Shapiro (2008), 53, no. 12: a cymbal in the form of a small bronze disc, probably part of the percussion instrument in cult dance in orgiastic rites and mysteries.

[128] E.g. *IG* XIV 643, *IGASMG* IV no. 15 (bronze axe).

[129] E.g. *IG* II^2 1388.69 (398/7 B.C.): Andron from the Attic deme Elaious dedicating two gold *drachmai*, probably in gold coins, as an *aparche* (*Ἄνδρων Ἐλαιόσιος ἀπήρξατο χρυσᾶς* : ⊢⊢). *PAA* II, 129270 (= *PA* 922), takes him as a goldsmith; but this is not apparent in the text.

[130] E.g. *I. Histriae* 101: a sixth-century fragmentary roof tile inscribed with the word *apargma*.

[131] E.g. a *kylix* is estimated to cost 1 *drachma* by Boardman (1988), 372, and a few *obols* by Stissi (2002), 194. On the price of pottery in ancient Greece, see the list of prices in Johnston (1979), 33, Amyx (1985), 277, table 1, with additions in Stissi (2002), 192.

While first-fruits of harvest and daily meals (Chapters Three and Four) were presumably offered to the gods on a more or less regular basis, the vast majority of first offerings in this chapter were apparently ad hoc offerings not governed by particular times or seasons. Rather they seem to have been motivated by occasions considered by the individual as worthy of commemoration or thanksgiving, be it a windfall, an agonistic victory, other awards of honour, a profitable voyage, manumission or retirement. As was discussed in Chapter Two, every time an individual came off well in an enterprise, he owed an 'occasional' debt to the gods; offering an *aparche* or a *dekate* was a way of settling it in part. Since they were usually made after certain success or benefits was attained or obtained, first offerings were akin to 'thank-offerings' (*χαριστήρια*) or 'good news offerings' (*εὐαγγέλια*). Very rarely do we find an individual making a first offering in a difficult situation in the hope of a change of fortune: the impoverished weavers in *Anth. Pal.* 6.288, who offered a *dekate* and prayed for prosperity, provide one such rare example.[132] Nevertheless, the distinction thus made between first offerings made in 'good' or 'bad' times can be somewhat slippery, as individuals might vow a first offering when hard-pressed, to be fulfilled subsequently when they had a better fortune.[133] Many of the work-related first offerings were doubtless time-restricted and conditional: one might vow an *aparche* or a *dekate* of his next year's earnings, for example, should his trade be prosperous or should it meet a certain return.

It is sometimes suggested that an *aparche* represents the 'first earnings' of a person's work.[134] However, none of the first offerings collected in this study can be

[132] Gow-Page, *HE*, I, 120, II, 350-2, no. 41, *Anth. Pal.* 6. 288.
[133] See e.g. Gow-Page, *HE*, I, 148, II, 426-7, no. 2, *Anth. Pal.* 6.285.
[134] 'First earnings' is the English translation given for *aparche* in several marble monuments in the new

shown to have been offered using the dedicator's 'first earnings'. It is also unlikely that an average individual's first salary, say first monthly income,[135] would be sufficient for commissioning an expensive marble monument worth perhaps several hundred or even several thousand *drachmai* (see below). While we cannot rule out the possibility that some individuals might have expended their first earnings on a first offering, there is no such information in the evidence available; or some individuals might have done so but the information has not come down to us. Rather some of the monuments appear to have been set up rather late in the dedicator's life (such as Nearchos, Euphronios, and Melinna whom we met earlier), perhaps using part of his/her savings after a period of successful working and earning. Retirement offerings probably served to mark the end of a career on the one hand, and to thank the gods for the prosperity enjoyed in life on the other. They are part offerings, but not strictly 'first part offerings': the idea of the 'preliminary' is significantly weakened and it is unclear where their sense of 'firstness' is.

The frequency with which first offerings were made probably depended on an individual's circumstances, his/her means as well as the nature and cost of the object. Our evidence suggests the possibility that first offerings could be dedicated more than once by the same individual in his/her lifetime. The Onesimos we met earlier dedicated seven marble basins, each was described as an *aparche*, in his own name, and a marble pillar as an *aparche* jointly with his son.[136] Nevertheless, we do not know if the seven basins were dedicated on one or seven different occasions; and if the former, they would constitute one *aparche*. The case of Onesimos is perhaps

Acropolis Museum at Athens (Acr. nos. 681, 6503, 6505+136; *IG* I^3 628, 647, 680).

[135] Ordinary individual earned about 1 *drachma* per day in Classical Athens. On wages of different workers in Classical Athens, see Loomis (1998).

[136] *IG* I^3 699, 926-932. Cf. the Latin inscription from Capua *CIL* X 3956 (= *ILS* 3413), which mentions a fruit-seller who three times made tithes to Hercules and lived 102 years.

unusual, as it is unlikely for an ordinary individual to dedicate on the same scale. Apart from Onesimos, if the woman Glyke who dedicated a bronze mirror handle as a *dekate* in c. 480 was the same Glyke who dedicated a bronze base as a *dekate* in the same period, this would be a further example of repeated dedications of first offerings.[137] Some individuals probably dedicated an *aparche* (or a *dekate*) as well as other unspecified offerings.[138] Most remarkable of all is Onesagoras son of Philonios, who presented to a Nymph some 270 items of inscribed pottery, on which he is described as *δεκατηφόρος* ('tithe-receiving' or 'tithe-paying'), in the Nymphaeum at Kafizin in Cyprus in the last quarter of the third century B.C. Unfortunately it is unclear whether these were tithes or not, and whether these were his own dedications or some payment he collected from another party for the Nymph.[139]

I said earlier that first offerings tend to be made on certain occasions considered by the individual concerned as worthy of thanksgiving or commemoration; but we should be aware that the same occasion could motivate others kinds of offerings than *aparchai* and *dekatai*. For example, on the Athenian acropolis are several dedications commemorating victories of various kinds; but these are not first offerings.[140] Various retirement offerings are recorded in epigrams, but these are not first offerings either.[141] In other words, on any given occasion, individuals were free to choose what kind of offerings to make and what word to use in their dedicatory inscription, be it *aparche*, *dekate*, *anathema*, *mnema*, *doron*, *hieron* or later *charisterion* etc.; and it is completely obscure to us how they decided on this. This lack of direct correlation

[137] *IG* I^3 536, 548 bis; *LGPN* II s.v. *Γλύκη* (1) and (11).
[138] E.g. 1) Hippotherides, a demesman of Acharnai who dedicated a *dekate* in *IG* I^3 698, is according to *LGPN* II identical to the dedicator in *IG* I^3 971 (not a first offering). 2) The washerwoman's name Smikythe in *IG* I^3 794 also appears in *IG* I^3 700 (not a first offering), but without the patronymic the two might or might not be the same person (see n. 51).
[139] Mitford (1980), Jim (forthcoming b).
[140] E.g. *IG* I^3 597 (victory in the Pentathlon), 757 (athletic victory), 893 (victory in wonder-making).
[141] E.g. *Anth. Pal.* 6. 4, 25-30, 90, 95, 104.

between the reasons or occasions for dedication and the kind of offering blurs the distinction between first offerings and some other *anathemata*. We have, for example, a fifth-century acropolis dedication described as a 'memorial of prospering [works]' (*μνῆμα [ἔργο]ν̣ θαλόντον*); the partitive genitive *[ἔργο]ν̣ θαλόντον* makes it very similar to a first offering.[142] Likewise, in a fifth-century inscription at Olympia already mentioned (*[τέν]δ̣ε Δίκον Διὶ δõρον ἀπ' [ἐργασί]ας ἀνέθεκεν / αὐτὸς ποιέ̣[σ]ᾳ̣ς . . . . . ε.ει σοφίαν*),[143] the difference between *δõρον ἀπ' [ἐργασί]ας* and *ἀπαρχὴ ἀπ' [ἐργασί]ας* is imperceptible to our eyes. A further example is a fragmentary verse inscription thus restored: *[–∪∪– ἀνέθεκεν ἀπὸ κ]τ̣εάν[ον] [τόδ' ἄγαλμα], / [ἑαυτõ καὶ γενεᾶς μνεμ' ἐπι]γ̣ιγνο[μένοις]*.[144] If the supplement *[ἀπὸ κ]τ̣εάν[ον]* may be relied upon, this is akin to a first offering of one's possessions we saw earlier,[145] except that the term *aparche* or *dekate* is not used. Here we return to the question already discussed in the introductory chapter: the identification of first offerings based on the actual appearance of the word *aparche*, *dekate* and the like in the sources is a relatively secure but admittedly not entirely satisfactory criterion; dedications intended as first offerings but not described explicitly as such will easily elude us.

The prominence of potters/painters in the evidence collected remains to be considered. As we have already seen, Raubitschek had a tendency to identify dedicators with known potters/painters based on often tenuous links, with the result that as many as 29 potters' dedications were identified in his collection of acropolis

142 *IG* I^3 718; its similarity with an *aparche* or a *dekate* is also noted in Friedländer (1948), no. 116.
143 *SEG* XXV 463, Lazzarini no. 819, cf. *CEG* no. 387 (see n. 44).
144 *IG* I^3 811.
145 E.g. *IG* I^3 647, 730, *IG* II^2 4334.

dedications in 1949.[146] Yet even if we reject most of his identifications as uncertain, we are still left with five dedicators who were almost certainly potters, of whom three set up first offerings on the acropolis.[147] The fact that securely identified potters outnumber other job descriptions among dedicators of first offerings on the acropolis is telling enough. The presence of the cult of Athena Ergane, patroness of art and craft, on the acropolis might have attracted dedications from craftsmen and craftswomen to the goddess even if few offerings were specifically addressed to Athena with the cult epithet Ergane.[148] First offerings from potters reflect their attempts to cultivate the goddess' favour for protection of their trade. A passage in the Pseudo-Herodotean *Vita Homeri* invokes Athena to assist in the firing of pots, while at the same time evoking demons who could break pots in the kilns should potters be deceitful.[149] There is also evidence to suggest that artisans were aware of the potential risks in their trade. Many clay plaques discovered at the sanctuary of Poseidon and Amphitrite at Penteskoupha, near potters' quarters in Corinth, depict potters working in precarious conditions: potters are shown stoking up the fire or climbing up the kiln to close the vent hole when it is flaring dangerously during the firing process.[150] Given the risks in pottery production, it was perhaps no less important to appeal to the gods in pottery than in other matters such as agriculture.[151]

That more potters/painters can be identified than other 'occupations' in the

---

146 *DAA*, p. 457-8, 465.
147 See n. 13.
148 Only three first offerings on the Athenian acropolis were addressed specifically to Athena Ergane: *IG* II^2 2939 (=4339), 4318, 4334. On Athena Ergane, see Paus. 1.24.3, Harrison (1894), Geagan (1996), esp. 154, Keesling (2003), 75, Parker (2003), 181, n. 76. On the link between Athena Ergane and craft, see Soph. fr. 844, Parker (2005), 464-5.
149 Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom*. 32.
150 Penteskouphia plaques: e.g. Staatliche Museen, East Berlin, nos. 611, 616, 802B, 827 B 909B; Noble (1988), 151, figs. 232-6, Boardman (1998), 203, figs. 409.2-3, Boardman (2001), 140, figs. 173.2. On the potential dangers in pottery production, see Noble (1988), 157-61.
151 Cf. Vernant (1983c), 253-4, who argued that agricultural and military matters in the ancient world presupposed greater dependence on the gods than did artisans' trade.

available evidence, however, does not mean that in actual practice more potters/painters dedicated first offerings than individuals in other trades did. In his article on the organization of production and its influence on Athenian economy and society, Harris has collected from epigraphic and literary sources a total of some 170 'occupations' at Athens between 500 and 250 B.C. Of the some 280 surviving instances of first offerings from Attica and elsewhere collected in this study, only eight instances (or 2.8 per cent) declare the dedicators' 'occupation' explicitly.[152] These eight instances involve five different kinds of work, which represent about three per cent of the different 'occupations' identified by Harris.[153] As we have seen in Chapter Three, remarkably few dedicators identified themselves as a farmer (*γεωργός*) in their dedicatory inscriptions although the population of Attica consisted largely of farmers. This is supported by Harris, who observes that 'of the roughly 170 occupations relatively few are in agriculture and animal husbandry'.[154] Farmers probably simply did not feel the need to categorize themselves as such in a society where most people worked the land. We must therefore not be distracted by the few instances of first offerings which state the individuals' 'occupations'. While it may seem intriguing to find such dedications, it is easy to overestimate their significance.[155]

The prominence of artisans over other kinds of workers on the Athenian acropolis is an interesting phenomenon for which historians have tried to provide explanations. It also raises questions of the relationship between dedicator's

[152] They include 3 potters, 2 fullers, 1 washerwoman, a butcher, and a merchant. Other dedicators, e.g. Onesimos (vase painter?), Melinna (most probably a craftswoman), Menandros (Athenian treasurer?), whose 'occupations' are identified only indirectly by name-matching or by inference from the information in the inscription are not counted here.
[153] Harris (2001), 88-99, appendix 1.
[154] Harris (2001), 69.
[155] Arafat and Morgan (1989), 312.

'occupation' or social status and the nature of his/her dedication. Raubitschek interpreted artisans' dedications (not first offerings specifically) as follows:

> 'The many dedications erected by artisans indicate the great importance of the industry, and especially pottery, at Athens. It is noteworthy that all these dedications are later than 525 B.C, and most of them can be dated after 510 B.C. It is, therefore, safe to assume that the Athenian *βάνανσοι*, who became wealthy in the course of the second half of the sixth century, gained social standing as well when the democracy was established.'[156]

The whole issue of the social status of artisans and the prosperity of their trade in the Archaic and Classical periods remains an obscure and complex matter.[157] While some scholars think that they were socially and economically insignificant,[158] others argue for their increased esteem and importance in Classical Athens.[159] All three first offerings made by the potters/painters (Nearchos, Euphronios, Peikon) we met earlier consist of marble *korai* of various sizes, which were undoubtedly expensive monuments.[160] Several of the potters/painters (Nearchos, Euphronios, Andokides, and perhaps Onesimos (?)) who set up expensive marble dedications on the acropolis – that is, if the identification between the dedicator and the potter/painter of the same name is correct – are said to have been well-known artisans and/or owners of a

---

[156] *DAA*, p. 465.

[157] The most recent and comprehensive study of the socio-economic status of artisans is by Feyel (2006), who demonstrates the heterogeneity in the civic status and socio-economic grouping of artisans working in sanctuaries in the Classical and Hellenistic periods. Yet his study is of limited relevance to our purpose, since he concentrates on one particular type of artisans, builders working in sanctuaries, but not potters and vase painters.

[158] E.g. de Ste. Croix (1981), 274-5, Gill and Vickers (1990), 6-8, Gill and Vickers (1994), 93-6.

[159] Raubitschek in *DAA*, p. 458, 465, Williams (1990), 36, Wagner (2000), 386-7.

[160] It is uncertain how much an average marble statue would have cost; but from the fourth-century account of the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo in Delphi, Bousquet (1988), 51-60, at 55, shows that each of the 24 pedimental statues (in Athenian pentelic marble) cost 5000 Attic *drachmai* or 3500 Aeginetan *drachmai*; followed by Rolley (1994), 56. But these splendid statues in Delphi by famous sculptors, together with the transport cost, must have been significantly more expensive than an average statue dedicated locally on the Athenian acropolis. As for bronze monuments, Schol. Pind. *Nem*.5.1 gives 3000 *drachmai* as the cost of a bronze statue in Pindar's day. Yet 3000 *drachmai* is also the price given in *IG* II^2 555 and Diog. Laert. 6.35 for a standard honorific bronze statue in the Hellenistic period. If it is correct to think that the scholia might have taken this later Hellenistic price as the price in Pindar's day, the cost of a bronze statue can be estimated as higher than 3000 *drachmai* in the Classical period. Discussed also in Smith (2007), 101-2.

prosperous workshop;[161] yet the argument risks being circular as some scholars seem to have taken the scale of the dedication as an indication of the scale of prosperity of the dedicator's trade.[162] More recently, Stissi has argued that the cost of statue dedications by potters very likely exceeded even an extremely profitable order or their best year's income,[163] so that a period of successful working, earning and saving was probably required before a statue could be dedicated to mark the end of a potter's career.[164] However that may be, some of the elaborate dedications from artisans on the Athenian acropolis suggest that at least *some* of the artisans had ample resources. But individual potters' prosperity was perhaps not typical of the whole artisan trade; the few elaborate sculptural dedications cannot be taken as a sufficient indicator that pottery as a trade brought financial or social success to all potters. The marble bases on the acropolis should not obscure the possibility raised earlier that smaller and less expensive dedications of pottery might also have been dedicated by craftsmen.

Influenced perhaps by the assumption that members of the lower socio-economic groups could not have dedicated expensive monuments, some scholars are inclined to think that their dedicators must have been exceptionally well-off individuals or members of a prosperous trade. Smikythe's *dekate*, a marble basin, seems to involve such extraordinary expenditure for a washer-woman that Vickers proposes that the textile industry at Athens was much more prosperous than we tend to think.[165] Another first offering, an *aparche* of a catch from perhaps a fisherman, is explained

[161] See Webster (1972), ch. 1.
[162] E.g. Webster (1972), 4: 'another indication of the scale of a workshop is given by the dedications made by potters which are described as tithes or first-fruits'; 10: 'this must have been a prosperous workshop since... Nearchos... dedicated a large *kore* in 510 B.C. or a little earlier'.
[163] A useful list of prices of pottery can be found in Johnston (1979), 33, Amyx (1958), 277, table 1, Stissi (2002), 192. However, it is difficult to use the evidence of pottery prices as a basis upon which to estimate the status of pottery and the profitability of the trade for complex reasons discussed in Stissi (2002), 190-5.
[164] Stissi (2002), esp. 159-160.
[165] Washerwoman: *IG* I^3 794; Vickers (1985), 125, n. 162. Discussed on p. 157 above.

by Raubitschek as follows:

> 'the dedicator ([Nau?]lochos) need not necessarily have been a poor fisherman who was once in his life successful.... It is quite conceivable that the dedicator, if he was a fisherman at all, was doing business on a larger scale. The same should be said of most of the dedications of people who mention their occupation; they must have been very prosperous in their business to afford a dedication on the acropolis, and they may have mentioned their business in the inscription as a kind of advertisement'.[166]

While I do not rule out the possibility of an exceptionally successful washerwoman or fisherman, Vickers' and Raubitschek's contentions originate from attempts to resolve the apparent incompatibility between an expensive dedication and an ordinary individual in the lower social classes. It seems to me equally possible, if not more likely, that this Smikythe was a menial worker of modest means rather than a wealthy member of the textile trade,[167] and that [Nau?]lochos was an ordinary fisherman, since other *banausoi* abounded on the Athenian acropolis: besides craftsmen, there are also dedications set up by a female bread-seller, a workman, a tanner, a fuller, and several clothes-washers.[168] In view of other job descriptions on the acropolis, dedicators of expensive first offerings did not have to be exceptionally well-off or successful individuals. There is nothing that prevented an average individual from offering an *aparche* or a *dekate* if he or she felt moved to and could afford to do so. Unfortunately, however, little is known about the price of different kinds of marble monuments in the Classical period based on which to estimate the dedicator's

---

166 Fisherman: *IG* I^3 828; Raubitschek in *DAA* no. 229, p. 262. Discussed on p. 157 above.

167 Ridgway (1987), 402, is in favour of the former; Kron (1996), 165 envisages both possibilities. Phot. and Hesych. s.v. *λουτρίδες* attest to a sacred office associated with the festival *Plynteria*, but the title was *plyntrides*, which gives as singular *plyntris*, not *plyntria*. It seems to me more probable that the use of the word *plyntria* in our inscription *IG* I^3 794, together with the presence of other washerwomen and *banausoi* on the acropolis (see the following note), points to a washerwoman, not a sacred title.

168 Other *banausoi*: e.g. *IG* I^3 546 (a female bread-seller, *ἀρτοπώλις*), *IG* I^3 554 (a fuller, *κναφεύς*), *IG* I^3 606 (a workman/craftsman, *τέκτων*), *IG* I^3 646 (a tanner, *σκυλόδεσφ-* -), *IG* II^2 2934 (a group of clothes-cleaners, *πλυνῆς*); but these are not first offerings and therefore are not discussed here. According to Dem. 57.45, if the defendant Euxitheus' words can be trusted, many citizen women had in the past been forced by poverty to work as wet-nurses, weavers and fruit-pickers, and that many after bring poor are now rich (*πολλαὶ δ' ἐκ πενήτων πλούσιαι νῦν*). Might our washerwoman Smikythe have become rich and dedicated a first offering?

resources or the period of earning and saving required for a particular type of monument to be dedicated.[169] Yet it is reasonable to think that expensive marble dedications must have involved a substantial part of the savings of ordinary individuals of little distinction and modest means. What would provide a sufficient motivation for humble individuals, such as an ordinary washerwoman and an ordinary fisherman, to expend a large sum on a dedication? Doubtless these individuals set up first offerings feeling that they had depended on, and owed their livelihoods to, the gods in one way or another. Yet the question of the extent to which these monuments were a means of self-display or an expression of piety necessarily remains unanswerable.

The tendency to draw far-reaching conclusions about the socio-political position of potters based on a few pieces of evidence is seen not only in Raubitschek. Neer's study of the interactions between vase-painting and social or political discourses at Athens in the late Archaic and early Classical periods, despite being an ambitious piece of work, is another illustration of this trend. On the basis of eight vase-paintings in which members of the Pioneer group depicted potters (either other potters or the maker himself) as participants in symposia or other activities with aristocratic connotations, Neer identifies a high degree of class consciousness among the vase-painters and sees vase-paintings as 'sites of negotiations' between artisans and aristocrats.[170] As the rise of vase-paintings coincided with democratic developments

[169] Nolan (1981), 57-9, also cited in Oliver (2000), 76, gives the cost of an uninscribed marble slab for a public document at between 11 and 23 *drachmai* (including the cost of quarrying, preparation, and transporting) in the fourth century. This is similar to Nielsen et al. (1989)'s estimate of the cost of a funerary monument at between 10 and 20 *drachmai* in the fourth century. Cf. Lawton (1995), 25: fourth-century *stelai* with reliefs cost between 20-50 *drachmai*.

[170] Neer (2002), esp. 87-134. Note the objections in the useful review of G. Hedreen, *BMCR* 2003.03.20.

at Athens,[171] he argues that these 'potter-portraits' (Neer's phrase) were exploited by potters/painters as a medium through which to express their aspiration to aristocratic lifestyle. Several difficulties with Neer's argument need to be addressed: among the eight potter-portraits on which Neer based his arguments, only one (Smikros' *stamnos*) was unquestionably a self-portrait. The other seven 'potter-portraits' all depicted other members of the Pioneer Group rather than the maker himself; and there is insufficient evidence to show that they were, as Neer suggests, intended as 'a stand-in' for the maker who projected himself into the position of the person depicted. Where another potter was depicted as a symposiast or aristocrat, it is arguable what the maker's intentions were: was it to flatter a fellow potter/painter in the same trade, or was it to mock another's ambition, or was it a mere fantasy? In fact it is equally plausible to interpret potters'/painters' references to each other on these 'potter-portraits' as a discourse between members in the same trade rather than between artisans and the elites. These 'potter-portraits' form such a tiny proportion of all the surviving vase-paintings that it is dangerous to generalize about potters' aspiration to higher social status during Athenian democratic developments. Neer's study is another illustration of the tendency to attribute to the materials socio-political implications which may not have existed.

Instead of competitions with or emulation of the upper classes, or polemical expressions of class consciousness by the lower socio-economic groups, dedications bearing one's 'occupation' in the inscription should be understood in terms of the individuals' self-perception of their work and dedication. The ancient Greeks have left us with little or no direct evidence concerning their attitude to their work. Individuals'

[171] Neer dates the beginning of red-figure vase-painting to 520 B.C. and its end to the first quarter of the fifth century B.C.

sense of identity with their work, explicit in only a handful of personal statements (such as the inscriptions of the retired mother and the great merchant seen earlier), is implicit in the 'occupational' designations inscribed on their dedications. In indicating his name and 'profession' in his inscription, an individual must have prided himself on his *techne* and the success of his trade regardless of what others or posterity might think of the status of his work. We may get the impression from orations in the Athenian assembly and the law courts that manual labour and 'banausic occupations' in general were scorned at Athens. But such rhetoric cannot be taken as a faithful representation of popular attitudes to these activities.[172] Ancient philosophers' prejudice against manual labour,[173] on the other hand, was based on its obstacles to the wellbeing of the mind or soul and not so much the character of the work itself. Attitudes to individuals' 'occupations' seem to take on a somewhat different tone once we enter the religious sphere: a washerwoman and a fuller could proudly declare their 'occupation', almost as if the value of their work was re-defined in a dedicatory context. In other words, the value of a given 'occupation' may differ between ancient and modern perspectives, and between political and religious contexts. Dedication on the acropolis provided a useful channel in which individuals, irrespective of their gender, 'occupation', and social standing, could express their piety and 'occupational' pride without being frowned upon. It was not social status *per se* that determined who would dedicate an object of what kind and value. The salient point about dedication is precisely that individuals, everyone from the most prominent to the most humble, could offer something of their own to the gods.

[172] E.g. Andoc. 1.146, Dem. 25.38, 57.30-36; Ober (1989), 274-7, 310-11.
[173] E.g. Xen. *Oec*. 4.2-3, Arist. [*Oec*.] 1343b, Arist. *Pol*. 1277a-b, 1337b.

Chapter VI

Military First Offerings

In his account of the battle of Sagra in the sixth century, Justin tells us that the people of Croton consulted the oracle at Delphi about the war against Locri, and were told that they would win by vows rather than weapons.[1] Croton vowed a tenth of the booty to Apollo if she won the battle, whereupon Locri vowed a ninth to outbid her enemy and came off successfully.[2] Despite being a late source, the tradition demonstrates that it was standard practice to give the gods a tenth of the profits of war, and that first offerings of spoils provided a way of cultivating the gods' favour in military affairs.

This chapter looks at the customary practice, widespread among Greek cities, of giving part of the fruits of war to the gods as a first offering after a successful military enterprise.[3] Individuals might also offer part of what they personally acquired in wars; but there is very little evidence for private dedications of this kind. Military first offerings could take various forms, such as captured spoils, conquered territory, or more commonly a commemorative monument. Compared to the humble first offerings of agricultural produce or food and drink seen in the preceding chapters, victory offerings were made on a much larger scale: their value could range from several to a hundred talents. Since considerable sums of money were involved, they

[1] On the oracle, see Parke and Wormell (1956), vol. 2, no. 76, Fontenrose (1978), 310, no. 127. Fontenrose considers it as not genuine.
[2] Justin, *Epit*. 20.3.
[3] Almost all first offerings collectively made by a Greek city or cities were military in nature. To my knowledge, there are only isolated non-military first offerings publically dedicated: 1) Paus. 5.27.9, 10.9.4: Corcyra dedicated a bronze bull in Delphi as a *dekate* in return for a large catch of tunnies; another bronze bull not specified as a first offering was set up at Olympia. 2) Hdt. 3.57, Paus. 10.11.2: the Siphnians built a treasury in Delphi in obedience to Apollo's oracle using a tithe of the revenue from their gold and silver mines; they continued to pay the tithe until they neglected the payment and their mines were flooded. 3) Neapolis' *aparche* (perhaps regularly made?) to her Virgin goddess in the fifth century, alluded to in *IG* I^3 101, but its nature remains unclear (see Chapter Seven, n. 12). 4) *Aparchai* dispatched by state delegations to Eleusis, Delos, Delphi and cities holding new Panhellenic festivals (these will be discussed in Chapter Seven).

had a much larger scope for ostentatious display and inter-state competition than other kinds of first offerings did. The acquisition and distribution of booty probably constituted the most potent opportunity for property distribution in the ancient world. In what follows I look at the division of booty between humans and the divine, the value of some of these offerings (where information is available), and their potential for expressing inter-state rivalries. Finally, by applying Gluckman's social anthropological model, I shall explore the extent to which setting aside the gods' share might have been a ritualized means of controlling conflicts between armies in the division of spoils.

Evidence of military first offerings is concentrated in the few decades following the Persian wars. The majority of them were dedicated in the Panhellenic sanctuaries of Olympia and Delphi;[4] they were also set up in local shrines though the evidence is less abundant.[5] Military first offerings were predominately referred to as *dekatai*, sometimes *akrothinia*, and rarely *aparchai*.[6] I append at the end a catalogue of military first offerings from Greek cities, selected examples of which are discussed below.

[4] A useful collection of dedicatory monuments (not specifically military first offerings) in Delphi is in Jacquemin (1999).
[5] E.g. Amyklai: catalogue no.1; Athenian acropolis: catalogue nos. 2-4; Lindian acropolis: catalogue nos. 29-36. Military first offerings (mostly mythical or of doubtful historicity) recorded in the Lindian Chronicle are listed in catalogue nos. 29-35, some of which (catalogue nos. 31-34) will be discussed later in Chapter Seven and not in this chapter.
[6] Military *aparchai*: Soph. *Trach*. 183, 761, Eur. *Phoen*. 857, Dem. 12.21, Paus. 9.4.1 (catalogue no. 3), Paus. 10.18.7 (catalogue no. 6), *Lindos* II, no. 2.C.77 (catalogue no. 34), *Lindos* II, no. 88 (catalogue no. 36).

I. Public Dedications

a) Division of Booty and the Gods' Share

Although there is an abundance of evidence pertaining to military first offerings, most references are only passing, and few reveal the actual treatment of the spoils. The only passages which describe the procedures in greater detail are found in Herodotus' account of the battles of Salamis and Plataea; for this reason they deserve some detailed examination.

Herodotus tells us that, as soon as the Greeks returned to Salamis after devastating Carystus, their first act was to set aside *akrothinia* for the gods (*πρῶτα μέν νυν τοῖσι θεοῖσι ἐξεῖλον ἀκροθίνια*), including three Phoenician triremes sent to the Isthmus, Sounion and Salamis respectively. Then they divided up the spoils and sent *akrothinia* to Delphi (*μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο διεδάσαντο τὴν λείην καὶ τὰ ἀκροθίνια ἀπέπεμψαν ἐς Δελφούς*), from which was made a statue (of Apollo?) of twelve cubits high, with the beak of a ship in its hand (catalogue no. 9).[7] It was not uncommon to dedicate captured ships in the event of a naval victory;[8] the ships were 'raw' offerings in the same way as captured arms and armour were. In Delphi a 'raw' offering was combined with a 'converted' offering in the form of a statue. Here we have two sets of *akrothinia* of different natures and values being set aside using different procedures (see below): a splendid monument was set up in a Panhellenic sanctuary, whereas less expensive 'raw' offerings were set up in local shrines. There is no mention of a vow before the battle of Salamis in Herodotus. Yet after dispatching

[7] Rawlinson (1862), vol. 4, 352, followed by How and Wells (1928), vol. 2, 275, assumed this to be the statue of Apollo, described in Paus. 10.14.5 as a dedication from the naval spoils of Salamis and Artemisium; but Bowie (2007), 213, points out that Pausanias does not mention the ship's prow.

[8] E.g. ships were similarly dedicated after the battles of the Corinthian gulf: Thuc. 2.84.4, 2.92.5 (these are not referred to as first offerings); but it was more common to cut the prows for dedication: e.g. Hdt. 3.59.3; Miller (1997), 33.

the gift to Delphi, the Greeks jointly inquired of the god if the offerings were enough and pleasing to him (*ἐπειρώτων τὸν θεὸν κοινῇ εἰ λελάβηκε πλήρεα καὶ ἀρεστὰ τὰ ἀκροθίνια*).[9] Apollo's answer is illuminating: he was satisfied with everyone except the Aeginetans, and demanded from them the *ἀριστήια* or prize of valour they had won earlier at Salamis.[10] The Aeginetans duly dedicated three stars fixed on to a bronze mast. It is interesting that Apollo should claim the *ἀριστήια*,[11] as if to emphasize that the god was the *ἀριστεύσας*: excellence was to be attributed in the first place to the divine and not to men.[12] Yet it has also been suggested that the Aeginetans might have dedicated their prize voluntarily and the tradition was told later to account for their dedication.[13]

After the battle of Plataea, the Spartan regent and general Pausanias proclaimed that no one was to lay hands on any of the spoils, and ordered the helots to collect everything of value. When all the valuables were collected from the Persian camp, the Greek allies set aside a *dekate* of the spoils for the god at Delphi (*συμφορήσαντες δὲ τὰ χρήματα καὶ δεκάτην ἐξελόντες τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖσι θεῷ*), from which was made a gold tripod resting on a bronze serpent column (catalogue no. 10).[14] The act of 'taking out' (*ἐξαιρέω*) the god's portion also applied to Zeus at Olympia and

[9] Hdt. 8.121-3.
[10] See Hdt. 8.93.1: at Salamis, the Aeginetans won the first prize of valour, and after them the Athenians.
[11] There were two kinds of *aristeiai*, awarded to the most distinguished city and individual respectively in the war. On *aristeiai*, see Pritchett (1974-), vol. 2, 276-90, Robert (1985), 472-3.
[12] Stein (1893-1908), accepted by Macan (1985-1908) and followed by How and Wells (1928), conjectured that Apollo had given the Aeginetans a propitious sign, such as that given to Lysander at Aegospotami (Plut. *Vit. Lys*. 12, Cic. *Div.* 1.34.75); therefore Apollo claimed the credit for the victory at Salamis.
[13] Bowie (2007), 213.
[14] This is referred to in Hdt. 9.81 as a *dekate* and in Thuc. 1.132.2 as an *akrothinion*; but neither word appears in *Syll*.[3] 31, ML 27. For the names of cities inscribed on the column, see n. 46 below.

Poseidon at the Isthmus, who each received a bronze statue of ten cubits[15] and seven cubits high respectively. It is unclear whether a tenth of all the spoils was divided equally among the three gods (in which case each god would receive 3.3 per cent of the whole), or each of the three divinities received a full tithe, or only Delphic Apollo received a full tithe and the other gods received an arbitrary portion of what remained.[16] One wonders on what principle the Greeks decided to which divinities to assign first offerings and on what scale. Having separated out the gods' share, they divided up the rest of the spoils (*ταῦτα ἐξελόντες τὰ λοιπὰ διαιρέοντο*), including the Persians' concubines, gold and silver, other valuables and yoke-animals, with each contingent receiving its due according to merit (*ἔλαβον ἕκαστοι τῶν ἄξιοι ἦσαν*).[17] Herodotus suggests that prominent individuals who excelled in the fighting must have received their dues, although it was unclear how much, and that Pausanias himself received ten of everything of value.

Plutarch adds some important details to Herodotus' account of Plataea: the Athenians and Spartans nearly came to blows over the *aristeia*. Thereupon a Megarian suggested that it be given to some third city. The suggestion of Plataea was accepted and therefore a sum of eighty talents was allotted to the Plataeans, who used it to build a sanctuary of Athena.[18] It is interesting to note that Plataea's *aristeia* (and the offering it funded for Athena) involved a much larger sum than Aegina's *aristeia* after Salamis: the value of three stars on a bronze mast for Apollo. The offerings from

[15] According to Paus. 5.23.1-3, on the pedestal of this statue of Zeus at Olympia was inscribed the names of the *poleis* that fought against Persia.

[16] Hdt. 9.80-1; Macan (1895-1908) envisaged all three possibilities; How and Wells (1928), Flower and Marincola (2002) do not comment on this. The English translations of Grene (1987) and Waterfield (1998) assume that each god received a full tithe.

[17] It is unclear if *ἕκαστοι* refers to individual soldiers or individual contingents, but Flower and Marincola (2002), 250, think that context strongly suggests the latter.

[18] Plut. *Vit. Aristid*. 20.3, Plut. *Mor*. 873. Cf. Paus. 9.4.1, who attributes the temple to Marathon instead of Plataea. The quarrel is not mentioned by Herodotus and its historicity has been suspected: How and Wells (1928), vol. 2, 317, rejected this account as not genuine and 'due to the late and untrustworthy Idomeneus'.

Plataea and Aegina, though made on very different scales, demonstrate that individual cities in an alliance could make their own offering to the gods in addition to the first offering collectively made in the name of the allied states. They also show that the gods' share was not necessarily restricted to the *dekate* or *akrothinion* set aside from the spoils. Depending on the initiative of individual cities, sometimes the gods might receive offerings in addition to their customary *dekate* or *akrothinion*.

These two passages suggest several methods of setting aside the gods' share. One way was to make a rough estimate and division of the spoils, from which a 'raw' portion was taken out and later converted into money. Herodotus' statement about the treatment of spoils at Plataea (*συμφορήσαντες δὲ τὰ χρήματα καὶ δεκάτην ἐξελόντες τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖσι θεῷ*), if taken literally, seems to suggest that a tithe was taken out without having sold the booty at this stage (or at least there is no mention of its sale).[19] Another possibility was to select items of arms of symbolic significance - in Salamis' case three Phoenician triremes signifying the naval victory - which do not necessarily represent any fixed portion of the total spoils collected. I wonder whether it is their random proportion that led Herodotus to describe the first offerings at Salamis as *akrothinia* rather than *dekatai*. A combination of different methods might also be used: thus after Salamis, the Phoenician triremes were taken out before the rest of the spoils were treated further, whereas the statue (of Apollo?) at Delphi must have been constructed using some of the proceeds from the sale of Apollo's share of the spoils, though we are not told at which stage the sale took place. A similar combination of 'raw' and 'converted' offerings is seen in another Herodotean passage: the Phocians dedicated half of the four thousand captured Thessalian shields at Abae

[19] Hdt. 9.80-1. Cf. Macan (1908), vol. I.2, 763, who thought that 'the spoils must have been valued, or even sold, before the tithe was actually handed over; unless we suppose that a rough estimate and division of spoils was made, and the tithes then converted into money'.

and the other half in Delphi; then they set aside the *δεκάτη τῶν χρημάτων* (apparently a tenth of the other acquired property save the shields) for setting up statues at Abae and Delphi.[20] Nowhere does Herodotus make any explicit mention of the conversion of booty into money and when it took place; but from other ancient authors we know that armies could sell their plunder to potential purchasers on the spot or in nearby places.[21] Therefore a further possibility was to sell the spoils collected before the gods' share was set aside and the monuments commissioned. More generally, regardless of how the gods' share was separated, it appears to be a general practice to set aside the gods' portion from the common store before any further distribution among the armies.[22] I shall return to booty division between participating armies in the final section.

b) Value of Dedications

In neither the battle of Salamis nor Plataea are we told the monetary value of the gods' share. The value of military first offerings and the resources from which they were made can be estimated in some other battles. To commemorate their victory over Boeotia and Chalcis in 506 B.C., the Athenians dedicated on the Athenian acropolis a bronze chariot as a tithe (catalogue no. 2), along with fetters used on the enemies.[23] Herodotus tells us that seven hundred Boeotians and an unknown number of Chalcidians were taken prisoner and later ransomed for 200 *drachmai* each.[24] This would mean a total of at least 140,000 *drachmai* (or 23.3 talents). If we assume that

[20] Hdt. 8.27. The date of this combat is uncertain; but How and Wells (1928), vol. 2, 242, thought that it was probably after 510 B.C. For a full discussion of the conflicts between Thessaly and Phocis, see Macan (1895-1908), vol. I.2, 393-5.
[21] E.g. Xen. *An*. 7.7.56, Polyb. 4.77.5, 5.24.10; Pritchett (1974-), vol. 5, 416-38.
[22] On the mechanism of division of booty, see also Pritchett (1974-), vol. 1, 82-4, vol. 5, 363-438, Chaniotis (2005), 132-42.
[23] *IG* I^3 501, ML 15. The monuments' placement varies in Hdt. 5.77 and Paus. 1.28.2.
[24] The sum of 200 *drachmai* (or 2 *mnai*) per prisoner may seem very large at first sight, but this was not unparalleled. E.g. Hdt. 6.79: among the Peloponnesians, the price of ransom was fixed at 2 *mnai* per head at the beginning of the fifth century. On ransom of captives, see Bielman (1994), esp. 233-4, 282-91, 300-1, Pritchett (1974-), vol. 1, 77-82, vol. 5, 245-96.

the *dekate* was a real tenth here, this bronze monument, with four horses and a chariot, would have cost at least 14,000 *drachmai* (or 2.3 talents), and a single statue would have cost at least 2,800 *drachmai* on average.[25] This seems to correspond more or less to the cost of bronze statues in the Classical period, which can be estimated as more than 3000 *drachmai*.[26]

However, the bronze statue of Athena Promachos on the Athenian acropolis gives a very different figure (catalogue no. 3). According to Pausanias, it was made by Pheidias and was dedicated as a first offering (referred to as a *dekate* and *aparche* interchangeably by Pausanias)[27] of the spoils taken from the battle of Marathon. Dinsmoor estimated from Attic building accounts that its total cost was 83 talents, spent over a period of at least nine years.[28] It was several decades after the battle of Marathon (490 B.C.) that the Athenians undertook its construction: its building accounts have been dated to slightly earlier than the middle of the fifth century based on letter forms and in particular the three-barred sigma;[29] but Gill has down-dated them to a period extending from the 440s to 432, thus further lengthening the time lag between the battle and the monument's construction.[30] The figure of 83 talents may seem exceptionally high; but it was by no means unparalleled. Xenophon tells us that in 394 B.C. the Spartan king Agesilaus dedicated in Delphi a tithe of his booty taken from his campaigns in Asia Minor, an offering of not less than 100 talents (*δεκάτην*

[25] Or if we assume that an equal number of Chalcidians have been captured and sold, the sum total and the *dekate* would be double the figures here.
[26] Schol. Pind. *Nem*.5.1; cf. *IG* II^2 555, Diog. Laert. 6.35; Smith (2007), 100-1. Discussed in Chapter Five n. 160.
[27] Paus. 1.28.2 (*dekate*), 9.4.1 (*aparche*); but neither word appears in the very mutilated inscription *IG* I^3 505, *DAA* no. 172.
[28] Dinsmoor (1921), esp. 126.
[29] A dating criterion now rejected by Stroud (2006), esp. 34.
[30] Dinsmoor (1921), 127, followed by Meritt (1936), 373; cf. Gill (2001), 269-74.

τῶν ἐκ τῆς λείας τῷ θεῷ ἀπέθυσεν οὐκ ἐλάττω ἑκατὸν ταλάντων).[31] It is unclear, however, what form Agesilaus' offering took, whether it was a monument, a great sacrifice, or a sum of money.[32]

The battle of Marathon appears to have been commemorated by more than one monumental first offering.[33] The Athenian treasury at Delphi (catalogue no. 8) is supposedly also related to this event. Pausanias tells us that it was built from the spoils taken at Marathon; this appears to be confirmed by the base in front of its south wall which bears the inscription *Ἀθεναῖοι τ[ῦ]ι Ἀπόλλον[ι ἀπὸ Μέδ]ον ἀκ[ροθ]ίνια τες Μαραθ[ῶ]νι μ[άχες]* ('the Athenians to Apollo [from the Med]es as first offerings from the battle of Marathon').[34] While the French excavators agreed with Pausanias in thinking that the inscription referred to the treasury, some scholars argue that Pausanias was mistaken and that the treasury was built between 506 and 490 B.C. before Marathon.[35] If the base was added later, it would mean that an existing monument originally intended for other purposes was converted into a first offering commemorating this battle. The problem remains controversial and is unlikely to be satisfactorily resolved. A third first offering associated with Marathon is a group of thirteen statues on the first lap of the sacred way at Delphi dated to c. 460 B.C., about 30 years after the battle (catalogue no. 14). The monument and inscription have not survived. Pausanias does not cite the inscription he read at his

[31] Xen. *Hell*. 4.3.21, Xen. *Ages*. 1.34, Plut. *Vit. Ages*. 19.

[32] The verb *ἀποθύω* refers to a blood sacrifice in Xen. *An*. 3.2.12, 4.8.25; but 100 talents seem incredibly large for animal sacrifice. Pritchett (1974-), vol. 1, 96 assumes this to be a sum of money.

[33] Of the monuments associated with Marathon, only the Athenian treasury at Delphi (catalogue no. 8) is described as an *akrothinion* in its inscription on stone; the other two (statue of Athena Promachos at Athens, statue group at Delphi; catalogue nos. 3, 14) are described by Pausanias as first offerings. A temple of Eucleia at Athens is also said to be built from the spoils at Marathon (Paus. 1.14.5), but this is not described as a first offering.

[34] *FD* III.2, no. 1, *IG* I^3 1463 B, ML 19, Paus. 10.11.5.

[35] For a summary of the main arguments, see ML 19 with addenda and Rups (1986), 132-7. On the Athenian treasury, see Partida (2000), 48-70. On its strategic placement in the sanctuary, see Scott (2010), 77-81.

time, but reports that according to the inscribed base the statue group was dedicated 'from a tithe of the spoils of Marathon' (*ἀπὸ δεκάτης τοῦ Μαραθωνίου ἔργου*), reiterating that the group was 'in truth a tithe of the spoils of the battle' (*καὶ ἀληθεῖ λόγῳ δεκάτη καὶ οὗτοι τῆς μάχης εἰσίν*).[36]

The monuments associated with Marathon are worthy of our attention as they raise the questions of whether the Athenians would have acquired enough spoils from Marathon alone to pay for so many elaborate monuments, and whether some *dekatai* and *akrothinia* might have come from a source different from the spoils resulting from the campaign they commemorate. Some scholars think that the loot gathered at Marathon would scarcely have been enough to meet the expenses of these monuments.[37] Miller suggests plausibly that the spoils from the battle of the Eurymedon in the early 460s might have helped to defray the expense of monuments for Marathon;[38] this would also explain the time-lag between Marathon and its associated monuments constructed a few decades later. Probably then, the (nearly) singled-handed Athenian victory at Marathon was so politically and ideologically significant to the Athenians that its commemoration was considered worthy of the expense, even if it far exceeded the profits from the battle. We saw earlier that it was possible to give more than a tithe to the gods by using some of what remained; here it is intriguing that the gods' offerings might have far exceeded the sum total of the financial gains from the war.

[36] Paus. 10.10.1-2 (adapted from Jones's translation); Bousquet (1942-3), 132-5.
[37] E.g. Harrison, (1965), 11 n. 68, Gauer (1980).
[38] Miller (1997), 38-9.

c) Dedications and their Dedicants

When it came to setting up a first offering by a state or jointly by several states, the question arose as to in whose name it would be dedicated. Ideally it should represent the participating state or states collectively; but sometimes prominent individuals might be entrusted with the task of making the offering on behalf of all and thereby claim most of the credit. This is best illustrated by a well-known passage in Xenophon's *Anabasis*. From the proceeds of the sale of captives taken by the Ten Thousand during the long march, a *dekate* was set aside for Apollo and Artemis and entrusted to Xenophon and six other generals.[39] Faced with a hazardous journey, Xenophon left his share for Artemis in the hands of the *Megabyxos*, a priestly official of Ephesian Artemis,[40] charging him to dedicate, in the event of his death, whatever offering he thought would please the goddess, but to return the sum to him if he returned safely. It is noteworthy that Xenophon should instruct the *Megabyxos* to return the sum to him upon his safe return, as if he had particular interest in making the first offering to Artemis in person. From the share of the *dekate* entrusted to him, Xenophon dedicated to Apollo an inscribed *anathema* in the above-mentioned Athenian treasury at Delphi;[41] and for Ephesian Artemis he later bought an estate at Scillus as Apollo's oracle directed. This passage has been studied in detail by Tuplin and others, and Xenophon's motives have been variously speculated on.[42] Here I shall focus on Xenophon's prominent role in making the offerings. The *anathema* for Apollo in Delphi was inscribed with Xenophon's own name and that of Proxenus, but not the Ten Thousand's. We should like to know how Xenophon decided on the

[39] Xen. *An*. 5.3.4-13. Bielman (1994), esp. 285-6, argues that sale of captives for payment of ransom was a quick and convenient means of making profits.
[40] On the *Megabyxos*, see Bremmer (2004), Bremmer (2008), 38-42.
[41] Treasuries might be regarded as 'active' offerings because of their function of housing and displaying ostentatiously future gifts to the gods from citizens of the state. This aspect of treasuries is discussed in Rups (1986), 253-6, Neer (2001) and (2004).
[42] See Purvis (2003), ch. 4, Parker (2004b), 137-8 and n. 20, Tuplin (2004).

amount to spend on Apollo and Artemis, what offering to make for each divinity, and what to inscribe on it. More prominent still is Xenophon's role in the offering for Ephesian Artemis. Although the sanctuary for Artemis was built out of public money and not Xenophon's own profits, it is evident that Xenophon played an active role and acquired much fame and honour among the Greeks and posterity for having established the shrine.[43] Zaidman expresses well 'la conjugaison de privé et du public' in this undertaking of Xenophon: 'offrande collective des "soldats de Cyrus" à Artémis, le sanctuaire et sa gestion sont aussi l'œuvre de la piété personnelle de Xénophon qui a choisi (sur le conseil du dieu Apollon), l'emplacement, la nature de sanctuaire et de la fête'.[44]

The prestige accorded by dedications to their dedicants can also be illustrated by the first offering for Delphic Apollo after the battle of Plataea (catalogue no. 10). As we saw earlier, the Greeks jointly dedicated a gold tripod resting on the so-called serpent column at Delphi as Apollo's *dekate*. According to Thucydides, it was upon this tripod that Pausanias was suspected of having inscribed the following elegiac couplet:

> *Ἑλλήνων ἀρχηγὸς ἐπεὶ στρατὸν ὤλεσε Μήδων,*
> *Παυσανίας Φοίβῳ μνῆμ' ἀνέθηκε τόδε.*[45]
> Leader of the Greeks, when he had destroyed the Persian army,
> Pausanias dedicated this memorial to Phoibos.

The couplet ascribed the monument to Pausanias and underlined his role as leader of the Greeks in overthrowing the Persians. The Spartans immediately had the couplet erased and inscribed the monument with the names of all the cities which had joined

[43] Bremmer (2008), 39, suggests that the *Megabyxos* might have been involved in Xenophon's founding of this shrine at Scillus and must have contributed to Xenophon's prestige.
[44] Zaidman (2005a), 105-6.
[45] Thuc. 1.132. Cf. the couplet in Diod. Sic. 11.33 (generally considered as not genuine). Cf. also Hdt. 1.50.3: Croesus' gold sprinkling-vessel (*perirranterion*) in Delphi was reinscribed by a Delphian to say that it was dedicated by the Lacedaemonians.

in defeating the Persians and dedicated it.[46] The episode suggests that it would cause great offence to the other Greeks if the joint war effort was attributed to a single Spartan; at the same time Pausanias' act also shows the potential of dedicatory inscriptions, especially those in Panhellenic shrines, to publicize the name and deeds of the dedicant.

d) Inter-State Rivalries and/or Obligations to the Gods?

Since large sums were usually involved, military first offerings had particular potential for displaying a city's wealth and military success. Monuments and their accompanying inscriptions were exploited as a medium to publicize one's victory.[47] The names of the victorious city and the defeated were frequently mentioned; there seems to have been little restraint in naming the vanquished, whether they were Greeks or non-Greeks. Reflections on this phenomenon are rare and perhaps unusual. Plato's *Republic* provides one of the few passages that criticize the dedication of spoils taken from fellow Greeks.[48] In a moral treatise in the second century A.D., Maximus of Tyre denounces soldiers as less useful than farmers, claiming that first-fruits of the fields are likely to be more pleasing to the gods than the tithes offered by Greek commanders Pausanias and Lysander (*πρῶτοι δὲ τῶν ἐκ γῆς καρπῶν τοῖς δεδωκόσιν θεοῖς ἀπαρξάμενοι· οἷς εἰκος χαίρειν τοὺς θεοὺς μᾶλλον ἢ Παυσανίᾳ τὴν δεκάτην ἀποθύοντι ἢ Λυσάνδρῳ τὴν δεκάτην*

[46] The eventual inscription (ML 27), engraved on the coils of the snakes, consists of the names of the participating states in the war, but not all the names agree with Herodotus' account, and some were inscribed after it was dedicated; hence arises the question of whether this was a memorial of the battle of Plataea or the whole Persian war. This is discussed in ML 27 with addenda, How and Wells (1928), vol. 2, 321-4.

[47] The formulae of military dedicatory inscriptions are studied by Jacquemin (2000), 155ff. On the role of offerings and dedicatory inscriptions in victory commemoration, see also Lonis (1979), esp. 271-7.

[48] Pl. *Resp*. 469e-470a. See similarly Plut. *De Pyth, or.* 15, 401c-d.

ἀνατιθέντι).[49] It has been suggested that there might have been a law in c. 440 banning the dedication of captured arms at Olympia.[50] Nevertheless, the use of offerings and inscriptions for commemorating one's victory (and another's defeat) appears to be taken for granted and was rarely seen as problematic by the Greeks at large.

In Panhellenic sanctuaries where dedications from a panorama of communities co-existed, first offerings are likely to have been made in a spirit of competition. The scale of the offerings and their strategic placement in the sanctuaries[51] all argue for some political motives beyond the simple dedication of thank-offerings to the gods. Competitive interactions may be illustrated by a few first offerings. In the fifth century, the Messenians and Naupactians dedicated a spectacular statue of Nike in Parian marble, mounted on a triangular column decorated with shields, at Olympia as a result of their victory with Athenian help over the Spartans (catalogue no. 42).[52] Its inscription reads *Μεσσάνιοι καὶ Ναυπάκτιοι ἀνέθεν Διὶ Ὀλυμπίωι δεκάταν ἀπὸ τῶμ πολεμίων*. ('The Messenians and Naupactians dedicated to Zeus Olympios a tithe from their enemy').[53] The shields decorating the column on which the Nike stood were taken from the unidentified battle in which Sparta was defeated.[54] Erected

[49] Max. Tyr., *Dissertations*, 14 (cited by the numeration of Taylor (1994 [1804]). Note that the Dissertation numbers vary in different editions: this treatise appears as *Dissertation* 14 in Taylor (1994 [1804]), but *Dissertation* 28, lines 108-11, in Trapp (1994). Pausanias' *dekate* (or rather his attempt to appropriate the Greeks' collective *dekate* as his own offering to the god) is mentioned in Thuc. 1.132; but I do not know of a *dekate* made by Lysander: Maximus' words need not be taken at face value.

[50] Scott (2010), 33, n. 24.

[51] On the 'spatial politics' of Panhellenic shrines, see Scott (2010).

[52] On the monument, see the detailed study by K. Hermann (1972) with reconstruction at 254, fig. 14. See also H.V. Hermann (1972), 159-60, Mallwitz and Herrmann (1980), 189-91, Scott (2010), 195-6.

[53] *IG* V.1 1568, *IvO* 259, ML 74, Paus. 5.26.1. Scholarship differs on which war was meant and whether the monument dates to the mid-fifth century or the 420s. Paus. 5.26.1 thinks that it commemorated the Mesenians' war with Acarnania and Oiniadai (c. 455), but it was due to fear of the Spartans that they themselves connected it with their participation in the Athenian exploits at Sphacteria in 425. Cf. ML 74: Meiggs and Lewis considered it most appropriate to refer to all the Messenian operations in support of Athens during the whole Archidamian War.

[54] A very similar monument appears to have been dedicated as a *dekate* at Delphi; see the

directly to the east of the temple of Zeus, the monument with its shields may be seen as rivalling the gold shield hung by Sparta on the temple's east pediment in commemoration of Spartan victory over Athens, Argos and the Ionians in the battle of Tanagra in c. 457 B.C. (catalogue no. 40), which too was dedicated as a *dekate* to Olympian Zeus.[55] When setting up victory dedications, the Greeks seem to be concerned with outbidding their enemies and advertising their achievements as much as giving thanks to the gods. Panhellenic sanctuaries in particular, because of their prestige and 'international' clientèle, provided an arena where rivalries among Greek cities were played out.

A military first offering could be re-dedicated to revive memories of inter-state rivalries. Athenian victory over Boeotia and Chalcis in the late sixth century appears to be commemorated by more than one first offering (catalogue no. 2). Archaeologists have discovered fragments of two statue bases similarly inscribed but of markedly different dates.[56] Some scholars infer that the original *dekate* was either destroyed or lost to the Persians, and a replica was set up later, perhaps to renew memory of the earlier victory at a time when Athenian superiority over Boeotia and Chalcis became topical.[57] An interesting parallel can be found in Delphi: in the 330s the Athenians re-dedicated the shields taken from the battle of Plataea in the new temple of Apollo at Delphi (before its rebuilding was actually finished), the old temple having collapsed in 373/2. The shields bore the inscription *Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπὸ Μήδων καὶ Θηβαίων, ὅτε*

---

reconstruction in Jacquemin and Laroche (1982), 191-204, with fig. 1 (*FD* III,4 no. 1, *SEG* XXXII 550).

[55] On the Spartan shield, see *IvO* 253, Paus. 5.10.4, ML 36, Boardman (1985), 33. On the rivalry between the two dedications, see Scott (2010), 195-6.

[56] *IG* I^3 501A,B, ML 15 A, B. Base A (*DAA* no. 168) is dated to c. 506 B.C. and base B (*DAA* no. 173) to c. 455-450B.C.

[57] Raubitschek in *DAA* no. 173, proposed a date after the battle at Oinophyta (c. 457); supported by Meiggs and Lewis in ML 15 with addenda. Others associate it with the Euboean revolt in 446. On the role of monuments as 'mnemonic devices' to help evoke and solidify memory that is otherwise fluid and temporary, see Connerton (1989), 1-31, Halbwachs (1992), Alcock (2002).

τἀναντία τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἐμάχοντο ('The Athenians, from the Medes and the Thebans, when they fought against the Greeks').[58] The statement that the Thebans joined the Medes in fighting against the Greeks was clearly intended to insult Thebes. The shields served to revive memories of Theban medism, and are likely to be part of Athens' anti-Theban propaganda in the fourth century.[59]

Like any gift to the gods, however, display and competitiveness were inseparable from piety. We should not neglect the presence of other less political motivations behind victory dedications. Doubtless an important reason for setting up military first offerings was to render the gods their dues and to acknowledge their role in military enterprises (as in any other human activities), a theme which I have already discussed in Chapter Two. There are indications that the allocation of the gods' share after a successful military undertaking was considered a matter of serious concern. We may recall the great care with which Delphic Apollo's share was treated after Salamis: the Greeks jointly inquired of the god if the *akrothinia* were enough and pleasing to him.[60] While duly discharging their debt to the god for the victory just won, they must have been hoping for continued divine assistance in the successive battles. Any failure to give the gods their dues, we can imagine, was likely to cause great anxiety among the army. We do not know whether military first offerings were necessarily made in fulfillment of a vow: the vast majority of examples collected here were not explicitly associated with one.[61] To return a preliminary portion of spoils to the gods, whether a vow had been made or not, was a way of settling the 'occasional' debt incurred when a city was delivered from danger or came off well in a battle. It

[58] Aesch. *In Ctes*. 116 (adapted from Darwin's translation), Paus. 10.19.4; Parke (1939a), 71-8.
[59] This is one of the events leading up to the so-called fourth Sacred War: Aeschin. *In Ctes*. 116, Bonner and Smith (1943), 3, Roux (1979), 30-3, Scott (2010), 132-3.
[60] Hdt. 8.120-1.
[61] On military vows, see Pritchett (1974-), vol. 3, 230-9.

acknowledged duly the gods' involvement in military affairs. Such is the idea expressed in a fifth-century inscription at Selinus concerning an unidentified battle: the text begins with the phrase *[δι]ὰ τός θεὸς τό[σ]δε νικõντι̣ τοὶ Σελινόν̣[τιοι]*, then follow the names of the gods responsible for Selinus' victory. That the Selinountians owed their victory to each of the gods listed is made explicit by the successive use of *διά* with the god's name. The second half of the inscription provides for the commission of a gold object of 60 talents on which the gods' names would be inscribed. This is evidently a thank-offering in return for the gods' favour in the battle. One wonders whether it was intended as a *dekate* or an *akrothinion* but was not described as such, and whether the 60 talents represented a tenth of the total profits acquired.[62]

It should be stressed that as far as booty was concerned, there was no legislation or written law ordaining the obligatory handing of a tenth to the gods. While the defeated city might be compelled to hand over its property, it was the voluntary decision of a city or cities to share the acquired profits with the gods. The practice is likely to have been socially prescribed by custom rather than by law. A passage in Demosthenes has been (mis-)taken by Pritchett and others as evidence for Athenian legislation attributing a tenth of booty to Athena: in the year 352 B.C., Demosthenes delivered a speech in which he attacked a law introduced by Timocrates that sought to protect the Athenian ambassadors who held onto the plunder (worth nine and a half talents) of a merchant ship captured off the Egyptian coast. Demosthenes compared the ambassadors to temple-robbers, claiming that Timocrates' law would deprive the gods of the *dekate* due to Athena (0.95 talents or 5,700 *drachmai*) and the *pentekoste*

[62] *IG* XIV, 268, ML 38 with addenda, *SEG* XXXIV 970, *SEG* XLV 1414, Manganaro (1995). It is disputed whether the 60 talents refer to the value or the weight in gold. Here I follow Meiggs and Lewis in considering the former as more likely.

or fiftieth (1,140 *drachmai*) to the other gods. Instead of referring to an existing law, the speaker is much more likely to be drawing on the usual practice of returning to the goddess a *dekate* of loot.[63] Justin's passage quoted at the beginning of this chapter shows precisely that a tenth was the gods' customary portion, and what was unusual was for Locri to transgress the norm by vowing a ninth.[64] While a *dekate* was the standard portion, a city could also give a random portion less than a tenth: this is probably what differentiated a *dekate* from an *akrothinion* or an *aparche* as suggested in Chapter One. Despite the lack of written laws requiring a tithe for the gods, the practice seems to be so strongly prescribed by tradition that any failure to bring one would have appeared unseemly or even offensive to the gods. It was the quasi-obligatory nature of military first offerings that gave Demosthenes' argument force in the law-court.

Much has been said so far about monumental offerings set up in Panhellenic sanctuaries. Yet some military first offerings were also dedicated in local shrines, most notably on the Athenian acropolis and the Lindian acropolis,[65] and doubtless in other local sanctuaries although the surviving evidence is scant.[66] Dedicated locally and viewed mainly by the local inhabitants, these victory offerings had less scope for ostentatious display and competition when compared to those at shrines with Panhellenic appeal. We should not think that military first offerings were necessarily elaborate commemorative monuments. The gods' share was not always invested in

[63] Dem. 24.120, 129. Pritchett (1974-), vol. 1, 93, vol. 3, 241. Likewise Jacquemin (2000), 154, speaks of a 'law' imposed at Athens based on this passage. I am grateful to Prof. Vincent Gabrielsen for discussing with me this passage; in personal correspondence he expresses similar doubts about Pritchett's interpretation.
[64] Justin, *Epit*. 20.3.
[65] Athenian acropolis: catalogue nos. 2-4; Lindian acropolis: catalogue nos. 29-36.
[66] E.g. Paus. 3.18.7-8, 4.14.2: Pausanias reports seeing in Amyklai three bronze tripods with statues of three goddesses dedicated by Sparta as a *dekate* of the Messenian war (catalogue no. 1); but it is unclear which Messenian war is meant. Their chronological problems are discussed in Frazer (1913), vol. 3, 351.

monumental building projects; sometimes it might be channelled back to the financing and maintenance of the cult concerned. After subduing the Mytilenian revolt in 428/7 B.C., the Athenians divided the island of Lesbos (save the area of Methymna) into 3,000 portions of which 300 were set aside for the gods. This is a real tenth although Thucydides does not use the word *dekate* here.[67] It appears to have been a standard Athenian practice to set aside *temene* in conquered territories to the gods;[68] but only in this Thucydidean passage do we know that the *temene* represented a real tenth of the appropriated land. The gods' *temene* were usually leased out and the land rent collected would finance the cult of the gods concerned.[69] A related but different practice is the use of some of the profits of war to buy a piece of land for the gods. For example, as we have seen earlier, Xenophon purchased an estate in Scillus for Ephesian Artemis using the goddess' share of the *dekate* from the long march. The land was leased out and tenants were required to pay a *dekate* of the land's produce to fund an annual festival held at the sanctuary.[70] Land and produce of land aside, military first offerings could also take the form of items of arm and armour,[71] an animal sacrifice,[72] and (in myths) captives dedicated alive.[73]

---

[67] Thuc. 3.50.

[68] For other evidence of land allotment to the gods by the Athenians, see e.g. Aelian, *VH* 6.1, *Agora* XIX p.171, L2, p.172, L3, collected and discussed in Polinskaya (2009), 250-1. On the practice of setting apart *temene* in newly acquired land to the gods, see Meiggs (1972), 295-6, Malkin (1987), 138-41, Isager and Skydsgaard (1992), 182-4, Polinskaya (2009), esp. 249-54.

[69] On leasing of sacred land, see Osborne (1988), esp. 281-304, Isager and Skydsgaard (1992), ch. 8, Von Reden (2010), 171-4.

[70] Xen. *An*. 5.3.4-13.

[71] E.g. Eur. *IT* 75, Lazzarini (1976), no. 704 (catalogue no. 37), *IvO* 254-6 (catalogue no. 41).

[72] E.g. Soph. *Trach*. 760-2.

[73] E.g. Diod. Sic. 4.66.5, Eur. *Phoen*. 202-15, 282. There is no historic example of such human first offerings to my knowledge: the gods were most probably given a portion of the proceeds from the sale of captives rather than the captives themselves. Diod. Sic. 11.65.5, on the Argive capture of Mycenae in 486 B.C., mentions a *dekate* from the Mycenaeans (*δεκατὴ ἐξ αὐτῶν*). This involves not a *ἀνθρώπων δεκατή* as Malkin (1987), 38, thinks, but a tithe of the money from the sale of captives. The latter interpretation is supported by Ducrey (1968), 132, Ducat (1974), 103, n. 3. On treatment of captives, see Ducrey (1968), Bielman (1994).

II. Private Dedications

Most military first offerings were public dedications made by a Greek city or jointly by several cities; individuals might also voluntarily offer part of what they personally acquired in wars, though the evidence is scant and uncertain. In the sixth century a colossal marble *kouros* was dedicated as a tithe of spoils to Apollo in Didyma. This appears to be a private dedication from an individual whose name ended in –es: *[--]ης ἀπήρ{σ}ξατο ληίης δεκάτην τõι Ἀπ[όλλωνι]* ('--es made a first-offering of a tenth of the spoils to Ap[ollo]').[74] Also in Didyma in perhaps the sixth century, two individuals dedicated a *dekate* to Apollo *ἀ̣πὸ λείο*. Inscribed boustrophedon on a bronze astragal is the text *τάδε τἀγάλματα ἀ̣πὸ λείο Ἀριστόλοχ[ος] [καὶ] Θράσων ἀνέθεσαν τ[ὠ]πόλλωνι δεκάτην· ἔχε[ε] δ′ αὐτὰ . σικλῆς ὁ Κυδιμ. ν .* ('Aristoloch[os and] Thrason dedicated these *agalmata* to Apollo as a tithe *ἀ̣πὸ λείο* (?). [--]sikles son of Kydim[-]n[--] cast[75] them'). If it is correct to think that *λείο* (= *λήϊου*) derives from *λήϊον*, an equivalent of *λεία* according to LSJ (citing this inscription), this would be a *dekate* of booty from two private individuals.[76] However, it has also been proposed to associate *λείο* with *λήϊον* in the sense of 'field'; accordingly this might be a tithe of the field's produce comparable to the *δεκάτη χοριόω* seen in Chapter Three.[77] The meaning of the

[74] Tuchelt (1970), 56, 117-8 K 9 bis fig. 24 pl. 14, Jeffery, *LSAG*^{2}, 473 H, Lazzarini (1976), no. 692. Tuchelt (1970), 118, thinks that this was a private dedication and cites several examples of individuals whose name ends in –es in Didyma. Cf. Soph. Trach. 761: *ἀπαρχὴ λείας*.

[75] If *ἔχε[ε]* is read, it most probably comes from *χέω* ('I pour') and not *ἔχω*. Cf. *ThesCRA*, vol. 1, 310, no. 184, which translates *ἔχε[ε] δ′ αὐτὰ* as 'had them'.

[76] *I. Didyma* 7, *Syll.*^{3} 3g, McCabe, *Didyma Inscriptions*, no. 140, Jeffery, *LSAG*^{2}, 334, 343, *ThesCRA*, vol. 1, 310, no. 184, *SEG* XXX 1290, *SEG* XLV 1566; c. 550-525 B.C. (?). The last sentence of the Greek text differs slightly in different editions, here I cite the text in *I. Didyma* 7. By analogy with Hdt. 4.152, Bravo (1980), 833-5, interprets this as a tithe from commercial profit made by aristocrats; but this is pure speculation. LSJ s.v. *λήϊον*: 3. '= *λεία*, booty, *SIG* 3g (Susa, from Didyma, v B.C.)'.

[77] Wilamowitz (1906), 639, n. 3, Dittenberger in *Syll.*^{3} 3g; cf. *IG* I^3 800: *δεκάτη χοριόω*; LSJ s.v.

phrase *ἀ̣πὸ λείο* remains uncertain.

Two private dedications in Delphi in the fourth century are described as an *akrothinion*. One was an unknown object dedicated by one Athenaios: *[Ἀ]θηναῖος Ἀπόλλων[ι] ἀκροθίν[ιον]* ('Athenaios (dedicated) an *akrothinion* to Apollo').[78] The other was a limestone column set up by an Orchomenian; its inscription reads *Θεός· τύχαν ἀγαθάν vacat Φίλων Τριτέα Ὀρχομένιος Ἀρκὰς Ἀπόλλωνι ἀνέθηκε ἀκροθίνιον* ('God; Good Fortune Philon son of Triteas, Orchomenian, Arcadian, dedicated an *akrothinion* to Apollo').[79] In neither of these two cases is the word *akrothinion* qualified by a genitive; therefore we cannot be certain that these were necessarily military in nature since the word *akrothinion* was applied predominantly, but not exclusively, to military first offerings.[80] It is possible that some individuals might have used the word loosely to signify 'first offerings' without any connection to booty.

III. Ritualization and Social Function

Contrary to Momigliano's celebrated notion that material self-enrichment was not the real cause of war in the Greek world,[81] it is now generally recognized that the fruits of war constituted a major, if not exclusive, motivating factor for military conflicts.[82] The figures collected by Pritchett show that the value of the booty acquired could reach hundreds or even thousands of talents in the Classical and

---

λήϊον: 2. 'corn-field'.
78 Daux (1939), 146
79 Daux (1939), 145, fig. 3, *IG* V.2 p. 69.
80 E.g. *IG* IX.1 131(*ἐξ ὁσίων ἔργων ἀκροθίν[ιον]*).
81 Momigliano (1966a).
82 E.g. Pritchett (1974-), vol.1, 75-6, Austin (1993), 206-8.

Hellenistic periods.[83] Accordingly, as we have already seen, the gods' share of the profits of war might involve considerable sums. Apart from a means of cultivating the gods and advertising victory, I suggest that the act of assigning first portions to the gods after a successful campaign might also have a practical social function, namely to preserve the solidarity of the army by avoiding conflicts in the division of spoils.

Our sources show that booty division was potentially divisive of the unity of the participating forces, easily leading to disagreements and desertion. The classic example can be found in the opening scenes of the *Iliad*: Achilles' conflict with Agamemnon was provoked, on the one hand, by the latter's rejection of the customary procedures in the distribution of booty;[84] and on the other hand, by his claim to the lion's share of the spoils while Achilles did most of the fighting.[85] There are several references to Sparta and her allies disputing their share of the booty from the Peloponnesian war;[86] the most well-known one (if the reference is really to spoils of war) is the Theban claim to the *dekate* for Apollo which, according to Xenophon, contributed to Spartan hostilities against Thebes in 395 B.C.: 'for they had long been angry with them (the Thebans) about the claim to the tithe to Apollo at Decelea' (*πάλαι ὀργιζόμενοι αὐτοῖς τῆς τε ἀντιλήψεως τῆς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος δεκάτης ἐν Δεκελείᾳ*).[87] Xenophon records another conflict in 395 B.C.: when the

[83] Pritchett (1974-), vol. 1, 75-6, vol. 5, 499-504.
[84] Agamemnon intended to seize Achilles' slave-girl Briseis, given to Achilles as a prize, to replace Chryseis, when all the spoils had already been distributed and it would be wrong to recall them now.
[85] Hom. *Il*. 1.121ff. On the mechanism of distribution in the Homeric world, see Wees (1992), appendix iv, 299-310, but principles of division in the Homeric world may not apply to later periods.
[86] E.g. Xen. 3.5.12, Plut. *Lys*. 27.2, Justin, *Epit*. 5.10.12. See also Pritchett (1974-), vol. 5, 373-4.
[87] Xen. *Hell*. 3.5.5 (adapted from Brownson's translation). Xenophon's allusion to Decelea is difficult to understand: neither Justin, *Epit*. 5.10.12 nor Plut. *Lys*. 27.2 mentions Decelea or Apollo; Breitenbach proposes the plausible emendation *τῆς ἐκ λείας* for *ἐν Δεκελείᾳ*. Parke (1932), 42-6, suggested that there was a Spartan harmost in Dekelea who was entrusted with the *dekate* for Apollo but did not explain what the dispute was. Pritchett (1974-), vol. 5, 374 suggests that the dedication for Apollo was not made in the name of the Thebans and it was the lack of recognition at Delphi which humiliated them. Uncertainties remain, however, as to whether the Theban claim concerns their own share of booty from the war (as in Justin, *Epit*. 5.10.12), or the *dekate* to the god, or whether there were two

Paphlagonians and Spithridates brought in the property they had captured, the Spartan Herippidas took everything away from them, with the result that they deserted from the Spartans.[88] In 322 B.C., one of Thibron's leaders called Mnasicles was said to have quarrelled with him about booty division and deserted to the Cyrenians. Diodorus Siculus considers this as one of the events which brought about Thibron's change of fortune.[89] Polybius tells us that after an expedition through Etruria in 299, the Aetolians fell out with each other about the division of the spoils and succeeded in destroying the greater part of their own forces and the booty itself.[90] Another passage in Polybius relates how the opponents of Philip V tried to weaken Philip's forces by disseminating among the soldiers rumours that they were at risk of losing all their privileges and that they did not receive in full their customary share of the booty. This roused the young soldiers to attempt to plunder the tents of the king's most prominent friends.[91] In short, armies were prone to conflicts over the distribution of booty and this could have grave consequences.[92]

As we have seen at the end of Chapter Three, Gluckman identified practical social functions in first-fruits ceremonies among the Bantu: by forbidding consumption of the newly available crops before the performance of the relevant rites, he argued, first-fruits rituals had the potential of channelling conflicts and reinforcing social cohesion among the participants.[93] While Gluckman's model has only limited explanatory value for agricultural first-fruits in ancient Greece where evidence for prohibition on eating is lacking, his idea may apply more appropriately to military

---

separate claims. The nature of the dispute remains unclear.
[88] Xen. *Hell*. 4.1.26-8.
[89] Diod. Sic. 18.20.1.
[90] Poly. 2.19.2.
[91] Poly. 5 25.1-3.
[92] For more examples of dissensions over division of spoils, see e.g. Diod. Sic. 13.62.5, Poly. 5.107.6, 18.27.4; Pritchett (1974-), vol. 5, 373-5.
[93] Gluckman (1938).

first offerings. As far as the distribution of booty was concerned, armies appear to be normally prohibited from claiming their share before the gods' portion was assigned. We have already seen that after Plataea, Pausanias forbad anyone from laying hands on the spoils as the valuables were being collected.[94] Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* provides many instances where Cyrus asked the *magi* to separate the gods' share before the rest of the booty was distributed to the generals and troops.[95] In the actual process of collection and division, we may envisage, individual soldiers must have been required to hand over the booty to an authority, who would oversee the 'taking out' of the god's share using any of the procedures envisaged earlier.[96] Then we would expect the remaining spoils to be divided among the armies according to prior agreements (if any)[97] or other principles as they saw fit. Known principles of division include the performance and the size of the contingents.[98] It was probably normal practice to assign *aristeiai* to the city and individual who most distinguished itself/himself in a battle,[99] and a sizeable reward (different from the *aristeiai*) to a victorious general or commander.[100] After that, soldiers might also receive a share of

---

94 Hdt. 9.80-81.

95 Xen. *Cyr*. 4.5.14, 4.5.51, 4.6.11, 5.3.2, 5.3.4, 7.3.1, 7.5.35.

96 See p. 192-3.

97 Such treaties abounded especially in Hellenistic Crete: e.g. *IC* I viii 4 (=ML 42B), I xvi 5, I xix 1, III iii 3A, 3B, 4, IV 180, 182; most of these are discussed with commentary in Chaniotis (1996). Recently Perlman (2010) has joined two previously unassociated blocks into a new composite Cretan text dated to the late archaic period; it contains two references to '*dekaton*' and probably preserves part of the earliest inter-state agreement between Cretan cities concerning booty division. The word *dekaton* refers perhaps to the gods' share, though we cannot rule out the possibility that a literal tenth to a city is meant. Other literary and epigraphic examples of treaties containing clauses in this matter are collected and discussed in Aymard (1957), Garlan (1977), 158-64, Pritchett (1974-), vol. 5, 363-73, Perlman (2010), 97-8.

98 According to merit: e.g. Hdt. 9.81.1 (*ἔλαβον ἕκαστοι τῶν ἄξιοι ἦσαν*), Xen. Cyr. 7.5.35 (*τὰ κράτιστα τοῖς ἀρίστοις*); size of contingents: e.g. Diod. Sic. 11.25.1(*κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν συστρατευσάντων*), 11.33.1(*κατὰ τὸν τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἀριθμὸν*). Note that Hdt. 9.81.1 and Diod. Sic. 11.33.1 differ on how booty was divided after Plataea.

99 But this appears to take place at no fixed stage: e.g. after the battle of Salamis, the *aristeiai* for the city (Aegina) and individuals were awarded immediately at Salamis (Hdt. 8.93) before the gods' share was set aside (Hdt. 8.121-2). But at Plataea, the *aristeiai* were allocated after the gods' share was separated (Hdt. 9.81, Diod. Sic. 11.33). Pritchett (1974-), vol. 2, 276-90, does not explain at which stage *aristeiai* were normally awarded.

100 E.g. Thuc. 3.114, Plut. *Vit. Cleom*. 19.4. On prizes to generals, see Pritchett (1974-), vol. 2, 126-32.

the spoils.[101] In addition to this, individual soldiers might also acquire items of booty through private plunder during the campaigns.[102] According to a passage in Xenophon, when the Greek army rested in the camp, individuals were allowed to turn out to plunder privately and keep what they acquired. However, whenever the entire army set out, anything an individual got by plunder was to be public property.[103] Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that the mechanisms of booty division are likely to have varied between cities and alliances, and no universal procedures can be established from the piecemeal evidence available.

For the process of division to be smooth and effective, it is important that soldiers should willingly hand over the booty captured, and that no one should lay hands on the common stock. We may expect individuals to have been more inclined to cooperate if it was considered religiously correct to give the gods their dues first. It is for this reason that Croesus expected the Persians to hand over the booty willingly to their king: when the Lydian city was being looted by the Persians, Croesus advised Cyrus to install guards at the city gates and take the spoils away from anyone trying to take them out of the city on the pretext that a tenth of the spoils had to be offered to Zeus. In this way, Croesus supposed, the Persians would appreciate the rightness of this act and willingly hand over the spoils.[104] The act of setting aside the gods' share provided divine authority for the handing over of the spoils. It also helped to prevent dissension by putting a curb on individual appropriation of the valuables at least at the initial stage of division. Anthropologists have also suggested that by ascribing a ritual quality and a divine nature to what is otherwise a 'profane' matter, religious rituals

[101] On soldiers' share and the question of whether the spoils served as payment for soldiers or rewards in addition to pay, see Pritchett (1974-), vol. 5, 375-98.
[102] E.g. Xen. *Hell*. 1.2.5 (κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας λείας).
[103] Xen. *An*. 6.6.2.
[104] Hdt. 1.89.

have the potential of promoting acceptance and compliance without the use of physical force.[105] Differentiating and privileging the gods' share first, followed by further division of the rest among secular authorities and soldiers, might have been a strategy of control, exercised indirectly and unconsciously, over the participating forces.

Another way by which military first offerings might help preserve harmony in the armies was by demonstrably abandoning a choice portion to a higher authority so that no one could claim it. This idea relates not to Gluckman's social anthropological study but to Burkert's ethological analysis. Burkert observes that the successful animal in the quest for food is prone to attacks by other jealous individuals, and that abandoning the prey is the only way to avoid catastrophe. In his view, demonstrative abandoning or giving away to a third party (such as the gods) in human societies is a similar strategy of preventing conflicts, since neither party can lay claim to the choicest portions.[106] He adduces an episode in Arrian to support this idea: when the army of Alexander the Great was crossing the Gedrosian desert and tormented by thirst, a party of his light infantry found a little water which they collected in a helmet and gave to Alexander who then, in full view of his troops, poured the water into the sand: nobody could drink, and this preserved the solidarity of the army.[107] Military first offerings may also have similar social functions: no one could claim the first portion to the spoils except the gods.

Nevertheless, the difficulty remains that conflicts could still arise at any stage of booty collection and division. Thus after Camillus successfully captured Veii, his attempt to pay the tithe as vowed to Apollo was met with great difficulties: not only

[105] On the power of ritualization, see e.g. Bell (1992), chs. 7-9.
[106] Burkert (1979), 53-4.
[107] Arr. *Anab*. 6.26.

were the people reluctant to return the booty to the state, there were also disputes in the senate as to what the tithe should consist of precisely.[108] After the battle of Plataea mentioned earlier, despite Pausanias' proclamation that no one should touch the spoils of war, the helots, who were ordered to collect the booty, are said to have stolen a great quantity of valuables and sold them to the Aeginetans, though we do not hear of any resulting conflict on this occasion.[109] The many instances of conflicts over booty seen above also seem to suggest that dissensions abounded in reality and that the strategy of control envisaged here was not necessarily effective. Prohibition on individual appropriation of spoils, and assigning the fruits of the war to the gods, was therefore a way of enhancing, but not a sufficient guarantee for, cohesion among the armies.

The military first offerings in this Chapter are remarkable in two respects when compared to other kinds of first offerings. First, their enormous value: they were made on a much larger scale than, and have brought us a long way from, the offerings of foodstuffs, seasonal produce and personal earnings in the preceding chapters. Yet this willingness to expend huge sums on a first offering should not surprise us. Sharing the profits of war with the gods was consistent with the customary practice of returning to the gods a portion of whatever benefits were received. It was a way of discharging a city's debt to the gods for its military success and its great wealth acquired in wars. Second, their quasi-obligatory nature: in contrast to other contexts where it concerned an individual's personal decision whether or not to make a first offering and if so, how much to offer, in the event of a successful campaign, it appears to have been strongly prescribed by convention for cities to give the gods a portion, usually a tenth.

[108] Liv. 5.21.1, 23.8-12, 25.4-13.
[109] Hdt. 9.80.

Although we cannot prove that each campaign which yielded booty would necessarily yield a first share for the gods, the available evidence is so abundant that the practice must have been fairly common.

Chapter VII

Dispatched First Offerings to Distant Sanctuaries

In the last two chapters we have seen first offerings dedicated by private individuals in local shrines, as well as military first offerings set up by Greek cities predominantly (but not exclusively) in the Panhellenic sanctuaries of Olympia and Delphi. In this chapter we turn to first offerings dispatched to the gods in distant shrines through official delegations known as *theoroi* on behalf of the community.[1] Part One discusses the *aparchai* sent by colonies or subjects to their mother-city or a hegemonic power, whether of the city's own accord or in fulfillment of some obligations. Part Two examines the mainly post-Classical evidence for *aparchai* sent to the prestigious cult centres of Delos and Delphi, as well as to cities holding the so-called new Panhellenic festivals in the Hellenistic period. Finally I discuss the relations of dispatched first offerings to *theoria*, and how the different first offerings surveyed here relate to each other and to those seen in the preceding chapters.

I. First Offerings in Imperial and Colonial Relations

In this section I am interested in how the bringing of first offerings, traditionally a form of human-divine communication, could be exploited as a way of maintaining power relations in certain inter-state interactions: it is beyond coincidence that we find subject-colonies dispatching *aparchai* and *dekatai* to their mother-city or a hegemonic power, whether by compulsion or spontaneously. Here I make use of Maurice Godelier's idea of 'debt', summarized already at some length in Chapter Two, to explain how some political powers played on the idea of debt to generate a sense of duty and derive material resources from their subject states by demanding *aparchai*

[1] On *theoria* and *theoroi*, see Daux (1967a), Dillon (1997), Rutherford (2000), 136-8, Perlman (2002), Elsner and Rutherford (2005).

for their gods. Instead of acting as a mere intermediary between the dedicating city and the divine recipient, it will be argued, the dominant city was almost put on a par with the gods, so that gifts to the gods and gifts to those in power became nearly indistinguishable. The Eleusinian first-fruits under the Athenian empire provide the most elaborate example of, and a useful way of conceptualizing, the phenomenon we are dealing with here; for this reason they deserve some detailed analysis. After looking at the two kinds of *aparchai* (tribute *aparchai* and Eleusinian *aparchai*) in the Athenian empire, I shall examine whether similar mechanisms were also at work in the relations between Miletus, Syracuse, Lindos and their respective subject-colonies. Comparable first-fruit practices in other cultures will also be mentioned to offer possibilities for understanding the Greek phenomenon.

a) *Aparchai* of Allied Tributes to Athena (and Apollo?)

Epigraphic records show that from 454/3 B.C. onwards, that is, presumably when the treasury of the Delian League was transferred from Delos to Athens,[2] an *aparche* of one-sixtieth of the tribute (*phoros*) paid by the Athenian allies was offered to Athena at Athens. We have no evidence that a monetary *aparche* was paid by members of the Delian League between the League's formation in 478/7 and the transfer of its treasury in 454/3: in this period some allies paid a monetary contribution called *phoros*, whereas others contributed ships; but no mention is made of an *aparche* of the *phoros*.[3] Recently, Chankowski has argued that it is 'très probable' that a similar *aparche* had been paid to Apollo before the transfer of the league treasury, and that this formed the major source of funds for the maintenance of

[2] Pritchett (1969) places the date of the treasury's transfer in the 460s; this is discussed in Hornblower (1991-2008), vol. 1, 146. Samos (2000), 101-2 supports the traditional date 454/3. On Athenian intervention in Delos, see Meiggs (1972), 47-9, Parker (1996), 149-51, Constantakopoulou (2007), 67-75.

[3] On the original organization of the Delian League and the first assessment of the *phoros*, see Thuc. 1.96, *Ath. Pol.* 23.5, Plut. *Arist*. 24.

the sanctuary, not least the construction of the temple of Apollo, a project which was terminated with the transfer of the treasury (and *aparche*) to Athena.[4] If there had previously been *aparche* to Delian Apollo as Chankowski suggests, the *aparche* might have been initially a collective decision of the Delian League, payable perhaps as an administration fee for the use of Apollo's treasury. The transfer of the *aparche* to Athena when the tribute came to be placed under her protection would then seem quite natural;[5] and Athena's share of the tribute need not be seen as an Athenian imperial invention. On the other hand, if *aparche* did not previously exist for Apollo, one-sixtieth of the tribute to Athena since 454/3 would most likely concern the Athenians' own initiative to share the fruits of the empire with their patron goddess. This would be in keeping with the customary Athenian practice of sharing with the goddess the benefits received by the city, whether or not the League money was entrusted to her protection. It is the implication of this latter possibility, that tribute *aparche* was introduced in 454/3, which I shall dwell on here.

If it was Athens' voluntary decision to give the goddess a share of the tribute, it was nevertheless presented as a fixed obligation for her allies. Athena's share was recorded annually (with one exception) on the so-called Tribute Quota Lists put up on the Athenian acropolis.[6] From the prescript restored in the first list in 454/3 B.C., we know that the *aparche* was a *mna* from the talent, in other words, one-sixtieth of the

[4] Chankowski (2002), 242-3, Chankowski (2008), esp. 37-43, 311, 317-23. The possibility has already been envisaged by ML 39, p. 84, Meritt (1972), 416, Meiggs (1972), 237.
[5] Here I follow the opinion held by most scholars that the league funds were entrusted to Apollo's treasury while on Delos, and were transferred to that of Athena at Athens after 454/3. Cf. Samons (2001), 109-110, 367ff, who argues that payment of 1/60th to Athena implies that the rest of the tribute flowed into another treasury.
[6] On the Athenian tribute lists, see *IG* I^3 259-90, Meritt, Wade-Grey and McGregor (1939-53). The placement of the surviving fragments of the tribute lists from 421/0 to 415/4 as presented by editors of *ATL* is now doubted by Kallet (2004) (= *SEG* LIV 63-69) on the basis of autopsy.

tribute.[7] In several of the subsequent lists we find the formula *haíδε ἀπέδοσαν ἀπαρχὲν τει θεõι μνᾶν ἀπὸ τὸ ταλάντο* ('the following cities paid an *aparche* to the goddess, a *mna* from the talent').[8] It is intriguing that the so-called Tribute Lists should record not the *phoros* itself but the one-sixtieth of it, as if to emphasize the sacred nature of the payment and to make it sound less oppressive. The publication of the *aparche* received on stone, and the display of the massive monumental stelai on the acropolis, all present the payments to Athena as a serious religious obligation. However, what is unusual about this *aparche* is that, unlike the traditional *aparchai* (such as of spoils and harvest) which constitute a portion of a greater source, the rest of which is retained, here the *aparche* is a portion (1/60th) payable together with the rest of the tribute (59/60th). In other words, the allies were obliged to pay an *aparche* of the tribute as well as the tribute itself. Despite a notional distinction between *phoros* and *aparche*, one wonders how the difference between the two was perceived among the allies, and whether they would see any difference at all. From the allies' point of view, it was perhaps politically and fiscally irrelevant whether the money sent to Athens was termed *phoros* or *aparche* and what proportion went to the goddess; the two were doubtless treated similarly with an ambivalent feeling because of the connotation of political subordination attached to both.

The ambiguity between political and religious obligation is seen most clearly in cases where the *phoros* was exempted for some allies. The amount of allied tribute was revised every four years when the Great Panathenaia was celebrated. In a decree probably associated with the re-assessment in the summer 430, Methone was allowed

[7] *IG* I^3 259 = *ATL* II 1. On the proportion of one-sixtieth as an *aparche*, cf. *LSS* 85: a late fifth-century Lindian decree prescribes that soldiers and mercenaries should pay one-sixtieth of their wages to the military god Enyalios; but the word *aparche* is not used here.
[8] This formula is attested in three lists: *IG* I^3 285, 287, 289 (all partially restored) = *ATL* II 33, 34, 39.

to pay only the *aparche* to the goddess and to remit the remainder of the tribute.[9] This decision is reflected in two tribute lists in the 420s: in lists 25 and 26 (*IG* I^3 281-282) Methone is listed together with two Thracian communities Haison and Dikaia under a special rubric *haίδε τõν πόλεον αὐτὲν τὲν ἀπαρχὲν ἀπέγαγον* ('the following cities paid the *aparche* itself').[10] Soon afterwards in 428/7, Aphytis was given the same privilege as Methone.[11] The insistence that Athena's share should be paid even when the rest was remitted is open to interpretation: it may be a pious fulfillment of a religious obligation and a rigorous protection of the goddess' right. Yet it may also be a means of maintaining the symbolic dependence of the cities on Athens: it is tempting to see the *aparche* to Athena as a signifier of Athens' dominance over her subject-allies, so that any remittance would be detrimental to her (or her goddess'?) honour.[12] What was probably a voluntary gift from the Athenians to their goddess was hardened into a duty-fulfillment for her allies. We must remember that

[9] *IG* I^3 61, ML 65 = *ATL* II D 3-6. Its date has been disputed: the editors of *ATL* III, p. 134-7, preferred 430; followed by ML 65, Samons (2000), 63. But Mattingly (1961), 154-65, (1970), 134-6, places it in 427/6; this was questioned by Meiggs (1972), 534-6. See also Samons (2000), 63, on the possible Athenian motives of such generous treatment.

[10] *IG* I^3 281.II.33ff (=*ATL* II 25. II.33ff, c. 430/29) (plausibly restored), *IG* I^3 282.II.51ff (= *ATL* II 26. II.51ff, c. 429/8); see also Meritt (1944), 211-24, esp. 221. The two lists *IG* I^3 281, 282 are generally agreed to be consecutive, but there have been long disagreements about which one precedes the other and their dates; the main arguments are summarized in Mattingly (1961), 154-61, Meiggs (1972), 534-6. Here I follow the dates given in *IG*.

[11] *IG* I^3 62 = ATL II D 21.

[12] The second of the two Athenian decrees in honor of Neapolis, *IG* I^3 101 (410/9-407/6 B.C.), has a reference to *τες ἀπαρχες τει Παρθένοι ἅ[περ κ]αὶ τέος ἐγίγνετο τει [θε]õι* ('the *aparche* to the Virgin goddess which even until recently was given to the goddess') (line 57). It ends with the decision that the Neapolitans should set aside the *aparche* for their Vigin goddess just as before (lines 63-4). Tod no. 84, p. 210, took *ἡ θεός* in line 57 to mean Athena at Athens and the *aparche* to mean the *aparche* of allied tribute (accepted by Meritt, Wade-Grey and McGregor in *ATL* I, p. 525-6), suggesting that Neapolis was asking that the tribute *aparche* previously paid to Athena be paid to her Neapolis' Virgin goddess instead. However, the idea that the tribute *aparche* was transferable from Athena to another divinity is incredible: given its religious and political significance, to deprive Athena of the *aparche* would severely undermine the goddess' and Athens' honour; it would also damage the goodwill between the two cities. More plausible is the view of Meritt and Andrewes (1951), 206-7, who thought that *ἡ Παρθένος* and *ἡ θεός* in line 57 were identical, and that Neapolis was asking Athens to agree to the restoration of her customary offering of *aparche* to her own Virgin goddess, which might have lapsed when Neapolis provided financial and military support to Athens against Thasos. Nevertheless, it is not clear why this matter should require Athenian permission, nor do we know the nature of the *aparche*, except that it seems to have been regularly made (as indicated by the imperfect tense *ἐγίγνετο*). Cf. Meiggs and Lewis in ML 89, p. 275.

traditionally an *aparche* was a portion of the greater whole; but for Methone and other communities similarly exempted from the larger *phoros*, the *aparche* was in fact an obligatory 'payment'. In other words, the *aparche* ceased to be a part of the *phoros*, but became somewhat like a *phoros* itself, albeit a much reduced one. Though addressed to Athena in name, in practice it is ambiguous whether the allies were paying to Athena or to Athens. The conflation between political and religious obligation is a theme which will recur constantly in this chapter. Whether demanded through genuine piety, political manipulation, or a combination of both, Athena's *aparche* needs to be seen together with other religio-political means of power exertion: that the City Dionysia should be made the occasion for the presentation of tribute, and the Panathenaic year for its reassessment and the receipt of a cow and panoply, all belong to similar attempts to strengthen political ties by enforcing religious participation.[13]

In 413 B.C., Athens replaced the tribute by a five-per-cent tax (*eikoste*) on all imports and exports through the ports of her subject-allies, the main motivation being, according to Thucydides, to raise more money.[14] It is reasonable to assume, as Kallet does,[15] that when tributes were no longer collected, *aparche* was no longer paid to Athena. Nevertheless, even though *aparche* of tribute ceased to be paid, another kind of *aparche* was implemented in the last quarter of the fifth century, and this time with even wider participation: not just the allies but other Greeks outside the *arche* were also encouraged to send *aparchai* of wheat and barley to Eleusis.

---

[13] *IG* I^3 34 (= ML 46), *IG* I^3 46 (=ML 49), *IG* I^3 71 (=ML 69). On the ambiguities between political and religious obligations, see also Parker (1996), 142-4, Kowalzig (2007), 116-7.

[14] Thuc. 7.28.4, Ar. *Ran*. 363. On the *eikoste*, see Meiggs (1972), 349, Kallet (2001), 121-6, 195-226, Figueira (2005), esp. 84-94. Contrary to the earlier view of Meritt (1936), followed by Meiggs (1972), 438ff, that tribute was revived in 410/9, it is now generally agreed that the *phoros* was not reintroduced by the Athenians at a later date: see e.g. Kallet (2001), 223, Figueira (2005), 110, Hornblower (1991-2008), vol. 3, 595-6.

[15] Kallet (2001), 196 and n. 47.

b) The Eleusinian First-fruits Decree (*IG* I^3 78)

In the late fifth century the Athenians issued the well-known Eleusinian first-fruits decree,[16] which required the Athenians and their allies, and invited other Greeks at large, to send *aparchai* of harvest to the two goddesses at Eleusis. The *aparchai* were to involve no less than one-sixth of a *medimnos* of barley from each one hundred *medimnoi* (1/600th), and no less than one-twelfth of a *medimnos* of wheat from each hundred *medimnoi (*1/1200th). Unlike the *aparchai* (1/60th) of tribute to Athena which concerned the Athenian allies only, all other Greeks were encouraged - as opposed to the allies who were obliged - to send agricultural *aparchai*, making the decree a Panhellenic invitation. Apart from wheat and barley, provisions appear to be made also for *aparchai* of olive oil; but implementation of this proposal is not attested and most probably it was not put into effect.[17]

The date of the Eleusinian first-fruits decree has long been a subject of dispute: despite numerous attempts to date the text on various criteria, the decree cannot be confidently dated. The long history of the scholarship up to 1996 has been summarized by Cavanaugh and I shall not review the arguments here.[18] More recently Kallet suggests that the Eleusinian *aparchai* might have been instituted in 413 B.C. as a replacement of the monetary *aparche* which ceased to be paid when allied tribute was abolished.[19] However, it is unlikely that the decree would have been issued at a time when Athens was preoccupied with the Sicilian expedition. The historical context is an important factor that has not been adequately addressed by historians. It was doubtless at the height of her political hegemony, and in a context of relative peace, that Athens could make this invitation to the Greek world at large. It is

[16] *IG* I^3 78, ML 73, *I. Eleusis* no. 28.
[17] Parker (1996), 144.
[18] Past scholarship before 1996 is summarized in Cavanaugh (1996), ch. 3.
[19] Kallet (2001), 196 and n. 47, 217 and n. 132.

hard to imagine that this Panhellenic proclamation would appeal to the cities not allied to Athens, many of which would have been hostile to Athens during the Peloponnesian War. One possibility would therefore be a date in the 430s, before the outbreak of the war.[20] Alternatively, might the decree have been complementary to, or followed shortly, the so-called Peace of Nicias in 422/1 B.C.? This may be supported by the fact that the seer Lampon, who moved the rider to this decree, was the first Athenian signatory of the Peace of Nicias and the alliance with Sparta which followed.[21] Guillon suggested long ago that *IG* I^3 78 might have been associated or more or less contemporary with the Peace of Nicias, and that its goal was to affirm this treaty in 421 B.C. In Guillon's words, 'ce text prend ainsi sa pleine signification dans l'ensemble des mesures qui, complétant le geste décisif de la paix de Nicias, a pour object d'assurer à la prospérité, et tout d'abord, grâce à la faveur des dieux, sa subsistance prochaine. Il est l'un des premiers actes d'une politique qui, au sortie de la guerre de dix ans, fut sans doute celle d'un groupe d'hommes fort divert mais unis dans l' épreuve et le souci du bien commun.'[22] Since hostilities broke out again in 418, it is probably in conjunction with or shortly after the conclusion of the Peace that Athens proclaimed the decree all over the Greek world.

The decree claims three times that the practice was *κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὲν μαντείαν τὲν ἐγ Δελφῶν*.[23] What precisely the 'ancestral customs' refer to is not made explicit; but as already discussed in Chapter Three, the decree might have been

[20] Cavanaugh (1996) dates the decree to the 430s based on the absence of the board of the Eleusinian *epistatai* in the decree; supported by Clinton in *I. Eleusis* vol. II, no. 28a, p. 52. I am open to the possibility of a date in the 430s, but not on these grounds: note the objections of Rosivach, *BMCR* 97.2.22.

[21] *IG* I^3 78.47, ML 73.47, p. 221. Thuc. 5.19.2, 24.1, Ar. *Av.*521, 988; *PA* 8996. Lampon's activities are known to have extended from at least 443 to 414 B.C.

[22] Guillon (1962), 467-75.

[23] *IG* I^3 78.4-5, 25-26, 34. Recently Cole (2008), 57-9, has studied the binding power of the formula *κατὰ τὰ πάτρια*.

drawing on a pre-existing association between agricultural *aparchai* and the Eleusinian *Proerosia* and extending this to Greece at large.[24] As for the Delphic oracle alluded to, its date, content and historicity are all obscure. The authoritative studies on Delphic oracles by Parke and Wormell and Fontenrose regard the oracle in question as historical.[25] Parke and Wormell take the Delphic oracle mentioned in *IG* I^3 78 as a subsequent re-pronouncement, in perhaps the sixth century, of the oracle in myth commanding pre-ploughing sacrifices at the *Proerosia*. But other scholars think that they were two distinct oracles.[26] However this may be, by emphasizing three times that the custom was prescribed by oracular instruction and ancestral tradition, the Athenians probably hoped to enhance the decree's authority and to promote acceptance of it.[27]

The requirement that *aparchai* be brought from the Greeks at large has traditionally been interpreted as a religio-political measure to re-assert Athens' standing in the Greek world. Mylonas suggested that the cult at Eleusis could be 'the instrument for the unification of the Greeks under the hegemony of Athens, whose prominence in activities of lasting value and of cultural renown would be enhanced by the undertakings at Eleusis'.[28] Meiggs thought that 'the decree was devised for the greater glory of Athens', and that Athens was invoking religion 'to support her claims to rule'.[29] Hornblower cites this decree as one of several examples where 'religion was used by the Athenians as a propaganda device inside their empire and even as an

[24] Discussed in Chapter Three, p. 113-4.
[25] Parke and Wormell (1956), vol. 1, 326, vol. 2, 72-3, no. 164, Fontenrose (1978), 247, H9. Cf. Smarczyk (1990), 171, 191-2, who notes that the antiquity of the oracle is unknown. The criteria of 'authenticity' adopted by Parke and Wormell (1956) and Fontenrose (1978) have been questioned by Maurizio (1997), Flower (2005), 216, n.13, 218, Kindt (2006), 46.
[26] Fontenrose (1978), 294-5, Q79, Brumfield (1981), 67 n. 29, Smarczyk (1990), 171, 191-2. On the oracle in myth commanding sacrifice at the *Proerosia*, see Chapter Three.
[27] On the use of oracles to enhance authority in literary and epigraphic sources, see e.g. Kindt (2006), 35, Petrović and Petrović (2006).
[28] Mylonas (1961), 127.
[29] Meiggs (1972), 304-5.

instrument of oppression and expropriation'.[30] Yet I will argue that the significance of the decree was twofold: not only was the contribution of the grain ideologically important, but it might also carry real economic significance for the democracy.[31]

The potential economic benefits that might result from the successful implementation of the decree are hinted at, first, by the complex arrangements made for the grain envisaged, and second, by comparison with similar measures in Attica and elsewhere. According to the decree, at Athens the demarchs were responsible for collecting the grain deme by deme, whereas allied cities were to choose collectors (*ἐγλογεῖς*) to manage its collection and delivery to Athens. As was discussed in Chapter Three, the occasion for the dispatch remains unidentified and unidentifiable by historians.[32] It is nowhere stated explicitly when and how the *aparchai* were to be sent (line 16: *ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἐγλεχθει, ἀποπεμφσάντον Ἀθέναζε*); but the transport of crops from other cities to Eleusis would suggest *theoria* involving state delegations of some sort.[33] Provisions were made for the construction of three new *siroi*,[34] which suggests that a large quantity of *aparchai* was anticipated.[35] The *hieropoioi*[36] were the ones who were to receive the grain, record its weight, and arrange for its storage in the *siroi*. From the proceeds of its sale, they were to perform sacrifices and dedicate *anathemata* to the two goddesses with the remaining proceeds. These *anathemata* would be inscribed with the name of every Greek city that contributed the *aparchai*

[30] Hornblower (1992), 182, 185-6.
[31] An issue explored neither by Garnsey (1988) nor Moreno (2007). Moreno (2007) mentions *IG* I^3 71 briefly on one page only.
[32] See Chapter Three, n. 20.
[33] An Athenian honorific decree (*IG* II^2 992) in the first half of the second century B.C. attests to a Milesian *theoria* to Eleusis, showing that there were occasional state missions to Eleusis. Noted by Parker (2005), 343 with n. 67.
[34] On the archaeological evidence for the *siroi*, see Kourouniotis (1936), 53, Mylonas (1961), 125-7, Mee and Spawforth (2001), 137-8, fig. 44.
[35] Cf. Smarczyk (1990), 185, who thinks that the grain collected must have been consumed soon after its arrival as no provision for longer storage was made.
[36] On Eleusinian officials, see Clinton (1974).

and with the statement that they were dedicated ἀπὸ τῶ καρπῶ τες ἀπαρχες. This practice of dedicating inscribed *anathemata* was imitated by members of the Panhellenion in the second century A.D.[37] The decree does not specify the procedures by which the grain was sold; but it is very probable that its sale involved price-fixing by the assembly, as it did in the fourth century. We learn from *IG* II^{2}1672 that in 329/8 B.C. the Eleusinian grain collected was sold (after some was set aside for various purposes) at prices fixed by the assembly (lines 282-3, 287: 3 *drachmai* for barley and 6 *drachmai* for wheat per *medimnos*) and apparently below the market price.[38] Noting that the year 329/8 B.C. was a year of serious food shortage at Athens,[39] Jameson postulated that the agricultural *aparchai* were sold to meet cult expenses in normal circumstances, but could function in emergency as a communal grain reserve for Athens. Just as the goddess' money in the sacred treasury could be borrowed in exceptional circumstances,[40] so the wheat and barley might have served as a communal grain reserve in times of food shortage.[41] Jameson is the only scholar to my knowledge to have considered the practical economic benefits of the Eleusinian first-fruits decree. However, we need not suppose as Jameson did that the grain provided a communal grain reserve only in crises: even in normal circumstances the grain received could be sold to the people at a fixed price as in *IG* II^{2}1672, and the proceeds could then be used to meet cult expenses.

---

[37] Eleusinian inscriptions record dedications by the Panhellenes ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Δημητρίου καρποῦ ἀπαρχῆς. See *IG* II^2 2956, 2957 = *I. Eleusis* 504, 532; Oliver (1970), 103-4, nos. 15, 16, Follet (1976), 128 (on the date), Spawforth and Walker (1985), 100, Clinton (1989a), 1520-22, Clinton (1989b), 57, Bowden (2009), 75.

[38] *IG* II^{2}1672.263-296, *I. Eleusis* no. 177. Jameson (1983), 10, Garnsey (1988), 158, and Clinton (2005-8), vol. 2, no. 177 p. 231, think that the prices are below the current market rates. Clinton further conjectures that they were 'evidently in response to the grain shortage'.

[39] Whether this year's harvest was normal or not is disputed: see n. 80.

[40] E.g. ML 72 (loans from sacred treasuries to Athens in 426/5-423/2), ML 77 (funds in Athena's treasury used to finance public purposes, 418-414 B.C.); Thuc. 2.13.3-5 (Pericles considered the sacred treasuries as financial reserves).

[41] Jameson (1983), esp. 10-11; Jameson's view is accepted by Spawforth and Walker (1985), 100.

The present decree may be compared to the well-preserved Athenian grain-tax law of 374/3 B.C. Since the publication of Stroud's *editio princeps* and commentary,[42] it is generally agreed that the law converts two pre-existing taxes (a *dodekate* and a *pentekoste*) in cash into the same taxes in kind. It is the former tax which concerns us here:[43] the *dodekate* (one-twelfth or 8.3 %) is most probably a tax on agricultural produce,[44] imposed on wheat and barley harvested by the Athenian *klerouchoi*[45] on Lemnos, Imbros, and Skyros. The law lays down elaborate provisions for the tax-farmers (*οἱ πριάμενοι*) to transport the grain to Athens, weigh it and store it in the newly renovated Aiakeion (the *temenos* of Aiakos) in the Athenian Agora. A new board of ten men was to be elected each year to supervise the grain's storage, weighing, quality and public sale at a price set by the assembly, and the proceeds were to go to the stratiotic fund. These provisions are strikingly similar to those made for the Eleusinian first-fruits: in both cases a fixed ratio of total grain produce was levied in kind, collected by state officials, stored in a granary specially built for the purpose, and sold at a price set by the assembly.[46] The aim of the law, as expressed clearly in lines 5-6, was to have grain publicly available for the people: *Ἀγύρριος εἶπεν· ὅπως ἄν τῶι δήμωι σῖ[το]ς ἦι ἐν κοινῶι, τὴν δωδεκάτην πωλ[εῖ]ν τὴν ἐν Λήμνωι καὶ Ἴμβρωι καὶ Σκύρω[ι κ]αὶ τὴν πεντηκόστὴν σίτο* ('Agyrrhios proposed: in order that the people may have grain publicly available, sell the tax of one-twelfth at

[42] Stroud (1998), *SEG* XLVIII 96, RO 26.
[43] The nature of the latter, the *pentekoste* or one-fiftieth, is disputed. Stroud (1998), 37-8: a hitherto unknown harbour (import-export) tax; supported by Bissa (2009), 189. Cf. Harris (1999), 270-2: a tax on imports and exports. RO 26, p. 126, envisage the possibilities of a tax on grain and a tax on imports and exports.
[44] *Dodekate*: Stroud (1998), 31, 109: a tax on wheat and barley grown in the three islands; supported by Bresson (2000), 207-8, RO 26, p. 124, Bissa (2009), 188-9. Cf. Harris (1999), 270-2: a tax on grains in transit through the islands.
[45] The inhabitants on the three islands were for the most part Athenians: see Stroud (1998), 31-2, Moreno (2009), 103.
[46] The similarities between the two inscriptions are discussed in Stroud (1998), 109-110. Note that price-fixing is attested in *IG* II^{2}1672 (lines 282-3, 287) but not in *IG* I^3 78.

Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros, and the tax of one-fiftieth, in grain').[47] Stroud takes this as 'the earliest surviving evidence at Athens for direct action taken by the polis to provide its citizens with a regular annual supply of wheat and barley', and suggests that Agyrrhios might have proposed the present law with a view to providing a constant supply of public grain (*δημόσιος σῖτος*) complementing the private grain in the market (*ὁ ἐν ἀγορᾷ σῖτος*).[48] Although the proportion of grain laid down is much smaller, the Eleusinian decree similarly constitutes a state-imposed produce tax in kind,[49] and may be thought of as an antecedent of the fourth-century Athenian grain-tax law, likewise intended to increase the supply of public grain.

State interventions to make grain publicly available for the people are also attested epigraphically in different parts of the Greek world, and have been the subject of several detailed studies.[50] Particularly worthy of our attention is the Samian grain law in the second century B.C.,[51] also adduced by Jameson in relation to the Eleusinian first-fruits decree.[52] The Samian text comprises a grain law (side A) and a long list of citizens and the sums contributed by each (sides B, C) inscribed on three sides of a rectangular marble block, the upper portion of which is missing.[53] The surviving part of the decree contains detailed regulations for the administration of a grain fund set up using the contributions by numerous citizens listed on the stone. Each *chiliastys* (a sub-unit of the tribe) was to elect a *meledonos* who would lend out a share of the fund and collect the principal and interest. The interest received was to

[47] Stroud (1998), *SEG* XLVIII 96, RO 26.5-6 (tr. Rhodes and Osborne).
[48] Stroud (1998), 116. On the law's intentions, see also Bissa (2009), 188-9.
[49] A possibility envisaged by Stroud (1998), 110.
[50] See e.g. Strubbe (1987), Fantasia (1989), Strubbe (1989), Bissa (2009).
[51] *IG* XII.6 172, *Syll.*[3] 976. Its generally accepted date is c. 200 B.C, but Tracy (1990) places it in c. 260 B.C. on prosopographical grounds; doubted by Gargola (1992), 13-14, n. 6.
[52] Jameson (1983), 10-11.
[53] Migeotte (1990), 301, followed by Gargola (1992), 20, thinks that an upper segment of the same size as the present stone is missing and that the original text was perhaps twice as long.

be turned over to a board of two men in charge of grain (*οἱ ἐπὶ τοῦ σίτου*). These officials were to buy the goddess' (presumably Hera's) grain from the *eikoste* (twentieth or five per cent tax) measured out from the territory of Anaia (*ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἀγοραζέτωσαν σῖτον τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς εἰκοστῆς ἀπομετρού[[--c.5--]]μενον τῆς ἐξ Ἀναίων*), paying to the goddess a price no less than five *drachmai* and two *obols* as previously fixed by the demos (lines 21-26). The land in Anaia refers to sacred land under Samian control located in Asia Minor to the east of Samos, and the *eikoste* appears to be an agricultural produce tax payable to the goddess.[54] The grain purchased would then be distributed to the citizens for free, at the rate of two measures[55] a month for each citizen for as many months as the grain would last. Distribution was to begin in the month of Pelusion, the first of the Samian year, and was limited to the first ten days of each month (lines 53-57). Detailed provisions were also made for an occasional additional purchase and distribution of grain. The aim of the decree, it appears, was to establish a procedure to make grain available to the Samian citizens for at least part of the year.[56] The decree also demonstrates that the portion of grain belonging to the goddess could be utilized as a public grain reserve for the people.

Might the collection of Eleusinian *aparchai* be intended as a comparable measure to increase the amount of grain available to the Athenians? Might it be an Athenian attempt to bring additional and free grain into Attica from other parts of Greece? Athens' claim to the Panhellenic contribution of *aparchai* to the two

[54] Dittenberger in *Syll.*[3] 976, n. 9-10. On Anaia, see Thuc.3.19, Shipley (1987), 27, 34-6, 219, 267.
[55] The measure is not made explicit. Foxhall and Forbes (1982), 60, assume that the *medimnos* is meant; but Migeotte (1990), followed by Gargola (1992), think that the *choinix*, a smaller unit than a *medimnos*, must be meant, as the amount of grain available was not huge.
[56] This is generally agreed to be the primary concern of the law, e.g. Tarn and Griffith (1952), 108, Austin (1981), 198, Jameson (1983), 10-11, Shipley (1987), 221, Garnsey (1988), 16. But the limited scale of the operation is emphasized by Shipley (1987), 219-20, Migeotte (1990), Gargola (1992).

goddesses was based ideologically on the mission of Triptolemus. Tradition had it that it was at Eleusis that Demeter's gift of corn first appeared, and was distributed by Triptolemus to the rest of mankind.[57] Godelier's idea of 'original debt' provides a useful perspective with which to conceptualize the Eleusinian first-fruits: by stressing Triptolemus' divine mission in mythical times, all the Greeks and not just the allies were rendered indebted to Athens (and her mythical hero) from the outset. It was therefore natural that all Greek cities should return a portion of their harvest to Eleusis in gratitude for Athens' beneficence. A debt was further created each time a city reaped a bountiful harvest; every successful harvest provided a cause for rendering thanks to Athens and the two goddesses. Further benefactions could be hoped for if one duly observed the cult practice. The decree invoked agricultural blessings for those who offered *aparchai*: 'for those who do this may there be many benefits in fruitful and abundant harvests, as long as they do not wrong either the Athenians or the city of the Athenians or the two goddesses' (*[τοῖ]ς δὲ ταῦτα ποιῶσι πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐἶναι καὶ εὐκαρπίαν καὶ πολυκαρπία[ν, ἥοί]τινες ἂν [μ]ὲ ἀδικῶσι Ἀθεναίος μεδὲ τὲν πόλιν τὲν Ἀθεναίον μεδὲ τὸ θεό*).[58] Although in name Athens was collecting the *aparchai* for the two goddesses, in practice it is ambiguous whether it was to the two goddesses or to Athens that the agricultural *aparchai* were sent. Athens, it may be said, was not a mere intermediary collecting the *aparchai* on behalf of the two goddesses, but had taken on the goddesses' divine role as a dispenser of wealth and agricultural prosperity. As Aelius Aristides puts it, she is the

[57] The myth is related in Xen. *Hell*. 6.3.6, Isoc. *Paneg*. 31, Aristid. *Or.* 1.36-37, 399, Aristid. *Or.* 22.3-4. See also Parker (1991), 1-17, Smarczyk (1992), 216-224, Parker (1996), 143, n. 85, Parker (2005), 331. On the competing claims between Athens and Sicily over who first received the art of agriculture, see Diod. Sic. 5.2.3ff, 5.4.3-7, Kowalzig (2008).
[58] *IG* I^3 78.44-46.

μητρόπολις τῶν καρπῶν for all the Greeks.[59] The salient point about an 'original debt' is that, as Godelier argues, it can never be fully repaid by any counter-gifts; therefore the Greeks were laid under a perpetual duty to their divine benefactor. This never-ending obligation provides a mechanism by which to create social relations on a vertical axis: as her intermediary role was believed to have made grain available to the whole of mankind, Athens could elevate her status above that of her subject-allies, and thereby justify political hierarchies and the continuous upward flow of grain from her subject-allies and other Greeks at large. In Godelier's words, 'it is in the context of gift-giving and the debts created by gifts that the process of caste and class formation is illuminated and takes on meaning'.[60]

This assimilation of the ruling power to the divinities finds an interesting parallel in the Roman period: Emperor Hadrian, who took extraordinary interest in the cult at Eleusis, was depicted on a series of silver coins holding stalks of wheat in the image of Ploutos.[61] His wife Sabina, on the other hand, was honoured as *Νέα Δημήτηρ* in Megara in the second century A.D. She appears to have been addressed also by Demeter's title *Εὐεργέτις Καρπ[οφόρος]* in a fragmentary second-century decree of the Panhellenes.[62] The imperial couple seems to have been placed on a par with the Eleusinian deities as dispensers of benefactions. It is tempting to see Classical Athens, by demanding first-fruits to Eleusis, as similarly elevating her position above that of the other cities, and almost to that of the goddesses. Paradoxically, however, if the myth of Triptolemus made manifest other Greeks' dependence on Athens for the gift of agriculture, in reality Athens had an overwhelming concern for, and dependence on,

[59] Aristid. 1.37, 399.
[60] Godelier (1999), esp. 29-31, 186-7, 193-8, at 30.
[61] Clinton (1989b), esp. 57-8.
[62] *IG* II^2 1088.49, *IG* VII 73, 74. Dittenberger ap. Graindor (1934), 130, Graindor (1934), 130-1, Mylonas (1961), 175-81; but doubts are expressed by Clinton (1989a), 1523.

other cities' supply of grain.[63] The social and political importance of grain for Classical Athens has been treated in several detailed studies and I shall not elaborate on this here.[64]

The suggestion presented here that the Eleusinian first-fruits decree might have an economic dimension to it can be strengthened by comparable practices in other cultures. As in ancient Greece, Polynesian societies had first-fruits festivals, variously named,[65] during which a part of the harvest would be offered to the gods, who were believed to be the primary source of food. Closest to the gods was the chief, who was their earthly representative and a mediator through whom divine blessings were conveyed to the society at large. During first-fruits festivals, it was the chief who recited the appropriate ritual formulae for securing rain, bountiful harvests, success in fishing and other blessings. Since it was through the chief that the first-fruits could be presented to the gods and the latter's blessings bestowed, he occupied an intermediary place in the circulation of favours between the people and the deities. In many Polynesian societies first-fruits were originally voluntary offerings but became compulsory tributes over time,[66] serving as a mechanism by which the chief appropriated food to enhance his economic and political position. Symbolically presented by the people to the gods through the chief, the gods' portions were intercepted by the chief to feed his family and relations who constituted a non-food-producing class.[67] Such obligations, Kirk argues, provided the material basis for the chiefly class and reinforced its supreme political power over other

[63] See e.g. *Ath. Pol.* 43.4, 51.4, Xen. *Poroi*, 1.3, Dem. 20.31, Plut. *Sol.* 24. On Athenian regulations concerning grain, see also Todd (1993), 320-1.
[64] E.g. Osborne (1987), esp. ch. 2, ch. 5, Moreno (2007), Oliver (2007). On the problem of food supply in the wider Greek world, see also Jameson (1983), Garnsey and Whittaker (1983), Garnsey (1988), Garnsey and Morris (1989).
[65] E.g. the '*makahiki*' in Hawaii, the '*inasi*' in Tonga, the '*matahiti*' in Tahiti.
[66] Kirk (1967), 166-7, Goldman (1970), 509.
[67] On the religious, economic and political role of the Polynesian chiefs, see Kirk (1984), esp. 37-9, 160-7.

classes.[68] In Tonga, the '*inasi*' (an annual first-fruits ceremony) was observed with scrupulous care, as it was believed that any neglect would incur the vengeance of the gods.[69] Gifford imagines that on such occasions many vessels from outlying islands would come carrying the first-fruits to the Tui Tonga (the chief): 'on board the vessel carrying such a cargo was a man who continually blew a conch shell trumpet as the vessel passed inhabited islands'; and he supposes that individuals in different islands would be appointed to petty offices responsible for bringing the first-fruits to the chief,[70] perhaps somewhat like the *theoroi* in ancient Greece. The '*inasi*' festival, then, had the potential to reinforce the link between outlying places and the chief.

The Polynesian case provides us with a valuable example where agricultural first-fruits for the gods were appropriated by those in power. It shows that some religious obligations of first-fruits cannot be understood separately from their political and economic contexts. About a century ago the anthropologist Lang had already recognized the political aspect of first-fruits ceremonies and their accompanying taboos in Polynesian societies. Some of these rituals and taboos were artificially imposed and created, he argued, to protect the interest of the ruling class or dominant power in society.[71] Like the Polynesian chiefs, Athens attempted to exploit her intermediary position between Demeter and Kore and the other Greeks as the agent through which the goddesses' blessings were bestowed on all, in order to legitimize the Panhellenic contribution of grain to Eleusis. As in the Polynesian case, the goddess' *aparchai* might have been utilized, after being symbolically presented to the goddesses, for Athens' own benefit. It is tempting to think that the Eleusinian first-fruits decree might have been a strategy to maximize the prospective amount of

[68] Kirk (1984), 230ff.
[69] Webster (1942), 342-3.
[70] Gifford (1929), 103.
[71] Lang (1901), ch. 14.

grain available to Athens. What was originally perhaps a communal custom within Attica to bring *aparchai* to Eleusis (see Chapter Three) was being extended to the other Greeks at large. Similar attempts to 'internationalize' an Athenian cult practice can be seen in the Great Panathenaia: under the empire this festival assumed the status of an imperial or almost a Panhellenic festival.[72] If the so-called Congress decree preserved in Plutarch, by which Pericles invited all the Greeks to send representatives to Athens to discuss matters of Panhellenic concern, was genuine,[73] it would betray the same kind of claim to Panhellenic leadership seen in the Eleusinian first-fruits decree. Nevertheless, we do not know the actual mechanism by which the decree might be implemented: it remains completely obscure how contributions of *aparchai* from Athenian allies (if not other Greeks, who were encouraged but not compelled) could be enforced, and on what occasion the grain was to be dispatched to Athens.

Although the economic returns from the successful implementation of the Eleusinian first-fruits decree cannot be verified statistically, circumstantial evidence (the exhortation to all to contribute, the complex management of the grain received, the importance of grain for Athens) and comparison with other grain measures in Attica and elsewhere all point to the possibility that the significance of the decree was not merely symbolic but also real. Unfortunately epigraphic evidence concerning Eleusinian *aparchai* is scant and unrevealing in this respect. *IG* I^3 391 records *ἀργύριον ἀπὸ τõ σίτο τες ἀπαρχες τοῖν θεοῖν* transferred by the *hieropoioi* to the *epistatai* over a four-year period (422/1-419/8). Yet the sums are so meager - where preserved, only 6 *drachmai* for 421/20 and 31 *drachmai* for 420/19 (lines 13 and 20) -

[72] See n. 13 above.

[73] Plut. *Per*. 17, with commentary and bibliography in Stadter (1989), 201-7. The decree's authenticity is disputed. Authentic: Raubitschek (1966), Meiggs (1972), 512-5, Griffith (1978), Walsh (1981), 59-63, MacDonald (1982), Cawkwell (1997); inauthentic: Seager (1969), Bosworth (1971), Robertson (1976). For a different line of interpretation, see Tronson (2000). See also Perlman (1976), 6-17, on the Panhellenic features of Pericles' policies.

that it is unclear what they represent.[74] An equally puzzling sum is recorded in an inventory account *IG* I^3 386-387, dated to 408/7: among the possessions of the goddesses deposited on the Athenian acropolis is a sum of 1137 *drachmai* 3 *obols* derived from the *aparchai*, but the significance of this, too, is largely obscure.[75] In the fourth century a fragmentary law concerning the Eleusinian Mysteries (c. 367/6-348/7?) contains a reference to 'those rendering the first-fruits of grain' (*[τ]ῶν τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τõ σίτο ἀπαγόντ[ων]*). Yet we do not know what provisions precisely are made for the *aparchai* here, nor is the text concerned primarily with Eleusinian *aparchai*.[76] Another uninformative decree, *IG* II^2 140 dated to c. 353/2, apparently amends or renews the practice prescribed in a previous law *τὸ]ν Χαιρημονίδο νό[μον τὸν περὶ τῆ]ς ἀπαρχῆς*; but the 'law of Chairemonides' does not survive, nor is it clear what the changes are.[77] The already-mentioned *IG* II^2 1672, an account of the *epistatai* of Eleusis and the treasurers of the Two Goddesses, gives a remarkably well-preserved record of the *aparchai* from Attica and her possessions in 329/8 under Lycurgus. From the inscription, the total *aparche* collected amounted to approximately 1134 *medimnoi* of barley and 122 *medimnoi* of wheat;[78] and their sale

[74] *IG* I^3 391, *I. Eleusis* no. 45. Körte (1896) and Jameson (1972), 479-80, considered it inconceivable that the meager sums recorded here resulted from the first-fruits decree and argued that this text must precede *IG* I^3 78. Cavanaugh (1996), 42-3, 68-9, proposes various plausible explanations for the small figures. Clinton (2005-8), vol. 2, no. 45, p. 65, thinks that they most probably represent income from the sale of the Eleusinian *aparchai* before deducing expenses for sacrifices and *anathemata*, and that the meagre sums reflect the effect of the Archidamian War. But the amounts seem implausibly small as the total sum realized from the sale of *aparchai*.

[75] *IG* I^3 386.5-6, *I. Eleusis* no. 52. See also Cavanaugh (1996), 121-5.

[76] *I. Eleusis* no. 138.B.a.13 (= *SEG* XXX 61, *SEG* XXXVIII 57), with commentary in vol. 2 p. 122-3, reiterating his view in Clinton (1980), 286.

[77] *IG* II^2 140, *I. Eleusis* no. 142. Clinton (1980), 272, thinks that the law of Chairemonides referred to in *IG* II^2 140 cannot be identified with the law in *I. Eleusis* no. 138 even if the latter might have preceded *IG* II^2 140, because Chairemonides' law was inscribed on a single stele set up in front of the Metroon (*IG* II^2 140.34-35) whereas *I. Eleusis* no. 138 was set up in the city Eleusinion as its find place indicates.

[78] *IG* II^{2}1672.263-300, *I. Eleusis* no. 177. See Garnsey (1988), 98, table 5, for the total amount of Attic grain production in 329/8 calculated by Garnsey. We must, however, be aware of the limitations of this inscription in inferring total productivity: Moreno (2007), 13-14, attacks the method used by Garnsey to extrapolate the total production of grain in Attica from the *aparchai* figures in *IG* II^{2}1672

resulted in a sum of 3510 *drachmai* 5.5 *obols* (line 288).[79] The unimpressive quantity of *aparchai* collected in 329/8 may be explained by the fact that this was a bad year for farmers: the 330s and 320s have been taken by some scholars as periods of serious food shortage.[80]

The several pieces of inscriptional evidence that have come down to us do not bear out Isocrates' claims in the fourth century that *aparchai* of grain were annually offered by most cities, and that the Pythia ordered non-conformers to comply with the custom.[81] If fulfillment of religious obligation was directly connected with perception of political power, then after the dissolution of the Athenian empire *aparchai* most probably came only from within Attica. Moreover, as Parker points out, any offering that might have continued to come from elsewhere might be voluntarily offered as a tribute less to Athens than to the religious importance of the Eleusinian cult.[82] We should therefore expect fourth-century yields of agricultural *aparchai* to differ from, and not necessarily to reflect, the potential yield envisaged at the height of Athenian imperialism. Little is known about the Eleusinian *aparchai* after the Classical period. *IG* II^2 1035.23-24 in the first century B.C. contains a possible and unnoticed reference to *aparchai* from the crops to the goddess, most likely Demeter, but in a largely undecipherable context.[83] The proper observance of the Eleusinian decree is also dwelled on by Aelius Aristides; but his speech is purely a literary exercise and does

(multiplying them by the ratios decreed in *IG* I^3 78), on the ground that the proportions might have changed over the fifth and fourth centuries; Moreno has avoided culling numbers from *IG* II^{2}1672 altogether. Similar cautions are also articulated by Stroud (1998), 34-6. But the method and figures in Gernsey (1988) continue to be accepted and followed by some: e.g. RO 26, p. 124, 127.

[79] Clinton (2005-8), vol. 2, no. 177, p. 234, notes that the inscribed total in line 288 (3510 *drachmai* 5.5 *obols*) does not agree exactly with that derived by adding up the money from barley and grain in lines 282 and 287-8. He thinks that the total sum of money realized should be 3505 *drachmai* 4.5 *obols*, i.e. 5 *drachmai* and 1 *obol* less than the figure given in line 288.

[80] E.g. Jameson (1983), 10-11, Garnsey (1988), 154-62, Sallares (1991), 393-4, Clinton (2005-8), vol. 2, no. 177, p. 231. Cf. Stroud (1998), 35-6, RO 26, p.124.

[81] Isoc. *Paneg*. 31.

[82] Parker (1996), 222 with n. 16.

[83] *IG* II^2 1035.23-24. Culley (1972), 83, thinks that the goddess is Athena; but Demeter must be meant, as line 22 refers to the sanctuary at Eleusis.

not prove that the practice continued down to Hadrian's reign in the second century A.D.[84]

The Eleusinian first-fruits provide the most elaborate example of, and a useful way of conceptualizing, other obligatory *aparchai* imposed on one's subject cities. As we shall see shortly, Syracuse and Miletus similarly required *aparchai* from their subjects; but without the same power exertion of imperialism, the degree of intensity and compulsion with which these *aparchai* were exacted was rather different.

c) Athens and Priene

Apart from being 'the mother-city of the crops', in the fifth century Athens also presented herself as the mother-city of her empire by requiring allies to send a cow and panoply to Athens at the Great Panathenaia, an obligation of colonies to mother-cities.[85] In the time of the Second Athenian Confederacy, similar offerings continued to be sent by some cities voluntarily. Shortly before 326/5 B.C. the people of Priene decreed that they would dispatch a *theoria* of two men bringing a panoply (line 4), *aparchai*, and sacrifices to Athena Polias at the Great Panathenaia every four years (lines 10-13: *αἱρεῖσθαι δὲ τ̣[ὸν δῆ]μον θεωρο̣[ὺς] δύο τοὺς τὰς ἀπαρχὰς ἀπ[ο]ί̣[σοντας καὶ τ]ὰ ἱερὰ̣ ποιήσοντας τῆι Ἀθηνᾶι τῆι Πολιάδι κα[θ' ἑκάστην] πεντετηρίδα*).[86] The decree also renewed the grants of citizenship, equality in taxes and the privilege of front-seats in contests to all the Athenians (lines 6-9).[87] These provisions need to be understood in their political context: by the last quarter of the

[84] Aristid. *Or.* 1.31-8.
[85] *IG* I^3 34 (= ML 46), *IG* I^3 71.56-58 (= ML 69). On 'cow and panoply' as an offering proper to colonists, see *IG* I^3 46.11-13 (= ML 49) (Brea), Meritt and Wade-Grey (1962), 69-71, Hornblower (1982), 193, Parker (1996), 142-3, 221 n. 13-14.
[86] *Inscr. Prien.* 5.
[87] The grants in *Inscr. Prien.* 5.6-9 are presumably referred to in *IG* II^2 566.7-8. See also *Inscr. Prien*. 6 (after 330/29), which grants citizenship to Philaios of Athens.

fourth century, the Great Panathenaia and the City Dionysia are likely to have lost much of their prestige and the imperial flavour formerly enjoyed in the heyday of the Athenian empire. When *aparchai* of tribute and harvest ceased to be a symbol of Athens' domination over her subject-allies, any further *aparchai* to Athena after 404 B.C. may be understood not so much as a duty fulfillment but as reflecting the desire to propitiate Athens and her patron goddess. We do not know what the *aparchai* in this text were; but they must have been sent of Priene's own accord. Unfortunately, it is difficult to uncover the political impetus (if any) that prompted the *aparchai*. Hornblower thinks that the existence of religious ties between Priene and Athens does not constitute sufficient proof of Athenian refoundation of,[88] or political interference in, Priene in the mid-fourth century; yet why Priene should suddenly be motivated to offer *aparchai* along with other grants to Athens in the 320s remains to be explained. The dispatch of *aparchai* may suggest a desire to reinforce the political ties between the two cities in this period, whatever the precise stimulus might have been.

More generally, Priene's offerings must have been an expression of goodwill (line 17: *εὔνοια*) for Athens and Athena. In the Prienians' own words, they served as a 'memorial of kinship and friendship from the beginning' (line 5: *μνημεῖον τῆς ἐξ ἀρχῆς συγγενείας καὶ φιλίας*). The Prienians probably saw Athens as their mother-city although this is not made explicit in the inscription;[89] and their offerings are comparable to those sent voluntarily by Athenian colonies or cities which acknowledged themselves as such. In the fourth century Paros and Colophon

[88] The question of the refoundation of Priene is complicated and controversial, see e.g. van Berchem (1970), Hornblower (1982), 323-30, Sherwin-White (1985), 88-9, Demand (1990), Rubinstein (2004), 1092.

[89] On Ionian cities' perception of Athens as their mother-city, see e.g. Snodgrass (1971), 376, Meiggs (1972), 294, Parker (1996), 88, n. 84, 142-3. On Athens' claims to be the mother-city of Ionia, see Graham (1964b), 63, Smarczyk (1990), 328ff. On the ideology of kinship in colonial and other interstate relations, see e.g. Curty (1995), Hornblower (1996), 61-80, Jones (1999).

spontaneously brought similar offerings (but not *aparche* specifically) to Athens, describing themselves as *ἄποικοι* of Athens.[90] Whether or not Athens' role in colonizing these places was a political fiction invented by the Athenians, these offerings were acknowledgements of the colonial relations that existed between the sender and the recipient. They indicate a desire to maintain contact with the mother-city and doubtless reflect a general sense of indebtedness to Athens for her part in the Ionian migration.

d) Syracuse and her Subjects

In a speech delivered in the assembly in 415 B.C. to dissuade the Athenians from undertaking the expedition to Sicily, Nicias describes the economic strength of Sicily as follows:

> *χρήματά τ' ἔχουσι τὰ μὲν ἴδια, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐστὶ Σελινουντίοις, Συρακοσίοις δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ βαρβάρων τινῶν ἀπαρχὴ ἐσφέρεται. ᾧ δὲ μάλιστα ἡμῶν προύχουσιν, ἵππους τε πολλοὺς κέκτηνται καὶ σίτῳ οἰκείῳ καὶ οὐκ ἐπακτῷ χρῶνται.*[91]
> 'The Selinountians have money, partly in the hands of private people, and partly in the temples, and an *aparche* is paid to the Syracusans from some barbarians. But the greatest advantage they have over us is the fact that they have many horses and they use home-grown and not imported corn.'

Some manuscripts (ABCEFM) read *ἀπαρχῆς φέρεται*, which is hardly translatable. Others read *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* (manuscript G) 'from time immemorial'.[92] It is now generally agreed that *ἀπαρχὴ* is far preferable to any other version, and the sense is that 'an *aparche* is paid to the Syracusans by some barbarians'.[93] Yet the

[90] *SEG* XXXI 67: in 373/2 Paros voluntarily offered to bring a cow and panoply to the Panathenaea and a cow and phallus to the Dionysia *kata ta patria*; *IG* II^2 456: Colophon dispatched a crown and panoply to Athena upon the liberation of Athens in 307/6. Both the Parians and Colophonians spoke of themselves as colonists of Athens.
[91] Thuc. 6.20.4.
[92] E.g. Haacke (1823), vol.1, 272, Jowett (1881), vol. 1, 424, Smith (1928-35), vol. 3, 222-3.
[93] Preferred by e.g. Dover (1965), 32, Gomme, Andrews and Dover (1945-81), vol. 4, 256-7;

nature of the *aparche* in question has long puzzled commentators. The word *εἰσφέρειν* is commonly used of money contributions required of individuals to a public fund;[94] so the *aparche* here may be a monetary payment. By analogy with the one-sixtieth of allied tribute paid to Athena in the Athenian empire, Hornblower suggests that *aparche* is here used loosely to refer to the whole amount of the tribute, practically meaning 'tribute'.[95] In his view, Thucydides is using the word *aparche* in a secular sense to signify the whole sum received by Syracuse with no reference to the gods' portion.[96] That Syracuse probably received tribute from her subject states is indicated by Diodorus, who tells us that the Syracusans imposed heavier tribute on the Sicels to help expand their military forces: *ἐπεμελήθησαν δὲ καὶ τῆς πεζῆς δυνάμεως, καὶ χρημάτων παρασκευὰς ἐποιοῦντο, φόρους ἀδροτέρους τοῖς ὑποτεταγμένοις Σικελοῖς ἐπιτιθέντες* ('they also developed their infantry forces and made financial preparations by laying heavier tributes upon the Sicels who were now subject to them').[97] However, the word used by Diodorus is *phoros* but not *aparche*: should not Nicias have said *phoros* if this is what he meant? As we saw earlier, the Athenian empire made a notional distinction between *phoros* and *aparche*, the former referring to the whole sum of tribute and the latter to the goddess' share. It is therefore unlikely that Nicias regarded the two as analogous. More importantly, known applications of the word *aparche* go decisively against Hornblower's view: as we have seen in Chapter One, the word *aparche* is always used with a religious

---

Hornblower (1991-2008), vol. 3, 355-6.

[94] LSJ s.v. *εἰσφέρω* I.2; Thuc. 3.19, 8.45.5.

[95] Hobbes (1723), vol. 2, 508, Dover (1965), 32, also translate the word as 'tribute'. Bodin and Romilly (1955), translate: 'Syracuse même reçoit aussi la quote-part de quelques peuples barbares'.

[96] The other appearance of the word *aparche* in Thucydides is Thuc. 3.58.4, where it is used with a religious significance and refers to offerings made to the Spartan war dead.

[97] Diod. Sic. 12.30.1 (tr. Oldfather). The Sicels here, the plain-dwelling subjects of the Syracusans, need to be distinguished from the Sicels of the interior who sided with the Athenians in Thuc. 6.34.1, 6.88.4. See Hornblower (1991-2008), vol. 3, 402, on Thuc. 6.34.1.

significance and we have no precedents for any secular application of the term. It seems to me therefore that a religious (rather than secular) payment must be meant, regardless of what form this took. If Syracuse levied tribute on some barbarians, we may perhaps suppose that a share went to the gods as an *aparche*, whereas the larger tribute itself was termed a *phoros*. Nevertheless, this interpretation is not satisfactory: Nicias should have mentioned the *phoros* and not the much smaller *aparche* when he wanted to emphasize Sicily's financial strength.

Instead of tribute or a portion of tribute, the *aparche* probably signifies a religious payment imposed on some local produce, such as grain mentioned in the same passage, and payable to the gods in Syracuse. Hornblower also envisages the possibility of 'a genuine and formally imposed fraction of agricultural produce';[98] but he does not explain whether this was some secular taxation or a religious payment. The payment's religious character is hinted at also by contextual information: Nicias has just mentioned the wealth of Selinus, both in private possession and in sacred treasuries (from which the city could borrow in time of war),[99] so the *aparche* brought in by the barbarians is likely to concern sacred revenue also. We may envisage that some barbarians were required to send a certain percentage of the local produce, or a percentage of the proceeds from its sale, to the gods of Syracuce. If the possibility suggested here is correct, then Syracuse would be reminiscent of imperial Athens in terms of the kind of (agricultural) *aparche* required of her subjects, but on a much smaller scale of operation and perhaps without the same intensity and coercive power outside the framework of imperialism.

[98] Hornblower (1991-2008), vol. 3, 356. See also Crawley (1874), 421, Warner (1954), 423, Kallet (2001), 42, who translate *aparche* here as 'first-fruits'.
[99] On the treasures in the Selinountian temples, see *IG* XIV, 268, ML 38 with addenda, *SEG* XXXIV 970, *SEG* XLV 1414, Manganaro (1995).

e) Miletus and her Colonies: Kios and Kyzikos

In the Hellenistic period Miletus received offerings regularly from some of her colonies, one of which was Kios, located on the south-eastern coast of the Propontis in Asia Minor. According to a Milesian inscription in c. 228 B.C., discovered in the Delphinion at Miletus, the Kians were required by traditional custom to send *phialai* as *aparchai* to the god, presumably Apollo.[100] The inscription begins by making explicit Kios' status as a Milesian colony; then it mentions the request made by two *hieropoioi* sent by the Kians, among other requests such as *isopoliteia*, to be exempted from the *phialai* owed to the god on account of the wars and dearth which beset Kian land. In reply to the Kian request, the Milesians decided that it was impossible for them to grant remission of the *aparchai* as the Milesians themselves were also pressed by war and dearth, and because the existing law prevented it. The Milesians resolved that the *aparchai* previously owed to the god should be repaid when it seemsed timely to the Kians; but from now on *aparchai* should be paid on time in accordance with what was agreed on by the forefathers.[101]

The inscription implies that it had been an ancestral custom for Kios to honour Apollo with *aparchai*. The insistence that *aparchai* be sent to the god even when the city was hard-pressed is strikingly similar to Athens' rulings for Methone, Aphytis and some other cities that the *aparche* of tribute could not be remitted. In both cases, the *aparche*/*ai* are likely to have served as a signifier of the city's symbolic link with her subject-colony: hence the reluctance to remit it. However, the two cases differ in that the *aparchai* probably represented the whole sum Kios had to pay, whereas Athenian allies normally had to pay both an *aparche* of tribute to Athena and the rest of the

[100] The Milesian origin of the city is confirmed by Aristotle fr. 514 Rose, who says that Kios was founded first by the Mysians from Chios, then by the Carians, and finally by the Milesians. On Kios, see Gorman (2001), 247, Avram (2004), 982-3, no. 745.
[101] *Milet* I.3, no. 141, esp. lines 23-34.

tribute to Athens. There is no sense of proportionality in the Kian *aparchai* or *phialai*: they appear to denote simply 'offerings' or religious 'payments' at a fixed value of 100 *drachmai* (see below).

We have further evidence for Kian *phialai* in an inventory list of the temple of Apollo at Didyma in 276/5 B.C., which records the communal dedication of a *φιάλη παρὰ Κιανῶν, ὁλκὴ δραχμαὶ ἑκατόν*.[102] Though not described explicitly as an *aparche*, this Kian *phiale* is extremely likely to be the same in nature as the *phialai* mentioned in the above inscription. Interestingly enough, we know that another Milesian colony, Kyzikos, located in more or less the same region as Kios on the southern coast of the Propontis,[103] also regularly offered *phialai* to Apollo Didymeus in the third century B.C., as indicated by the recurrent phrase *Κυζικηνῶν φιάλη* or similar expressions in numerous inventory lists.[104] The *phialai* from Kyzikos are recorded ten times, always weighing a hundred Alexandrian *drachmai*, but are not described as *aparchai*. By analogy with the *phialai* required of Kios, the *phialai* from Kyzikos are very likely to have been *aparchai* required of this colony also. Unfortunately the incomplete decree regulating the relations between Miletus and Kyzikos in the late fourth-century does not contain any references to *aparchai* or *phialai*; but one wonders whether the treaty might have contained provisions for these which are simply not preserved.[105] Given that the sanctuary at Didyma was under Milesian control by the third century B.C. and possibly much earlier,[106] it is highly

[102] *Didyma* no. 427.6-7.
[103] On Kyzikos, see Graham (1964b), 107-8, Gorman (2001), 246.
[104] *Phialai* from Kyzikos: *Didyma* nos. 432.6, 433.7, 444.3, 452.3-4, 453.5-6, 463.17-18, 464.10-11, 468.8-9, 471.8-9, 475.17-18. In most cases the entry reads *Κυζικηνῶν φιάλη*, sometimes *φιάλαι δύο ἐκ Κυζικοῦ* (432.6) and *ἀνάθημα Κυζικηνῶν* (433.7). The *phialai* offered by Kios and Kyzikos are mentioned in passing by Graham (1964b), 108 and n. 1, Fontenrose (1988), 67, n. 8.
[105] *Milet*. I.3 no. 137 (c.334-323 B.C.); see also Graham (1964b), 107-108, 161.
[106] The relation between Miletus and the sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma has been disputed: Hdt. 1.46.2

likely that the *phialai* from both Kios and Kyzikos were *aparchai* required by Miletus for Apollo Didymeus.

Kios and Kyzikos aside, several other Milesian colonies are also known to have sent *phialai* occasionally. A *phiale* of unknown weight from Naucratis, another Milesian colony, is attested once.[107] The list of 225/4 B.C. records a *- - - -]ων φιάλη ἀπαρχή, ὁλκὴ Ἀλεξάν[δρειαι ἑκατόν* from a city whose name is lost:[108] might this be from a Milesian colony as well? Apart from *phialai* collectively dedicated, an individual from the Milesian colony Sinope also dedicated a *phiale*.[109] However, it appears from the inventory lists that not all Milesian colonies dedicated *phialai* to Apollo Didymeus in the Hellenistic period, while at the same time other cities which were not Milesian colonies also dedicated *phialai*. Miletus herself also dedicated a *phiale*; Iasos,[110] Salamis (in Cyprus), ambassadors from Amorgos, and other cities are also known to have sent such dedications.[111] The *phiale* was the most common offering to Apollo Didymeus.[112] Especially after the expansion of the Didymeia in the last quarter of the third century, Apollo Didymeus must have received offerings from a wider community of Greek cities.

---

says that Didyma was located in Milesian territory. Tuchelt (1988), 430-3, suggest that the sanctuary was in fact independent; however, Ehrhardt (1998) argues for an early connection between the sanctuary and Miletus. It is generally accepted now that Didyma belonged to Miletus early, and certainly by the third century B.C.

[107] Naucratis: *Didyma* no. 452.9-10 (*ἄλλη{ν} φιάλη Ναυκρα[τιτῶν*).

[108] *Didyma* no. 446.7.

[109] *Didyma* no. 447.7, *LGPN* V.A s.v. *Θέων* (35).

[110] Iasos: *Didyma* nos. 427.7-8, 428.5-6, 431.8, 432.9-11, 433.8-10, 444.3-4, 449.6, 464.11-12, 475.19. Iasian *phialai* appear in inventory lists as many as nine times, almost always weighting 100 Alexandrian *drachmai*. Iasos was an Argive colony located near Didyma. Ehrhardt (1998), 26-27, warns that the presence of Iasian dedications in Didyma should not be (mis-)taken as an indication that Iasos was a Milesian colony; the offerings are explained by Iasos' proximity to the sanctuary.

[111] *Didyma* nos. 426.5 (Miletus), 446.8-9 (ambassadors from Amorgos), 446.9-11 (Salamis).

[112] But other Didymaean deities also received *phialai* e.g. *Didyma* no. 427.13-14 (Artemis). On *phialai*, see Luschey (1939); on the ubiquity of *phialai* in temple inventories, see e.g. Harris (1995).

f) Lindos and her Alleged Colonies

In 392/1 B.C. the temple of Athena at Lindos was destroyed by fire together with its dedications. The temple was subsequently rebuilt; and in 99 B.C. it was decided that a monument would be made to record the offerings that had once been in the original temple; this is the so-called Lindian Chronicle. It is arranged chronologically so that it moves from the dedications of the mythical period, followed by the archaic period with many references to colonies and their founders, and then to later centuries (down to the third century B.C.) in which we find genuine offerings. In recording the offerings, the Lindians were not interested in the dedications as present in the temple in 99 B.C., but only in those which were 'historically' important to them. Because of its elements of invented tradition, the Chronicle's reliability as a historical document must remain suspect.[113] Most of the first offerings in what follows come from the archaic period and cannot be securely taken as authentic pieces of epigraphic evidence. I have already listed them in the catalogue (nos. 31-34) that accompanies the preceding chapter since they concern spoils. Here it is not their military nature, but their dedicator's purported link with Lindos, which is of interest to us.

The Chronicle records a *dekate* from the Lindians who are said to have colonized Cyrene. The inscription given is as follows: *″Λινδίων τοὶ μ[ε]τὰ τῶν Πάγκιος παίδων Κυράναν κτίσαντες σὺν Βά[τ]τω[ι] Ἀθαναίαι καὶ Ἡρακλεῖ [δ]εκά[ταν ἀπὸ] λαίας ἃν ἔλ[α]βον ἀ[πὸ ....Ι....Σ..Ι]ων″* ('those of the Lindians who with the children of Pankis founded a colony on Cyrene with Battos to Athena and Herakles a tenth of the booty which they took from...').[114] It is not unparalleled for colonists to

[113] A full commentary is provided by Higbie (2003). Elements of invention are discussed in Higbie (2001) and (2003). On the structure and arrangement of the chronicle, see Higbie (2003), 155-203.
[114] *Lindos* II, no. 2.B.109-117 (tr. Higbie).

dispatch first-offerings to their home city as a means of maintaining contact with their homeland,[115] and the *dekate* dispatched by the Lindian settlers in Cyrene may be understood as such. What is peculiar about this *dekate* is that the Lindian dedicators are said to have colonized Cyrene with the children of Pankis and with Battos, the legendary founder and king of Cyrene in the seventh century. There is no evidence of Lindian involvement in the foundation of Cyrene, and this *dekate*'s historicity must remain doubtful.[116]

The Chronicle also mentions first offerings dispatched from three other cites (Soloi, Gela and Akragas) to Lindos from their military exploits.[117] I shall examine these one by one. A *phiale* was supposedly dedicated by the Soloians in Cilicia as a *dekate* and an *aparche* of booty: *"[Σολεῖς] Ἀθάναι Λινδί[αι] δεκάταν καὶ ἀπαρχὰν λαίας, ἃν ἔλα[βο]ν μετὰ Ἀμφ[ιλόχ]ου ἀπὸ ΜΕΤΑΒΛΥΡΕΩΝ καὶ ΣΠΕ..ΩΝ"* ('[Soloians] to Athena Lindi[a] a *dekate* and an *aparche* of booty which they took together with Amph[iloch]us from... and...').[118] Amphilochus is likely to be the mythological figure (rather than a historical namesake) who is closely connected to Soloi in some traditions.[119] This entry must have been fabricated to support a Lindian claim that Soloi was a Lindian colony as some traditions have it,[120] and that

[115] Cf. Lindos II, no. 2 C 29-35 (a *dekate* from a Lindian Deinomenes who colonized Gela; see below). See also *IG* I^3 514 (= ML 66, *DAA* no. 306, *ThesCRA* vol. 1, p. 278, no. 45): Athenians colonists set up a marble dedication at Athens, 429 B.C. (*ἐποίκον ἐς Ποτείδαιαν* 'from the new settlers at Poeidaea' (tr. Parker)). But this is not a first offering; nor do we know whether it was sent before or after the Athenian colonists set out to Potidaea.

[116] On the foundation of Cyrene, see ML5, Hdt. 4.150-8, Pind. *Pyth*. 4.60, Fontenrose (1978), 120-2, Malkin (1987), 60-9, 204-16, Calame (1988), 105-25, Calame (1996), Mari (1999), 269, Austin (2008).

[117] *Lindos* II, no. 2.C.11-14 (Gela, *akrothinion*), 56-9 (Akragas, *akrothinion*), 75-9 (Soloi, *dekate* and *aparche*).

[118] *Lindos* II, no.2.C.75-9 (adapted from Higbie's translation). The supplement *[Σολεῖς]* appears to be based on the compiler's description of the object as *Σολεῖς φιάλια* in the same entry (line 75).

[119] Strab. 14.5.16-17. On traditions related to Amphilochus, see Gantz (1993), 527-8, Higbie (2003), 127.

[120] Strab. 14.5.8, Arist. fr. 582R; but Soloi is also said to be founded by Athens in Diog. Laert. 1.51.

the connection went as far back as mythical times.

Another entry refers to an *akrothinion* sent by the people of Gela in Sicily: *"Γελῶιοι τᾶ[ι] Ἀθαναίαι τᾶι Πατρώιαι ἀκροθίνιον ἐξ Ἀριαίτου"* ('Geloians to Athena Patroia an *akrothinion* from Ariaitos').[121] The place Ariaitos is otherwise unknown and is probably invented, though presumably it refers to a town defeated by Gela.[122] It is no mere coincidence that Deinomenes, described explicitly as a Lindian who had colonized Gela,[123] dedicated a gorgon made of cypress as a *dekate* from Sicily (*τῶν ἐκ Σικελίας [δεκάτ]αν*),[124] where Deinomenes' sons (Gelon, Hieron, Polyzalos) were tyrants of Syracuse. Gela is generally considered to have been founded jointly by the Rhodians and the Cretans in 688 B.C.[125] In face of the Cretans' competing claims for the colony,[126] both the *akrothinion* from the Geloians and the *dekate* from Deinomenes must reflect a Lindian attempt to assert a traditional link with Gela. Similar motives may underlie the recording of an *akrothinion* supposedly sent by the Akragantines in Sicily: *"Ἀκραγαντ[ῖ]νοι τᾶ[ι] Ἀ[θά]ναι [τᾶι Λινδίαι ἀκρο]θίνιον ἐκ Μινώιας"* ('Akragant[i]nes to Athena [Lindia an *akro*]*thinion* from Minoa').[127] Akragas' foundation has been variously attributed to Gela or Rhodes or a

[121] *Lindos* II, no. 2.C.11-14 (adapted from Higbie's translation).
[122] Dunbabin (1948), 113, thinks that Ariaitos is an unknown place, but he treats the offering as historical and dates it to the first half of the seventh century, followed by Jeffery (1990), *LSAG*^{2}, 272.
[123] Higbie (2003), 111, thinks that two Deinomenes are being confused or conflated by the complier: Deinomenes (father of Gelon, Hieron, Thrasyboulos and Polyzalos) is a descendant and later namesake of an earlier Deinomenes who *may* be the founder of Gela according to a variant preserved in *Etym. Magn.* s.v. *Γέλα*. But Deinomenes' role is not attested in Hdt. or Thuc. (see n. 125 below). For a possible family tree of the Deinomenids, see Dunbabin (1948), 483.
[124] *Lindos* II, no. 2.C.29-35. See also Graham (1964b), 20 with n. 4, 161-2.
[125] Hdt. 7.153.1 (Herodotus leaves out Cretan involvement), Thuc. 6.4.3, Diod. Sic. 8.23.1; Dunbabin (1948), 20, 64-6, Malkin (1987), 52-4, 180.
[126] Malkin (1987), 52-3, suggests that the oracle about Gela's foundation recorded in Diod. Sic. 8.23.1 was fabricated to assert Cretan status.
[127] *Lindos* II, no. 2.C.56-9 (adapted from Higbie's translation). Graham (1964b), 162, takes this as a historical dedication in the second half of the sixth century.

joint enterprise of both.[128]

In none of the above cases is it certain that the city from which the first offering was allegedly sent was indeed a Lindian colony. The *dekatai* and *akrothinia* were thus recorded in the Chronicle to assert metropolis-colony relationship between Lindos and these cities. By emphasizing the involvement of famous mythological figures and by placing the offerings in the archaic period or earlier, the Lindians could claim that such cities had long-established colonial ties with Lindos. Although they were not genuine offerings, these *dekatai* and *akrothinia* illustrate the idea we have already encountered, that there was an expectation (if not obligation here) that colonies should honour the mother-city with first offerings.

g) Dispatched *Aparchai*: Political Relations or Relations with the Gods?

The application of ideologies for private relations, such as reciprocity, friendship and kinship, in interstate relations has been a subject of several studies in modern scholarship.[129] What we have seen in Part One of this Chapter involves the extension of another kind of relations, namely human-divine relations, to the interaction between Greek cities. While it is certainly not uncommon for cities to exchange *charis*, what is unusual is the bringing of first offerings and in particular *aparchai*, traditionally destined for the gods alone, to another city. It may be objected that the first offerings were still addressed to the gods; but as we have seen above, in some political contexts, the first offerings appear to be intended for the recipient city as much as, if not more than, her divinity.

With the exception of the offerings from Priene and the alleged Lindian colonies,

[128] Thuc. 6.4.4, Polyb. 9.27-8, Strab. 6.2.5; Dunbabin (1948), 310-2, Malkin (1987), 180-1.
[129] E.g. Curty (1995), Hornblower (1991-2008), vol. 2, 61-80, Mitchell (1997), *passim*, Jones (1999), Low (2007), esp. 36-76.

the first offerings seen above are all obligatory offerings or payments required of one's subjects.[130] They involve the formalization of traditional voluntary gifts to the gods into religio-political obligations of fixed sums or proportions performed at specified times or with regularity. This conflation between religious and political duty is intriguing: adopting the language and practice of bringing first offerings in imperial and colonial interactions leaves ambiguous in whose honour – the city or her patron divinity – the offering was sent. The two probably amount to more or less the same thing, as one way of paying homage to another city was to honour her patron deity with *aparchai*. From the subject states' point of view, it is unclear whether they perceived any difference between the two; the distinction was perhaps politically irrelevant as the obligation was imposed by the city in the name of the gods. One may even go further to suggest that the dominant city was almost placed on a par with the gods: instead of being a mere intermediary receiving the first offerings on behalf of the divinities, the dominant city elevated her status almost to that of the gods by demanding *aparchai*, so that gifts to the gods and gifts to those in power became almost indistinguishable. One way of conceptualizing the phenomenon is to suppose a three-tier relationship between the gods, the recipient city, and the subjects: the imperial or colonial power is poised mid-way between the divine recipient and the subjects thus obliged, so that the hierarchical relations between the three parties are made manifest. If traditional first offerings usually concern a more or less[131] bilateral relation between the worshipper or the worshipping community and the divine, in these contexts we find a three-tier relation on a vertical axis.[132] The paradigm is

[130] Note that the Eleusinian *aparchai* were required of Athenian subject-allies but invited from other Greeks.

[131] I say 'more or less' because in some cases a bilateral relation cannot sufficiently encapsulate the dynamics of human-divine relations. Thus de Polignac (2009), 441, proposes a 'triangular' relation between the deity, the individual dedicator and his community.

[132] This idea modifies and develops upon Dignas (2002)'s notion of a triangular relation between the

illustrated most clearly in the Eleusinian first-fruits decree: by presenting herself as *μητρόπολις τῶν καρπῶν*, Athens attempted to exploit her intermediary position between the two goddesses and her subject-allies (and all other Greeks) to justify and perhaps intercept Panhellenic contributions of agricultural *aparchai* to the two goddesses. One is reminded of the birds in Cloudcuckooland, in many ways a replica of imperial Athens: with their city set up midway in the air, the birds imagine themselves as 'new gods' dispensing blessings to mankind and intercept the offerings designated for the Olympian gods.[133] The analogy is imperfect as the birds have competing claims with the Olympian gods, whereas imperial Athens aligned herself with Demeter and Kore; but it is the image of a city asserting her superiority over her subjects and justifying the upward flow of *aparchai* which is relevant to us here. We may conceive of a similar process – although, I should emphasize, without the same power exertion of imperialism and with varying degrees of intensity and compulsion – in the other metropolis-colony relationships studied earlier.

In the power relations between the Greek cities, therefore, first offerings could serve as a means of maintaining a symbolic dependence of the subjects on the dominant city. Obligatory payments of *aparchai*, such as the *aparche* of tribute to Athena and the *phialai* to Apollo Didymeus, constituted an important signifier of the dedicating city's link with, and dependence on, the recipient, which explains the insistence that no exemption could be made even if other concessions might be granted. So great was their symbolic value for the mother-city that the Lindians fabricated many such offerings supposedly dedicated by their 'colonies' in order to

gods, the king and the city in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor: the king did not always side with the interest of the city as is sometimes supposed, but would often act as a mediator in favour of the god when sacred matters were at stake.

[133] Ar. *Av.*

assert Lindos' connection with these cities. However, it was not simply because of their symbolic significance that first offerings were demanded by those in power; there was a financial aspect to the phenomenon as well. Athena's treasury at Athens profited substantially from the tribute *aparche*, which probably constituted a source of sacred wealth available to the city as loans in emergencies.[134] Likewise the gods at Syracuse appear to have been enriched by the *ἀπαρχὴ ἀπὸ βαρβάρων τινῶν*, hence Nicias' argument about Sicily's economic strength.[135] The *phialai* to Apollo Didymeus, almost invariably weighing 100 Alexandrian *drachmai*, also provided income for the sanctuary, though whether they could be melted down to generate monetary wealth for Miletus we do not know. I have also suggested that the Eleusinian first-fruits decree, if successfully implemented, could have provided the democracy with a supplementary source of grain, sold at prices fixed by the assembly. In the Lindian Chronicle, on the other hand, what was important to the Lindians was not so much the actual value of the purported first offerings from their 'colonies' but the recognition of metropolis status that is implied in the act of dedication itself.

We have explored in Chapter Two the possible reasons why the gods were thought to deserve *aparchai* from mankind. Here it is worth considering the grounds on which some cities could claim *aparchai* for themselves (and/or their gods). Only in the case of Eleusis do we find a ready explanation: the myth of Triptolemus justifies the Panhellenic contribution of agricultural *aparchai* in terms of Athens' benefaction to mankind in mythical times, rendering the Greeks indebted to Athens for the gift of agriculture from the outset. The Eleusinian first-fruits decree further claims that the

[134] On loans from Athena's treasury, see e.g. ML 72, ML 77; Thuc. 2.13.3.
[135] Thuc. 6.20.

practice was *κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὲν μαντείαν τὲν ἐγ Δελφῶν*.[136] A similar rhetoric was used also by Miletus: in response to Kios' request to be exempted from the obligation to deliver *phialai*, the Milesians present the duty as one ordained by an existing law (*διὰ τὸ τὸν νόμον τὸμ περὶ τούτων ὑπάρχοντα*) and an agreement made by their forefathers (*κατὰ τὰ ὑπὸ [τῶ]μ προγόνων συγκείμενα*).[137] The implication is that the long-standing custom could not be changed. Yet how the practice came into being in the first place is left unexplained by Miletus: the rhetoric of 'ancestral custom' is perhaps sufficient in itself.[138] What might have been an artificially imposed duty was nevertheless couched in the language of traditionalism. This appeal to ancestral traditions played on strong expectations of appropriate behaviour towards the gods on both sides: since traditional expressions of piety and traditional rights of the gods could not be neglected, there was an expectation that the obligation would be met with respect. In the remaining cases – tribute *aparche* to Athena, Priene's free-will *aparchai*, some barbarians' *aparchai* to Syracuse, and *dekatai/akrothinia* from Lindian 'colonies' – where the first offerings were justified neither by aetiological myths nor by 'ancestral customs', one wonders why the subject-colonies should send them whether voluntarily or by compulsion. We may suppose that the subject-colonies felt, or rather were expected to feel, a general sense of indebtedness to their mother-city[139] (and her patron deity) for her role in founding the colony, assistance in wars, political protection, and other benefits generally available to the subjects (such as grants of *politeia* in some cases,[140] safer transport at sea for the Athenian subject-colonies), in return for which first offerings should be

[136] *IG* I^3 78.4-5, 25-26, 34.
[137] *Milet*. I.3, no. 141, lines 28, 33-34.
[138] Cole (2008), 57-9, has studied the binding power of 'ancestral customs'.
[139] Note that Athens was not, strictly speaking, the mother-city of all her allies, but she presented herself as such.
[140] E.g. *Milet*. I.3, no. 141, line 34.

made.[141] Although it is nowhere explicitly stated in these terms in the sources, the initial act of foundation had probably created an 'original debt' for the colonies, in return for which certain duties and loyalty could be expected from the subjects. Any failure to honour the mother-city with first offerings, especially where they were obligatory, would probably be considered disrespectful and offensive. Like the divinities, the mother-city might be justifiably angered when she was not given her dues. In colony-metropolis interactions as in human-divine relations, the sending of *aparchai* reflects first and foremost the dedicator's dependence on and subordination to the recipient.[142]

Another way of conceptualizing first offerings dispatched to mother-cities is to conceive of a strong centre dominating a set of subordinate communities whose links with the centre were constantly reinforced by means of *theoria*. By requiring subject states to dispatch *aparchai* to the dominant power at certain times of the year, the cult practice had the potential to serve as a ritual cement binding the outlying places to the central political core. The theoric network thus formed might be particularly useful for reinforcing ties with the more distant or economically important states. Might Miletus have felt a particular need to maintain her symbolic link with Kios and Kyzikos, both of which are located in an economically vital region in the southern Propontis? For Athens and Miletus, the important sanctuaries under their control lie at the centre of this network of religious activities. It is currently believed that Eleusis had been part of Athens from the beginning and was not incorporated later,[143] and that Didyma

[141] On the benefits enjoyed by the Athenian allies, see e.g. de Ste Croix (1954), Finley (1981), ch.3.
[142] On the analogy between human-divine relations and subjects-king relations, see also Mikalson (2010), 34-5.
[143] Osborne (1994), esp.152-3, Sourvinou-Inwood (1997b); cf. older scholarship e.g. Walton (1952), Richardson (1974).

belonged to Miletus early and certainly by the third century B.C.[144] These sanctuaries were exploited as places of political power and served as a unifying centre to which first offerings were sent. If it is correct to think that the *aparchai* were ceremonially conveyed by state delegations on particular occasions, the ritual process and the magnificent sight it created would also provide an opportunity for the ostentatious display of the power relations between the sender and recipient.[145] However, a core-periphery model risks over-simplifying the complexity and diversity of relationship between the ruling power and the subject as well as the interconnectedness among the subject cities. Nor can it account sufficiently for variations within the model:[146] for example, the fact that only Kios and Kyzikos but not all Milesian colonies can be shown to have been obliged to send *phialai* to Didyma would not be explained.

The dispatched first offerings in Part One demonstrate how a traditional religious practice could be exploited in interstate relations as a means of expressing and maintaining power relations. We need not suppose, however, that all *aparchai*-bearing *theoriai* were undertaken principally for political reasons. In Part Two I turn to the conveyance of *aparchai* by Greek cities to prestigious shrines of Delos, Delphi and festival-holding cities as a more traditional means of maintaining human-divine relations, though the practice was not entirely free from political impetus.

[144] See n. 106.
[145] See e.g. the scene at the *matahiti* (first-fruits ceremony) in Tahiti envisaged in Moerenhout (1837), vol. 1, 518-21, Oliver (1974), 261-2.
[146] On centre-periphery model, see e.g. Kristiansen et al. (1987), Bilde (1993). For critiques of the model, see Renfrew and Cherry (1986), Ma (2003).

II. First Offerings to Delos, Delphi and New Panhellenic Festivals

In what follows I will first study the *aparchai* sent to the prestigious cult centres of Delos and Delphi; then I will turn to the *aparchai* destined for cities holding the so-called new Panhellenic festivals in the Hellenistic period. Finally, in light of the frequent association between *theoriai* and *aparchai* seen in this Chapter, I suggest that the reference to *aparche* (of disputed meaning) in two inscriptions at Thasos (*IG* XII.8 273, 274) most likely refers to the traditional first offering sent by Thasian *theoroi* to the gods in another sanctuary, possibly the sanctuary of Great Gods at Samothrace.

As far as Delos and Delphi are concerned, the *aparchai* appear to have been sent with irregular frequency and may or may not be connected with particular festivals. That the Greek cities would risk long and dangerous journeys to bring *aparchai* to Delian and Pythian Apollo should not surprise us. Delos and Delphi were both sacred spaces and objects of 'pilgrimage': Delos was the birth-place of Apollo and the 'holiest of islands' (*νησάων ἁγιωτάτη*),[147] whereas Delphi was the site of Apollo's oracle and was considered distinct from, and to have a greater appeal than, any other local shrine of Apollo, just as Lourdes is considered in some sense more sacred than neighbouring Catholic churches.[148]

a) Delos

The dispatch of *aparchai* to Delos was perhaps felt to be such an ancient practice that it could be traced back to mythical times. The Hyperboreans, a legendary race of Apollo-worshippers living 'beyond the North Wind' (*hyper boreas*),[149] are said to have sent *aparchai* to Delos each year, which passed down a long chain of

[147] Callim. *Hymn* 4, 275ff.
[148] On 'degrees of sacredness', see Rigsby (1996), 6-9. I owe the parallel between Delphi and Lourdes to Rigsby (1996), 6.
[149] On the Hyperboreans, see Romm (1992), 60-7. On the Hyperboreans' offerings to Delos, see Tréheux (1953), Bruneau (1970), 39-48, Kowalzig (2007), 121-4.

intermediary Greek cities before eventually reaching Delos. Our information comes mainly from the accounts of Herodotus, Callimachus, and Pausanias.

According to Callimachus, every year *aparchai* were dispatched to Delos, and cities from all four directions in the Greek world would send choruses (*ἀλλά τοι ἀμφιετεῖς δεκατηφόροι αἰὲν ἀπαρχαί πέμπονται, πᾶσαι δὲ χοροὺς ἀνάγουσι πόληες*). It is interesting that Callimachus qualifies *aparchai* with the adjective *dekatephoroi*, the meaning of which is two-fold here: Apollo was *dekatephoros* ('tithe-receiving', a cult epithet of Apollo);[150] and the *aparchai* were to pay a tithe ('tithe-paying'). The Hyperborean *aparchai* were passed to Dodona, then to Malis, Euboa and Delos.[151] The route given by Herodotus is similar to that in Callimachus: the sacred offerings originating with the Hyperboreans were first sent to Scythia, then from tribe to tribe westward until they reached the head of the Adriatic, then southward to Dodona, Malis, Carystus in Euboea, Tenos and Delos.[152] However, Pausanias' account is slightly different: the Hyperborean *aparchai* were given to the Arimaspi, then the Issedones, and then the Scythians carried them to Sinope. In the last stage of the journey the *aparchai* passed through Prasiae in Attica and were carried by the Athenians to Delos.[153] The special prominence accorded to the Athenians in the final stage may suggest that Pausanias' account was influenced by an Athenian variant of the tradition.[154] I will return to Athens' involvement (if any) in the conveyance of the Hyperborean *aparchai* shortly.

---

[150] E.g. Paus. 1.42.5.
[151] Callim. *Hymn* 4, 275ff; with commentary in Mineur (1984), 223ff.
[152] Hdt. 4.33; Asheri, Lloyd and Corcella et al. (2007), 605, suggest that the *aparchai* were sent out from Dodona, and that the part of the journey associated with the Hyperboreans and the Scythians was legendary.
[153] Paus. 1.31.2; the route via Prasiae is also discussed in Parker (1996), 225, Parker (2005), 82.
[154] Despite possible elements of invention of tradition in Pausanias' account, both Tréheux (1953), 766-7 with n. 47, 770, and Bruneau (1970), 43, regard the itinerary as real and attempt to pin down the period when the change in route took place.

We do not know what these mythical Hyperborean *aparchai* were:[155] Herodotus describes them as 'sacred offerings tied up in straw' (*ἱρὰ ἐνδεδεμένα ἐν καλάμῃ*); likewise Pausanias says that they were 'hidden in wheat straw, and they are known to none' (*τὰς δὲ ἀπαρχὰς κεκρύφθαι μὲν ἐν καλάμῃ πυρῶν, γινώσκεσθαι δὲ ὑπ' οὐδένων*).[156] The great care taken to conceal them and to ensure their safe transport during the long journey all hint at some valuable and non-perishable offerings. Interestingly enough, two fourth-century Delian inscriptions mention 'offerings from the Hyperboreans', which suggest that they still arrived, or were believed to have arrived, in the fourth century.[157] Their very appearance in the inventory lists seems to suggest that objects thus inscribed were brought to the sanctuary; yet who sent them and what they were remain unknown.

Herodotus recounts an aetiological myth that explains the special manner by which the Hyperborean *aparchai* were conveyed. Tradition had it that the first Hyperborean messengers to bring *aparchai*, comprising two maidens called Hyperoche and Laodice escorted by five men, failed to return home from their sacred mission. To avoid further loss of people, future Hyperborean *aparchai* were sent to Delos by a process of relay by neighbouring peoples in succession.[158] Yet Herodotus' account presents a complication: according to the Delians, he says, the purpose of Hyperoche's and Laodice's visit was 'to bring Eileithyia tribute they had undertaken to pay in exchange for a quick and easy labour at childbirth' (*ταύτας μέν νυν τῇ*

[155] Some modern suggestions are e.g. sacrificial victims, honey from Hyperborean bees, swan eggs, ears of corn etc. See Tréheux (1953), 764-5 with bibliography in n. 34-38.
[156] Hdt. 4.33, Paus. 1.31.2 (tr. Jones).
[157] *Inscr. Délos* no. 100.49 (372/367 B.C.): *[τὰ ἐξ] Ὑ̣περβορέων ἱερά*, *Inscr. Délos* no. 104(3) A8 = *IG* II^2 1236 A.8 (c.367 B.C.): *εἰς ἱερὰ] τὰ ἐξ Ὑπερβορ[έ]ων H*; Bruneau (1970), 39-40, Parker (1996), 225 n. 30.
[158] Hdt. 4.33-34. The names and number of the Hyperborean envoys given in Callim. *Hymn* 4, 291-9 and Paus. 1.43.3 are different from those in Herodotus.

Εἰλειθυίη ἀποφερούσας ἀντὶ τοῦ ὠκυτόκου τὸν ἐτάξαντο φόρον ἀπικέσθαι).[159] It is disputed whether the adjective *ὠκυτόκος* refers to Leto's delivery of Apollo and Artemis or the Hyperborean girls' own child-birth.[160] Herodotus seems to imply, in his rather confusing account, that the subsequent Hyperborean *aparchai* to Delos were a continuation of the practice of bringing *phoros* for Eileithyia. However, *phoros* for Eileithyia is mentioned neither by Callimachus nor Pausanias,[161] who only speak of Hyperborean *aparchai* to Delos (without naming the divine recipient). Or were there different kinds of Hyperborean offerings intended for different divinities (*aparchai* for Apollo, different from the *phoros* for Eileithyia)? As we shall see shortly, in historic time different Greek cities' *aparchai* were designated to Apollo, not Eilethyia.

Apart from Pausanias' statement that the Athenians carried the Hyperborean *aparchai*, there is no evidence for Athenian delegations conveying *aparchai* to Delos. To our knowledge, Athens was involved in at least two major kinds of *theoriai* destined for the island. First, Athens sent a quadrennial mission to the Ionian *panegyris* called the Delia, which was reinstituted on Delos by the Athenians after the purification of the whole island in 426/5 B.C. Earlier in the fifth century a festival had also existed there but on a smaller scale.[162] The most conspicuous Athenian delegation is perhaps that led by Nicias as described by Plutarch.[163] Nevertheless,

[159] Hdt. 4.35 (tr. Waterfield). Eileithyia was the goddess of childbirth who, according to a tradition in Paus. 1.18.5, came from the Hyperboreans to Delos to help Leto in her birth-pains. On Eileithyia's cult in Delos, see Bruneau (1970), 212-19.
[160] Leto's delivery: Macan (1895-1908), How and Wells (1928), Larson (1995), 120; the Hyperborean girls' birth-pains: Rawlinson (1862). If the latter was the case, the *phoros* brought by Hyperoche and Laodice would concern a different and possibly private religious practice of the maidens themselves, to be distinguished from the *aparchai* sent collectively by the Hyperboreans.
[161] This complication is not addressed by Tréheux (1953) or Bruneau (1970).
[162] *Hom. Hymn Apollo* 147ff, Thuc. 3.104. On the Delia, see Parker (1996), 150-1, 222-3, Parker (2005), 81.
[163] Plut. *Nic*. 3.5-7.

there is no evidence that Athenian *theoroi* carried *aparchai* specifically to the Delia.[164] Some scholars have conjectured that the Delia and the transport of *aparchai* to Delos were linked.[165] Yet these conjectures are based on the assumption that both the Hyperborean *aparchai* and their conveyance by the Athenian as described by Pausanias reflect historical reality. Second, an annual mission was dispatched to Delos perhaps exclusively by Athens. In Plato's account of Socrates' trial and death, Phaedo explains that the Athenians had vowed to send a mission to the island every year in honour of Apollo if the Twice Seven were saved. Even to his day, therefore, the priest of Apollo would garland the stern of Theseus' ship for the voyage and no execution was allowed until its return.[166] This annual Athenian dispatch of a chorus, in what was thought to be Theseus' ship, was a re-enactment of Theseus' exploit in saving the Twice Seven. However, there is no mention in our sources of *aparchai*. The inscription *IG* II^2 2336, perhaps due to its mention of Delian officials, used to be taken as an otherwise unattested *Pythaïs* sending *aparchai* from Athens to Delos in the late second or early first century B.C.;[167] but Tracy has now demonstrated that it relates to a Delphic and not a Delian delegation.[168] Based on the evidence available, therefore, the historical reality of Athenian *theoriai* carrying *aparchai* to Delos – be these Athenian *aparchai* or Hyperborean *aparchai* conveyed by the Athenians, as tradition had it – should remain doubtful.

As for the other Greek cities, it is left obscure by Callimachus whether the cities

[164] Athenian delegations bringing offerings (but not *aparchai* specifically) to the Delia are mentioned in Thuc. 3.104.6, Plut. *Nic*. 3.5-7.
[165] Nilsson (1906), 147: 'Es gibt wirklich auch Spuren, wenn auch z. T. nicht ganz unbedenkliche, die das Ueberbringen der Erstlinge mit dem delischen Feste in Verbindung setzen, vor allem die attische Version der Hyperboreersage'; Tréheux (1953), 767-9, followed by Bruneau (1970), 43. Parker (2011), 192, n. 76, considers the link between the Hyperborean *aparchai* and a particular festival 'highly plausible, but currently indemonstrable'.
[166] Pl. *Phd*. 58a-c; see also Xen. *Mem*. 4.8.2, Parker (2005), 81-2.
[167] E.g. Ferguson (1932), 147 n. 1, Daux (1936), 525, n. 1, Bruneau (1970), 128-37.
[168] Tracy (1979), Tracy (1982), esp. 147-9.

which sent choruses to Delos also dispatched their own *aparchai*, or whether they were merely intermediaries through which the Hyperborean *aparchai* were conveyed as implied in Herodotus' and Pausanias' accounts. It seems that all three sources are recounting the aetiological myth of the *aparchai* to Delos, with the Hyperborean offerings being the *aition* for Delos' receipt of *aparchai* from the Greeks in historic time. What survives in these literary accounts may thus be a mixture of mythical traditions and contemporary theoric activities. Epigraphic evidence attests to envoys sent by miscellaneous Greek cities to Delos,[169] some of whom carried *aparchai*. The Delian inventory lists in the third and second centuries B.C. record numerous *aparchai* dedicated to Apollo (not Eileithyia) in the form of *phialai* from the Mapsichidians (who belonged to a *trittys* on Delos)[170] and the Coans.[171] According to Bruneau's statistics, at least 25 Coan *phialai* are recorded in the period of Delian independence (315/4-167/6 B.C.), and another 35 *phialai* after 166 B.C.[172] Some of these are referred to as *aparchai*,[173] others as *anathemata*,[174] and some simply as *phialai*. In at least one inventory list, a Coan *phiale* is described simultaneously as an *aparche* and an *anathema* to Apollo (*φιάλη καρυωτὴ ἔκτυπον ἔχουσα ζώιδιον, τῆς πόλεως τῆς Κώιων ἀνάθημα, τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι ἀ[παρχ]ήν*),[175] which suggests that the term *aparche* might have been used loosely as an equivalent of *anathema*, with a weakened partial connotation which the word usually carries. The Coans and

[169] Bruneau (1970), 97-114.
[170] In which case no *theoria* was involved. On the Mapsichidians, see Jones (1987), 212.
[171] Mapsichidian *phialai* as *aparchai*: *Inscr. Délos* nos. 313.AB.75, 314.B.83, 320.B.42, 58, 338.C.48 (supplemented), 442.B.114, 443.B.38; Coan *phialai* as *aparchai*: *Inscr. Délos* nos. 298.A.14, 313.AB.11, 372.B.22, 379.12 (supplemented), *IG* XI.2 161.B.74-75, 184.6 (supplemented), 199.B.7, 244.10 (supplemented), 287.B.42.
[172] Bruneau (1970), 97-101, 109-110. A list of inscriptions mentioning Coan *theoriai* to Delos is collected in Sherwin-White (1978), 91 n. 50.
[173] See n. 171.
[174] Coan *phialai* as *anathemata*: e.g. *Inscr. Délos* nos. 298.A.18, 371.B.17, 396.B.55 (supplemented), 421.59, 62 (supplemented), *IG* XI.2 161.B.14, 15, 66, 74, 162.B.11, 12, 53, 164.A.3, 199.B.8 (supplemented).
[175] *IG* XI.2 161.B.74.

the Mapsichidians aside, other places such as Alexandria, Kalymna, Kasos, Knidos, Megalopolis, Naxos, Rhodes, Tarentum and Tauromenion also sent *phialai* to Delos with varying frequency and on unknown occasions;[176] but none of these is described in the inventory lists as an *aparche* and therefore they cannot be securely identified as such.[177] The *phialai* dedicated by different cities are perhaps more or less of the same kind; the difference probably lies in the ways in which the objects were initially inscribed and accordingly recorded in the inventory.

b) Athenian *Pythaïs* to Delphi

Athens also sent *theoriai* to Delphi with irregular frequency and not tied to any festival. According to Strabo, the sanctuary of Pythian Apollo southeast of the Athenian acropolis was the point of departure for the Athenian *theoroi* to Delphi: the sacred offering would be dispatched after lightning over Harma was observed from the altar of Zeus Astrapaios.[178] The Athenian delegation, also known as the *Pythaïs*, paid homage to Apollo with processions, sacrifices, offerings and games. It presented *aparchai* and perhaps a tripod, and brought back a sacred tripod and sacred fire to Athens.[179] While the Athenian *theoriai* to Delos examined earlier went by sea, this *theoria* must have set out by land along the sacred road to Boeotia and through it to the sanctuary.[180]

---

[176] E.g. *IG* XI.2 161.B.70, 72, 199 B.14, 226.B.3; Bruneau (1970), 93-114, esp. 109-110.

[177] Cf. Bruneau (1970), 111-2, who seems to considers all the offerings dispatched by different Greek *theoroi* (regardless of what form these offerings took and how they were described in the inventory) as *aparchai*. Following Tréheux (1953), 765, n. 40, 773, Bruneau suggests that the unique function of these *theoriai* to Delos was 'de transporter une offrande à titre d'*ἀπαρχή* et de la remettre solennellement au dieu', and that the *aparche* 'conserve le souvenir de l'*ἀπαρχή* de récoltes, versée probablement en nature, qu' à l'époque archaïque les cités groupées dans le primitive confédération délienne consacraient à Apollon'. The uncertainty of *aparchai* to Delian Apollo by members of the Delian League has already been noted above. If indeed there were such *aparchai*, they are likely to have been a sum of money rather than crops.

[178] Strab. 9.2.11.

[179] The most recent discussion of the *Pythaïs* is Parker (2005), 83-7.

[180] We have a fourth-century *horos* in the Athenian agora thus inscribed: *ὅρος ἱερᾶς ὁδῦ δι' ἧς πορεύεται ἡ Πυθαὶς ἐς Δελφός* 'boundary of the sacred road through which the *Pythaïs* journeys to

The Classical period has left few attestations of these *theoriai*. The earliest *Pythaïs* known to us was in 355B.C.[181] It was perhaps not until 326/5 B.C., when Lycurgos revived the institution, that the next mission was sent.[182] Surviving fourth-century dedications made by the *Pythaïsts*, discovered in the Pythion of the deme Icaria, probably attest to a third, and earlier, celebration in the fourth century.[183] We know of successive revivals of the custom in the late Hellenistic period from inscriptions commemorating the participants, engraved on the south wall of the Athenian treasury at Delphi.[184] At least four such missions took place: in 138/7, 128/7, 106/5, 98/7 B.C. No *Pythaïs* is attested between 325 and 138 B.C.; but the Marathon Tetrapolis dispatched several separate *Pythaïdes* of its own and apparently continued the practice when Athens neglected it.[185] It is unclear why the state *Pythaïdes* to Delphi were sent at such irregular intervals.[186] In theory, so Strabo tells us, the *Pythaïs* was dispatched to Delphi on a signal of lighting. But in practice, as Parker suggests, it is highly probable that a mission was sent when the Athenians desired;[187] and political impetus has been identified for several missions.[188]

Delphi' (*Agora* XIX, H 34) (tr. Parker (2005), 86). Ferguson (1909), 307-9, (1911), 372-3, envisaged that the journey by land would take three days, and the distance was over one hundred miles.

[181] *Pythaïs* in 355B.C.: Isae. 7.27; Parke (1939b), 80-3.

[182] Lycurgan *Pythaïs*: *Syll.*^{3} 296, 297. On its date, see Lewis (1955), esp. 34, Lewis (1968), 377, n. 29. The *Pythaïdes* in the fourth century are discussed in Daux (1936), 528-31.

[183] Dedications: *IG* II^{2} 2816, 2817; Voutiras (1982). Parker (2005), 86, n. 28, thinks that the *Pythaïs* in which the dedicators of *IG* II^{2} 2816 served is likely to be earlier than 355 B.C., whereas *IG* II^{2} 2817 may be associated with the Lycurgan *Pythaïs* of 326/5 B.C.

[184] *FD* III.2 nos. 2-58 = *Syll.*^{3} 696-99, 711, 728. See also *IG* II^{2} 1136 (=*Syll.*^{3} 711 K), a Delphic honorific decree for the Athenians and the priestess of Athena who served in the *Pythaïs* in 106/5.

[185] But *aparchai* are not mentioned in the *theoriai* of the Marathon Tetrapolis to Delphi. See Philochorus *FGrH*328F75; *FD* III.2 nos. 18-22; Parker (2005), 83, 85 n. 24.

[186] But in 98/7 there appears to be an attempt to regularize the *Pythaïs* to eight-year intervals (*enneeteris*): see *IG* II^{2} 1136.2, *FD* III.2 no. 48.7-8; Colin (1905), 134-9, Tracy (1982), 146-7.

[187] Parker (2005), 86.

[188] Parke (1939b), 83: the *theoria* in 355 might have been an Athenian demonstration in favour of the Phocians who had a good prospect of establishing themselves at Delphi; Parker (1996), 247: the mission in 326/5 is commonly thought of as part of the Lycurgean attempt to revive Periclean Athens; Mikalson (1998), 269: the first Hellenistic mission was perhaps connected to Athens' reestablishment of the authority of the Amphictiones over Delphi; Tracy (1982), 150-2: the *Pythaïs* of 98/7 probably aimed to renew old traditions and to reassert Athens' importance in Greek affairs.

The dispatch of *aparchai* and the people appointed for the task are explicitly mentioned in the inscriptions for the years 128/7, 106/5, and 98/7.[189] Although they do not appear in earlier epigraphic evidence, *aparchai* are likely to be traditional offerings already sent by the *Pythaïdes* in the earlier period. It is unclear what form the *aparchai* took, but in the late Hellenistic period they might have been a sum of money.[190] From Tracy's detailed study of *IG* II^2 2336 (a list of monetary contributions of *aparchai* for the *Pythaïs* in 98/7, collected between 103/2 and 97/6 B.C.), we learn that in this later period at least, the *aparchai* were jointly contributed by selected Athenian and Delian officials. The inscription's preamble has been restored to read:

> *Ἀγαθῆι τύχηι τῆς βουλῆς κ[αὶ το]ῦ δ]ήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων. ὁ κεχειροτο<ν>[ημέν]ος ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξαποστο-*
> *λὴν τῆς Πυθαίδος καὶ τὰς ἀπαρχὰς τῆς πρώτης ἐν[[νεετη]]?ρί[δος Ἀμφικρ]άτης Ἐπιστράτου Πε-*
> *ριθοίδης ἀνέγραψ[εν] τοὺς δόντας τῶν ἀρχόν[[των τὰς ἀπαρ]]χὰς [τ]ῶι Ἀπό[λλωνι] τῶι Πυθίωι κα*
> *τὰ τὸ ψήφισμα [ὅ Ξε]νότιμος ἐγ Μυρρι[νο]ύττης εἶπεν.*[191]
> With good fortune of the council and the people of the Athenians. The one elected for the sending of the *Pythaïs* and the *aparchai* of the first *enneeteris*, Amphikrates son of Epistratos of Perithoidai recorded the officials who contributed the *aparchai* to Apollo Pythios according to the decree which Xenotimos from Myrrhinoutta proposed.

It appears from the prescript that some officials were required, according to a decree proposed by [Xe]notimos from Myrrhinoutta, to contribute *aparchai* for Apollo Pythios. There follows a list of contributors and contributions arranged chronologically into year panels, each panel is introduced by the formula *οἵδε ἀπέδωκαν τὰς ἀπαρχὰς ἐπὶ τοῦ δεῖνα ἄρχοντος*. Tracy suggests that legislation was enacted in 103/2 to raise a sum for the *aparchai* of the *Pythaïs* scheduled in 98/7. The officials obliged to contribute include, for example, Athenian hoplite generals, the

[189] *Aparchai*: *FD* III.2 nos. 6.3 (=*Syll.*^{3} 728 B), 13.19 (=*Syll.*^{3} 711 D^1), 46.1 (=*Syll.*^{3} 697K), 48.11 (=*Syll.*^{3} 711L), 54.4.
[190] Parker (2005), 84.
[191] I give the Greek text in Tracy (1982), which differs from that in *IG* II^2 2336.

herald of the Areopagus, archons, lesser Athenian officials, the *epimeletai* of Delos, priests and lesser officials on Delos. The requirement that chosen officials should contribute to the *aparchai* for Apollo on behalf of the city is representative of the Hellenistic practice of linking the exercise of public functions with financial obligations: magistrates had to meet certain public expenses from their own resources.[192] Yet not all the officials paid regularly every year: Tracy notes serious disruptions in contributions for the years 100/99 and 99/98; perhaps because of this the fund-raising effort fell short of the projected goal, so that a supplementary set of contributions of 2450 *drachmai* had to be solicited from the officials in 97/6. This was perhaps too late for the 98/7 *Pythaïs* and was probably dispatched to Delphi later but nevertheless recorded here.[193] From the joint contributions for *aparchai* made in seven consecutive years between 103/2 and 97/6, a total sum of about 3 talents was raised. If Tracy's interpretation is correct, it is significant that such elaborate arrangements were made to raise money for the *aparchai* for Delphic Apollo: preparation began six years in advance and serious efforts (as in the last-minute fund-raising in 97/6) were made to ensure that a sum of three talents was met. Might the Athenians have vowed to Apollo Pythios three talents as an *aparche* to be paid in 98/7? One wonders how the sum was determined and whether similar fund-raising mechanisms were in force for the *aparchai* in other *Pythaïdes*.

[192] On the link between magistracy and financial obligations in the Hellenistic period, see Veyne (1976), 214-7, 251-3, 272-6.
[193] Tracy (1982), 96.

c) *Aparchai* to New Panhellenic Festivals

In the Hellenistic period many Greek cities established new festivals or expanded existing festivals to Panhellenic scale.[194] Two types of *theoroi* were associated with them: first, the *theoroi* sent out by the festival-holding city to invite participation and to request *asylia* (or inviolability) of the sanctuary from other cities,[195] where they would be received by officials known as *theorodokoi*. Second, the *theoroi* sent by the invitees to attend the celebration.[196] Our evidence comes predominantly from the surviving dossier of *asylia* decrees, which are the invitees' responses to the festival-holding city. They mention two types of monetary payments: an *a/eparche*[197] and an *ekecheiron*. The former was a cash gift for the deity whose festival was being proclaimed, whereas the latter's meaning is less certain.[198] It is the *a/eparche* which I am interested in here. Since the phenomenon of sending an *aparche* to the organizer is similarly attested in different festivals and since the Hellenistic materials are strictly speaking beyond the chronological scope of this study, I shall only discuss the most well documented case of Magnesia on the Maeander, and I shall list in a footnote the sources mentioning *aparchai* dispatched to other cities holding new Panhellenic festivals.[199]

---

[194] On new Panhellenic festivals in the Hellenistic period, see Parker (2004c), 9-22.

[195] Parker (2004c), 10-11, notes that requests for participation and *asylia* were not necessarily connected.

[196] On *theoroi* and *theorodokoi*, see Perlman (2000), 37-62.

[197] The form *eparche* is used in three texts: *Asylia* 101.33 (Magnesia on the Maeander), *FD* III.2 88 (Delphi), Bizard (1920), 247-9, no. 9 (Akraiphia).

[198] LSJ s.v. *ἐκέχειρον*: '= *ἐκεχείριον*, travelling allowance for *θεωροί* who announce a sacred truce'. Boesch (1908), 74-9, suggested that an *ekecheiron* was a cash gift for the festival-announcing *theoroi* themselves, probably for sacrificial use (but he did not say whether this was a sacrifice on the spot or in the festival), to be distinguished from an *aparche* which was an offering given to the *theoroi* for the god whose festival they proclaimed. Oulhen (1992), 241-6, thinks that the two terms were synonymous for money sent to the deity for a sacrifice on the occasion of the festival. Dillon (1997), 19: an honorarium for the visiting *theoroi* presumably to help cover their expenses. Perlman (2000), 47-8, 128: 'although certainty is not possible, it appears that the *aparche* was the gift sent to the patron deity of the festival while the *ekecheiron* was used for a sacrifice [on the spot] performed to solemnize the invitee's acceptance of the sacred truce'.

[199] An unidentified festival at Delphi: *FD* III.1 318-3-4, *FD* III.2 88; the Asclepia at Cos: *Asylia* 28.10, 29.7, 32.9, Rigsby and Hallof (2001), *Chiron* 31, no. 2.A.12, B.16, no. 3.a.9; the Didymeia at Miletus:

In 208 B.C. Magnesia on the Maeander decided to establish a Panhellenic festival, the Leucophryenia, for Artemis Leucophryene and requested participation and *asylia* from other Greek cities. The background is given in Magnesia's own account of events: the Delphic oracle ordered that Apollo and Artemis be honoured and the city and territory of Magnesia be declared sacred and inviolable.[200] Accordingly the Magnesians sought recognition of *asylia* and invited participation in a competition (probably crown games) in 221/0 B.C.;[201] yet the original attempt failed and the games had to be reestablished in 208 B.C.

In response to Magnesia's request in 208 (now lost), we have a dossier of some 65 decrees from different Greek cities inscribed along the perimeter walls of the Magnesian agora.[202] Fourteen replies make provisions for an *aparche* to be sent.[203] Of the fourteen decrees, most state explicitly that the *aparche* was for the goddess; and in at least five cases it was entrusted to the Magnesian *theoroi* who proclaimed the festival.[204] In one reply from an unknown city, however, it appears that the *aparche* was carried by the *theoroi* of the city invited. The city's response reads *εἰς*

Didyma no. 463.13-16; the Hyacinthotrophia at Knidos: *FD* II.1 308.11; the Pan-Boeotian (not Panhellenic) Ptoia at Akraiphia in Boeotia: *IG* VII, 4138, *IG* VII 4139, Bizard (1920), 247-9, no. 9.1-10; an unidentifiable festival at Samothrace: McCabe, *Insc. Iasos*, 75 (= Habicht (1994), *Chiron* 24, 69-74, *SEG* XLIII, 715, Dimitrova (2008), 253, appendix I.3, no. 3).

[200] Magnesia's account of the event: *Asylia* 66, see also Gehrke (2001). On Magnesia's possible political motives, see Rigsby (1996), 174-5,179-184, Thonemann (2007), 159-60.

[201] Following Ebert (1982) (*πρῶτ[ον ἀργυρί]την ἀγῶνα θεῖναι τῶγ κατοικούντων τὴν Ἀσίαν [ἐψηφίσαν]το, κτλ.*) (*Asylia*, 66.16-17), Rigsby (1996) thinks that the initial attempt in 221 B.C. was to set up a money contest for those in Asia and in 208 to expand it to crown status. But Slater and Summa (2006) argue that it was in 221 and not 208 that the Magnesians wished to upgrade their festival to crown status, supplementing instead *πρῶτ[ον στεφανί]την* (lines 16-17). This view had been expressed earlier by Kern (1900). However, Thonemann (2007) proposes *πρῶτ[οι στεφανί]την ἀγῶνα θεῖναι τῶγ κατοικούντων τὴν Ἀσίαν [ἐψηφίσαν]το, κτλ.* (lines 16-18), according to which in 221 B.C. the Magnesians were claiming to be 'the first of those dwelling in Asia to vote in favour of establishing a stephanitic contest' (to which all the Greeks were invited).

[202] The dating of these inscriptions is discussed in Rigsby (1996), 182.

[203] These are *Asylia* 68.18 (Attalus I and his subjects), 79.21 (Delphi), 80.1 (unknown city), 81.35 (Acarnanian League), 86.19 (Ithaca), 97.26 (Chalcis), 102.40 (Clazomenae), 107.35 (unknown city), 109.a.6 (Laodicea on the Lycus), 110.24 (unknown city), 127.10 (unknown city), 128.12 (Attalid city), 129.22, 27 (Tralles), 131.20 (Attalid city).

[204] *Asylia* 97, 102, 127, 129, 131.

[δὲ] τὸ λοιπὸν ἀ[ποστέλλειν θεωρ]ούς τ̣ε καὶ θυσίαν καὶ̣ <ἀ>παρχ̣[ὴν] τῆι θε̣ᾶι κα[θ' ἕκαστα? Λευκοφρ]υηνὰ δρ̣αχμὰς ἑκατὸν ἑκάσ̣[τοτε] (lines 34-6).[205] Taken literally, in future the participating city was to 'send out' *theoroi* to attend the festival together with sacrifice and an *aparche* to the goddess of 100 *drachmai* on each occasion. In the remaining cases either no sufficient information survives or it is left unspecified which set of *theoroi* was entrusted with the *aparche*.[206] Only one reply makes explicit the use to which the cash gift was to be put: the Acarnanians decided that the treasurer Hipparchon was to give 150 silver *drachmai* as an *aparche* for the goddess for the *thusia* (*δόμεν δὲ Ἵππαρχον τὸν ταμίαν εἰς ἀπαρχὰν τᾶι θεῶι εἰς τὰν θυσίαν ἀργυρίω δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα*).[207] In most cases the *aparche* is simply designated as 'for the goddess' (*τῆι θεᾶι*) without specifying its use;[208] but analogy with the Acarnanians' reply suggest that it was likely used for a sacrifice for the goddess.[209] These *aparchai* were of varying sums in *drachmai* or other local measures; the most common value is 100 *drachmai*.[210] Several sums of *aparchai* are said to be 'specified by law' (*ἐκ τοῦ νόμου*), referring perhaps to some *nomos* made locally concerning the value of the *aparchai*.[211] Instead of a traditional 'part offering', the *aparche* in these texts is simply a monetary 'offering' or 'religious payment'. Two cities indicate in their reply that an *aparche* would be sent to the

[205] *Asylia* 107.34-6.
[206] *Asylia* 68, 79, 80, 81, 86, 109, 110, 128.
[207] *Asylia* 81.34-6.
[208] *Aparche* 'for the goddess': e.g. *Asylia* 81, 86, 107, 109, 127, 128, 129, 131.
[209] Boesch (1902), 79 explains an *aparche* in these inscriptions as 'eine Geldspende zum Opfer für die Gottheit'; Perlman (2000), 47: 'the identification of the *aparche* with the money provided for the sacrifice to the deity whose festival was being announced seems certain'.
[210] *Asylia* 80 (2 *staters*), 81(150 silver *drachmai*), 86 (15 local *drachmai*), 107 (100 *drachmai*), 127 (20 Alexandrian *drachmai*), 129 (100 *drachmai*), 131(100 *drachmai*).
[211] Eg. *Asylia* 80.1, 97.27. This phrase *ἐκ τοῦ νόμου* is also used in several *asylia* decrees for the Coan Asclepieia (*Asylia* 28.10-11, 29.7, 32.9, but the last two are supplemented) and the Ptoia at Akraiphia (*IG* VII 4138).

goddess on each occasion (ἑκάστοτε) of the festival in the future.[212] But we do not know whether this is representative of all other cities sending *aparchai*.[213] Where the frequency is not stated, one wonders whether an *aparche* was paid only when a festival was newly established and first announced, or whether it was a regular offering at each subsequent celebration of the festival. The lack of epigraphic evidence for subsequent celebrations of the festivals makes it difficult to know.

Perlman suggests that with the promise to recognize a festival as Panhellenic and to grant *asylia* also came the expectation that the invitee would meet several obligations, two of which (*aparche* and *ekecheira*) required a cash gift.[214] However, it does not appear from the evidence that the invited city was obliged to pay an *aparche*. The Magnesian account of the games' establishment (*Asylia* 66) makes no mention of an *aparche* or other monetary payments; an *aparche* was probably not 'invited' along with other Magnesian requests in the first place. Where the oracular response or the original decree of request has come down to us, only the oracle of Trophonius, in accordance with which the games of Apollo Ptoius at Akraiphia were declared sacred and Pan-Boeotian, required that 'sacred funds' be collected upon the games' proclamation: 'they are both to collect sacred funds, for the common good, in every land, and proclaim the holy contest' (*οὕτως δὲ ἀγιρέμεν ἀμφοτέρως τὰ ἱαρὰ χρείματα κυνῆ ἐφ' οὐγίη κατὰ πᾶσαν χώραν, κὴ τὸν ἀγῶνα ἱαρὸν καταγγελλέμεν*).[215] But even in the Akraiphian case, the attempt to collect sacred funds in accordance with the oracle does not necessarily imply an obligation to pay, nor that the organizer was able to compel payment from those invited. It is difficult to

[212] *Asylia* 102.39-41, 107.34-6.
[213] Cf. Haussoullier (1902), 170, who thinks that the *aparche* was renewed as often as the games were held and the *theoroi* visited.
[214] Perlman (2000), 46.
[215] *Ayslia* 2 = *IG* VII, 4136 (tr. Rigsby). On the Ptoia, see Rigsby (1996), 59-62.

imagine that every city which accepted the new festivals was obliged to pay. In fact there are far more responses which do not mention an *aparche* than those which do, though this may be influenced by the chance survival of the word on stone, and some *aparchai* may have been sent but not recorded in the *asylia* decrees. That *aparche* is not ubiquitous, and that its sum varies where it appears, makes it likely that it was up to the invited city to decide whether to send an *aparche* and if so, of what value.

Late though the *asylia* decrees are, the custom of sending an *aparche* to the cities holding festivals may date from earlier periods. There is no direct evidence from the Archaic and Classical periods attesting to *aparchai* dispatched to the traditional Panhellenic games; but we learn in Clazomenai's reply to Magnesia on the Maeander that 'the (Magnesian) *theoroi* who come each time for the proclamation shall be given *aparchai* and *xenia*, in the same way as they are given to those proclaiming the Pythian games' (*δ[ίδοσ]θαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς θεω[ρ]οῖς τοῖς ἑκάστοτε πορευομένοις ἐπὶ τὰς [ἐπα]γγελίας τὰς ἀπαρ[χ]ὰς καὶ τὰ ξένια καθάπερ καὶ τοῖς τὰ Πύθ[ια ἐ]π̣αγγέλλ̣ουσιν δί[δ]οται*).[216] An *aparche* to the traditional Pythian games is also alluded to in another response, probably from Mytilene: 'the festival-announcing *theoroi* from Magnesia shall be given, for the *aparche* and the sacrifice at the public hearth and *xenia*, as much as it is written in the law for those announcing the Pythian games' (*δίδωσθαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐπαγγελλόντεσσι θεώροισι πὰρ Μαγν[ή]των εἴς τε ἐναρχὰν καὶ ἐφέστιον κ[αὶ] ξ̣έ̣νια, [ὅσ]σα καὶ τοῖς τὰ Πύθια ἐπαγγελλόν[τ]εσσι[ν ἐν] [ν]όμῳ γέγραπται*).[217] The word

[216] *Asylia* 102.39-41.
[217] *Asylia* 101.31-35. Other examples abound in the *Asylia* dossier where the festival-announcing *theoroi* are to be given *xenia* and/or an *ekecheiron* (but not an *aparche*), just like those announcing the Pythian or Olympian games: e.g. *Asylia* 26.14-16, 82,47-49, 83, 18-20, 93.30-32, 178.26-27.

ἐναρχὰν here, as Rigsby notes, is the stonecutter's error for *ἐπαρχή*. A further example is found in the Geloian response to the Coan invitation to the new Asclepieia: 'the treasurers shall give them (the Coan *theoroi*), for the sacrifice and procession for Asclepius, as much as to those announcing the Olympic games, ten *mnai* legal tender' (*διδό]ντω δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ οἱ πωλητῆρες εἴς [τε τὰν] θυσ[ίαν κα]ὶ τὰμ πομπὰν τῶι Ἀσκλαπιῶι, ὅσσο[ν κ]αὶ τοῖς [τ]ὰ Ὀλύμπια περιαγγελλόντεσσι, ἀρ[γυ]ρίου δοκίμου [δέ]κα μνᾶς*).[218] The ten *mnai* are most probably an *aparche* although the term is not used. The implication seems to be that *aparchai* had been sent to the traditional Panhellenic games in the Hellenistic period and perhaps earlier, and that the practice was not a unique Hellenistic development. As the new Panhellenic games modelled themselves on many of the characteristics of the traditional Panhellenic festivals (such as festival announcement and requests for *isolympian /isopythian/isonemean* honours for the victors),[219] it is reasonable to think that monetary *aparche* in the Hellenistic documents might also be an extension of the traditional honour for the god at the four traditional festivals.

d) Thasian *Theoroi* Carrying *Aparchai*?

In the ancient agora at Thasos once stood a monumental structure commonly known as the 'Passage of the *Theoroi*'.[220] On the inside of its western wall were inscriptions listing names of *theoroi* arranged chronologically in columns. The inscriptions which concern us here, engraved on the first and fourth blocks of the first column,[221] have been dated to the late sixth century based on prosoprography.[222]

---

[218] *Asylia* 49.30-33.
[219] On elements of traditionalism in the new Panhellenic games, see Parker (2004c), Perlman (2000).
[220] On the topography of the ancient city, see Daux (1967b), Graham (2000).
[221] On the placement of the inscriptions on the wall, see the reconstruction in Salviat (1979), fig. 6. The lists were inscribed in vertical columns and were not restricted to the space of one wall block, with the

They contain two references to *ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης ἀπαρχῆς* and *ἐπὶ τῆς δευ[τέρη]ς ἀπαρχῆς* in the preamble, each followed by a list of twelve names of the individuals who served as *theoroi*. Between these two lists is another preamble followed by a list of names. After these three headings and lists, we find a fourth and final heading of 'the rule of the 360' followed by names in groups of three, extending from the bottom of column one to column nine. In other words, the prescripts and order of the inscriptions in the first column are as follows:[223]

IG XII.8 273 *ἀγαθῆι τύχη[ι οἵδε ἐθεόρεο]ν| ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης ἀπαρχῆς.*[224]
IG XII.8 275A *ἐπι τῶν δυώδεκα ἀρχόντων |οἵδε ἐθεόρεον.*
IG XII.8 274A *ἐπὶ τῆς δευ[τέρη]ς ἀπαρχῆς| οἵδε ἐθεόρεον.*
IG XII.8 276A *ὑπο τὸν χρόνον |ὅν οἱ ἑξήκοντα καὶ |τριηκόσιοι ἦρχον| οἵδε ἐθεόρεον.*

The meaning of the word *aparche* and the nature of the *theoroi* have been disputed. In the late nineteenth century Jacob argued that the word *aparche* could not have had its normal meaning of 'first-fruits' or 'offering'; but must be the equivalent of *ἀρχή* ('rule'). His view was accepted by the editors of LSJ, who explain the word as 'board of officials'.[225] Likewise Salviat interprets the *aparche* here as a political term: it was a board of magistrates, a detached or local political power, appointed by

result that the college under *ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης ἀπαρχῆς* consists of 12 names cut across two wall blocks *IG* XII.8 273 and 275A.1-3; likewise the college under *ἐπὶ τῆς δευ[τέρη]ς ἀπαρχῆς* consists of 12 names on two blocks *IG* XII.8 274A and 276A.1-3.

[222] Graham (1982), and (2001a). The building is dated to the beginning of the fifth century (c. 480) by the style of its sculptured reliefs, while it is generally thought that the list of *theoroi* began to be inscribed in perhaps the middle of the fourth century. In other words, if such estimates can be relied upon, the lists of *theoroi* in our texts were probably put up about two centuries after the *theoriai* had taken place in the sixth century.

[223] I have not cited the lists of names following the prescripts here.

[224] The block *IG* XII.8 273 occupies the top left corner of the western wall. Another block of the same height (Thasos inv. 1313 = Pouilloux (1954-8), vol. 2, p. 231-3, no. 406) has a *nu* of the same size and at exactly the same distance from the top edge as the letters of *Ἀγαθῆι Τύχη[ι].* It has been convincingly placed in the top course and the heading has been restored by Pouilloux to read *Ἀγαθῆι Τύχη[ι οἵδε ἐθεόρεο]ν*, accepted by Salviat (1979), 108 and Graham (1982), 234.

[225] Jacobs (1893); LSJ s.v. *ἀπαρχή*. I.6

the mother-city to supervise affairs in the colony.[226] His explanation is accepted by Martin,[227] and now appears in the revised supplement of LSJ: 'app. a board of officials sent by a city to order the affairs of a colony, *IG* 12(8), 273, 280. 283, 285 (Thasos, vi BC, v. esp. *BCH*. 107.185); cf. *ἀπάρχης*.' The *theoroi* on these lists, on the other hand, have been interpreted as magistrates or eponymous officials at Thasos,[228] whose functions remain unexplained. The first scholar to object to these views is Graham, who argues that *aparche* does not designate magistracy, but the traditional first offering, and that the *theoroi* were irregular boards appointed for special occasions. He suggests that a college of *theoroi* was twice appointed to make an important offering, an *aparche*, possibly occasioned by the discovery of a new mine or vein by comparison with the *aparche* of the Siphnian mines in Hdt. 3.57.2.[229]

My understanding of the word *aparche* is similar to Graham's, but for different reasons.[230] First, there are no epigraphic or literary parallels of magistrates or non-religious functionaries called *aparchai*, a term used invariably with religious significance as discussed in Chapter One. Examples of *aparche* and its cognate verb *aparchesthai* in their usual religious meaning are not wanting at Thasos: we have a sacred law for the cult of Theagenes in the first century B.C. which requires religious payments from people sacrificing to Theagenes: *τοὺς θύοντας τῷ Θεογένηι [Θα]σ[ίω]ι ἀπάρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν θησαυρὸν μὴ ἔλασσον ὀβολοῦ· τῶι δὲ μὴ ἀπαρξαμένωι καθότι προγέγραπται ἐνθυμιστὸν εἶναι* ('those who sacrifice to Theagenes at Thasos shall offer no less than an *obol* into the *thesauros*; he who fails

[226] Salviat (1979), 120-1, reiterated in Salviat (1983).
[227] Martin (1980), 1442-3.
[228] E.g. LSJ s.v. *θεωρός* II, Reger (2004), 780 (both citing *IG* IXII.8 263, a block on the fifth column of the wall, where the noun *theoroi* instead of the verb *theorein* is used).
[229] Graham (1982), 112-6, (2001a), 396-7.
[230] Graham's arguments are based on 1) lexicographical grounds and 2) the connection between *theoroi* and *aparchai*, but he fails to discuss parallels for the latter.

to make the offering as prescribed shall have scruples').[231] Here the act of making a cult payment is expressed by the verb *aparchesthai*, a usage which we shall see in the next chapter. Although much later than our list of Thasian *theoroi*, it shows that the cognate verb *aparchesthai* in its religious sense is not unattested at Thasos. Second, it is not uncommon for the names of *theoroi* (in the sense of religious envoys) visiting distant sanctuaries to be inscribed on the walls of monumental buildings. For example, the names of the Athenian *Pythaïsts* in four sacred missions to Delphi (138/7, 128/7, 106/5, 98/7) were engraved on the south wall of the Athenian treasury at Delphi as already mentioned;[232] and at least 18 lists of *theoroi* at Samothrace were inscribed on wall blocks of a monumental building in the sanctuary of the Great Gods.[233] Third, the connection we have traced in this chapter between *theoria* and *aparchai* in the Classical and Hellenistic periods lends support to the possibility that the *aparche* and the *theoroi* in the Thasian inscriptions concern the traditional practice of sending first offerings by sacred envoys to a sanctuary. Thasian 'pilgrims' who travelled to another sanctuary are not unknown. We find individual Thasians recorded in as many as six Samothracian *theoroi* lists in the second and first centuries B.C.[234] Might Thasian *theoria* to her neighbouring city Samothrace be a practice that went back several centuries earlier? Might the Thasian *theoroi* in our inscriptions be destined for Samothrace carrying *aparchai*, perhaps in attendance of the Samothracian mysteries? Though the destination and the divine recipient must remain conjectural, it seems to me that we are dealing with state representatives from Thasos charged with the religious duty of bringing offerings called *aparchai* to some divinity in another city.

---

[231] *LSS* 72.A-B, Martin (1940-41), 162ff; Chamoux (1979). This example is also noted in Graham (1982), 248.
[232] *FD* III, 2 nos. 2-58.
[233] The identity of the building is disputed: see Conze et al. (1880), 97-101, esp. 101; cf. Lehmann and Spittle (1982), 17, 19, with n. 45-46, Cole (1984b), 55.
[234] Dimitrova (2008), nos. 8 (=*IG* XII.8, 161), 24 (=*IG* XII.8 172), 41 (=*IG* XII.8 220), 48, 53, 62.

III. Conclusion

It emerges from the above that there existed a dense theoric network or networks criss-crossing the Greek world, conveying various kinds of first offerings to the gods with different frequency.[235] The dispatched *aparchai* in Part One are rather different in nature from those in Part Two: the bringing of *aparchai* by subject-colonies to the dominant city involves the extension of a traditional cult practice to (in most cases) a fixed religio-political obligation for political purposes.[236] As the dominant city stands in for the divinity as recipient, the *aparchai* pays homage to the recipient city as much as, and sometimes even more than, to the divine recipient. By contrast, the *aparchai* destined for Delos, Delphi and festival-holding cities are more representative of the traditional custom of spontaneously bringing gifts to the gods in distant sanctuaries. Though not free from political impetus and self-interested motivations (such as display and competition which may be said of all gifts to the gods), the precise motives underlying such missions are more difficult to pin down. In the cases of Delos and Delphi, the *aparchai* do not appear to have been prompted by specific benefits just received or by immediately perceived goals. They were probably sent in return for the divine services rendered by Pythian and Delian Apollo, such as the god's oracular advice, his role in directing colonizing expeditions,[237] and other benefits generally conferred to the cities. To apply the idea of the two kinds of debts proposed in Chapter Two, these *aparchai* were probably not intended to settle an 'occasional debt' incurred when a city fared well (such as when she made an unexpected profit or won a battle), but an 'original debt' to the god in his capacity as a giver of good things. More generally, the *aparchai* served as a means of maintaining a

[235] On theoric networks and network theories, see Rutherford (2009).
[236] With the exception of the *aparchai* from Priene and the *dekatai/akrothinion* from alleged Lindian colonies, which were sent voluntarily and not by compulsion.
[237] See Malkin (1987), Mari (1999).

healthy relation, and building up favour, with Apollo. Although the epigraphic evidence of such *aparchai* is rather late, the practice is likely to have dated from the Classical period or earlier.

In the Hellenistic period, the dispatch of *aparchai* to cities holding new Panhellenic festivals was probably an imitation of a pre-existing practice of sending *aparchai* to the traditional Panhellenic games; but there was the new element of interacting with and expressing goodwill for the city holding the festival. Such *theoriai* may be seen as belonging to part of the broader system of civic interaction in the Hellenistic world. They created a network of diplomacy among what Ma calls 'peer polities', which were 'structurally homologous, autonomous states of the same size, linked by networks of concrete and symbolic interaction' on a horizontal (as opposed to the traditional 'core-peripheral' or vertical) level.[238] If the *aparchai* sent to mother-cities in Part One reinforced the hierarchical relations between the recipient and the sender on a vertical axis, those sent to the festival-holding city in Part Two linked the cities on a horizontal level. For these cities, what was important was not so much the actual sum of the *aparche* but the acceptance and recognition of the games' status that it implied. At the same time failure or refusal to do so might be a deliberate statement.[239]

It may be no coincidence that the vast majority of the first offerings surveyed in this chapter (in both Parts One and Two) were *aparchai*: *dekatai* and *akrothinia* feature only in the Lindian Chronicle as military first offerings from Lindian 'colonies'. What, then, made *aparchai* particularly appropriate gifts when a city visited the gods and those in power? That they should be chosen (instead of *dora*,

[238] Ma (2003), 23. On festival *theoroi* as a form of peer polity interaction, see Ma (2003), esp. 12, 14.
[239] E.g. Dem. 19.128: outraged by the Macedonian treatment of the Phocians, Athens in 346 refused to send their ancestral *theoria* to the Pythian games.

mnema, anathemata etc.) on such occasions may be related to two aspects of *aparchai*. First, the implied dependence of the dedicator. In their role as founders or providers of good things, the mother-city or divinity had a claim to a portion of the goods and resources enjoyed by the dedicating city. *Aparchai* best exemplified the dedicator's dependence on, and debts to, the recipient: they duly gave back to the mother-city or deity some of the benefits that originated from them. Second, their emphasis on the recipient's precedence and honour. Although all gifts can be said to confer honour in one way or another, *aparchai*, because of the priority they gave to the recipient, had particular potential for emphasizing the *timai* and prestige of the cult or city in question. As they implicitly acknowledged the recipient as superior while recognizing the dedicators as dependent and subordinate, they provided a useful means by which to express and reinforce the hierarchical relation between the recipient and the sender, a fact that held true for both human-divine relations and colony-metropolis relations.[240] Yet such *charis* relations and symbolic significance were lacking in the *aparchai* dispatched to cities holding new Panhellenic festivals. In this context the word *aparche* was used with diminished connotations of a 'preliminary portion' and 'priority': it was a cash gift or a token offering given voluntarily as an expression of goodwill and cordiality between 'peer polities'. The varying ways and varying degrees of intensity by which first offerings tied the recipient and the dedicator together constitute one of the most interesting observations of this chapter.

[240] On religion as a system of rank and hierarchy, see Burkert (1996), ch. 4, 80-101.

Table 1: *A/eparchai*, *Dekatai* and *A/Epargmata* in Cult Finance

	Source	Date	Place	Cult of	People concerned	Contributions	Use of Contributions	Terms used
(a)	*IG* I^3 130	c. 432	Piraeus, Athens	Apollo Delios? Zeus Soter?	shipowners	1 dr.	building	*apa[rche], eparche*
(b)	*IG* I^3 136	c. 430? c. 413/2?	Piraeus, Athens	Bendis	--	--	[sacrifice]?	*eparche*
(c)	Petrakos (1997), no. 276 =*LSS* 35	c. 402-387	Oropus	Amphiaraus	[those who seek cure]	> 1 Boeotian dr.	--	*[eparche]*
(d)	*SEG* XVI 182	early 4th C	Athens	Aphrodite Ourania	maidens getting married	1 dr.	--	*aparche, proteleia*
(e)	Xen. *An*. 5.3.13	early 4th C	Scillus	Ephesian Artemis	tenants of sacred land	in kind?	sacrifice (*katathuein*), furnishing the temple	*dekate*
(f)	Petrakos (1997), no. 277 = RO 27	c. 386-374	Oropus	Amphiaraus	whoever intends to be cured	> 1.5 dr. (in any legal currency)	--	*eparche*
(g)	*CID* II 1, 3, 4 (=RO 45), 10, 11, 12, 23, 24; *BCH* (1938), 349	360s-330s	Delphi	Apollo	-- (cities and individuals)	varies (voluntary)	temple building	*eparchesthai*
(h)	*I.Priene* 362 =*LSAM* 39	mid-4th C	Thebes at Mycale	--	shepherds and goatherds	a kid and a lamb	sacrifice, banquet, perquisites of religious officials	*koupreion*
(i)	*IG* II^2 333.C.17-18	335/4	Athens	Athena Itone	--	--	adornment for the goddess	*aparche*
(j)	*LSS* 46 = *IG* XII.9 192	c. 308/7	Eretria	Dionysos	choruses (compulsory or not?)	--	--	*eparchesthai*
(k)	*IG* XII.3 436 = *LSCG* 134	4th C	Thera	Mother of the Gods	tenants of sacred land? (not explicitly mentioned)	twice-yearly sacrifice in kind	--	*epargmata*
(l)	*SEG* IV 187-188 = McCabe, *Halikarnassos* nos. 34, 36	4th/3rd C	Halikarnassos	Demeter Demosia (and ?)	--	--	--	*apargmata*
(m)	*Ath. Agora* 16, no. 160	early 3rd C	Piraeus, Athens	--	--	--	building?	*eparche, eparchesthai, epidosis, epididonai*
(n)	*IG* II^2 1215	early 3rd C	unidentified deme, Athens	--	office-holders	--	building, *anathema*	*eparche, eparchesthai*
(o)	*LSCG* 155	c. 300-250	Cos	Asclepius	--	--	--	*aρ[archai],[pelanoi]*
(p)	*LSCG* 88	c. 230?	Olbia	--	those who sacrifice	?	--	*aparchesthai*
(q)	*Chiron* (2001), no. 6	3rd or early 2nd C	Cos	Hermes Enagonios	contractors	--	--	*aparchesthai*
(r)	*Chiron* (2000), no. 1	c. 125-100	Cos	Aphrodite Pandamos and Pontia	those who sacrifice, freedmen, fishermen, shipowners	(i)sacrificers: different for different animals. (ii) shipowners, fisherman, freedmen: 5 dr.	(i) half for the priestess, half for constructions and repair of the sanctuary.	*aparche, aparchesthai*
(s)	*Chiron* (2001), no. 4A	1st C	Cos	Asclepius	those who sacrifice	same as (t) (i)	One-third for the priest, two-thirds for an *anathema*	*aparche*
(t)	*LSS* 72	1st C	Thasos	Theagenes	those who sacrifice	> 1 obol	*anathema* or *kataskeuasma*	*aparchesthai, eparchesthai*
(u)	Schuler (2007), 134.	Hellenistic	Patara, Lycia	--	those who sacrifice	in kind?	priestly perquisites	*aparche*
(v)	*LSCG* 86 = *IG* IX.1 654	late 2nd /early 3rdC A.D.	Ithaca	Artemis	tenants of sacred land	in kind?	sacrifice (*katathuein*), furnishing the temple	*dekate*

-- indicates that no information is available in the inscriptions; dr. = *drachma/ai*

Chapter VIII

A/eparchai and *Dekatai* in Cult Finance

The vast majority of the first offerings discussed in this study were dedications, and sometimes sacrificial offerings, given more or less voluntarily to the gods. In this chapter I consider the third and final context in which *aparchai*, *dekatai* and their synonyms appeared, namely in cult finance. The question of sacred finance in ancient Greece is a dark subject which awaits more systematic research on its own.[1] Here I shall focus only on various kinds of religious contributions termed *a/eparchai*, *dekatai* and *a/epargmata*. The word *dekate* was also used widely in secular taxations and customs duties; but non-religious payments will not be discussed here.[2] Two major types of religious payments may be identified:[3] i) cult fees payable for the use of cult utilities and services, and ii) obligatory contributions imposed on certain classes of individuals like a tax. Cult revenue also came from iii) voluntary donations and iv) sacred fines on certain offences.

Already in the fifth century we find the word *a*/*eparche* used in the sphere of religious finance, and examples abounded in the fourth century and the Hellenistic period. I have already treated the semantic aspect of the forms *a/eparchai* and *a/eparchesthai* in Chapter One. Here I shall discuss the actual practices, focusing on the types of payments, the individuals so obliged, and the cult uses to which the payments were put, though the semantic aspect will also be touched upon again.

---

[1] Existing discussions on cult finances are e.g. Andreades (1933), 190-3, Schlaifer (1940), 233-41, Sokolowski (1954), Linders (1992), Von Reden (2010), ch. 6. A recent unpublished dissertation by Pafford (2006), on 'cult fees and the ritual of money', has a chapter on *aparche*, but it explores primarily the administrative similarities between the Eleusinian *aparchai* in *IG* I^3 78 and other sacred laws (especially *IG* I^3 6) establishing coin fees; Pafford's section on '*aparche* as cult fee' is interested mainly in the 'ritualized nature' of the coined *aparchai*.

[2] On tithes as non-religious taxes, see e.g. *IG* I^3 52.A.6-7 (= ML 58.A.6-7), Xen. *Hell*. 1.1.22, *Ath. pol.* 16.4, Arist. [*Oec*.] 2.1346a31-b6, 1346b.31-32, 1351a.10-12, 1352b.28-32, Diog. Laert. I. 53. On public finance, see e.g. Boeckh (1828), Andreades (1933), Samons (2000), Bresson (2007-8), vol. 2, ch. 3, Rhodes et al. (forthcoming).

[3] A categorization following Sokolowski (1954).

Finally I shall discuss how these *a/eparchai*, *dekatai* and *a/epargmata* relate to, or differ from, the traditional first offerings. For ease of reference, I collect in a list at the end the epigraphic sources referred to in Parts One and Two.[4]

I. Cult Fees

It was a practice widely attested in different parts of the Greek world to charge a cult fee for certain activities in the sanctuaries, most notably for offering a sacrifice.[5] A third-century decree from Olbia **(p)** mentions a board of seven officials in charge of a *thesauros* into which were deposited the fees from those who sacrificed (*τοὶ θύοντες*);[6] the act of making such payments was termed *aparchesthai* (*τοὺς θύοντας ἀπάρχεσθαι [ε]ὶς τὸν θησαυρόν*).[7] The text ends with a list of figures for different animals: for an ox 1200, for an *ἱερεῖον*[8] and a goat 300, for [another animal] 60 (*βοὸς μὲν χιλίους διακοσίους, ἱερείου δὲ καὶ αἰγὸς τριακοσίους .έ[. .]ους*[9] *δὲ ἑξήκοντα*). These figures are so unusually high that it is unclear what they refer to.[10] To this we may compare a *diagrapha* regulating the sale of the priesthood of Aphrodite Pandamos and Pontia on Cos in the late second or

[4] See p. 301 Table 1.
[5] See also Lupu (2005), 59-60.
[6] On the ambiguity in the application of the word *θύειν*, in that it can be used both of the worshipper who brought an animal for sacrifice (*le sacrifiant*) and the officiating priest (*le sacrificateur*), see Parker (2009). In the context of the several sacred laws **(p, r, s, t, u)** in this chapter, the phrase *τοὶ θύοντες* refers to individuals who brought victims for sacrifice; I shall refer to them as *les sacrifiants* following the useful French distinction made by Hebert and Mauss (1964 [1898]) and used by Parker (2009).
[7] *LSCG* 88. On the forms and functions of *thesauroi*, see Rups (1986), Kaminski (1991), 63-181.
[8] An *ἱερεῖον* is most probably a sheep: Stengel (1920), 123, Sokolowski in *LSCG* 88, followed by Dubois (1996).
[9] *IosPE I²* , no. 76, suggests *[τ]έ[ρφ]ους*; Sokolowski in *LSCG* 88 did not provide a supplement but thought that it concerned the wool of the sheep, for which one had to pay a supplementary sum; Dubois (1996), no. 88, supplements *[δ]έ[λφ]ους*.
[10] Sokolowski (1954), 157, suggested that 'the charges are so high that they seem to be paid not only for the service and for the implements, but for the victims themselves'. But the prices are still too high for the victims on Sokolowski's view. Cf. Dubois (1996), no. 88, p.140-1: 'quelle que soit l'unité, ne peuvent que représenter le prix de chaque victime qui sera fournie aux sacrifiants par l'administration du sanctuaire, laquelle gérait donc un troupeau sacré'; but he does not explain what these sums are.

early first century B.C. **(r)**: one clause requires that 'all other people who sacrifice shall also make an offering into the *thesauros* for Aphrodite' (*ἀπαρχέσθων δὲ καὶ τοὶ λοιποὶ πάντες τοὶ θύοντες ἐς τὸν θησαυρὸν τᾶ[ι] Ἀφροδίται*): for cattle 2 *drachmai*, for other full-grown victims a *drachma*, for young animals three *obols*, for birds one *obol*.[11] Based perhaps on this text, the same amounts have been supplemented as the fees payable by the *sacrifiants* in another first-century Coan *diagrapha* for the cult of Asclepius **(s)**.[12] Although the sums of the *aparchai* vary according to the type of sacrificial animals, they do not appear to represent an implied percentage of the victims' value.[13] Unlike the Olbian and Coan cases, in Hellenistic Thasos the *aparchai* required was a flat rate: we learn from a first-century *lex sacra* for the cult of Theagenes **(t)**, already mentioned in the last chapter, that a minimum payment of one *obol*, presumably irrespective of the kind of animal sacrificed, was required of the people sacrificing to Theagenes. The *thesauros* was inscribed with this text: *τοὺς θύοντας τῷ Θεογένηι [Θα]σ[ίω]ι ἀπάρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν θησαυρὸν μὴ ἔλασσον ὀβολοῦ· τῶι δὲ μὴ ἀπαρξαμένωι καθότι προγέγραπται ἐνθυμιστὸν εἶναι* ('those who sacrifice to Theagenes of Thasos shall pay no less than an *obol* into the *thesauros*; he who fails to make the offering as prescribed shall have scruples').[14]

In all the above instances the *aparchai* required of the *sacrifiants* took the form of money deposited into a *thesauros*.[15] But we also have an example where payment

[11] Parker and Obbink (2000), no. 1.10-12 (tr. Parker and Obbink).
[12] Parker and Obbink (2001), no. 4A. The original construction of a *thesauros* at the Asclepieion and the collection of *aparchai* (and *pelanoi* by supplement) are mentioned in an earlier Coan inscription *LSCG* 155 **(o)** in the second half of the third century.
[13] It is unclear how much animals would cost in the first century B.C., but in fourth century Athens, the figures given by Rosivach (1994), 95-106, are, for an oxen 40-90 *drachmai*, an adult sheep 12-15 *drachmai*, a goat 10-12 *drachmai*, a swine 20-40 *drachmai*, a piglet 3 *drachmai*.
[14] *LSS* 72.A. See also Martin (1940-41), Chamoux (1979).
[15] On the effects of the adoption of coinage on religious activities, see Davies (2001b), Von Reden (2010), ch. 6.

appears to be made in kind and went directly to the priest: a newly published Hellenistic *lex sacra* from the city of Patara in Lycia **(u)** requires the *sacrifiants* to make an *aparche* from each animal to the priest: *τοὺς θύοντας | Διὶ Λαβραύνδωι | ἢ τῶν ἐντεμενίων θεῶν τινι | διδόναι τῶι ἱερεῖ ἀπαρχήν | ἀφ' ἑκάστου ἱερε<ί>ου πλάτα ἴσον* ('those who sacrifice to Zeus of Labraunda or to any of the gods in the precinct are to give to the priest an *aparche* from each victim *πλάτα ἴσον*').[16] What the phrase *πλάτα ἴσον* refers to remains obscure;[17] but the *aparche* here appears to be a portion of the sacrificial victim set aside as a priestly perquisite. I have already emphasized the unusual application of the noun *aparche* to a portion of sacrificial flesh, here given to the priest; this is not to be confused with the traditional preliminary portion (of hair and/or flesh) customarily set aside for the gods by the act of *aparchesthai* in an animal sacrifice.[18]

Payments of *a/eparchai* might also be required for healing. Two inscriptions **(c, f)** concerning the cult of Amphiaraus at Oropus prescribe a fee for those who came to be cured by the god.[19] The earlier and fragmentary document dated to c. 402-387 B.C., supplemented by Petropoulou based on the later text on the same cult, stipulates that those who sought treatment from the god 'shall pay an *eparche*, each one dropping into the offering box no less than a Boeotian *drachma*' (*[ἐπαρχὴν διδοῦν ἕκαστο]ν ἐμβάλλοντα εἰς τὸ[ν] [θησαυρὸν μὴ ἔλαττον δρα]χμῆς βοιωτίης*).[20] The later

[16] Engelmann ap. Schuler (2007), 134-5.
[17] The interpretation of Engelmann ap. Schuler (2007), 135, 'die glatte Fläche am Unterleib der Tiere', is far from certain.
[18] Discussed in Chapter One.
[19] Petrakos (1997), nos. 276 (= *LSS* 35), 277 (= RO 27); Petropoulou (1981), nos. 1-2.
[20] Petrakos (1997), no. 276 (= *LSS* 35); Petropoulou (1981), no. 1. Petrakos avoids supplements in line 4; I here cite the Greek text in Petropoulou. The text is non-stoichedon (as Petropoulou notes) and so it is uncertain how reliably it could be restored, though comparison with the other text **(f)** makes her restorations plausible. Cf. Sokolowski' supplements in *LSS* 35 without the word *eparche*: *[- - - - - τὸν*

text dated to c. 386-374 B.C. provides for an *eparche* in any legal currency (instead of Boeotian currency)[21] to be paid to the *neokoros* on the same occasion. It shows signs of erasure where the amount of the *eparche* was inscribed, and the sum of nine *obols* seems to have replaced one *drachma*, reflecting probably inflation towards the end of the fourth century B.C.:

> *ἐπαρχὴν δὲ διδοῦν τὸμ μέλλοντα θεραπεύεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ ἔλ<α>ττον [[ἐννέ' ὀβολοὺς δοκί]]μου ἀργυρίου καὶ ἐμβάλλειν εἰς τὸν θησαυρὸν παρεόντος τοῦ νεωκόρου [[----------c.19----------]]*[22]
> 'Whoever intends to be cured by the god shall pay an *eparche* of no less than nine *obols* of legal currency and drop it into the offering box in the presence of the *neokoros*.'

Unlike the traditional *aparche*, usually made in retrospect for benefits received, here the *eparche* was a payment required preliminary to treatment. This leads Petropoulou to explain an *eparche* as 'an offering made to obtain a god's favor, as distinct from *ἀπαρχή*, one made in thanks for a favor'.[23] This view is true of the *eparche* in the Oropus texts, where a healing fee was required before treatment, but not of all other *eparchai*. As we shall see below, some *eparchai* were not prompted by any immediately perceived goals of, or services required by, the individuals.[24]

II. Cult Taxes

Different from cult fees payable on certain cult activities are the *a/eparchai* and *dekatai* levied like taxes on certain groups of individuals. Known classes of people thus required include brides, traders, shipowners, office-holders, contractors,

---

ἑκάστοτ]ε ἐμβάλ[λ]οντα εἰς τὸ[ν] [θησαυρὸν - - - - μὴ ἔλαττον δρα]χμῆς βοιωτίης (lines 4-5).

[21] Petrakos (1997), nos. 277 (= RO 27). Petropoulou (1981), no. 2, 58-9, sees the specification of the Boeotian *drachma* as an indication of Boeotian influence at Oropus, and the change to any legal currency a result of the cessation of Boeotian monopoly over coinage with the Boeotian confederacy's dissolution. On the oscillation between Theban and Athenian control over Oropus and the political motives behind Athenian promotion of the cult of Amphiaraus, see Parker (1996), 146-9. On the sanctuary at Oropus, see Roesch (1984).

[22] Petrakos (1997), no. 277.20-24 (= RO 27.20-24). I quote the Greek text in RO 27.

[23] Petropoulou (1981), 53, following Colin in *FD* III.2 88, p. 100.

[24] E.g. voluntary contributions termed *eparchai* for the temple rebuilding at Delphi (see below).

freedmen, fishermen, shepherds and goatherds, and land-holders etc. A useful collection of other classes of individuals obliged to make similar payments (but not specifically *a/eparchai* or *dekatai*) is provided by Parker and Obbink and these will not be discussed here.[25]

In classical Athens maidens were expected to make a cult payment before marriage. A *thesauros* in the early fourth century discovered not far from the Athenian acropolis **(d)** is thus inscribed *θησαυρὸς ἀπαρχες ὁ̣ | Ἀφροδίτει Οὐρανίαι | προτέλεια γάμο* :⊦ ('offering box for *aparche*, the one for Aphrodite Ourania: a pre-marriage offering, one *drachma*').[26] The term *προτέλεια* refers to an offering made before any solemnity, such as before marriage-rites;[27] and here the word *aparche* is used as its equivalent, meaning a 'preliminary payment'. We do not know if every Athenian bride paid an *aparche* as a *proteleia*; but many probably did so to secure Aphrodite's blessings for their marriage life. Similar pre-marriage offerings (in cash or in kind) were also required in some other cities; but these were not termed *aparchai*.[28]

Very often cult taxes were levied on people in certain 'occupations' or status. *IG* I^3 130 dated to c. 432 B.C. **(a)**, concerning a cult at Piraeus,[29] requires shipowners

[25] See Parker and Obbink (2000), 428-9.
[26] *SEG* XL1, 182; Tsakos (1990-1), Kazamiakes (1990-1), Parker (1996), 196, Dillon (1999), 73.
[27] E.g. Aesch. *Ag*. 227, Eur. *IA* 718, *IG* I^3 5.2 (supplemented); Burkert (1983), 62-3, n. 20; LSJ s.v. *προτέλεια*.
[28] E.g. *LSCG* 175.4-5 (fees payable by *ταὶ τελεύμεναι* and *ταὶ ἐπινυμφευόμεναι*, probably those betrothed and those about to be married, to Demeter at Antimacheia at Cos, 4th century B.C.); *LSCG* 163.1-2 (sacrifice to Nike required by those who married in the shrine, 2nd-century Cos). On customary pre-marital rituals and sacrifices, see Dillon (1999), 71-4.
[29] Schlaifer (1940), 234, suggested Zeus Soter. Lewis (1960) suggested Apollo Delios; followed by Garland (1991), 110-1. Lewis' view is questioned by Mattingly (1990), 112-13 (= *SEG* XL 10), who proposes *τὸς δὲ λί[θος]* instead of *τὸς Δελί[ος]* in line 19, and who supposes Zeus Soter to be the god concerned here. However, both *τὸς Δελί̣[ος]* and *τὸς δὲ λί̣[θος]* are rejected by Matthaiou (2000-03) (= *SEG* LI 31) on the basis of autopsy, who reports that the letter following the *lambda* is not

who docked along Phaleron to pay a *drachma* each from the ship as an *aparche* or *eparche*.[30] Shipowners again feature in the above-mentioned Aphrodite *diagrapha* on Cos (c. 125-100) **(r)**: shipowners who sailed around the country and fishermen who fished out of the city were to pay five *drachmai* as an *aparche* annually per ship.[31] We have an earlier Coan *diagrapha* (c. 198 B.C.) requiring traders and shipowners who sailed out of Cos to make a sacrifice, but the word *aparche* is not used.[32] We therefore know that the payment, originally in kind, came to be replaced by a cash fee termed *aparche* over the course of the second century B.C. The later Coan *diagrapha* **(r)** also requires τοὶ ἐλευθερούμενοι to pay five *drachmai*, in addition to what was paid earlier,[33] as an *aparche* in the year in which they were freed.[34] These *aparchai* required of freedmen were different in character from first offerings made voluntarily by manumitted slaves in gratitude for and in commemoration of being freed.[35] Another Coan text, regulating the priesthood of Hermes Enagonios **(q)**, refers to an *aparche* payable to Hermes from τοὶ ἐργωνήσαντες, who were contractors for sacred or public work; but the text is broken on the edges where the sum would probably have been stated.[36]

At Athens deme officials might also be obliged to contribute *a/eparchai*: a third-century decree from an unidentified Attic deme **(n)** has a reference to an *eparche* levied on office-holders: 'the *eparche* which the demesmen offer, each of them from whatever office he obtains by lot, for the building of the temples/sanctuaries and the

---

an *iota*, but another *lambda*, so that line 19 should read τὸς δ′ ΕΛΛ[----------].

30 Both words are used interchangeably in this text: *IG* I^3 130.7 (*aparche*), 17-8 (*eparche*).

31 Parker and Obbink (2000), no. 1.27-29.

32 ED 178.21-24.

33 It is not stated what the earlier payments were.

34 Parker and Obbink (2000), no. 1.25-27. On parallels for religious payments imposed on the manumitted, see commentary in Parker and Obbink (2000), 441-2, with bibliography on p. 441 n. 104-5.

35 E.g. McCabe, *Chios Inscriptions*, no. 154 (discussed in Chapter Five).

36 Parker and Obbink (2001), no. 6.85-88.

dedications' (*τεῖ ἐπαρχεῖ ἣν ἐπάρχονται οἱ δημόται ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἕκαστος ἧς ἂν λάχει εἰς τὴν οἰκοδομίαν τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν ἀναθημάτων*).[37] Whitehead associates this levy with some financial crisis in the deme: it 'evidently suffered some calamitous damage to the fabric of its cult center: an extraordinary damage levy (*eparche*) was imposed on the deme's officials'.[38] From what we have seen above, however, the tax on deme officials was perhaps not so 'extraordinary': it was a normal practice of religious fund-raising for the maintenance of cults and shrines.

Instead of monetary payments, we have an example where offerings in kind were required of members of a pastoral community. A regulation from Thebes at Mycale in the mid-fourth century **(h)** requires goatherds (*οἱ τὰς αἶγας βόσκοντες*) to offer to Hermes a young goat from each of his own herd as a *κούρειον*,[39] and shepherds (*οἱ τὰς πρόβατα βόσκοντες*) a lamb from his flock if there were five new-born, along with offerings of cheeses, cakes and wine required of both.[40] The term *aparchai* is not used of the young animals; but the kid and the lamb, required as shearing offerings (*koureia*), may be thought of as *aparchai* of the proceeds from the wool collected at shearing time, though the scale on which the latter (the lamb) was made was unusually high for an *aparche*: one-fifth or twenty percent.[41] The phenomenon is

[37] *IG* II^2 1215. Based on the stone's find-place at Kypseli, Whitehead (1986), 379, postulates that the deme may be Erikeia.
[38] Whithead (1986), 112.
[39] Instead of its usual meaning of a sacrifice offered for the induction of boys into the phratry on the third day of the *Apatouria* called *Koureotis*, the word *koureion* here apparently denotes a shearing offering (of goats and sheep) in spring: see Labarbe (1953), 366-8 ('une victim "immolée à l'occasion de la tonte"'), Sokolowski in *LSAM* 39, p. 111, Parker (2005), 459 with n. 13, LSJ Supplement, s.v. *κούρειον*. I. b.
[40] *Inscr. Prien.* 362 = *LSAM* 39.
[41] Depending on how *εἰὰν πέντε τέκωσι* (*Inscr. Prien.* 362.19 = *LSCG* 39.18) is interpreted – 'one out of every five new-born' or 'if five (or more) are born' – the *aparche* from the lambs would be 20 percent or at most 20 percent respectively. Here I follow Sokolowski in *LSAM* 39 in understanding the former: 'one for every five'. That an *aparche* was proportional to the amount available is not unparalleled: *IG* I^3 78 requires 1/600th of barley and 1/1200th of wheat as *aparchai*. On the connection between the timing of sacrifices and that of the stock-rearing year, see Jameson (1988a), esp. 100-3.

very similar to what we are dealing with in this chapter: the offering of *aparche* was made compulsory and turned into a kind of tax. The element of coercion is possibly suggested by the reference to oaths sworn to the gods at the beginning of the text. The oaths' content is not preserved; but they probably bound the goatherds and shepherds to make the offerings prescribed here.[42]

Apart from pastoralists, tenants of sacred land were also among those required to make cult payments, using part of the produce.[43] According to the famous passage in Xenophon's *Anabasis* **(e)**, in the fourth century after establishing a sanctuary of Ephesian Artemis at Scillus near Olympia using the goddess' share of the *dekate* entrusted to him, Xenophon set up a law specifying that whoever held the land and enjoyed its fruits should *δεκάτην καταθύειν* every year, and that any surplus should be used for furnishing the temple:

> *ἱερὸς ὁ χῶρος τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος. τὸν ἔχοντα καὶ καρπούμενον τὴν μὲν δεκάτην καταθύειν ἑκάστου ἔτους. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ περιττοῦ τὸν ναὸν ἐπισκευάζειν. ἂν δὲ τις μὴ ποιῇ ταῦτα τῇ θεῷ μελήσει.*[44]
> 'The place is sacred to Artemis. He who holds it and enjoys its fruits must offer the tithe every year in sacrifice, and from the remainder must keep the temple in repair. If any one leaves these things undone, the goddess will look to it'.

Interestingly enough, a small marble plaque of the late second to early third century A.D., found in Ithaca **(v),** is inscribed with a *lex sacra* in exactly the same wording as the law in Xenophon's passage.[45] It is disputed whether this is a later copy of Xenophon's inscription or an ancient forgery or a law for another cult foundation.[46]

---

[42] Cf. Sokolowski in *LSAM* 39, p. 111: 'le serment garantissait que le nombre des têtes du bétail possédé était juste'.
[43] On leasing of sacred land, see Osborne (1988), esp. 281-304, Isager and Skydsgaard (1992), ch. 8, Von Reden (2010), 171-4.
[44] Xen. *An*. 5.3.13 (tr. Brownson).
[45] *LSCG* 86.
[46] Dittenberger in *IG* IX.1, 654, followed by Ziehen, *LGS* II 83, conjectured that it was a copy made by an admirer of Xenophon to be placed in a small temple of Artemis in the late second or early third century A.D., a period of revival of Classical literature. Cf. Michel ap. Cumont (1913), no. 124, p.

In both texts the word *dekate* retains its partial sense and most probably denotes a literal tenth of the proceeds from the sale of the agricultural produce, with which one was to offer a sacrifice. More generally, the leasing of sacred land was a way of generating sacred revenue;[47] and the land rent required could be in various proportions and was not necessarily a tenth. Thus in the fourth century, to finance sacrifices at the Little Panathenaia, sacred land in Nea was leased out for a rent of a fiftieth (*πεντηκοστὴ*), procuring an income of 41,000 *drachmai* for the festival.[48]

We may be dealing with a similar phenomenon in a fourth-century *lex sacra* in Thera **(k)**: a *temenos* appears to have been established by an individual called Archinos for the Mother of the Gods. On a marble stele which marks the boundary of the precinct is a law requiring the sacrifice of *ἐπάργματα* twice a year:

οὗροι γᾶς
Θεῶν Ματρί.
θεὸς ἀγαθᾶι τ-
ύχαι ἀγαθοῦ δ-
αίμονος. θυσία
Ἀρχίνου· τῶι ἔτ-
ει τῶι πρατίστ-
ωι θύσοντι βοῦ-
ν καὶ πυρῶν ἐγ
μεδίμνου καὶ
κριθᾶν ἐγ δύο μ-
εδίμνων καὶ οἴνο-
υ μετρητὰν και ἄλλα
ἐπάργματα ὧν αἱ ὧρ-
αι φέρουσιν, μηνὸς Ἀρτε-
μισίου πέμπται ἱσταμ-
ένου καὶ μηνὸς Ὑακινθίο-

143-4, who doubted the inscription's authenticity on the basis of its letters, which are mixed strangely with forms from different periods. Graindor (1922). 25-8, considered its authenticity indisputable: it was not uncommon to use different forms for the same letter in a single inscription in the imperial period (citing other examples).

[47] On the motives of the lessor and lessee of sacred land, see Osborne (1988), 281-304.

[48] RO 81.7-18.

> *υ πέμπται ἱσταμένου.*[49]
> 'Boundaries of the land of the Mother of the gods. God, with good fortune of good daimon. Sacrifice of Archinos: in the first year they will sacrifice an ox and of wheat from a *medimnos* and barley from two *medimnoi* and a measure of wine and other *epargmata* from what the seasons bring, on the fifth of the month Artemisios and of the month Hyakinthios'.

It is unclear whether the offerings were to include an ox and *ἐπάργματα* taken from various kinds of seasonal produce, or whether a sacrificial cake representing an ox was to be made from the prescribed portions of wheat, barley and other *ἐπάργματα*.[50] It is also curious that the text does not make explicit who was so obliged; but Ziehen and Sokolowski supposed very plausibly that it concerned tenants of the sacred land. And if so, it would be reminiscent of Xenophon's *lex sacra*. Also noteworthy here is the fact that, like the word *aparche*, the term *apargmata* has its prefix *apo* replaced by *epi* when used in sacred finance to signify 'religious contributions' or 'religious payments'.[51]

Religious Usages of *A/eparchai*, *Dekatai* and *A/epargmata*

Religious payments of *a/eparche*, *dekatai* and *a/epargmata* were frequently used to finance a sacrifice and a banquet. At Mycale **(h)** the young animals provided by the shepherds and goatherds were to support a sacrifice and a public banquet. In the above *lex sacra* in Thera **(k)**, depending on whether the offerings consisted of an ox and agricultural *epargmata* or a cake representing an ox, they would allow an animal sacrifice or the consumption of simple vegetarian food in the local community twice a year. In some cases *a/eparchai* were paid in cash and spent on a sacrifice: when the law in Xen. *An*. 5.3.13 **(e)** requires the tenants of the sacred land of Artemis to

[49] *IG* XII.3 436, *LSCG* 134, Ziehen, *LGS* II 128.
[50] Ziehen, *LGS* II 128, thought that a cake was meant, as two cows a year would be too expensive. On sacrificial cakes representing cows, see e.g. *LSCG* 25 (*ἕβδομοι βόες*), *LSS* 21, Kearns (1994), esp. 68.
[51] On *apargmata* as cult payments, see also *SEG* IV 187-8: two fragmentary inventory lists in Halikarnassos in the fourth/third century B.C. record offerings for various divinities *ἀπο τῶν ἀπαργμάτων* **(l)**; these *apargmata* apparently mean 'cult fees'.

δεκάτην καταθύειν, it most probably means a sacrifice supported by a tenth of the proceeds from the sale of the agricultural produce, performed in an annual festival in which men and women from the neighbouring places would take part.[52]

Sometimes the *a/eparchai* could go, partially or wholly, to religious officials. Where the *a/eparchai* were paid in cash in a *thesauros* **(d, f, o, p, r, s, t)**, the money collected might be used to support various cult activities, including remunerating religious functionaries. In the Asclepius *diagrapha* **(s)** on Cos, the *thesauros* was to be opened each year; the priest was to get a third of the *aparchai* collected from the *sacrifiants*; the other two-thirds was to pay for an *anathema* in the sanctuary.[53] Similarly the Aphrodite *diagrapha* **(r)** prescribes that half of the *aparchai* deposited in the *thesauros* by the *sacrifiants* should go to the priestess, whereas the other half should go to the public bank for the construction and repair of the sanctuary.[54] Where an animal sacrifice was performed, religious officials would often be entitled to certain sacrificial portions. Thus at Mycale **(h)** at the public banquet supported by the young animals contributed as *koureia*, the *eisagontes*, probably the priests and their assistants who led the animals to the altar,[55] were to receive specified portions of the *koureia* before the rest was distributed among the people. This is representative of the wider phenomenon that payments in kind were often prescribed in *leges sacrae* for the officiating priests (and other religious officials) at a sacrifice. Nevertheless, as was discussed in Chapter One, priestly prerequisites were normally termed ἱερεώσυνα, τραπεζώματα and γέρα, but not ἀ/ἐπαρχή.[56] The *lex sacra* in Patara in Lycia **(u)**

[52] Xen. *An*. 5.3.7-13; the festival is mentioned in 5.3.9. See similarly Plut. *Nic*. 3.6.
[53] Parker and Obbink (2001), no. 4A.13-16. See also Parker and Obbink (2000), 439, who give examples of the money collected in *thesauroi* being divided among religious and civic officials.
[54] Parker and Obbink (2000), no. 1.16-22.
[55] Following Sokolowski's interpretation in *LSAM* 39, p. 111.
[56] E.g. *IG* II^2 1356, 1359, 1363, *LSAM* 24A, *IG* V.1 1390, *IG* XII.7 237, *SEG* XXXV 113. On priestly

is unusual in this respect: apparently the priest was to receive a portion termed *aparche* as priestly dues from the *sacrifiants*. This is the only instance where the *aparche*, instead of a traditional 'first offering' for the gods or a 'religious payment' (for various purposes), went entirely to the priest alone so that the word signifies a 'priestly portion'.

More frequently the money collected would be used to provide *anathemata*,[57] furnish the temple,[58] or build a temple or a shrine.[59] For example, the *lex sacra* for the cult of Theagenes in Thasos **(t)** stipulates that the *aparchai* collected from the *sacrifiants* were to be given each year to the *hieromnemon*, who would keep it until 1000 *drachmai* were accumulated; then the *boule* and the demos were to decide on what *anathema* and *kataskeuma* the money should be spent.[60] A fragmentary fourth-century decree moved by Lycurgus has a reference to 'the adornments for Athena Itone from the *aparche* from the sacred precincts' (*τ]ῆι Ἀθηνᾶι τῆι Ἰτωνη[ι τοὺς κόσ]μους ἐκ τῆς ἀπαρχῆς τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν τε[μενῶν*) **(i)**.[61] At the beginning of the third century, office-holders in an unidentified deme in Attica **(n)** were required to pay an *eparche* 'for the building of the temples/sanctuaries and the dedications' (*εἰς τὴν οἰκοδομίαν τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν ἀναθημάτων*).[62] As we shall see below, temple re-building in Delphi formed the major occasion for the collection of contributions, albeit voluntary ones, called *eparchai* from private individuals and cities in different parts of the Greek world **(g)**.

---

prerogatives, see Gill (1974), 127-33, Le guen-Pollet (1991), Van Straten (1995), 154-5.
[57] E.g. *IG* II^2 1215 **(n)**, Parker and Obbink (2001), no. 4A **(s)**, *LSS* 72 A **(t)**.
[58] E.g. Xen. *An*. 3.5.13 **(e)**, *LSS* 72A **(t)**, *LSCG* 8 **(v)**.
[59] E.g. *IG* I^{3}130 **(a)**, *Ath. Agora* 16, no. 160 **(m)**, *IG* II^2 1215 **(n)**.
[60] *LSS* 72 A **(t)**.
[61] *IG* II^2 333.C.17-18. The word *temenos* could be used for the temple-precinct and for revenue-earning estates, which could be located at a great distance from the temple itself, as noted by Parker (1996), 145.
[62] *IG* II^2 1215.

III. Voluntary Religious Contributions

In 373/2 B.C. the temple of Apollo at Delphi was destroyed by fire and/or earthquake. This led to a fund-raising campaign, in which both individuals and cities were encouraged to contribute money for its reconstruction. From the epigraphic records of the funds for rebuilding administered by the *naopoioi* or 'temple builders' (*CID* II, nos. 1-30), we know that there were three sources of contributions: a compulsory levy of one *obol* per head (*ἐπικέφαλος ὀβολός*) on the population of members of the Amphictiony,[63] voluntary donations (*eparchai*) of non-Amphictionic cities and individuals, and a particular contribution imposed on the Delphians.[64] The contributions were listed on a stele, normally with the *ἐπικέφαλος ὀβολός* recorded first, followed by a list of cities and individuals paying *eparchai* under the formula *τάδε πόλεις καὶ ἰδιῶται ἐπάρξαντο ταύται τᾶι πυλαίαι* ('the cities and private individuals contributed *eparchai* as follows in this *Pylaia*'); and it would end with the total receipt received.[65] Instead of obligatory payments of a fixed sum, these *eparchai* were voluntary donations of varying amounts given by cities and individuals,[66] collected by officials called *argyrologoi*.[67] After the Third Sacred War (356-346 B.C), however, the *ἐπικέφαλος ὀβολός* was suspended,[68] and hence several inscriptions record *eparchai* only.[69] Thereafter it appears that contributions from both

[63] The 'first *obol'* was collected from spring 366 to spring 361 (the 1st to the 11th *Pylaiai*), the 'second *obol'* from spring 361 to autumn 356 (the 11th to the 22nd *Pylaiai*).
[64] Roux (1979), 73, 159-174, Davies (1998), 5, Sánchez (2001), esp. 125-32.
[65] E.g. *CID* II, nos. 1, 3, 4, 10 record receipts of both the *ἐπικέφαλος ὀβολός* and the *eparchai*.
[66] Cf. the fragmentary decree *Ath. Agora* 16, no. 160 **(m)**, which too mentions two kinds of religious contributions probably intended for some religious rebuilding (as indicated by the words *οἰκοδομία* and *λίθος*). The words *eparche/eparchesthai* and *epidosis/epididonai* appear together: the *epidosis* signifies a voluntary contribution, whereas the *eparche* most probably refers to an obligatory payment levied on some demesmen.
[67] *Argyrologoi*: e.g. *CID* II, no. 7 A. I.2-4, 10 A. I. 9-12, 11 A.3-6, 11 B.4-6, 12 II.12-13, 23.3-4, 24 I.11-14.
[68] Bousquet in *CID* II, nos. 11, 12, 23, 24; supported by Sánchez (2001), 131. Cf. Roux (1979), 158, 161 (now dismissed by Sánchez).
[69] E.g. *CID* II nos. 11, 12.

Amphictionic and non-Amphictionic cities were listed under the *eparchesthai* rubric.

The non-Amphictionic states known to have contributed *eparchai* are, for example, Stratos and Phoitiai (350 *drachmai*), Naxos (350 *drachmai*), Messene (70 *drachmai*), Naucratis in Egypt (350 *drachmai*), Phigalia (70 *drachmai*), Megalopolis (200 *drachmai*), Anaia in Ionia (126 Phocian *hectes*), Heraclea in Italy (100 Italian *nomoi*), Lacedaimon (510 Aeginetan *drachmai*).[70] These state delegations are more or less consistently indicated in the *naopoioi* accounts by a formula expressing the name of the city, the amount, the verb *ἤνικε/ἤνικαν*, and the state representative(s) who brought the money: an example is *Φοιτιεῖς καὶ Στράτιοι δραχμὰς τριακοσίας πεντήκοντα, ἤνικαν δὲ τὸ ἀργύριον Πυρροίτας Στράτιος, Δράκων Φοιτιεύς* ('the Phoitiaians and the Stratians 350 *drachmai*, Pyrroitas of Stratos (and) Drakon of Phoitiai brought the money').[71] Sometimes state delegates who brought an *eparche* on behalf of their city might also make a private donation in their own name. For example, Nikolochos, who brought an *eparche* for Megalopolis, also contributed a *drachma* himself: *Μεγαλοπολῖται ἐξ Ἀρκαδίας δραχμὰς διακοσίας· ἤνικεν Νικόλοχος Προξένου. Νικόλοχος Μεγαλοπολίτας δραχμάν* ('Megalopolitans from Arcadia 200 *drachmai*; Nikolochos son of Proxenos brought it. Nikolochos a Megalopolitan a *drachma*').[72]

[70] *CID* II no. 1 II.16-23 (Stratos and Phoitiai), no. 4 I.16-19 (Naxos), I.28-29 (Messene), I.37-39 (Naucratis), III.45-47 (Phigalia), III.50-53 (Megalopolis), no. 6 A.1-8 (Anaia), no. 6.B.2-9 (Heraclea in Italy), no. 24 I. 15-22 (Lacedaimon). To the information collected in Bousquet, *CID* II, p. 11, I add Lacedaimon. It is arguable whether the sum of 510 Aeginetan *drachmai* brought to Delphi as an *eparche* by the king Cleomenes in 336 B.C. represented a public or private donation, but the way it is recorded is in keeping with the formula used for *eparchai* contributed by cities; therefore a public donation seems to me to be more probable. The political motives behind the public contributions of Messene, Megalopolis and Phigalia have been conjectured by Davies (2001a), 219, Rutherford (2004), 110-111.

[71] *CID* II, no. 1 II.16-23.

[72] *CID* II no. 4.III.50-57.

Of particular interest are the *eparchai* from ordinary individuals. There were both male and female donors;[73] some of them appear in the list together with their children or other family members.[74] The geographical distribution of individual contributors is fairly widespread. The statistics collected by Davies, concerning the numbers (not value) of personal contribution in *CID* II nos. 1-30, indicate an inverse relationship between the distance from Delphi and the propensity to contribute: there were altogether 14 private donations from Thessaly, 18 from Central Greece, 104 from Ionia and the Aegean, 48 from the Peloponnese, and 34 from the outliers.[75] The value of private donations varies: most of them were a few *drachmai*, and they could be as little as one *obol*.[76] We also have two exceptionally large *eparchai* of 70 *drachmai* each from private individuals.[77] One of them was made by Theodorus, a famous Athenian tragic actor at the time; he might have been performing in Delphi and wanted to express his piety or make an impression by offering an *eparche* of his earnings.[78] The other 70 *drachmai* came from Timeas of Apollonia, whose identity remains unknown.[79] In 362/1 B.C., it appears that a family group from Karystos, comprising Klearistos and his three children, offered *eparchai*. The entry reads: *Ἀριστίς, Κλεαριστίς, Ἀριστοκλῆς ὀβολοὺς πέν|τε, Κλεάριστος Καρύστιος δραχμὰς δύο* ('Aristis, Klearistis and Aristokles five *obols*, Klearistos a Karystian

[73] E.g. six individual contributors in the well-preserved *CID* II no. 4 are women: Eurydika of Larisa, 2 *drachmai* (4 I.44), Aischylis of Selinous, 2 *drachmai* (4 I.46-7), Kleino of Phleious, 3 *obols* (4 I.49-50), Echenike of Phleious, 1.5 *obols* (4 I.51-2), Kleonika of Phleious, 1.5 *obols* (4 I.53-4), Philostratis of Lacedaimon, 3 *obols* (4 I.55-6). Davies (2001a), 220 with n. 55.
[74] E.g. *CID* II no. 1.II.26-30 (father and three sons).
[75] Davies (2001a), 220.
[76] E.g. *CID* II no. 4.III.13-14 (one *obol* from a Phocian called Anaxis).
[77] *CID* II no. 4.I. 67-69 (Theodorus), 76-77 (Timeas).
[78] On Theodorus, see e.g. Dem. 19.246, Arist. *Pol*. 7.1336 B.27-31, *Rhet*. 3.1404 B21-3, Plut. *Glor. Ath*. 348 E, Paus. 1.37.3, *IG* II^2 2325.262; *LGPN* II s.v. *Θεόδωρος* (31), *PAA* 506155.
[79] *CID* II, no. 4 I.76-77. Note that Timeas' *eparche* coincided with Apollonia's gift of grain recorded in the same inscription (II.1.22). Might he have been some Apollonian official who escorted its transport to Delphi?

two *drachmai*'). Klearistos contributed an *eparche* of 2 *drachmai*, while his children paid five *obols* together. Noting that Klearistos' father Aristokles, who was Lysander's admiral, had a statue in Delphi, some scholars think that Klearistos might have travelled with his children to Delphi to attend the Pythian games in 362 B.C. and to show them their grandfather's statue.[80] Nevertheless, not everyone whose name appears in the building accounts necessarily visited Delphi in person: we do not know the actual mechanism by which the donations were collected and reached Delphi. The status of the other private contributors and how they sent their *eparchai* are hard to determine. The *eparchai* of a few *obols* or *drachmai* were simply token offerings rather than 'first offerings', not dissimilar to the random sums one would insert into an offering box when one goes to church today.

IV. Sacred Fines

A further source of sacred revenue came from fines levied on certain offences. The available evidence comes mainly from Athens; and here I am only interested in sacred fines of the value of a *dekate*. In Classical Athens it appears to be a regular practice for a tenth of confiscated property to be paid into Athena's treasury; and this applied mainly to serious political offences. Shortly after the restoration of the Athenian democracy in 410/409, Demophantus carried a decree under which a tenth of the property confiscated from anyone who tried to overthrow the democracy would be paid to Athena: 'if anyone overthrows the democracy at Athens, or holds any office when the democracy has been overthrown, he shall be an enemy of the Athenians and shall be killed with impunity; and his property shall be confiscated and a tenth part of it devoted to the goddess' (*ἐάν τις δημοκρατίαν καταλύῃ τὴν Ἀθήνησιν, ἢ ἀρχήν τινα ἄρχῃ καταλελυμένης τῆς δημοκρατίας, πολέμιος ἔστω*[3] *Ἀθηναίων καὶ*

[80] Paus. 10.9.8, Bousquet in *CID* II no. 1.II.26-30, p.14, Rutherford (2004), 109.

νηποινεὶ τεθνάτω, καὶ τὰ χρήματα αὐτοῦ δημόσια ἔστω, καὶ τῆς θεοῦ τὸ ἐπιδέκατον).[81] In the foundation decree of the Second Athenian League in 378/7, it is stipulated that anyone who proposed contrary to the decree should be *ἄτιμος*, and his property made public, with a tenth going to Athena.[82] Similar provisions were made as punishments for other offences.[83] But where other cities were concerned, the recipient divinity may or may not have been Athena. Thus in Athens' settlement decree with Chalcis in 446/5, any Chalcidian citizens who failed to swear the oath of loyalty and obedience to Athens would be without rights, his property made public and Olympian Zeus (presumably in Chalcis) would receive a tithe.[84] In all these instances the word used for the tenth part for the deity was *ἐπιδέκατος*.

In these cases just cited the offenders had all their property confiscated, of which a tenth went to the divinity and the rest went to the state. The phenomenon is very similar to the military practice of setting aside a tenth of the spoils for the gods discussed in Chapter Six: both cases involve large-scale appropriation of property by the state; both concern the voluntary decision of the state to share the windfall with the divinities. It was in keeping with the customary practice of returning to the gods a share of whatever profit were received that tithes of confiscated property were offered. A similar division of profits between the gods and the city is seen in offences

[81] Andoc. 1.96-98 (tr. MacDowell). This law is (wrongly) said to be a law of Solon in Andoc. 1.95. On the decree of Demophantus, see Ostwald (1955), Rhodes (1981), 220-2, cf. MacDowell (1962), 135.
[82] *IG* II^2 43.51-57 = RO 22.51-57.
[83] E.g. *IG* II^2 125.10-14 = RO 69.10-14 (Athenian penalties for future attacks on Eretria or any other allied city of Athens or Athens' allies, 343 B.C.?); Xen. *Hell*. 1.7.10 (Athenian generals judged guilty after the battle of Arginusae in 406). Note also Ar. *Eq*. 300-2: Paphlagon threatens to report the Sausage-seller to the prytaneis for possessing 'sacred tripe belonging to the goddess on which no tithe has been paid' (tr. Sommerstein) (*καὶ φανῶ σε τοῖς πρυτάνεσιν ἀδεκατεύτους τῶν θεῶν ἱερὰς ἔχοντα κοιλίας*). The nature of the tithe in question is uncertain. Rogers (1910), 44, suggested that what is referred to is some kind of confiscated estate (represented by the 'sausages') for which a tithe was payable to Athena; cf. Sommerstein (1981), 159, who thinks that a tithe on war booty is meant. LSJ s.v. *ἀδεκάτευτος*: 'tithe-free'.
[84] *IG* I^3 40.33-36 = ML 52.33-36.

concerning olive trees, but no total confiscation is involved in this case: according to Demosthenes 43.71, anyone who dug up an olive tree except for certain purposes would be fined 100 *drachmai* for each tree. The sum would go into the public treasury, a tenth of which would belong to the goddess (*ὀφείλειν ἑκατὸν δραχμὰς τῷ δημοσίῳ τῆς ἐλάας ἑκάστης, τὸ δὲ ἐπιδέκατον τούτου τῆς θεοῦ εἶναι*).[85]

It is worth mentioning that some offences entailed fines of a fixed amount payable to the gods alone but not to the state.[86] On the other hand, there were also offences which incurred penalties that went completely to the state (and sometimes shared with the informer) but not the gods.[87] The question of how cities determined how much of the fine - all of it, a portion, or none at all – should belong to the god is hardly explained, though this is probably related to the nature of the crime and the amount of the fine.

V. Conclusion

Instead of the traditional 'first offerings', the *a/eparchai* examined in this chapter are 'fees', 'payments' or 'donations' for religious purposes. Rather than representing a portion of a greater source, they are usually fixed sums of money as far as cult fees and payments (but not donations) are concerned. The much diminished sense of a 'portion' is reflected in the replacement of the prefix *apo-* with *epi-* in the words *eparche* and *eparchesthai*, though the usual forms *aparche* and *aparchesthai* are also used in this context; and sometimes we find both forms used interchangeably in the

[85] Dem. 43.71.
[86] E.g. Dem. 24.22 (1000 *drachmai* to Athena from a *prytanis* who failed to convene the assembly, 40 *drachmai* from a *proedros* who failed to deliberate), Dem. 43.54 (1000 *drachmai* to Hera from an archon who failed to compel an heiress' next of kin to marry her himself or to give her in marriage), *IG* II^2 1237.22-26, 38-42 = RO 5.22-26, 38-42 (100 *drachmai* to Zeus Phratrios from a man introducing a rejected member to a phratry; 1000 *drachmai* to Zeus Phratrios from a rejected member of a phratry after a failed appeal).
[87] E.g. *IG* II^2 43.35-46 = RO 22.35-46 (half went to the informant, half became public), RO 80 (half went to the informer, half to the state).

same text.[88] We have thus moved a long way from *aparchai* as traditional first offerings made (usually) occasionally[89] using a portion of one's resources, to religious obligations of fixed sums performed at specified times or on specified occasions (with the exception of the donations for Delphi). Nevertheless, despite this change in meaning, the term *a/eparche* is used invariably with a religious significance, whereas *dekate* can denote payments in both the religious and non-religious spheres. The dual aspect of the word *dekate* can be illustrated well in a third/second century Cretan inscription containing regulations imposed by Gortyn on a dependent island Gaudos: it requires the people of Gaudos to pay *dekatai* (taxes) of various products to Gortyn, and *dekatai* (offerings) to Apollo Pythios from whatever washed ashore from the sea. Both the religious and non-religious payments are denoted by the word *dekatai* here.[90] Unlike *a/eparche*, the word *dekate* retains its partial sense when used in cult finance. The *dekate* of the land's produce and the *dekate* of confiscated property discussed in this chapter are likely to represent a literal tenth of the total profits.

The application of the word *a/eparche* to the sphere of sacred finance is an interesting phenomenon which deserves attention. In Andreades' rather dated study of Greek public finance, he identified the four key terms used for taxes or levies in Classical Greece as *φόρος*, *σύνταξις*, *τέλος*, and *εἰσφορα*, omitting *ἀ/ἐπαρχή*.[91] Other terms commonly used in cult finance are *προτέλεια*[92] and *πελανός*.[93] Thus

[88] E.g. *IG* I^3 130.7 (*aparche*), 18 (*eparche*); *IG* II^2 1672.182 (*eparche*), 263 (*eparche*), 288 (*eparche*), 297 (*aparche*).
[89] But some traditional first offerings, e.g. agricultural first-fruits (Chapter Three) and first offerings at meals (Chapter Four), were presumably offered regularly.
[90] *IC* iv 184 = Chaniotis (1996), 407, no. 69.A. On *dekatai* in secular taxation, see n. 2 above.
[91] Andreades (1933), 80-2; *aparche* is only mentioned on p.190 in the appendix.
[92] See n. 27.
[93] The word *πελανός* originally signified an edible substance, a cake, offered to the gods usually as an additional offering to a sacrifice. Since the late fifth-century or possibly earlier the word also denoted a

the woman in Herodas 4.90-1 inserts a coin into a money-box as a *πελανός*.[94] Very often no specific terms are used for cult fees at all. For example, a *lex sacra* in Erythrae in the fourth century, and another from Halicarnassus in the third, similarly require individuals to pay a cash fee on the occasion of offering a sacrifice; in both inscriptions the amount is simply stated without using any specific Greek terms.[95] In the late fifth-century, a Lindian decree requires those embarking on campaigns from Lindos to pay one-sixtieth of their wages (*τὰν ἑξ̣α̣[κοστ]ὰν [τõ] μισθõ*) to the military god Enyalios, but this is not referred to as an *a/eparche* either.[96] A comprehensive semantic analysis of the terms describing religious contributions is beyond the scope of this study. But the few cases cited here suffice to show that the word *a/eparche* is far from being systematically applied to religious payments, and that there is no general identifiable pattern of expressing cult payments in *leges sacrae*. The question therefore arises as to why *some* religious payments, but not others, should be called *a/eparchai*. One possibility is the transformation of previously voluntary 'first offerings' into required 'cult payments'. It may be observed that the persons so obliged to pay an *a/eparche* were very often the ones closely associated with, and particularly beholden to, the cult in question and hence most likely to make contributions.[97] Thus it might have been customary for Athenian maidens before marriage to bring an offering to Aphrodite Ourania in her role as a marriage deity. Traders, shipowners and fishermen might have originally offered part of their profits

---

money offering, used particularly for payment for oracular consultations and also other cult services. The word is used in this sense in e.g. RO 37.29-30 (= *LSS* 19.29-30), *CID* I 9 (= *LSS* 39), *LSCG* 155 B (supplemented) **(o)**. On *πελανός*, see Sokolowski (1954), 157, Amandry (1950), 86-103, Kaminski (1991), 71-2, Parker and Obbink (2000), 438, n. 89.

[94] Herod. 4.90-1. See the commentary by Cunningham (1971), 145: the collection-box has an effigy of the holy serpent on top; she is not offering a cake to the serpent.

[95] *LSAM* 24.13-20, *LSAM* 73.29-32.

[96] *LSS* 85. For more examples, see the useful collection of materials in Parker and Obbink (2000), 428-9.

[97] I owe this idea to the acute observation of Parker (1996), 125, Parker and Obbink (2000), 429.

as an *aparche* to Aphrodite Pontia, their protecting divinity at sea.[98] Shepherds and goatherds are likely to have traditionally honoured Hermes with offerings in his role as the protector of the herds.[99] A practice initially prescribed by custom probably came to be formalized over time, and the term was nevertheless retained. Seen thus, the phenomenon was not entirely divorced from the traditional cult practice, though admittedly we do not know if all of these cult fees and taxes had such a spontaneous origin, and not all payments examined in this chapter can be thus explained.[100] Ancient Egypt provides us with an interesting parallel of the transformation of a first offering customarily made in kind into a monetary payment: vine-growers used to offer a libation using a portion of the first wine obtained from the new grapes to Dionysus, the god of wine, as first-fruits. Evidence from papyri shows that, by at least the second century A.D. or earlier, the libation came to be replaced by a wine tax fixed almost always at eight *drachmai*; but the phrase *σπονδή Διονύσου* was nevertheless kept, with *sponde* meaning a 'payment'.[101] This is comparable to the Greek *pelanos*, originally a vegetarian offering, but later signifying a cult payment.[102] Whether or not a spontaneous origin can be traced for all the Greek *a/eparchai*, the extension or borrowing of a term charged with religious significance could emphasize the sacred character of the payment, and thereby made it more palatable to those expected or obliged to make it. In other words, the 'sacredness' of the word *aparche* may create a special aura for those making the contributions.[103]

---

[98] On Aphrodite's association with the sea, see Parker (2002), 146-52, Demetriou (2010).

[99] *Inscr. Prien.* 362.9 = *LSAM* 39.8 mentions *Ἑρμῆς Κτηνίτης* ('Hermes of Herds').

[100] E.g. *IG* II^2 1215 **(n)**, which obliged each office-holder to contribute an *eparche*. Unfortunately the divine recipient is not preserved, but the requirement seems to relate to the Hellenistic practice of linking public functions with financial obligations (cf. *IG* II^2 2336), rather than a codification of a previous close connection between office-holders and a particular deity.

[101] Eitrem (1937), Herrmann (1971), 140-2.

[102] See n. 93 above.

[103] I am grateful to Beate Dignas for this observation.

Another important feature which marked the *a/eparchai* and *dekatai* in this chapter as different from the traditional first offerings is their obligatory nature. I have emphasized in this study that, with the exception of a few special cases,[104] first offerings were free-will offerings prescribed by social custom rather than by law: usually no provisions were made to stipulate their offering, the amount to be offered, and when to offer them. However, apart from the voluntary *eparchai* for the temple rebuilding at Delphi, the *a/eparchai* and *dekatai* studied in this chapter were mostly obligatory payments of a specified amount, required of certain individuals as set out in the religious regulations. Even in the case of *eparchai* donated to Delphi, the donations were at least encouraged or sought in the fund-raising campaign, whereas normally first offerings were not called for by the gods or religious authorities. It was the element of compulsion (or appeal in Delphi's case) which marked these *a/eparchai* and *dekatai* as different. Different again is the nature of compulsion in the *dekatai* of sacred fines: while the individual offenders were obliged to pay, it was the voluntary decision of the city to give a tenth to the gods.

Nevertheless, despite the expectation that certain groups of individuals should pay, the questions of whether the regulations were necessarily observed and how often payments were enforceable are difficult to answer. Where an *a/eparche* was a necessary precondition for divine service, there would be less room for evasion. At the Amphiareium at Oropus, the fourth-century regulation seen earlier **(f)** requires that the *eparche* be paid before treatment could be sought. It further ensures payment by stipulating that the names of the incubant and his city should be recorded by the *neokoros* on a register as soon as he paid the money.[105] In some cases, a breach of the

[104] E.g. Eleusinian first-fruits (ML 73), Kian *aparchai* to Miletus (*Milet* I.3, no. 141), all of which are anomalies vis-à-vis the usual practice.
[105] Petrakos (1997), no. 277.39-43 = RO 27.39-43.

regulations would incur fines. The Aphrodite *diagrapha* on Cos **(r)** mentions penalties for those who failed to perform what was prescribed; and it was in the power of the priestess and the lessee (to whom the dues were leased out) to 'exact payment' (πράσσεσθαι) as if in fulfillment of a legal verdict.[106] Instead of fines, sometimes the consequence of non-payment was a bad conscience: in Theagenes' cult at Thasos any *sacrifiant* who failed to pay was to have an *enthumion* **(t)**,[107] whereas in the cult of Ephesian Artemis at Scillus **(e)** 'the goddess will see to it if anyone does not do these things' (ἂν δὲ τις μὴ ποιῇ ταῦτα τῇ θεῷ μελήσει).[108] The use of threats, and possibly even oaths,[109] in *leges sacrae* reflect a concern for, and an attempt to guard against, non-payment. In other cases where no provisions were made to ensure payments,[110] it remains unclear whether payments could be enforced.

It was for practical reasons that *a/eparchai* and *dekatai* were required or requested: they were intended to meet the financial needs of particular cults, some of which were newly established (such as that of Bendis **(b)**)[111] and local cults (such as at the deme Piraeus **(a, b, m)**) which probably lacked sufficient sources of funds otherwise. In the case of Delphi, the *eparchai* were intended to meet the emergency of a specific project, namely the reconstruction of the temple of Apollo. On Cos, such payments had the effect of increasing the income of the priests and therefore the value of the priesthoods.[112] More generally, these payments were necessitated by the need to generate sacred revenue for the upkeep of cult activities and the sacred

[106] Parker and Obbink (2000), no. 1.1-2, 13-16, 29-32, with commentary on p. 432-2, 444. For penalties on failure to pay sacrificial tariffs (not termed *a/eparchai*), see also *ED* 62 (= *LSCG* 161), ED 178 (a) (A) 24-26.
[107] *LSS* 72 **(t)**.
[108] Xen. *An*. 5.3.13 **(e)**; similarly in *LSCG* 86 **(v).**
[109] Possibly in *Inscr. Prien.* 362=*LSAM* 39 **(h)**.
[110] E.g. *SEG* XVI 182 **(d)**.
[111] *IG* I^3 136; but its date is uncertain. On the introduction of the Thracian cult of Bendis into Athens, see Garland (1991), 111-4, Parker (1996), 170-5, Archibald (1999).
[112] Parker and Obbink (2000), 426, n. 39, 428.

personnel.[113] We are presented here with the dual role of the gods as givers and takers: to what extent did the Greek gods depend on people's contributions? Were they benefactors or beneficiaries when seen in this light? Initially I said in Chapter Two that the honour conferred on the divinities was more important than the actual value of the *aparchai* or *dekatai*, and that the sustenance of the Greek gods did not depend on gifts from the mortals. And yet the *a/eparchai* and *dekatai* in this chapter evidently had a practical function in the financing and maintenance of the cults. This apparent contradiction can be resolved if we consider the religious contributions not as a mere payment, but as a means of paying *back* the gods for divine services enjoyed from their cult. Whereas the gods may appear to be the ones in need of funds in this chapter, these contributions do not invalidate the gods in their roles as *euergetai*, who deserved rewards for the benefactions they granted to individuals and cities. Thus fishermen and traders enjoyed Aphrodite Pontia's protection at sea; pastoralists benefitted from the favours of Hermes Ktenites; average individuals might need to seek cure from Amphiaraus. It is precisely because of past benefits received, and further benefits expected (such as blessings after marriage, healing, protection at sea, oracular advice from Delphic Apollo), from the gods that individuals were willing to contribute to the upkeep of their cults. Implicit in the payments is their recognition of the goods generally rendered by the gods, and their need for the continued existence and healthy functioning of their cults. These *a/eparchai* and *dekatai* therefore need not be seen as completely isolated from the traditional *aparchai*; they illustrate once again the relationship of mutual interdependence between the mortals and the divine.

[113] Cf. Pafford (2006), 93-4, 200, who argues that the imposition of coin fees deposited in a *thesauros* was driven not so much by a sanctuary's real economic needs, as by a desire to ritualize the otherwise mundane and impersonal nature of the coin.

Conclusion:

Gifts and Giving Back to the Gods

First offerings were not merely gifts to the gods; they were 'back payments'[1] which gave *back* to the gods some of the benefits received from the divinities in the first place. Whether it was a bountiful harvest, a simple meal in private households, regular income from one's labour, or captured spoils worth tens to hundreds of talents, worshippers and worshipping communities customarily returned a portion of the things they enjoyed to the gods. Although we cannot prove that each harvest, each meal, or each military victory was necessarily accompanied by a first offering, the overriding impression which the available evidence leaves is that it must have been fairly common.

I have emphasized throughout that with the exception of certain cult payments[2] and politically imposed *aparchai*,[3] first offerings were free-will offerings made over voluntarily to the gods. They were not obligatory in the sense that they were not regulated or requested by religious authorities or the gods themselves; everyone who felt moved to do so could offer a voluntary, variable proportion as they saw fit. Nevertheless, we have also seen that some first offerings display a quasi-obligatory nature: religious convention or tradition made it more or less a customary practice to set aside a preliminary portion for the gods in an animal sacrifice and in the division of spoils after a battle. In the vast majority of cases, however, especially where private individuals were concerned, the offering of *aparchai* and *dekatai* was a self-regulated

[1] I use the phrase 'back payment' here not in the technical sense of 'payment to cover a past period of time' (*OED* s.v. back II.3.a) or 'payment in arrears to make up for past under- or non-payment of wages.' (Heery and Noon (2008), s.v. back pay), but in the sense of a payment returning part of what was given.

[2] See Chapter Eight.

[3] E.g. *IG* I^3 78 (Eleusis first-fruits to Athens), *Milet* I.3, no. 141 (Kian *phialai* to Miletus), and possibly Thuc. 6.20 (*aparche* to Syracuse).

obligation in which the role of the individual worshipper was paramount: unlike the 'first-fruits' and tithes in Judaism and Christianity, which were laid down as a religious duty in the Scriptures,[4] for the Greeks the act of returning a portion was a personal act and the decision to return a part fell first and foremost to the individual worshipper; each situation was defined and interpreted by the individual himself regarding whether to make a first offering and, if so, how much to return and in what form. First offerings therefore illustrate the flexibility of Greek religion and the ample room it offered for worshippers to make choices and decisions. It is interesting that private individuals and communities at large engaged in similar practices with regard to making first offerings, though on very different scales. We do not know whether public practices influenced those at the private level or vice versa, but that each side was affected by a certain degree of mutual interaction seems certain.

As already discussed in Chapter Two, there existed a range of attitudes underlying the act of making first offerings to the gods. At one end of the spectrum, so to speak, was a feeling of honour for and obligation and gratitude to the gods, who were mankind's benefactors. Poised about midway was a 'neutral' state of conformity with social conventions and religious traditions, the safest course being perhaps to follow without deviation a longstanding custom practised by most people. At the other end of the spectrum was the fear of offending the divine powers and taking care not to damage a relationship with the gods, who were considered the sources of both goods and evils. Individuals and cities might have had several concurrent motives for making first offerings, or they might have had no specific motivation at all. The different strands of motivations are too closely intertwined to be separable. As anthropologists tell us, any distinction between 'sacred' and 'secular' motives breaks

[4] E.g. *Ex*. 23.16-19, *Lev*. 23.9-11, *Nu*. 18.12-13, 28.26.

down as no religious act is purely disinterested or purely manipulative.[5] It is not the aim of this study to provide a single explanation encompassing the whole phenomenon of making first offerings when there can be none. What I have endeavoured to show is the spectrum of different motivations, ranging from more 'religious' to more 'secular', that could be present in the same religious act, and the general trends or common features identifiable among them. Amid the diversity of possible reasons for returning a first portion to the gods, a central feature cannot escape us: first offerings were retrospective in nature, made almost invariably after some benefits were received. Unlike other gifts to the gods which might be made whenever the need to beseech the divine arose, *aparchai* and *dekatai* were almost always made in view of some benefits enjoyed recently or in the past. Thus we would expect a hard-pressed farmer praying for the fertility of his fields to make a sacrifice or other gifts but not a first offering. It is usually after a harvest that first-fruits would be presented to the gods. The impoverished weavers in *Anth. Pal.* 6. 288 who offered a *dekate* of their work praying for a change of fortune provide an exception to the rule.[6]

As 'back payments' to the gods, first offerings bear on the important issue in Greek religion of the nature of gift-giving between humans and the divine. The *charis* relations between men and gods have frequently been interpreted along the lines of *do ut des* ('I give so that you may give') and *da ut dem* ('give so that I may give') in modern scholarship.[7] While these formulae are certainly relevant, they cannot adequately encapsulate the human-divine *charis* relations expressed by first offerings.

---

[5] Bell (1997), 109.

[6] Gow-Page, *HE*, I, 120, II, 350-2, no. 41, *Anth. Pal.* 6. 288. This is attributed to Leonidas of Tarentum in the third century B.C. and was probably a literary exercise.

[7] E.g. Harrison (1903), Festugière (1976), *passim*, Burkert (1979), 54, Van Straten (1981), 73, Parker (1998), esp. 107-8, 111-14, Bremer (1998), 130-1, Satlow (2005), *passim*, Kearns (2010), 89-90. The idea is certainly present although some scholars do not use the formulae explicitly.

As far as '*do ut des*' is concerned, although many first offerings were doubtless given in the hope of further benefits, they did not normally initiate the cycle of *charis* between men and gods. For an *aparche* or a *dekate* to be made, some prior success or benefit was usually attained or obtained; and the worshipper might then use the opportunity of the first offering to ask for further favours. In other words, the hope of a pleasing return was a secondary rather than a primary motivating factor. On the other hand, the notion of '*da ut dem*' is not entirely appropriate either: some first offerings might have been vowed to the gods on the condition of a request being granted; yet the fact remains that the vast majority of first offerings do not mention a vow and cannot be demonstrated to have been made in fulfillment of one. Instead, first offerings embody first and foremost the idea of restoring to the gods part of what they gave men in the first place, or *do quia dedisti*. Individuals and communities that presented *aparchai* and *dekatai* to the gods doubtless felt beholden to the gods in one way or another for some assistance, protection or benefits that the divinities had bestowed. It was because of their role in providing (and withdrawing) these things that the gods had a claim to the goods available to mankind. First offerings returned in part and in symbol what was owed to the gods, and might be thought of as a means of settling a man's debt, albeit only partially, to the divine. Whether they were offered to the gods out of feelings of gratitude and indebtedness, a desire for ostentatious display and competition, in conformity with tradition, a fear of offending some divine power, or a mixture of all these, first offerings were almost always given in retrospect and in view of some benefits granted by the gods, with or without a vow to do so having been made. Whether great or small, 'piously' motivated or otherwise, first offerings should be understood as tangible proofs of the gods' benefactions and an act of recognition of the relationship of dependence on the divine.

A further notion which first offerings undermine is the definition suggested in Plato's *Euthyphro* that gift-giving constituted an *ἐμπορικὴ τέχνη* between men and gods.[8] As first offerings returned to the gods only a portion of the goods received according to one's means, they were partial payments that could not fully repay the gods for their benefactions. The unequal value of the gifts circulated between men and gods is made explicit in a passage in Aristotle:

> *οὕτω δὴ καὶ τοῖς ἀνίσοις ὁμιλητέον, καὶ τῷ εἰς χρήματα ὠφελουμένῳ ἢ εἰς ἀρετὴν τιμὴν ἀνταποδοτέον, ἀποδιδόντα τὰ ἐνδεχόμενα. τὸ δυνατὸν γὰρ ἡ φιλία ἐπιζητεῖ, οὐ τὸ κατ᾽ ἀξίαν: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐν πᾶσι, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς τιμαῖς καὶ τοὺς γονεῖς: οὐδεὶς γὰρ τὴν ἀξίαν ποτ᾽ ἂν ἀποδοίη, εἰς δύναμιν δὲ ὁ θεραπεύων ἐπιεικὴς εἶναι δοκεῖ.*[9]
> 'This then is also the way in which we should associate with unequals; one who receives a benefit in terms of money or virtue must pay back in return honour, paying back what is possible. Friendship seeks what is possible, not what is based on value. It is not possible (to return equal value) in all matters, as, for example, in the honours towards the gods and parents. For no one might ever pay back their value (the equivalent of what he gets), but the person serving to the limit of his means seems to be a decent man'.

It is the asymmetry in the *charis* relation and men's inability to pay back the gods sufficiently for the benefits received that renders the worshippers perpetually indebted to them. The reciprocal relations between humans and the divine involve favours of different scale and value and cannot be understood as a commercial exchange between men and gods (which supposes exchanges of equal value).[10] While the implicit or explicit hope of rewards from the divinities is doubtless present in many *aparchai* and *dekatai*, first offerings cannot be understood narrowly as an investment for further returns or a business deal between humans and the divine. They were more fundamentally recognitions that the gods were at work in this world, and that they

[8] Pl. *Euthphr*. 14C.
[9] Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 8.1163b13-18 (adapted from the translation in Mikalson (2010), 62).
[10] Also argued in Mikalson (2010), 39-42.

were responsible for the fortune of an individual or a community. The study of Greek piety should go beyond the traditional notions of *do ut des* and *da ut dem* to embrace the possibility that a psychological feeling of dependence and an inner move to give thanks to the gods might also have been involved.

If the Eleusinian Mysteries and Orphic rites were aimed at securing a better lot in the afterlife, first offerings may be considered as a means of securing one's well-being in this life by always returning something to the gods. *Aparchai* and *dekatai*, along with prayers, animal sacrifice, and oracular consultations, were part and parcel of the ways in which the Greeks communicated with the gods and cultivated their goodwill, given the unpredictability of divine operation. Amid the perpetual uncertainties and insecurities in life, first offerings probably satisfied men's psychological need for a safe anchor in life as much as, and perhaps even more than, their material needs for a pleasing return. Some anxiety, hope, and indebtedness was probably expressed by each of the *aparchai* and *dekatai* offered to the gods. They represent a felt obligation, an important recourse in the uncertainties of life, a means of thanks-giving, and a way of maintaining good relations with the gods. The practice has far outlived the ancient world; it has survived to the present day in many other religious cultures.

Approximate number of words: 100,000

Catalogue of Military First Offerings

The following list of military first offerings dedicated by Greek cities is not meant to be exhaustive. Under each sanctuary I list the dedicating city, object dedicated, its date, the sources, following by the dedicatory inscription (where available). Where the inscription does not survive or does not use the word *aparche*, *dekate* or *akrothinion*, I cite the literary passage which describes the object as such.

Amyklai

1. Sparta, bronze tripods with statues of three goddesses, date uncertain:
Paus. 3.18.7-8, 4.14.2.

τούτου τε οὖν ἐστιν εἰκὼν καὶ τρίποδες χαλκοῖ· τοὺς δὲ ἀρχαιοτέρους δεκάτην τοῦ πρὸς Μεσσηνίους πολέμου φασὶν εἶναι.

So there is the statue of this man; there are also bronze tripods. The older ones are said to be a tithe of the Messenian war. (Tr. Ormerod).

Athens

2. Athens, two bases of a bronze chariot, c. 506 (base A), c. 455-450 (base B):
IG I^3 501, ML 15, *DAA* nos. 168, 173, Hdt. 5.77, Paus. 1.28.2, 9.4.1, *Anth Pal*. 3.343.

A. *[δεσμῶι ἐν ἀχνύεντι σιδερέοι ἔσβεσαν hύβ]ριν*
παῖδε[ς Ἀθεναίον ἔργμασιν ἐμ πολέμο]
[ἔθνεα Βοιοτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδέον δαμάσαντες]
τῶν hίππος δ[εκάτεν Παλλάδι τάσδ' ἔθεσαν].

B. *[ἔθνεα Βοιοτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδέον δαμά]σαν[τες]*
[παῖδ]ες Ἀθεναίον ἔργμα[σιν ἐμ πολέμο]
[δεσμῶι ἐν ἀχνύεντι σιδερέοι ἔσβε]σαν [hύβριν]
[τ]ῶν hίππος δεκά̣τ̣[εν Παλλάδι τάσδ' ἔθεσαν].

A. [In dismal chains of iron they quelled their] pride,
the sons [of the Athenians, by deeds in battle,]
[when they crushed the people of Boeotia and of Chalcis,]
from whom (these) horses, as a t[ithe, they dedicated to Pallas (Athena).]

B. [When they] crushed [the people of Boeotia and of Chalcis,]
[the so]ns of the Athenians, by deeds [in battle,]
[in dismal chains of iron] quelled [their pride,]
from whom (these) horses, as a tithe, [they dedicated to Pallas (Athena).]
(Tr. Fornara).

3. Athens, a bronze statue of Athena Promachos, after 480:
IG I^3 505, *DAA* no. 172, Paus. 1.28.2, 9.4.1, Dem. 19.272.

a. *[— — — ἀν]έθε[σαν — — —]*

b. *[— — — ἐκ τ[ῶν — — —]*
*[— — —*de]deic[ated*— — —]*
*[— — —*from t[he*— — —]*

χωρὶς δὲ ἢ ὅσα κατέλεξα δύο μὲν Ἀθηναίοις εἰσὶ δεκάται πολεμήσασιν, ἄγαλμα Ἀθηνᾶς χαλκοῦν ἀπὸ Μήδων τῶν ἐς Μαραθῶνα ἀποβάντων τέχνη

Φειδίου
In addition to the works I have mentioned, there are two tithes dedicated by the Athenians after wars. There is first a bronze Athena, tithe from the Persians who landed at Marathon. It is the work of Pheidias... (Paus. 1.28.2, tr. Jones).

μέγεθος μὲν οὐ πολὺ δή τι ἀποδεῖ τῆς ἐν ἀκροπόλει χαλκῆς, ἣν καὶ αὐτὴν Ἀθηναῖοι τοῦ Μαραθῶνι ἀπαρχὴν ἀγῶνος ἀνέθηκαν.
In size it is but little smaller than the bronze Athena on the acropolis, the one which the Athenians also erected as first-fruits of the battle at Marathon. (Paus. 9.4.1, tr. Jones).

4. Athens and allies, a statue base, c.365/4:
IG II^2 2789.
[Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ] οἱ σύμμαχοι [ἀνέθεσαν τῶ]ι Ἀπόλλωνι [δεκάτην ἀπὸ τῶ]μ πολεμίων.
[The Athenians and] their allies [dedicated] to Apollo [a tithe from the]ir enemy.

Delphi

5. Cnidus, a treasury, c. 550-525:
FD III.1, no. 289, *Syll.*^{3} 8, Paus. 10.11.5, Salviat (1977).
[Κνίδιοι] τὸν θησαυρὸν τόνδε καὶ τἀγάλμα[τα Ἀπόλλωνι] Πυθίωι [ἀνέθεν] δεκάτ[αν ἀπὸ τῶμ πολεμί]ων.
[The Cnidians] dedicated this treasury and the *agalma*[*ta* to Apollo] Pythios as a tith[e from their enem]y.

6. Marseilles, statue of Apollo, war against Carthage, 6th or 5th century (?)
Paus. 10.18.7.
ὁ δὲ Ἀπόλλων ὁ ἐγγυτάτω τοῦ λέοντος Μασσαλιωτῶν ἐστιν ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς Καρχηδονίους ἀπαρχὴ ναυμαχίας.
The Apollo, very near to the lion, was dedicated by the Massiliots as firstfruits of their naval victory over the Carthaginians. (Tr. Jones).

7. Tarentum, statues of women and horses, c. 500-475:
FD III.1, nos. 129-130, Paus. 10.10.6-8.
[Μεσσαπίον Ἀπόλλονι Ταραντ]ῖνο[ι τάδ' ἑλ]όντες.
[Ταραντῖνοι Ἀπόλλωνι ἀπὸ Μεσσαπ]ίων [ἑλόντε]ς δεκάταν.
The Tarentines to Apollo having taken these things from the Messapians.
The Tarentines to Apollo, (as) a tithe, having taken from the Messapians.

8. Athens, a treasury, c. 490 (?):
FD III.2, no. 1, *IG* I^3 1463B, ML 19, Paus. 10.11.5.
Ἀθεναῖοι τ[ῶ]ι Ἀπόλλον[ι ἀπὸ Μέδ]ον ἀκ[ροθ]ίνια τες Μαραθ[ῶ]νι μ[άχες].
The Athenians to Apollo [from the Med]es as first offerings from the battle of Marathon.

9. Greek cities, a bronze statue of Apollo (?) holding the beak of a ship, c. 480:

Hdt. 8.121-2, Paus. 10.14.5
Πρῶτα μέν νυν τοῖσι θεοῖσι ἐξεῖλον ἀκροθίνια ἄλλα τε καὶ τριήρεας τρεῖς Φοινίσσας, τὴν μὲν ἐς Ἰσθμὸν ἀναθεῖναι, ἥ περ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν, τὴν δὲ ἐπὶ Σούνιον, τὴν δὲ τῷ Αἴαντι αὐτοῦ ἐς Σαλαμῖνα. Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο διεδάσαντο τὴν λείην καὶ τὰ ἀκροθίνια ἀπέπεμψαν ἐς Δελφούς, ἐκ τῶν ἐγένετο ἀνδριὰς ἔχων ἐν τῇ χειρὶ ἀκρωτήριον νεός, ἐὼν μέγαθος δυώδεκα πήχεων·
First they set aside victory-offerings for the gods, including three Phoenician triremes, one of which they dedicated at the Isthmus (where it remained till my day), and another at Sunium, while the third was dedicated on Salamis itself to Ajax. Then they divided up the spoils and sent their victory-offerings to Delphi, which paid for a statue, twelve cubits tall, with the beak of a ship in its hand. (Hdt. 8.121, tr. Waterfield).

10. Greek cities, a gold tripod resting on a bronze serpent column, c. 479-8:
Syll.[3] 31, ML 27, Hdt. 9.81, Thuc. 1.132.2, Dem. 59.97, Paus. 5.23.1.
Συμφορήσαντες δὲ τὰ χρήματα καὶ δεκάτην ἐξελόντες τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖσι θεῷ, ἀπ᾽ ἧς ὁ τρίπους ὁ χρύσεος ἀνετέθη ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ τρικαρήνου ὄφιος τοῦ χαλκέου ἐπεστεὼς ἄγχιστα τοῦ βωμοῦ.
Having gathered all the treasure, they set aside a tithe for the god of Delphi, from which was dedicated the gold tripod on the bronze three-headed serpent standing very close to the altar. (Hdt. 9.81, adapted from Waterfield's and Sélincourt's translation).

καὶ ὅτι ἐπὶ τὸν τρίποδά ποτε τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς, ὃν ἀνέθεσαν οἱ Ἕλληνες ἀπὸ τῶν Μήδων ἀκροθίνιον, ἠξίωσεν ἐπιγράψασθαι αὐτὸς ἰδίᾳ τὸ ἐλεγεῖον τόδε
...and that on the tripod at Delphi, which the Greek dedicated as a first offering from the Medes, he thought fit to be inscribed upon it, on his own authority, the following elegiac couplet (Thuc. 1.132.2, adapted from Smith's translation).

11. Macedon, a gold statue of Alexander I, c. 479:
Hdt. 8.140-2, 9.44-5, 8.121, Dem. 12.21.
Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ προγόνου πρώτου κατασχόντος τὸν τόπον, ὅθεν καὶ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων Μήδων ἀπαρχὴν ἀνδριάντα χρυσοῦν ἀνέστησεν εἰς Δελφούς.
It was my ancestor, Alexander, who first occupied the site, and, as the first-fruits of the Persian captives taken there, set up a golden statue at Delphi.
(Dem. 12.21, tr. Vince).

12. Thessaly, statue of a horse, second quarter of 5th century:
G. Daux, *BCH* 82 (1958), 329-34, Lazzarini (1976), no. 987.
Θεσσαλοὶ τὸν hίππον ἀνέθεν τοπόλλονι δεκάταν τõν ἀ[π]ὸ Ταναγ[ραίον], πολεμαρχεόντον τõνδε·
Ἀμύντα,
Ἀρχαγόρο
καὶ{σ}
Προτέας,
Εὐκρατίδας,
Μέννες,

hυβρίλαος,
Πολυδάμας.

The Thessalians (dedicated) this horse to Apollo as a tithe (of the spoils) from the Tanagraians,
when the following were *polemarchs*:
Amyntas
Archagoros
and
Proteas,
Eukratidas,
Mennes,
Hybrilaos,
Polydamas.

13. Tarentum, statues of footmen and horsemen, c. 470-60:
Syll.[3] 40, Paus. 10.13.10.
[Ταραντῖνοι ἀνέθεν δεκάταν ἑλόντες ἀπὸ] Πευκε[τίων].
[The Tarentians dedicated a tithe having taken from the] Peuke[tians].

14. Athens, statues representing Athena, Apollo, Miltiades and ten Athenian heroes, seven of which were eponymous heroes c.460:
Paus. 10.10.1-2, Bousquet (1942-3), 132-5.
τῷ βάθρῳ δὲ τῷ ὑπὸ τὸν ἵππον τὸν δούρειον [δὴ] ἐπίγραμμα μέν ἐστιν ἀπὸ δεκάτης τοῦ Μαραθωνίου ἔργου τεθῆναι τὰς εἰκόνας·
On the base below the wooden horse is an inscription which says that the statues were dedicated from a tithe of the spoils taken in the engagement at Marathon. (Tr. Jones).

15. Gortyn, a bronze statue, mid-5th century:
FD III.4, no. 456, *Syll.*[3] 49, Jeffery, *LSAG*[2], 211, 215 no. 17.
K[o]ρτύνιοι δεκάταν πολεμίον.
Gortynians (dedicated) a tithe from the enemy.

16. Caphyai (in Arcadia), a statue, second half of 5th century:
FD III.4 no. 191, *Syll.*[3] 48.
[Κα]φυιες̣ ἀ̣νέθεν [τὸ]πόλλονι δεκάτ[αν]ε̣λόντες τῶν [πο]λεμίον.
The Caphyans dedicated to Apollo a tithe having taken from their enemy.

17. Messenia and Naupactus, a pillar monument with shields and tripod, c. 426 (?):
FD III.4, nos. 1-2, *Syll.*[3] 81A,B, Thuc. 3.105-115; Bousquet (1961), 69-71, Jacquemin and Laroche (1982), 192-204, Jacquemin (1999), no. 362.
[Μεσ]σάνιο[ι καὶ Ναυπάκτιοι] ἀνέθ[εν δεκάτα-]
ν ἀπ]ὸ Καλ [. . . . . τ]ῶι Ἀπ[όλλωνι].
[The Mes]senia[ns and Naupactians] dedic[ated a tithe]
[from] Kal . . . . . to Ap[ollo]

να[....]ε̣νπη[.....]ι̣οπ[..]τος

[.... ἀν]εθ[.....]
[..... τ]ὴν δ[εκάτην(?). vac.]
(the last three lines are too fragmentary to be translated).

18. Argos, statue base for Trojan horse, c. 414 (?):
*FD*III.1, no. 573, p. 385 fig. 62, Thuc. 6.95; Pouilloux and Roux (1963), 62-5.
[Ἀργεῖοι τἀπόλλονι] ἀπὸ Λακεδαίμονος δεκάταν.
[The Argives to Apollo] (dedicated) a tithe from Lacedaemon.

19. Tegea, sails, c. 369-360:
Vatin (1981), 454-5, no.1, *SEG* XXXI 558.
τὰ ἱστία ἑλόντες Λ[α]κόνων Τεγεᾶτα[ι] Ἀρκάδες Ἀπόλ[λ]ων[ι] [δ]εκάτα[ν.
The Tegeans, Arcadians, (dedicated) a [t]ithe to Apol[l]o, having taken the sails of the L[a]conians.

20. Phocis, statues of Apollo, the seer Tellias and others, c. 355/3:
Syll.[3] 202B, Paus. 10.13.4,6,7.
Φωκε[ῖς ἀνέθ]ηκαν δ[εκάταν Ἀ]πόλλωνι [ἀπὸ Θεσσαλῶν].
The Phoci[ans dedi]cated a t[ithe to A]pollo [from the Thessalians].

21. Phocis, bronze statues, c. 325-275:
FD III.3, no. 150, *Syll.*[3] 203, Paus. 10.13.4,6,7.
[Φωκεῖς ἀνέθηκαν δεκάτ]αν
τῶι [Ἀπόλλωνι ἀπὸ Θεσσα]λῶν.
[The Phocians dedicated a tith]e to [Apollo from the Thessa]lians.

22. Unnamed city, a limestone base, c. 325-275:
FD III.4, no. 208.
δεκάταν ἀπ̣ὸ π̣[ολεμίων?]
σοι Ἀπόλλωνι ἀνέθ̣η̣[κα]ν̣.
(An unnamed city) dedi[cated] a tithe from the e[nemy?] to you Apollo.

23. Cnidus, bases for statues of Triopas, Leto, Apollo and Artemis, 4th century:
FD III.1, no. 137, Paus. 10.11.1.
Κνίδιοι τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι ἀπὸ τῶμ πολεμίων δεκάταν.
The Cnidians (dedicated) to Apollo a tithe from their enemy.

24. Lipara, marble base, fourth century:
FD III.4, no. 184; cf. *Syll.*[3] 14c, *CEG* 832.5-6.
[τᾶς δ′ ἐκ ν]αυμαχί[ας] δε[κάταν ἔστησα]ν ἑλ[όντες]
[ἐξὸς δου]λοσύνα[ς χ]ά[ριν εἰδότες Ἀπ]όλλ[ωνι]ι.
Taking a tithe from the naval battle they set it up in gratitude to Apollo, free from slavery.

25. Aetolia (?), limestone base, beginning of 3rd century:
Flacelière, *BCH* 54 (1930), 392-4, fig. 1

— — — Ἀπ]όλλω[νι] ἀπὸ τῶ[ν πολεμίων?]| δε[κ]άταν
— — — [to Ap]ollo a tithe from th[e enemy?].

26. Athens, figure-heads of ships and bronze shields, undated:
Paus. 10.11.6.
ἀνάκειται δὲ καὶ πλοίων τὰ ἄκρα κοσμήματα καὶ ἀσπίδες χαλκαῖ· τὸ δὲ ἐπίγραμμα τὸ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἀριθμεῖ τὰς πόλεις ἀφ᾽ ὧν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὰ ἀκροθίνια ἀπέστειλαν, τήν τε Ἠλείων καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων Σικυῶνά τε καὶ Μέγαρα καὶ Πελληνέας Ἀχαιῶν Ἀμβρακίαν τε καὶ Λευκάδα καὶ αὐτὴν Κόρινθον·
There are also dedicated the figure-heads of ships and bronze shields. The inscription on them enumerates the cities from which the Athenians sent first-fruits: Elis, Lacedaemon, Sicyon, Megara, Pellene in Achaia, Abracia, Leucas, and Corinth itself. (Tr. Jones).

27. Cnidus, object unknown, undated:
FD III.6, no. 60.
Κνίδιοι τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι ἀπὸ τῶμ πολεμίων δεκάταν.
The Cnidians (dedicated) to Apollo a tithe from their enemy.

28. Syracuse, an unknown object lost by shipwreck, undated:
Syll.[3] 35Bb.
τοὺς δ᾽ ἀπὸ Τυρρηνῶν ἀκροθίνια Φοίβῳ ἄγοντας
ἓν πέλαγος, μία νύξ, εἷς τάφος ἐκτέρισεν.
Those conveying first offerings from the Tyrrhenians to Phoibos
one sea, one night, one tomb has buried.

Lindos

29. Lindians who fought with Tlapolemos against Ilium, 9 shields, 9 daggers, 9 leather caps, 9 pairs of greaves, mythical:
Lindos II, no. 2 B. 56-59.
τοὶ μετ[ὰ Τλαπολέμου] εἰς Ἴλιον στρατευσάμενοι τ[ᾶι Ἀθάναι τᾶι]
Λινδίαι ἀκροθίνια τῶν ἐκ Τροί[ας.
The men making an expedition with Tlapolemos against Ilion to Athena the Lindian, first offerings of those (spoils) from Troy. (Adapted from Higbie's translation).

30. Merione son of Molos, silver quiver, mythical:
Lindos II, no. 2 B.79
[M]ηριόνης Μόλου υἱὸς ἀ[κρο]θίνια τῶν ἐκ Τροίας
Meriones the son of Molos, first offerings of those (spoils) from Troy.
(Adapted from Higbie's translation).

31. Lindians who colonized Cyrene, unspecified object of lotus wood, mythical:
Lindos II, no. 2 B. 113-16.
Λινδίων τοὶ μ[ε]τὰ τῶν Πάγκιος παίδων
Κυράναν κτίσαντες σὺν Βά[τ]τω[ι] Ἀθαναί-

αι καὶ Ἡρακλεῖ [δ]εκά[ταν ἀπὸ] λαίας ἂν ἔλ[α]-

βον ἀ[πὸ ....I....Σ..I]ων

Those of the Lindians who with the children of Pankis founded a colony on Cyrene with Battos to Athena and Herakles a tenth of the booty which they took from... (Tr. Higbie).

32. Akragas, statue of Athena, undated:
Lindos II, no. 2.C.57-8.
Ἀκραγαντ[ῖ]νοι τᾶ[ι] Ἀ[θά]ναι[τᾶι Λινδίαι ἀκρο]θίνιον ἐκ Μινώιας.
Akragant[i]nes to Athena [Lindia an *akro*]*thinion* from Minoa. (Adapted from Higbie's translation).

33. Gela, a great krater, undated:
Lindos II, no. 2.C.12-13
Γελῶιοι τᾶ[ι] Ἀθαναίαι τᾶι Πατρώιαι ἀκροθίνιον ἐξ Ἀριαίτου.
Geloians to Athena Patroia an *akrothinion* from Ariaitos. (Adapted from Higbie's translation)

34. Soloians, a *phiale* with a gorgon in the middle, embossed in gold, undated:
Lindos II, no. 2.C.76-8.
[Σολεῖς] Ἀθάναι Λινδί[αι] δεκάταν καὶ ἀπαρχὰν λαίας, ἂν ἔλα[βο]ν με-
τὰ Ἀμφ[ιλόχ]ου ἀπὸ ΜΕΤΑΒΛΥΡΕΩΝ καὶ ΣΠΕ..ΩΝ
[Soloians] to Athena Lindi[a] a *dekate* and an *aparche* of booty which they took together with Amph[iloch]us from... and... (Adapted from Higbie's translation).

35. Lindians, adornments of a statue (?), fourth or third century (?):
Lindos II, no. 2.C.80-3.
Λίνδιοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκ Κρήτας λαφύρων δεκάταν
τάν τε χρυσέαν στεφάναν καὶ τοὺς ὅρμους καὶ
τοῦ ἄλλου κόσμου, ὃν εἶχε τὸ ἄγαλμα, κατεσκευά-
ξαντο τὸν πλεῖστον.
The Lindians, as a tenth from the spoils from Crete
fashioned the golden circlet and the necklaces and most
of the other adornments, which the statues had.

36. Lindian naval officials and crews, marble bow of a war galley, c. 265-260:
Lindos II, no. 88.A.1-2.
[ἄρχοντες ἀφράκτων ναυαρχεῦντος — — — — τοῦ Ν]ικασύλου καὶ
τριηραρχεύντων Ἀγαθοστράτου τοῦ Πολυαράτου Γόργωνος τοῦ Ἀρχέλα καὶ
τοὶ σὺν [αὐτοῖς ποτὶ Τυρρανοὺς στρατευσάμενοι, οὓς καὶ ὁ δᾶ]μος
ἐστεφάνωσε πλεύσαντας ἐν ταῖς τριημιολίαις, ἀπαρχὰν ἀπὸ τῶν λαφύρων
Ἀθάναι Λινδίαι.
[the commanders of the undecked ships when — — — — son of N]ikasylos [was naval commander] when Agathostratos son of Polyaratos and Gorgon son of Archelas were trierarchs and those [who made an operation against the Tyrrhenians together with them, whom the peo]ple crowned when they sailed in the *triemioliai*, (dedicated)

an *aparche* from the booty to Lindian Athena.

Olympia

37. Unknown city, bronze greave, 6th century:
Kunze (1937-), VIII, 88, Lazzarini (1976), no. 704.
ἀϙροθίνια τῶ Διὸς τῶ Ὀλυπίο.
First offerings for Zeus Olympios.

38. Unknown city, a long thin tetragonal pole inscribed backward, 5th century:
Kunze (1937-), VIII, 89, Lazzarini (1976), no. 705.
τῶ Διὸς τῶ Ὀλυπίο hακροθίνιον τὸ πεδι[— —]
For Zeus Olympios a first offering [— —]

39. Apollonia, a statue of Zeus, c. 475-50:[11]
Paus. 5.22.3, Kunze (1937-), V, 149ff, *SEG* XV 251, Jeffery, *LSAG*^{2}, 221 no. 21, 229.
μνάματ' Ἀπολλονίας ἀ[νακείμεθα, τὰν ἐνὶ πόντοι]
[I]ονίοι Φοῖβος Ϝοίκι[σ' ἀκερσεκόμας],
[οἰ γ]ᾶ̣[ς τέ]ρ̣μ̣ᾰ̣θ̣' [ἑλόντες Ἀβαντίδος ἐνθάδε ταῦτα]
[ἔστασαν σὺν θεοῖς ἐκ Θρονίου δεκάταν].
We are set up as memorials of Apollonia, which on the
Ionian sea long-haired Phoibos founded,
After taking the boundaries of the land of Abantis, they set up here
these images with gods' help as a tithe from Thronium

40. Sparta and allies, a gold shield, c. 457:[12]
IvO 253, ML 36, Paus. 5.10.4.
[ναὸς μὲν φιάλαν χρυσέα]ν ἔχει, ἐγ δὲ [Τανάγρας]
[τοὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι συμ]μαχία τ' ἀν[έθεν]
[δῶρον ἀπ' Ἀργείων καὶ Ἀθα]ναίων καὶ [Ἰάνων]
[τὰν δεκάταν νίκας εἶν]εκα τοῦ πο[λέμου].
[— — — — — — — — —] Κορ[ίνθ]ι [— — —]
[— — — — — — — — —] P̣[— — — — — —]
[The temple] has [a gold shield] and from [Tanagra]
[the Lacedaemonians] and (their) alliance de[dicated] (it)
[as a gift from Argives, Athe]nians and [Ionians]
[the tithe] (due) because [of victory] in the war.
[— — — — — — — — —] Cor[inth]i[ans [— — —]
[— — — — — — — — —— — — — — —]. (Tr. Fornara).

41. Taranto, three similar inscriptions on spear heads, after 440:
IvO 254-6.
a. *σκῦλα ἀπὸ Θουρίων Ταραντῖνοι ἀνέθηκαν Διὶ Ὀλυμπίῳ δεκάταν.*
b. *σκῦλα ἀπὸ Θουρίων Τα[ραντῖν]οι ἀνέθηκαν Διὶ Ὀλυ[μπίῳ] δεκάταν.*
c. *σκῦλα ἀπὸ Θουρ̣[ί]ων Ταραντ̣[ῖ]νοι ἀνέθηκαν Διὶ Ὀλυμπίῳ δεκάταν.*

[11] The restoration is based on the inscription recorded in Paus. 5.22.3.
[12] The restoration is based on the inscription cited in Paus. 5.10.4.

The Tarantians dedicated spoils from the Thurians as a tithe to Zeus Olympios.

42. Messenia and Naupactus, statue of Nike in Parian marble, c. 423:
IG V.1 1568, *IvO* 259, ML 74, Thuc. 3.105-114, 4.9.1, 4.36.1, 4.41.2, Paus. 5.26.1.
Μεσσάνιοι καὶ Ναυπάκτιοι ἀνέθεν Διὶ Ὀλυμπίωι δεκάταν ἀπὸ τῶμ πολεμίων. Παιώνιος ἐποίησε Μενδαῖος καὶ τἀκροτήρια ποιῶν ἐπὶ τὸν ναὸν ἐνίκα.
The Messenians and Naupactians dedicated to Zeus Olympios a tithe from their enemy. Paionios of Mende made it and in making the *akroteria* on the temple he won. (Adapted from Fornara's translation).

43. Cleitor, a bronze base with a statue of Zeus, undated:
Paus. 5.23.7.
Κλειτόριοι τόδ' ἄγαλμα θεῷ δεκάταν ἀνέθηκαν,
πολλᾶν ἐκ πολίων χερσὶ βιασσάμενοι.
†καιμετρειτ† Ἀρίστων ἠδὲ Τελέστας
αὐτοκασίγνητοι καλὰ Λάκωνες ἔθεν.
The Cleitorians dedicated this image to the god as a tithe,
having reduced many cities by might of hand.
† †Ariston and Telestas made them beautifully
own brothers and Laconians. (Adapted from Jones' translation).

44. Mende, a statue with jumping weights and an inscription engraved on its thigh, undated:
Paus. 5.27.12.
Ζηνὶ θεῶν βασιλεῖ μ' ἀκροθίνιον ἐνθάδ' ἔθηκαν
Μενδαῖοι, Σίπτην χερσὶ βιασσάμενοι.
To Zeus, king of the gods, as first-fruits was I placed here
by the Mendeans, who reduced Sipte by might of hand. (Tr. Jones).

45. Thessaly, a statue of Zeus crowned with flowers and holding a thunderbolt, undated:
Paus. 5.24.1.
τὸ δὲ ἐπίγραμμα τὸ ἐπ'αὐτῷ δεκάτην ἀπὸ τοῦ πολέμου Φωκέων καὶ Θεσσαλῶν φησιν εἶναι.
The inscription on it says that it is a tithe from the war between Phocis and Thessaly. (Tr. Jones).

46. Myanians, a bronze-plated shield, a helmet and greaves, undated:
Paus. 6.19.4.
ἐπίγραμμα δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὅπλοις, ἀκροθίνιον τῷ Διὶ ὑπὸ Μυάνων ἀνατεθῆναι.
An inscription on the armour says that they were dedicated by the Myanians as first-fruits to Zeus. (Tr. Jones).

Bibliography

Ackerman, R (1975), 'Frazer and Myth and Ritual', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 36.1, 115-34.

— (1987), *J.G. Frazer: His Life and Work* (Cambridge).

— (1991), *The Myth and Ritual School* (New York; London).

Adkins, A.W.H. (1975), *Merit and Responsibility* (Chicago).

Alexiou, M. (2002), *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Lanham; Oxford), revised ed.

Alcock, S. (2002), *Archaeologies of the Greek Past* (Cambridge).

Amandry, P. (1950), *La mantique apollinienne à Delphes* (Paris).

Amyx, D.A. (1958), 'The Attic Stelai: Part III. Vases and Other Containers', *Hesperia* 27, 163-310.

Anderson, J.K. (1974), *Xenophon* (London).

Andreades, A.M. (1933), *A History of Greek Public Finance* (Cambridge, Mass).

Arafat, K. and Morgan, C. (1989), 'Pots and Potters in Athens and Corinth: a Review', *OJA* 8, 311-46.

Archibald, Z.H. (1999), 'Thracian Cult – from Practice to Belief', in G.R. Tsetskhladze (ed.), *Ancient Greeks West and East* (Leiden), 427-68.

Arlen, S. (1990), *The Cambridge Ritualists* (Metuchen, N.J.; London).

Asheri, D., A.B. Lloyd, and A. Corcella et al. (eds.) (2007). *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV* (Oxford).

Aune, D.E. (2003), 'Distinct Lexical Meanings of *Aparche* in Hellenism, Judaism and Early Christianity', in A.J. Malherbe, J.T. Fitzgerald, T.H. Olbricht, and L.M. White (eds.), *Early Christianity and Classical Culture* (Leiden), 103-29.

Austen. M.M. (1981), *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest* (Cambridge).

Austin, M. (1993), 'Alexander and the Macedonian Invasion of Asia: Aspects of the Historiography of War and Empire in Antiquity', in Rich and Shipley (eds.), 197-223.

Austin, M. (2008), 'The Greek in Libya' in Tsetskhladze (ed.) (2006-8), vol.2, 187-217.

Avram, A. (2004), 'The Propontic Coast of Asia Minor', in Hansen and Nielsen (2004), 974-99.

Aymard, A. (1957), 'Le partage des profits de la guerre dans les traités d'alliance antiques', *RH* 217, 233-249.

Bayet, J. (1926), *Les origines de l'Hercule romain* (Paris).

Beard, M (1992). 'Frazer, Leach, and Virgil: The Popularity (and unpopularity) of *The Golden Bough*', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 34, 203-24.

— (1991), 'The function of the written word in Roman religion', in M. Beard et al., *Literacy in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor, MI).

Beazley, J.D. (1927), 'Icarus', *JHS* 47, 222-33.

— (1929), 'Charions', *JHS* 49, 38-78.

— (1944), *Potter and Painter in Ancient Athens* (London).

— (1956), *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters* (Oxford).

— (1963), *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters* (Oxford), second edition, vols. 1-2.

— (1978), *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters* (New York), revised edition.

— (1989), *Beazley Addenda* (Oxford).

Bechtel, F. (1902), *Die Attischen Frauennamen nach ihrem Systeme dargestellt*

(Göttingen).
Beer, H. (1914), *Aparche und verwandte Ausdrücke in griechischen Weihinschriften*, diss. Würzburg.
Beer, M. (2009), *Taste or Taboo: Dietary Choices in Antiquity* (Totnes).
Bell, C. (1992), *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (Oxford).
— (1997), *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions* (Oxford).
Bérard, J. (1957), *La colonisation grecque de l'Italie méridionale et de la Sicile dans l'antiquité* (Paris).
Bernstein, P. L. (1996), *Against the Gods. The Remarkable Story of Risk* (New York; Chichester).
Berthiaume, G. (2005), 'L'aile ou les mêria : sur la nourriture carnée des dieux grecs'', in S. Georgoudi, R. K. Piettre, F. Schmidt (eds.), 241-250.
— (1982), *Les rôles du mágeiros* (Leiden).
Bettenworth, A. (2007), The Mutual Influence of Inscribed and Literary Epigram', in Bing and Bruss (eds.), 69-93.
Bielman, A (1994), *Retour à la liberté* (Lausanne).
Bilde, P. (ed.) (1993), *Centre and Periphery in the Hellenistic World* (Aarhus).
Bing, P. and Bruss, J.S. (eds.) (2007), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden)
Bingen, J. and A. Schachter (eds.) (1992), *Le Sanctuaire grec* (Vandœuvres-Geneva).
Bîrzescu, I. (2005), 'Les graffiti', in P. Alexandrescu et al. *Histria. Les Résultats des Fouilles.* VII (Bucuresti), 414-32.
Bissa, E.M.A (2009), *Governmental Intervention in Foreign Trade in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Leiden; Boston).
Bizard, L. (1920), 'Fouilles du Ptoïon (1903) II. Inscriptions', *BCH* 44, 227-62.
Blinkenburg, Chr. (1938), *Triemiolia. Étude sur un type de navire rhodien* (Kobenhavn).
Boardman, J. (1974), *Athenian Black-Figure Vases* (London).
— (1975a), 'Herakles, Peisistratos and Eleusis', *JHS* 95, 1-12.
— (1975b), *Athenian Red Figure Vases. The Archaic Period* (London).
— (1985), *Greek Sculpture: the Classical Period* (London).
— (1988), 'The trade figures', *OJA* 7, 371-3.
— (1998), *Early Greek Vase Painting* (London).
— (2001), *The History of Greek Vases* (London).
—, T. Mannack and C. Wagner et al. (2004), 'Dedications. Greek Dedications. II. Greek Votive Objects', in *ThesCRA* (Basel; Los Angeles), vol. 1, 281-318.
Bodel, J.P. and S.M. Olyan (2008), *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity* (Oxford).
Bodin, L. and J. de Romilly (1955), *Thucydides. La guerre du Péloponnèse*. *Livres VI et VII* (Paris).
Boeckh, A. (1828), *The Public Economy of Athens* (London).
Boedeker, D. (2008), 'Family Matters: Domestic Religion in Classical Greece', in Bodel and Olyan (eds.), 229-47.
Boer, W. den (1979), *Private Morality in Greece and Rome* (Leiden).
Boesch, P. (1908), *Theoros: Untersuchung zur Epangelie griechischer Feste* (Göttingen).
Bommelaer, J.-F. (1991), *Guide de Delphes. Le Site.* (Paris).
Bonnechere, P. (1994), *Le sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne* (Athens; Liège).

— (2009), ‘La sacrifice humain, entre norme et anormalité’, in P. Brulé (ed.), *La norme en matiere religieuse en Grèce ancienne* (Liège).
Bonner, R.J. and G. Smith (1943), ‘Administration of justice in the Delphic Amphictyony’, *CPh* 38, 1-12.
Borbein, A.H. (1962-), *Antike Plastik*. (Berlin), vols.1-29.
Bosworth, A.B. (1976), ‘The Congress Decree: another Hypothesis’, *Historia* 20, 600-16.
Bouchon, R. and I. Pernin (2005), ‘“La construction à Delos, les entreprises et leur financement”, compte rendu du séminaire organisé à Lyon, le 8 mars 2003’, *Topoi* 12/13, 827-840.
Bousquet, J. (1942-3), ‘Inscriptions de Delpes’, *BCH* 66-67, 124-36.
— (1961), ‘Inscriptions de Delpes’, *BCH* 85, 69-97.
— (1988), *Études sur les comptes de Delphes* (Paris).
Bowden, H. (2005), *Classical Athens and the Delphic Oracle* (Cambridge).
— (2009), Cults of Demeter Eleusinia and the Transmission of Religious Ideas’, in I. Malkin, C. Constantakopoulou, and Panagopoulou, K. (eds.) (2009), *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean* (London).
Bowie, A.M. (2007) (ed.), *Herodotus. Book VIII* (Cambridge).
Bravo, B. (1980), ‘Sulân. Représailles et justice privée contre des étrangers dans les cités grecques’, *ASNP* 10.3, 675-987.
— (1984), ‘Commerce et noblesse en Grèce archaïque. A propos d’un livre d’Alfonso Mele’, *DHA* 10, 99-160.
Bremer, J.M. (1998), ‘Reciprocity of Giving and Thanksgiving in Greek Worship’, in Gill, Postlethwaite and Seaford (eds.) (1998), 127-37.
Bremmer, J.N. (1983), ‘Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece’, *HSCP* 87 (1983), 299-320. Reprinted in Buxton (ed.) (2000), 271-93, and in J.N. Bremmer (2008), *Greek Religion and Culture* (Leiden, Boston), 169-214.
— (1994), *Greek Religion* (Oxford).
– (1998), ‘“Religion”, “ritual” and the Opposition “Sacred vs. Profane”’, in F. Graf (ed.), *Ansichten griechischer Rituale* (Stuttgart), 9-32.
— (2004), ‘The Spelling and Meaning of the Name *Megabyxos*’, *ZPE* 147, 9-10.
— (2008), ‘Priestly Personnel of the Ephesian Artemisium: Anatolian, Persian, Greek and Roman aspects’, in Dignas and Trampedach (eds.) (2008), 37-53.
Bresson, A. (2000), *La cité marchande* (Bordeaux).
— (2007-8), *L'économie de la Grèce des cités* (Paris), vols.1-2.
Brock, R. (1994), ‘The Labour of Women in Classical Athens’, *CQ* 44, 336-46.
Brouskare, N.S. (1974), *The Acropolis Museum* (Athens).
Bruit, L. (1990), ‘The Meal at the Hyakinthia’, in O. Murray (ed.) (1990), *Sympotica* (Oxford), 162-74.
Brulé, P. (1987), *La fille d’Athènes* (Paris).
— (ed.) (2009), *La norme en matiere religieuse en Grèce ancienne* (Liège).
Brumfield, A.C. (1981), *The Attic Festivals of Demeter and their Relations to the Agricultural Year* (Salem, N.H.).
Bruneau, P. (1970), *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale* (Paris).
Bucker, W.H. and D.M. Robinson (1932-), *Greek and Latin Inscriptions* (Leiden), vol. 8.
Burford, A. (1972), *Craftsmen in Greek and Roman Society* (London).

Burkert, W. (1966), ‘Greek Tragedy and Sacrificial Ritual’, *GRBS* 7, 87-121. Reprinted in W. Burkert, (2001), *Savage Energies* (Chicago) (Tr. P. Bing), 1-36.
— (1979), *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley; London).
— (1983), *Home Necans* (Berkeley, London). (Tr. P. Bing).
— (1985 [1977]), *Greek Religion. Archaic and Classical* (Oxford). (Tr. J. Raffan, orig. Stuttgart, 1977).
— (1987a), ‘Personal needs in this life and after death’, in Burkert (1987b), 13-29.
— (1987b), *Ancient Mystery Cults* (Cambridge, Mass; London).
— (1987c), ‘Offering in Perspective: Surrender, Distribution, Exchange’, in Linders and Nordquist (1987), 43-50.
— (1996a), ‘Escape and Offerings’, in Burkert (1996b), 34-55.
— (1996b), *Creation of the Sacred* (Cambridge, Mass; London).
Buxton, R. (ed.) (2000), *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion* (Oxford).
Calame, C. (1990), *Thésée et l’imaginaire athénien: légende et culte en Grèce antique* (Lausanne).
Callaway, J.S. (1950), *Sybaris* (Baltimore).
Cameron, A. (1993), *The Greek Anthology* (Oxford).
Carraro, F. ‘The “speaking objects” of Archaic Greece. Writing and speech in the first complete alphabetic documents’, in K. Lomas, R. Whitehouse and J. Wilkins (eds.), *Literacy and the State in the Ancient Mediterranean* (London), 65-75.
Casabona, J. (1966), *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec, des origines à la fin de l’époque classique* (Aix-en-Provence).
Cavanaugh, M.B. (1996), *Eleusis and Athens* (Atlanta).
Cawkwell, G.L. (1997), ‘The Peace between Athens and Persia’, *Phoenix* 51, 115-31.
Chamoux, F. (1979), ‘Le Monument de Théogenès: autel ou statue?’, *Thasiaca* (*BCH Suppl*. 5),143-53.
Chaniotis, A. (1996), *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit* (Stuttgart).
— (2005), *War in the Hellenistic World* (Malden, MA).
Chankowski, V. (2002), ‘I. A. Des archives enregistrant les biens du sanctuaire’, in C. Prêtre and M. Brunet et al., *Etudes Epigraphiques 4. Nouveau choix d’inscriptions de Délos. Lois, comptes et inventaires* (Athens), 241-3.
— (2008), *Athènes et Délos à l'époque classique* (Athens).
Chantraine, P. (1968-80), *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque* (Paris), vols.1-4.
Clark, G. (ed.) (2000), *On Abstinence from Killing Animals* (London).
Clarke, E.C., J.M. Dillion, and J.P. Hershbell (eds.) (2004), *Iamblichus. De Mysteriis* (Leiden; Boston).
Classen, J. (1895-1922), *Thukydides* (Berlin), vols. 1-8.
Clinton, K. (1974), *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Philadelphia).
— (1979), ‘The Eleusinia and the Eleusinians’, *AJP* 100, 1-12.
— (1980), ‘A law in the City Eleusinion concerning the Mysteries’, *Hesperia* 49, 258-88.
— (1989a), ‘The Eleusinian Mysteries. Roman initiates and benefactors, second century B.C. to A.D. 267’, *ANRW* 18, 1499-1539.
— (1989b), ‘Hadrian's contribution to the renaissance of Eleusis’, S. Walker and A. Cameron (eds.), *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire* (London), 56-68.

— (1992), *Myth and Cult*. *The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Stockholm).
— (2005-2008), *Eleusis, the Inscriptions on Stone* (Athens), vols. 1-2.
— (2009), 'Donors of *kernoi* at the Eleusinian sanctuary of the two goddesses', in C. Prête et al. *Le donateur, l'offrande et la déesse*. *Kernos Suppl*. 23 (Liège), 239-46.
— (2010), 'The Eleusinian *Aparche* in Practice: 329/8 B.C.', in I. Leventi and Ch. Mitsopoulou (eds.), *Sanctuaries and Cults of Demeter in the Ancient Greek World* (Volos), 1-15.
Cole, S. (1984a), 'The Social Function of Rituals of Maturation. The *koureion* and the *arkteia'*, *ZPE* 55, 233-44.
— (1984b), *Theoi Megaloi* (Leiden).
— (2008), 'Professionals, Volunteers, and Amateurs. Serving the Gods *kata ta patria*', in Dignas and Trampedach (eds.), 55-72.
Colin, G. (1905), *Le culte d'Apollon Pythien à Athènes* (Paris).
Connerton, P. (1989), *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge).
Connor, W.R. (1988), '"Sacred" and "Secular": *Ἱερὰ καὶ ὅσια* and the Classical Athenian Concept of the State', *Ancient Society* 19, 161-88.
Constantakopoulou, C. (2007), *Dance of the Islands* (Oxford).
Conze, A., A. Hauser, and O. Benndorf (1880), *Archäologische Untersuchungen auf Samothrake* I (Vienna).
Cook, P.A. (1930), 'The *Inqwala* Ceremony of the Swazis', *Bantu Studies* 4, no. 3, 205-10.
Cornford, F.M. (1913), 'The *ἀπαρχαί* and the Eleusinian Mysteries', in E.C. Quiggin (ed.), *Essays and Studies Presented to William Ridgeway on his Sixtieth Birthday* (Cambridge), 153-66.
Coughanowr, E.N. (ed.) (1990), *Herodoti Vita Homeri* (Villanova).
Crawley, R. (tr.) (1874), *The History of the Peloponnesian War* (London).
Croiset, A. (1886), *Θουκυδιδου ξυγγραφε* (Paris).
Cropp, M. (2000), *Euripides. Iphigenia in Tauris* (Warminster).
Csapo, E. (2005), *Theories of Mythology* (Malden, MA; Oxford).
Culley, G.R. (1972), *The Restoration of Sacred Monuments in Augustan Athens* (Chapel Hill).
Cumont, F. (1913), *Catalogue des Sculptures & Inscriptions Antiques* (Bruxelles).
Cunningham, I.C. (1971), *Herodas. Mimiambi* (Oxford).
—, A.D. Knox and J. Rusten (eds.) (1993), *Theophrastus. Characters. Herodas. Mimes. Cercidas and the Choliambic Poets* (Cambridge, Mass; London).
Curty, O. (1995), *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques* (Geneva).
Dale, A.M. (ed.) (1954), *Euripides. Alcestis* (Oxford).
D'Amore, L (2007), *Iscrizioni greche d'Italia: Reggio Calabria* (Rome).
Dasen, V. and M. Piérart (eds) (2005), *Ἰδίᾳ καὶ δημοσίᾳ. Les cadres 'prives' et 'publics' de la religion grecque antique. Kernos supp. 15* (Liège).
Daux. G. (1936), *Delphes au IIe et au Ier siècle* (Paris).
— (1939), 'Inscriptions de Delphes', *BCH* 63, 142-82.
— (1958), 'Dédicace thessalienne d'un cheval à Delphes', *BCH* 82, 329-34.
— (1967a), 'Théores et théarodoques', *REG* 80, 292-300.
— et al. (1967b), *Guide de Thasos* (Paris).
Davies, J.K. (1998), 'Finance, Administration, and *Realpolitik*: the case of

fourth-century Delphi', in G. Rickman et al., *Modus Operandi* (London), 1-14.
— (2001a), 'Rebuilding a Temple. The Economic of Piety', in D.J. Mattingly and J. Salmon (eds.), *Economies beyond Agriculture in the Classical World* (London), 209-29.
— (2001b), 'Temples, Credit, and the circulation of Money', in A. Meadow and K. Shipton (eds.) *Money and its Uses in the Ancient Greek World* (Oxford), 117-28.
Dawe, R.D. (1993), *The Odyssey. Translation and Analysis* (Lewes).
De Polignac, F. (2009), 'Sanctuaries and Festivals', in K. A. Raaflaub and H. van Wees (eds.), *A Companion to Archaic Greece* (Chichester, UK; Malden, MA), 427-43.
De Ste. Croix, G.E.M. (1954), 'The Character of the Athenian Empire', *Historia* 3, 1-41.
Demand, N. H. (1990), *Urban Relocation in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Bristol).
Demetriou, D. (2010), '*Τῆς πάσης ·αντιλίης φύλαξ*: Aphrodite and the Sea', *Kernos* 23, 67-89.
Denniston, J.D. (ed.) (1939), *Euripides. Electra* (Oxford).
Denoyelle, M. (ed.) (1992), *Euphronios Peintre* (Paris).
Depew, M. (1997), 'Reading Greek Prayers', *ClAnt* 16, 229-58.
Detienne, M. and J.-P. Vernant (eds.) (1989), *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks* (Chicago; London). (Tr. P. Wissing, orig. Paris, 1979).
Deubner, L. (1932), *Attische Feste* (Berlin).
Dickins, G. (1912-21), *Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum* (Cambridge), vols.1-2.
Dignas, B. (2002). *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor* (Oxford).
— and K. Trampedach (eds.) (2008), *Practitioners of the Divine* (Washington, DC).
Dijkstra, J., J. Kroesen and Y. Kuiper (eds.), *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity. Studies in the History of Religions in Honour of Jan. N. Bremmer* (Leiden).
Dillon, M. (1994), 'The Didactic Nature of the Epidaurian Iamata', *ZPE* 101, 239-60.
— (1997), *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece* (London).
— (1999), 'Post-nuptial Sacrifices on Kos (Segre, *ED* 178) and Ancient Greek Marriage Rites', *ZPE* 124, 63-80.
— (2001), *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion* (London; New York).
Dimartino, A. (2003), 'Omicidio, contaminazione, purificazione: il 'caso' della *lex sacra* di Selinunte', *ASNP* ser. 4 vol. 8, 305-349.
Dimitrova, N.M. (2008), *Theoroi and Initiates in Samothrace* (Princeton, N.J.).
Dinsmoor, W.B. (1913), 'Attic Building Accounts I. The Parthenon', *AJA* 17, 53-80.
— (1921), 'Attic Building Accounts', *AJA* 25, 118-29.
Dodd, D.B. and C.A. Faraone (eds.) (2003). *Initiation and Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives* (London; New York).
Dover, K.J. (1965), *Thucydides. Book VI* (Oxford).
— (ed.) (1971), *Theocritus. Select Poems* (London).
Dow, S. and R.F. Healey (1965), *A Sacred Calendar of Eleusis* (Cambridge, Mass; London).
Dubois, L. (1996), *Inscriptions grecques dialectales d'Olbia du Pont* (Geneva).
— (2003), '*La nouvelle loi sacrée de Sélinonte*', *CRAI*, 105-25.
Ducat, J. (1974), 'Les thèmes des récits de la foundation de Rhégion', in G. Daux et al. *Mélanges helléniques offerts à Georges Daux* (Paris), 93-114.
Ducrey, P. (1968), *Le traitement des prisonniers de guerre dans la Grèce antique*

(Paris).
Due, B (1989), *The Cyropaedia: Xenophon's Aims and Methods* (Copenhagen).
Dunbabin, T.J. (1948), *The Western Greeks* (Oxford).
Dunbar, N. (ed.) (1995), *Aristophanes. Birds* (Oxford).
Durkheim, É. (2001 [1912]), *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (Oxford). (Tr. C. Cosman).
Easterling, P.E. (ed.) (1982), *Trachiniae* (Cambridge).
Ebert, J. (1982), 'Zue Stiftungsurkunde der Leukophryena in Magnesia am Mäander', *Philologus* 126, 198-216.
Edelstein, E. J. and L. Edelstein (1945), *Asclepius: a Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies* (Baltimore).
Ehrhardt, N. (1983), *Milet und seine Kolonien* (Frankfurt; New York).
Eidinow, E. (2007), *Oracles, Curses, and Risk among the Ancient Greeks* (Oxford).
Eitrem, S. (1937), 'A Few Remarks on *σπονδή*, *θαλλός*, and other Extra Payments in Papyri', *Symbolae Osloenses* 17, 26-48.
Ekroth, G. (1999), *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-cults in the Archaic to the early Hellenistic Periods*. (Stockholm).
— (2009), 'Thighs or Tails? The Osteological Evidence', in P. Brulé (ed.), *La norme en matière religieuse en Grèce ancienne* (Liège), 124-49.
Elsner, J. and I. Rutherford (eds.) (2005), *Pilgrimage in the Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity: Seeing the Gods* (Oxford).
Fantasia, U. (1989), 'Finanze cittadine, liberalità privata e *sitos demosios*: Considerazioni su alcuni documenti epigrafici', in *Serta Historica Antiqua*, vol. 2, 47-84.
Faraone, C.A. (2003), 'Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis. Female Initiation or Substitute Sacrifice?', in Dodd and Faraone (eds.), 43-68.
— (2008), 'Household Religion in Ancient Greece', in Bodel and Olyan (eds.), 210-28.
Ferguson, W.S. (1909), 'Researches in Athenian and Delian Documents III', *Klio* 9, 304-30.
— (1911), *Hellenistic Athens* (London).
— (1932), *Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge).
Festugière, A.J. (1954), *Personal Religion among the Greeks* (Berkeley).
— (1976), '*Ἀνθ' Ὧν*', *RSPh* 60, 389-418.
Feyel, C. (2006), *Les artisans dans les sanctuaires grecs aux époques classiques et hellénistiques à travers la documentation financière en Grèce* (Athens).
Figueira, T.J. (2005), 'The imperial commercial tax and the finances of the Athenian hegemony', *IncidAntico* 3, 83-133.
Finley, M.I. (1981), *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece* (London).
Firth, R. (1967), *The Work of the Gods in Tikopia* (London, New York).
Fisher, N. (2009), 'The Culture of Competition', in K.A. Raaflaub and H. van Wees (eds), *A Companion to Archaic Greece* (Chichester, UK; Malden, MA), 524-41.
Flacelière, R. (1930), 'Inscriptions de Delphes', *BCH* 54, 392-403.
Flower, M.A. and J. Marincola (2002), *Herodotus: Histories. Book IX* (Cambridge).
— (2008), *The Seer in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley; London).
Follet, S. (1974), 'Deux vocables religieux rares attestés épigraphiquement', *RPhil* 48, 30-4.
— (1976), *Athènes au IIe et au IIIe siècle* (Paris).
Fontenrose, J.E (1978), *The Delphic Oracle* (Berkeley).

— (1988), *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult and Companions* (Berkeley; London).
Forde, F. (1949), 'Integrative Aspects of the Yako First Fruit Rituals', *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 79, 1-10. Reprinted in D. Forde (1964), 'First Fruits Rituals', in *Yakö Studies* (London), 234-53.
Forrest, W.G. (1963), 'The Inscriptions of South-East Chios, I', *ABSA* 58, 53-67.
Forsythe, G. (2005), *A Critical History of Early Rome* (Berkeley; London).
Fortenbaugh, W.W. et al. (1992), *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought, and Influence.* Part II (Leiden).
— (2003a), 'Theophrastus: Piety, Justice and Animals', in Fortenbaugh (2003b), 173-192.
— (2003b), *Theophrastean Studies* (Stuttgart).
—, P.M. Huby and A.A. Long (eds.) (1985), *Theophrastus of Eresus. On his Life and Work* (New Brunswick, U.S.A).
— and R.W. Sharples (eds.) (1988), *Theophrastean Studies. On Natural Science, Physics and Metaphysics, Ethics, Religion, and Rhetoric* (New Brunswick; Oxford).
Foxhall, L. (1995), 'Women's ritual and men's work in ancient Athens', in R. Hawley and B. Levick (eds.), *Women in Antiquity* (London), 97-110.
— (2005), 'Cultures, landscapes, and identities in the Mediterranean World', in I. Malkin (ed.), *Mediterranean Paradigms and Classical Antiquity*, 75-92.
— and H.A. Forbes (1982), 'Sitometreia: the Role of Grain as a Staple Food in Classical Antiquity', *Chiron* 12, 41-90.
Frazer, J.G. (1911-15), *The Golden Bough* (London), vols.1-12, 3rd ed.
— (1913), *Pausanias's Description of Greece* (London), vols. 1-6.
— (1922), *The Golden Bough* (London), abridged ed.
Friedländer, P. (1948), *Epigrammata. Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars* (Berkeley).
Furtwängler, A. (1885), *Beschreibung der Vasensammlung im Antiquarium* (Berlin).
Gabrielsen, V. (1997), *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes* (Aarhus).
Gantz, T. (1993), *Early Greek Myth* (Baltimore; London).
Gargola, D.J. (1992), 'Grain Distribution and the Revenue of the Temple of Hera on Samos', *Phoenix* 46, 12-28.
Garlan, Y. (1977) 'Le partage entre allies des defenses et des profits de guerre', in A. Chastagnol, C. Nicolet and H. van Effenterre (eds.), *Armées et fiscalité dans le monde antique* (Paris), 149-164.
Garland, R. (1991), *Introducing New Gods* (London).
Garnsey, P. (1988), *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World* (Cambridge).
— (1992), 'Yield of the Land', in B. Wells (ed.), *Agriculture in Ancient Greece* (Stockholm), 47-153.
— (1999), *Food and Society in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge).
— and C.R. Whittaker (eds.) (1983), T*rade and Famine in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge).
— and I. Morris (1989), 'Risk and the *polis*: the evolution of institutionalised responses to food supply problems in the ancient Greek state', in P. Halstead and J. O'Shea (eds.), *Bad Year Economics* (Cambridge), 98-105.
Garvie, A.F. (1994), *Odyssey. Books VI-VIII* (Cambridge).

Gauer, W. (1980), 'Das Athenerschatzhaus unde die marathonischen Akrothinia in Delphi', in B. Neutsch, F. Krinzinger et al., *Forschungen und Funde* (Innsbruck), 127-36.
Gauthier, P. (1972), *Symbola: les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques* (Nancy).
— (1976), *Un commentaire historique des Poroi de Xénophon* (Geneva).
Geagan, D. (1996),'Who was Athena?', in M. Dillon (ed.), *Religion in the Ancient World*. (Amsterdam), 145-64.
Geary, P. J. (2003), 'Gift Exchange and Social Science Modeling', in G. Algazi, V. Groebner and B. Jussen et al., *Negotiating the Gifts* (Göttingen), 129-40.
Gehrke, H.-J. (2001), 'Myth, History, and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (2001), 286-313.
Georgoudi, S., R. K. Piettre and F. Schmidt (eds.), *La cuisine et l'autel* (Turnhout).
Gera, D. L. (1993), *Xenophon's Cyropaedia* (Oxford).
Gifford. E.W. (1929), *Tongan Society. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 61* (Millwood, New York).
Gill, C., N. Postlethwaite and R. Seaford (eds.) (1998), *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece* (Oxford).
Gill, D.H. (1974), '*Trapezomata*: a Neglected Aspect of Greek Sacrifice', *HTR* 67, 117-37.
— (1991), *Greek Cult Tables* (New York).
— and S. Dow (1965), 'The Greek Cult Table', *AJA* 69, 103-14.
Gill, D.W.J. (2001), 'The Decision to build the Temple of Athena Nike (*IG* I^3 35)', *Historia* 50, 257-78.
— and M. Vickers (1990), 'Reflected glory: pottery and precious metal in classical Greece', *JDAI* 105 (1990), 1-30.
— and M. Vickers (1994), *Artful Craft: Ancient Greek Silverware and Pottery* (Oxford).
Giovannini, A (1990), 'Le tresor d'Athena et le tribut des Allies', *Historia* 39, 129-48.
— (1994), 'Greek Cities and the Greek Commonwealth', in A. Bulloch, E.S. Gruen et al., *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley), 265-95.
Gluckman, M. (1938), 'Social Aspects of First Fruit Ceremonies among the South-eastern Bantu', *Africa* 11, 25-41.
— (1954), *Rituals or Rebellion in South-east Africa. Frazer Lecture, 1952.* (Manchester). Reprinted in M. Gluckman, (1963), *Order and Rebellion in Tribal Africa* (London), 110-36.
Godelier, M. (1986), *Mental and the Material* (London). (Tr. M. Thom).
— (1999), *The Enigma of the Gift* (Cambridge). Tr. N. Scott).
Godley, A.D. (ed.) (1926-38), *Herodotus. Histories* (Cambridge, Mass; London).
Goldman, I. (1970), *Ancient Polynesian Society* (Chicago).
Gomme, A.W., A. Andrewes, and K.J. Dover (1945-81), *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford), vols. 1-5.
Goode, W.J. (1951), *Religion among the Primitives* (Glencoe, Ill).
Gorman, V.B. (2001), *Miletos, the Ornament of Ionia* (Ann Arbor).
Gould, J. (1985) 'On making sense of Greek religion', in P. Easterling and J.V. Muir (eds.) *Greek Religion and Society* (Cambridge), 1-33. Reprinted in J. Gould (2001), *Myth, Ritual Memory, and Exchange* (Oxford), 203-34.

Gow, A.S.F. (1940), 'The Seventh Idyll of Theocritus', *CQ* 34, 47-54.
— (ed.) (1950), *Theocritus* (Cambridge), vols. 1-2.
— (1960), 'The Gallus and the Lion', *JHS* 80, 88-93.
— and D.L. Page (1965), *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams* (Oxford), vols. 1-2.
— and D.L. Page (1968). *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip, and Some Contemporary Epigrams* (London).
Graef B., and E. Langlotz et al. (1925-33), *Die antiken Vasen von der Acropolis zu Athen* (Berlin), vols. 1-2.
Graf, F. (1979), 'Apollon Delphinios', *MusHelv* 36, 2-22.
— (2003), 'Initiation. A concept with a troubled history', in Dodd and Faraone (eds.), 3-24.
Graham, A.J. (1964a), 'ΟΙΚΗΙΟΙ ΠΕΡΙΝΘΙΟΙ', *JHS* 84, 73-5.
— (1964b), *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece* (Manchester).
— (1978), 'The Foundation of Thasos', *BSA* 78, 61-101. Reprinted in Graham (2001), 165-229.
— (1982), 'On the Great List of Theori at Thasos', *Ancient World* 5, 103-21. Reprinted in Graham (2001b), 231-56.
— (2000), 'Thasos: the Topography of the ancient City', *BSA* 95, 301-27.
— (2001a), 'Thasian Controversies', in Graham (2001b), 365-401.
— (2001b), *Collected Papers on Greek Colonization* (Leiden).
Graindor, P. (1922), *Marbres et textes antiques d'époque impériale* (Gand).
— (1934), *Athènes sous Hadrian* (Cairo).
Grandjean, Y. and F. Salviat (2000), *Guide de Thasos* (Athens).
Grene, D. (tr.) (1987), *Herodotus*. *The History* (Chicago, London).
Griffin, J. (1980), *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford).
Griffith, G.T. (1978), 'A note on Plutarch *Pericles* 17', *Historia* 27, 218-9.
Griffith, M. (ed.) (1999), *Sophocles. Antigone* (Cambridge).
Guarducci, M. (1956), 'Un'antica offerta alla Era di Samo', in *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni* (Milan), vol. 1, 23-7.
— (1968-69), 'II. La Dedica', *SMG* 9-10, 47-51.
Guillon, P (1962), 'Le décret Athénien relatif aux prémices d'Éleusis et la paix de Nicias', *BCH* 86, 467-75.
Haacke, C.F.F. (ed.) (1823), *Thucydidis de bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo* (London).
Hägg, R. (ed.) (1994), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence* (Stockholm; Jonsered)
—, N. Marinatos and G. Nordquist (1988), *Early Greek Cult Practice* (Gothenburg, Stockholm).
Halbwachs, M. (ed.) (1992), *On Collective Memory* (Chicage). (Tr. L.A. Coser, orig. Paris, 1968).
Halleran, M.R. (ed.) (1995), *Euripides. Hippolytus* (Warminster).
Halstead, P. and Jones, G. (1989), 'Agrarian Ecology in the Greek Islands: Time Stress, Scale and Risk', *JHS* 109, 41-55.
Hamilton, R. (2000), *Treasure Map. A Guide to the Delian Inventories* (Michigan).
Hammond-Tooke, W. D. (1953), 'The Function of annual first fruit ceremonies in Baca social structure', *African Studies* 12:2, 75-87.
Hands, A.R. (1968), *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome* (London).

Hansen, M.H. and T. H. Nielsen (2004), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford).
Hanson, V. D. (1983), *Warfare and Agriculture in Classical Greece* (Pisa).
— (1995), *The Other Greeks* (New York).
Harris, D. (1995), *The Treasures of the Parthenon and the Erechtheion* (Oxford).
Harrison, E.B. (1965), *Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture* (Princeton).
Harris, E.M. (1999) 'Notes on the new grain-tax law', *ZPE* 128, 269-72.
— (2001), 'Workshop, Marketplace and Household', in P. Cartledge, E. Cohen and L. Foxhall (eds.), *Money, Labour and Land* (London), 67-99.
Harrison, J.E. (1894), 'Athene Ergane', *CR* 8, 270-1.
— (1903), *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (Cambridge).
— (1912), *Themis. A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion* (Cambridge).
Harrison, T. (2000), *Divinity and History* (Oxford).
Hastings, J. (ed.) (1908-26), *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (Edinburgh), vols. 1-12.
Haussoullier, B. (1902), *Études sur l'histoire de Milet et du Didymeion* (Paris).
Heery, E. and M. Noon (2008), *A Dictionary of Human Resource Management* (Oxford).
Hellström, P. and B. Alroth (eds), *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World* (Uppsala).
Herda, A. (2006), *Der Apollo-Delphinios-Kult in Milet und die Neujahrsprozession nach Didyma* (Mainz am Rhein).
Herrmann, H.V. (1972), *Olympia: Heiligtum und Wettkampfstätte* (Munich).
Herrmann, J. (1971), '*Sponde* und *Spondai*', in *Studi in Onore di Edoardo Volterra* (Milan), vol. 3, 135-42.
Herrmann, K. (1972), 'Der Pfeiler der Paionios-Nike in Olympia', *JDAI* 87, 232-57.
Herrmann, P. (1965), 'Antiochos der Grosse und Teos', *Anadolu* 9, 29-160.
Herzog, R. (1928), *Heilige Gesetze von Kos* (Berlin).
Heubeck, A., S. West and J.B. Hainsworth (1988), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford), vol. 1.
—, and A. Hoekstra (1989), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford), vol. 2
—, J. Russo and M. Fernández-Galiano (1992), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford), vol. 3.
Hewitt, J.W. (1912), 'On the Development of the Thank-Offering among the Greeks', *TAPA* 43, 95-111.
— (1914), 'The Thank-Offering and Greek Religious Thought', *TAPA* 45, 77-90.
— (1917), 'Some Aspects of the Treatment of Ingratitude in Greek and English Literature', *TAPA* 48, 37-48.
— (1927), 'The Terminology of "Gratitude" in Greek', *CP* 2, 142-61.
Higbie, C. (2001), 'Homeric Athena in the Chronicle of Lindos', in S. Deacy and A. Villing (eds.), *Athena in the Classical World* (Leiden).
— (2003), *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of the Past* (Oxford).
Hobbes, T. (tr.) (1723), *The History of the Grecian War* (London).
Hobsbawn, E. and T. Ranger (1983), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge).
Hodkinson, S. (2000), *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta* (London).
Holloway, R.R. (1992), 'Why *Korai*?', *OJA* 11, 267-74.
Holtzmann, B. (2003), *L'Acropole d'Athène: monuments, cultes et histoire du sanctuaire d'Athèna Polias* (Paris).

Homolle, T. (1895), 'Inscripitions de Delphes. Règlements de la phratrie des Labyadai', *BCH* 19, 5-69
Horden P. and N. Purcell (2000), *The Corrupting Sea* (Oxford).
Hornblower, S. (1982), *Mausolus* (Oxford).
— (1991-2008), *A Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford), vols. 1-3.
— (1992), 'The Religious Dimension to the Peloponnesian War', *HSCP* 94, 169-97.
— and C. Morgan (eds.)(2007), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals* (Oxford).
How, W.W. and J. Wells (eds.) (1928), *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford), vols.1-2
Hubert, H. and M. Mauss (1964 [1898]), *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Functions* (Chicago). (Tr. W.D. Halls, orig. Paris 1898).
Humphrey, C. and J. Laidlaw (1994), *The Archetypal Actions of Ritual* (Oxford).
Humphrey, J. W., J. P. Oleson., and A. W. Sherwood (1998), *Greek and Roman Technology: a Sourcebook* (London).
Hunter, R. (ed.) (1999), *Theocritus. A Selection* (Cambridge).
Imbs, P. (ed.) (1971-94), *Trésor de la langue française* (Paris).
Immerwahr, H.R. (1990), *Attic Script* (Oxford).
Isager, S. and J.E. Skydsgaard (1991), *Ancient Greek Agriculture* (London).
Jaccottet, A.-F. (1990), 'Le Lierre de la Liberté', *ZPE* 80, 150-6.
Jackson, A.H. (1991), 'Hoplites and the Gods' in V.D. Hanson (ed.), *Hoplites: the Classical Greek Battle Experience* (London).
— (1992), 'Arms and armous at the Panhellenic sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia', in W. Coulson and H. Kyrieleis (eds.), *Proceedings of an International Symposium on the Olympic Games* (Athens), 141-3.
Jacobs, A. (1893), *Thasiaca* (Berlin).
Jacquemin, A. (1995), 'Ordre des termes des dédicaces delphiques', *Annali di archeologia e storia antica* 2, 141-57.
— (1999), *Offrandes monumentales à Delphes* (Athens).
— (2000), *Guerre et religion dans le monde grec* (Liège).
— and D. Laroche (1982), 'Notes sur trois piliers delphiques', *BCH* 106, 191-218.
Jameson, M.H (1949), *Offerings at Meals. Its Place in Greek Sacrifice* (diss., University of Chicago).
— (1951), 'The Hero Echetlaeus', *TAPA* 82, 49-61.
— (1972), 'Reviews. Russell Meiggs and David Lewis. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the fifth century B.C.*', *AJP* 93, 474-80.
— (1978), 'Agriculture and Slavery in Classical Athens', *CJ* 73, 122-45.
— (1983), 'Famine in the Greek World', in Garnsey and Whittaker (eds), 6-16.
— (1988a), 'Sacrifice and Animal Husbandry in Classical Greece', in C.R. Whittaker (ed.), *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge), 87-119.
— (1988b), 'Sacrifice and Ritual: Greece', in M. Grant and R. Kitzinger (eds.), *Civilization of the Ancient Mediterranean* (New York), vol. 2, 959-79.
— (1990a), 'Space in the Greek City-State', in S. Kent (ed.), *Domestic Architecture and the use of Space* (Cambridge), 92-113.
— (1990b), 'Private Space and the Greek City', in O. Murray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford), 171-95.
— (1991), 'Sacrifice before Battle', in V.D. Hanson (ed.), *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience* (London), 197-227.

— (1994), ‘Theoxenia’, in Hägg (ed.) (1994), 35-57.
—, D.R. Jordan, and R.D. Kotanski (1993), *A lex sacra from Selinous* (Durham).
—, C.N. Runnels, T.H. van Andel (1994). *A Greek Countryside* (Standford, California).
Jebb, R.C. (ed.) (1908), *The Trachiniae of Sophocles* (Cambridge).
Jeffery, L. H. (1976), *Archaic Greece. The City States*, c. 700-500 B.C. (London).
— (1990), *Local Scripts of Archaic Greece.* Rev. Ed. (Oxford).
Jim, S.F. (forthcoming 2011), ‘The vocabulary of *ἀπάρχεσθαι, ἀπαρχή* and related terms in Archaic and Classical Greece’, *Kernos* 24.
— (forthcoming 2012), ‘Seized by the Nymph? Onesagoras the ‘*dekatephoros*’ in the Nymphaeum at Kafizin in Cyprus’, *Kernos* 25.
Johnston, A.W. (1979), *Trademarks on Greek Vases* (Warminster).
— (1987), ‘Amasis and the Vase Trade’, in M. True (ed.), *Papers on the Amasis Painter and His World* (Malibu, California), 125-40.
Jones, C.P. (1999), *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass; London).
Jones, N.F. (1987), *Public Organization in Ancient Greece* (Philadelphia).
Jowett, B. (ed.) (1881), *Thucydides* (Oxford), vols. 1-2.
Kadletz, E. (1984), ‘The Sacrifice of Eumaios the Pig Herder’, *GRBS* 25, 99-105.
Kallet-Marx, L. (1989), ‘Did Tribute Fund the Parthenon?’, *ClAnt* 8, 252-66.
Kallet, L. (2001), *Money and the Corrosion of Power in Thucydides* (Berkeley; London).
— (2004), ‘Epigraphic Geography: the Tribute Quota Fragments Assigned to 421/0-415/4 B.C.’, *Hesperia* 73, 465-496.
Kaltsas, N.E. and H.A. Shapiro (2008), *Worshipping Women. Ritual and Reality in Classical Athens* (New York).
Kaminski, G. (1991), ‘Thesauros. Untersuchungen zum Antiken Opferstock’, *JDAI* 106, 63-181.
Kazamiakis, K.N. (1990-1), ‘*Θησαυρός Αφροδίτης Ουρανίας· η κατασκευή*’, *Horos* 8-9, 29-44.
Kearns, E. (1990), ‘Saving the City’, in O. Murray and S.R.F. Price (eds.), *The Greek City: from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford), 323-44.
— (1994), ‘Cakes in Greek sacrificial Regulations’, in Hägg (ed.) (1994), 65-70.
— (1995), ‘Order, Interaction, Authority: Ways of looking at Greek religion’, in A. Powell (ed.), *The Greek World* (London), 511-29.
— (1998), ‘The Nature of Heroines’, in S. Blundell and M. Williamson (eds.), *The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece,* 96-110.
— (2010), *Ancient Greek Religion: a Sourcebook* (Chichester).
Keesling, C. (1995), ‘Reviewed work(s): Didier Viviers: *Recherches sur les ateliers de sculpteurs et la cite d’Athenes a l’epoque archaique: Endoios, Philergos, Aristokles*. Bruxelles’, *Gnomon* 67, 630-3.
— (2003), *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis* (Cambridge).
— (2005), ‘Patrons of Athenian Votive Monuments of the Archaic and Classical periods’, *Hesperia* 74, 395-426.
— (2006), ‘Heavenly Bodies: Monuments to Prostitutes in Greek Sanctuaries’, in C. A. Farapone and L. K. McClure (eds.), *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World* (2006), 59-76.

Kern, O. (1900), *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander* (Berlin).
Kindt, J. (2006), 'Delphic Oracle Stories and the beginning of Historiography: Herodotus' *Croesus Logos*', *CP* 101, 34-51.
Kirk, G.S. et al. (1985-93), *The Iliad: A Commentary* (Cambridge), vols.1-6.
Kirk, P. V. (1984), *The Evolution of the Polynesian Chiefdoms* (Cambridge; New York).
Klaffenbach, G. (1953), 'Archaishe Weihinschrift aus Samos', *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts* VI, 15-20.
Körte, A. (1896), 'Die Ausgrabungen am Westabhange der Akropolis IV', *AM* 21, 276-332.
Kourouniotes, K. (1936), *Eleusis. A Guide to the Excavations and the Museum* (Athens).
Kowalzig, B. (2005), 'Mapping the *Communitas*: Performances of Theoria in their Sacred and Political Context', in Elsner and Rutherford (eds.) (2005), 41-71.
— (2007), *Singing for the Gods* (Oxford).
— (2008), 'Nothing to do with Demeter? Something to do with Sicily! Theatre and Society in the Early Fifth-Century West', in M. Revermann and P. Wilson (eds.), *Performance, Iconography, Reception* (Oxford), 128-57.
— and T. Morgan (forthcoming), *Thinking about Thinking Gods: Beliefs and Conceptions of the Divine in the Ancient World* (Oxford).
Kristiansen, K., M.T. Larsen, and M.J. Rowlands (1987), *Centre and Periphery in the Ancient World* (Cambridge).
Kron, U. (1996), 'Priesthoods, Dedications and Euergetism: What Part did Religion play in the Political and Social Status of Greek Women?', in Hellström and Alroth (eds) (1996), 139-82.
Kunze, E. and A. Mallwitz et al. (1937-), *Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia* (Berlin).
Kuper, H. (1947), 'The Drama of Kingship', in *An African Aristocracy* (London), 197-225.
— (1952), *The Swazi* (London).
Kurke, L. (1999), *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold. The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece* (Princeton).
Kyle, D.G. (1993), *Athletics in Ancient Athens* (Leiden).
— (1996), 'Gifts and Glory: Panathenaic and Other Greek Athletic Prizes', in J. Neils (ed.), *Worshipping Athena* (Madison), 106-36.
Labarbe, J. (1953), 'L'âge correspondant au sacrifice du *κούρειον* et les données historiques du sixième discours d'Isée', *Bulletin de la Classe des lettres et des science morales et politiques*, 5e Série, tome 39, 358-94.
Lang. A. (1901), *Magic and Religion* (London).
Lansdell, H. (1906), *The Sacred Tenth. Studies in Tithe-giving, Ancient and Modern* (London), vols. 1-2.
Larson, J. (1995), *Greek Heroine Cults* (Madison).
— (2007), *Ancient Greek Cults* (New York; London).
Latte, K. (1960), *Romische Religionsgeschichte* (Munich).
Lawton, C.L. (1995), *Attic Document Reliefs* (Oxford).
Lazzarini, M.L. (1976), *Le formule delle dediche votive nella Grecia arcaica*. (Rome).
Le Guen-Pollet, B. (1991), 'Espace sacrificiel et corps des bêtes immolées', in R. Étienne and M.-Th. Le Dinahet (eds.), *L' espace sacrificiel dans les civilisations méditerranéennes de l'antiquité* (Paris), 13-23.

Leaf, W. (1900-02), *The Iliad* (London).
Legrand, P. (1938), 'Herodotea', *REA* 40, 225-34.
Lehmann, P.W. and D. Spittle (1982), *The Temonos* (Princeton, N.J.).
Leitao, D.D. (2003), 'Adolescent Hair-growing and Hair-cutting rituals in Ancient Greece', in Dodd and Faraone (eds.) (2003), 109-29.
Lewis, D.M. (1955), 'Notes on Attic Inscriptions (II)', *BSA* 50, 1-36.
― (1960), 'Apollo Delios', *BSA* 55, 190-4.
― (1966), 'After the Profanation of the Mysteries', in V. Ehrenberg (ed.), *Ancient Society and Institutions* (Oxford), 177-91.
― (1968), 'Dedications of Phialai at AthensDedications of Phialai at Athens', *Hesperia* 37, 368-80.
Lhôte, É. (2006), *Les lamelles oraculaires de Dodone* (Geneva).
Lidonnici, L.R. (1992), 'Compositional background of the Epidaurian *ʾIÁMATA*', *AJPh* 113, 25-41.
Linders, T. (1992), 'Sacred Finance: some observations', in Linders and Alroth (eds.) (1992), 9-13.
― and G. Nordquist (1987), *Gifts to the Gods* (Uppsala).
― and B. Alroth (eds.) (1992), *Economic of Cult in the Ancient Greek World* (Uppsala; Stockholm),
Lissarrague, F. (1990), *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet* (Princeton). (Tr. A. Szegedy-Maszak).
Livingstone, N. and G. Nisbet (2010), *Epigram*. *Greece and Rome, New Surveys in the Classics no.38* (Cambridge).
Lonis, R. (1979), *Guerre et religion en Grèce à l'époque classique* (Paris).
Loomis, W.T. (1998), *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens* (Ann Arbor).
Loraux, N. (1982), '*Ponos'*, *Annali del Seminario di studi del mondo classico*, 171-92.
Low, P. (2007), *Interstate Relations in Classical Greece* (Cambridge).
Lupu, E. (2003), '*Μασχαλίσματα*: a note on *SEG* XXXV 113', in D. Jordan and J. Traill (eds.), *Lettered Attica. A Day of Attic Epigraphy* (Toronto), 69-77.
― (2005), *Greek Sacred Law* (Leiden).
Luschey, H (1939), *Die Phiale* (Bleicherode, Harz).
Ma, J. (1999), *Antiochos III and the Cities of Asia Minor* (Oxford).
― (2003), 'Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age', *P&P* 180, 9-39.
Macan, R.W. (ed.) (1895-1908), *Herodotus* (London), vols. 1-3.
MacDonald, B.R. (1982), 'The Authenticity of the Congress Decree', *Historia* 31, 120-3.
MacDowell, D.M. (1962), *On the Mysteries* (Oxford).
Malay, H. and M. Ricl (2009), 'Two New Hellenistic Decrees from Aigai in Aiolis', *EA* 42, 39-55.
Malkin, I. (1987), *Religion and Colonisation in Ancient Greece* (Leiden).
―, C. Constantakopoulou and K. Panagopoulou (eds.) (2009), *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean* (London).
Mallwitz, A. and H.V. Herrmann (eds.) (1980), *Die Funde aus Olympia* (Athens).
Manganaro, G. (1995), 'L' *elaphos* di oro dedicato dai Selinuntini (IG XIV, 268)', *ZPE* 106, 162-4.
Mannhardt, W. (1875), *Wald- und Feldkulte. Erster Teil*. *Der Baumkultus der*

Germanen und ihrer Nachbarstämme (Berlin).
— (1877), *Wald- und Feldkulte. Zweiter Teil*. *Antike Wald- und Feldkulte aus nordeuropäischer Überlieferung* (Berlin).
Mare, W. H. (1962), *A Study of the Greek βωμός in Classical Greek Literature* (diss., University of Pennsylvania).
Marett, R.R. (1914), *The Threshold of Religion* (London).
Mari, M. (1999), 'Le "primizie di uomini" ad Apollo delfico. Indagine su un rito greco', *MedAnt* 2, 263-320.
Martelli. M. (1988). 'La stipe votiva dell'Athenaion di Jalysos: un primo bilancio' in S. Dietz and I. Ch. Papachristodoulou (eds.), *Archaeology in the Dodecanese* (1998), 104-20.
Martin, R. (1940-1), 'Un nouveau règlement de culte thasien', *BCH* 44-45, 163-200.
— (1980), 'Relations entre métropoles et colonies: aspects institutionnels', *Φιλίας χάριν*. *Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di Eugenio Manni* 4, 1435-45.
Marwick, B.A. (1940a), 'Religion and Magic. Ceremonial Life. First Fruit Ceremony', in Marwick (1940b), 182-95.
— (1940b), *The Swazi. An Ethnographical Account of the natives of the Swaziland Protectorate* (London).
Mastrokostas, E. (1953), 'Latype delphike', in *Geras Antoniou Keramopoullou*. *Hetaireia Makedonikon Spoudon Epistemonikai Pragmateiai, Seira philologike kai theologike* 9, 635-46.
Mattaiou, A.P. (2000-03), '*Εἰς IG* I^3 130', *Horos* 14-16, 45-49.
Mattingly, H.B. (1961), 'The Methone Decrees', *CQ* 11, 154-65.
— (1970), 'Epigraphically the twenties are too late ...', *BSA* 65, 129-149.
— (1987), 'The Athenian Coinage Decree and the assertion of empire,' *BAR* 343, 65-71
— (1990), 'Some Fifth-Century Epigraphical Hands', *ZPE* 83, 110-122.
— (1996), *The Athenian Empire Restored* (Ann Arbor).
Maurizio, L. (1997), 'Delphi Oracles as Oral Performances: Authenticity and Historical Evidence', *ClAnt* 16, 308-334.
Mauss, M. (1990 [1925]), *The Gift*. (London). (Tr. W.D. Halls).
Maxmin, J. (1974), 'Euphronios *Epoiesen*: Portrait of the Artist as a Presbyopic Potter', *GaR* 21, 178-80.
Mazon, P. (1914), *Hésiode: les travaux et les jours* (Paris).
McClees, H. (1920), *A Study of Women in Attic Inscriptions* (New York).
McGregor, M.F. (1938), 'The Last Campaign of Cleon and the Athenian Calendar in 422/1 B.C.', *AJP* 59, 145-68.
McLean, B.H. (2002), *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman periods from Alexander the Great down to the reign of Constantine* (Ann Arbor).
Mee, C. and A. Spawforth (2001), *Greece. An Oxford Archaeological Guide* (Oxford).
Meiggs, R. (1972), *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford).
Meritt, B.D. (1936), 'Greek Inscriptions', *Hesperia* 5, 355-441.
— (1944), 'Greek Inscriptions', *Hesperia* 13, 210-65.
— (1972), 'The Tribute Quota List of 454/3 B.C.', *Hesperia* 41, 416,
— and A. Andrews (1951), 'Athens and Neapolis', *BSA* 46, 200-9.
—, H.T. Wade-Grey and M.F. McGregor (1939-53), *The Athenian Tribute Lists* (Princeton, New Jersey).

—, H.T. Wade-Grey (1962), 'The Dating of Documents to the mid-Fifth Century I', *JHS* 82, 67-74.
Merry, W.W. and J. Riddell (1886 [1876]), *Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford), 2nd ed.
Meuli, K. (1975), *Gesammelte Schriften* (Basel; Stuttgart), vols. 1-2.
Meyer, E. (2010), *Metics and the Athenian Phialai-Inscriptions* (Stuttgart).
Migeotte, L. (1990), 'Distributions de grain à la période hellénistique: le "pain gratuit" pour tous?', *Opes Atticae* (Steenbrugge), 297-308.
Mikalson, J.D. (1975), *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton).
— (1979), 'Religion in the Attic Demes', *AJP* 98, 414-35.
— (1983), *Athenian Popular Religion* (Chapel Hill).
— (1998), *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (Berkeley; London).
— (2010), *Greek Popular Religion in Greek Philosophy* (Oxford).
Miles, M.M. (1998), *The City Eleusinion* (Princeton, N.J.).
Miller, M.C. (1997), *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century B.C.* (Cambridge).
Mineur, W.H. (1984), *Callimachus, Hymn to Delos. Introduction and Commentary* (Leiden).
Mitchel, F.W. (1970), *Lykourgan Athens* (Cincinnati).
— (1973), 'Lykourgan Athens: 338-322', in L.T. Semple, E. Sjöqvist and G.G. Boulter (eds.), *Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple. Second Series, 1966-1970* (Norman), 163-214.
Mitchell, L.G. (1997), *Greeks Bearing Gifts* (Cambridge).
Mitford, T.B. (1980), *The Nymphaeum of Kafizin* (Berlin; New York).
Mitropoulou, E. (1977), *Corpus, I: Attic Votive Reliefs from the 6th and 5th Centuries B.C.* (Athens).
Moerenhout, J.A. (1837), *Voyage aux îles du Grand Océan* (Paris), vols. 1-2.
Momigliano, A. (1966a), 'Some observations on causes of war in ancient historiography', in Momigliano (1966b), 112-26.
— (1966b), *Studies in Historiography* (London).
Mondolfo, R. (1954), 'The Greek Attitude to Manual Labour', *P&P* 6, 1-5.
Monro, D.B. (ed.) (1901), *Homer's Odyssey. Book XIII-XXIV* (Oxford).
Moreno, A. (2007), *Feeding the Democracy* (Oxford).
Moretti, L. (1983), 'Epigraphica', *RFIC* 111, 44-57.
Morgan, J. (2010), *The Classical Greek House* (Exeter).
Morris, B. (1987), *Anthropological Studies of Religion* (Cambridge).
Morwood, J. (2007). *Euripides. Suppliant Women* (Oxford).
Most, G..W. (ed.) (2006-7). *Hesiod* (Cambridge, Mass; London), vols. 1-2.
Mullen, A. (2008), 'Rethinking "Hellenization" in South-eastern Gaul: the gallo-Greek epigraphic record', in R. Häussler (ed.) *Romanisation et épigraphie. Études interdisciplinaires sur l'acculturation et l'identité dans l'Empire romain* (Montagnac), 249-66.
— (forthcoming), 'Reflets du multiculturalisme: la création et le développement du gallo-grec', *Contacos lingüisticos en la Antigüedad: el Mediterráneo occidental* (Madrid).
Murray, O. (ed.) (1990), *Sympotica* (Oxford)
Mylonas, G.E. (1961), *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton).
Neer, R.T. (2001), 'Framing the Gift: the Politics of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi', *ClAnt* 20, 273-336.
— (2002), *Style and Politics in Athenian vase-Painting: The Craft of Democracy, ca.*

530-460BCE. (Cambridge).
— (2004), 'The Athenian Treasury at Delphi and the Material of Politics', *ClAnt* 23, 63-93.
Neil, R. A. (1901), *The Knights of Aristophanes* (Cambridge).
Nelson, S. A. (1998), *God and the Land* (New York; Oxford).
Nielsen, T.H., L. Bjertrup, M.H. Hansen, L. Rubinstein and T. Vestergaard (1989), 'Athenian Grave Monuments and Social Class', *GRBS* 30, 411-20.
Nilsson, M.P. (1906), *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung* (Leipzig).
— (1925), *A History of Greek Religion* (Oxford).
— (1940), *Greek Popular Religion* (New York).
— (1948), *Greek Piety* (Oxford).
— (1967-74), *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* (Munich), 2nd ed., vols. 1-2.
Noble, J. V. (1988), *The Techniques of Painted Attic Pottery* (London), revised ed.
Nock, A.D. (ed.) (1926), *Sallustius. Concerning the Gods and the Universe* (Cambridge).
— (1972a), 'Study of the History of Religion', in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* (Oxford), vol. 1, 331-40.
— (1972b), 'Religious Attitudes of the Ancient Greeks', in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* (Oxford), vol. 2, 534-50.
Nolan, B.T. (1981), *Inscribing Costs at Athens in the Fourth Century BC* (diss. Ohio State University).
Obbink, D. (1988), 'The Origin of Greek Sacrifice: Theophrastus on Religion and Cultural History', in Fortenbaugh and Sharples (eds.) (1988), 272-95.
— and P.A. Vander Waerdt (eds.) (1991), *The School of Hellas* (New York; Oxford).
Oleson. J.P. (ed.) (2008), *The Oxford Handbook of Engineering and Technology in the Classical World* (Oxford).
Oliver, D.L. (1974), *Ancient Tahitian Society* (Honolulu), vol. 1.
Oliver, G. J. (2000), 'Athenian funerary monuments: style, grandeur and cost', in G.J. Oliver (ed.), *The Epigraphy of Death* (Liverpool), 59-80.
— (2007), *War, Food and Politics in Early Hellenistic Athens* (Oxford).
Oliver, J.H. (1970), *Marcus Aurelius. Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East* (Princeton, New Jersey).
Olson, S.D. (ed.) (1998), *Aristophanes Peace* (Oxford).
Osborne, R. (1987), *Classical Landscape with Figures* (London).
— (1988), 'Leasing of Land and Property in Classical and Hellenistic Greece', *Chiron* 18, 279-323.
— (1994), 'The Politics of Sacred Space in Attica', in S. Alcock and R. Osborne (ed.), *Placing the Gods* (Oxford), 143-60.
Osborne, M.J. and S.B. Byrne (1996), *The Foreign Residents of Athens* (Lovanii).
Ostwald, M. (1955), 'The Athenian Legislation against Tyranny and Subversion', *TAPA* 86, 103-28.
Oulhen, J. (1992), *Les théarodoques de Delphes.* (Diss. University of Paris X).
Pafford, I.A. (2006), *Cult Fees and the Ritual of Money in Greek Sanctuaries of the Classical and Hellenistic Period* (diss. University of California, Berkeley).
Page. D.L. (1981), *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge).
Parke, H.W. (1932), 'The Tithe of Apollo and the Harmost at Decelea, 413 to 404 B.C.', *JHS* 52, 42-6.
— (1939a), 'Delphica', *Hermathena* 53, 59-78.

— (1939b), 'The Pythais of 355B.C. and the Third Sacred War', *JHS* 59, 80-3.
— (1948), 'Consecration to Apollo', *Hermathena* 72, 82-114.
— (1986), *Festivals of the Athenians* (London).
— and D.E.W. Wormell (1956), *The Delphic Oracle* (Oxford), vols. 1-2.
Parker, L.P.E. (2007), *Alcestis* (Oxford).
Parker, R. (1983), *Miasma* (Oxford).
— (1984), 'A note on *φόνος, θυσία* and *μασχαλισμός*', *LCM* 9.9, 138.
— (1987), 'The Festival of the Attic Demes', in Linders and Nordquist (eds.) (1987), 137-47.
— (1988), 'Dionysus and the Spartan Pantheon', in Hägg, Marinatos and Nordquist (eds.) (1988), 99-103.
— (1991), 'The Hymn to Demeter and the Homeric Hymns', *GaR* 38, 1-17.
— (1992), 'The Origins of *Pronoia*: a Mystery', in W.W. Cruickshank (ed.), *Apodosis: Essays Presented to Dr. W.W. Cruickshank to Mark his Eightieth Birthday* (Barnes), 84-94.
— (1996), *Athenian Religion, a History* (Oxford).
— (1997), 'Gods Cruel and Kind', in C. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford), 143-160.
— (1998), 'Pleasing Thighs: Reciprocity in Greek Religion', in Gill, Postlethwaite and Seaford (eds.) (1998), 105-25.
— (2002), 'Cult of Aphrodite Pandamos and Pontia on Cos', in H.F.J. Horstmanshoff, H.W. Singor, F.T. Van Straten, and J.H.M. Strubbe (eds.), *Kykeon. Studies in Hnour of H.S. Versnel* (Leiden), 143-60.
— (2003), 'The problem of the cult epithet', *Opuscula Atheniensia* 28, 173-83.
— (2004a), 'Dedications. Greek Dedications. I.', in *ThesCRA* (Basel; Los Angeles), vol. 1, 269-81.
— (2004b), 'One Man's Piety: the Religious Dimension of the Anabasis', in R. Lane Fox (ed.), *The Long March* (New Haven; London), 131-53.
— (2004c), 'New "Panhellenic" Festivals in Hellenistic Greece', in R. Schlesier and U. Zellmann (eds.), *Mobility and Travel in the Mediterranean from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (Müster), 9-22.
— (2004d), 'What are Sacred Laws?', in E. Harris and L. Rubinstein, *The Law and the Courts in Ancient Greece* (London), 57-70.
— (2005), *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford).
— (2007), 'Gilbert Murray and Greek Religion', in C. stray (ed.), *Gilbert Murray Reassessed* (Oxford), 81-102.
— (2009), '*τίς ὁ θύων*', in L. Bodiou et al., *Chemin faisant: mythes, cultes et societé en Grèce ancienne* (Rennes), 167-171.
— (2010), 'New Problems in Athenian Religion: the "Sacred Law" from Aixone', in Dijkstra, Kroesen and Kuiper (eds.), 193-206.
— (2011), *On Greek Religion* (Cornell).
— and D. Obbink (2000), 'Aus der Arbeit der "Inscriptiones Graecae" VI. Sales of Priesthoods on Cos I', *Chiron* 30, 415-49.
— and D. Obbink (2001), 'Aus der Arbeit der "Inscriptiones Graecae" VII. Sales of Priesthoods on Cos II', *Chiron* 31, 219-52.
Partida, E.C. (2000), *The Treasuries at Delphi* (diss., University of Birmingham).

Pasquier A. and M. Denoyelle et al., *Euphronios peintre à Athènes au VIe siècle avant J.-C.* (Paris).
Patton, K.C. (2009), *Religion of the Gods* (Oxford).
Payne, H. and G.M. Young (1936), *Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis. A Photographic Catalogue* (London), vols.1-2.
Perdizet, P. (1903), 'De quelques monuments figurés de culte d'Athéna Ergané', in G. Perrot (ed.), *Mélanges Perrot* (Paris), 259-67.
Perlman, P.J. (2002), *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece* (Götinggen).
— (2010), 'Of Battle, Booty, and (Citizen) Women. A "New" Inscription from Archaic Axos, Crete', *Hesperia* 79, 79-112.
Perlman, S. (1976), 'Panhellenism, the Polis and Imperialism', *Historia* 25, 1-30.
Persson, A.W. (1942), *The Religion of Greece in Prehistoric Times* (Berkeley; Los Angeles).
Petrakos, V. Ch. (1997) *οἱ ἐπιγραφὲς τοῦ Ὠρωποῦ* (Athens).
Petropoulou, A. (1981), 'The *Eparche* Documents of the early Oracle at Oropus', *GRBS* 22, 39-63.
— (1984), *Studies in Greek Cult and Sacrificial Ritual* (diss., University of Colorado).
— (1987), 'The Sacrifice of Eumaeus Reconsidered', *GRBS* 28, 135-49.
Petrović, A and I. Petrović (2006), '"Look who is talking now!" Speaker and Communication in Greek Metrical Sacred Regulations', in E. Stavrianopoulou (ed.), *Ritual and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World, Kernos Suppl.* 16, 151-79.
Picard, Ch. (1946), 'La route des processions hyperboréennes en Grèce ', *RHR* 132, 98-109.
Pirenne-Delforge, V. (1996), 'Les Charites à Athènes et dans l'île des Cos', *Kernos* 9, 195-214.
Platnauer, M. (1938), *Iphigenia in Tauris* (Oxford).
Pleket, H.W. (1967), 'Technology and Society in the Greco-Roman World', *AHN* 2, 1-25.
— (1973), 'Technology in the Greco-Roman World: a General Report', *Talanta* 5, 6-47.
Polinskaya, I. (2009), 'Fifth-century Horoi on Aigina', *Hesperia* 78, 231-67.
Pollitt, J.J. (1979), 'Kernoi from the Athenian Agora', *Hesperia* 48, 205-33.
Pomeroy, S.B. (1994), *Xenophon. Oeconomicus* (Oxford).
Pötscher, W. (1964), *Peri eusebeias* (Leiden).
Pouilloux, J. (1954-8), *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos* (Paris), vols. 1-2.
— (1979), 'Une énigme thasienne: le passage des théores', in *Thasiaca* (*BCH Suppl*. 5), 129-41.
— and G. Roux (1963), *Énigmes à Delphes* (Paris).
Prêtre, C. and M. Brunet et al. (2002), *Nouveau choix d'inscriptions de Délos. Lois, comptes et inventaires. Etudes epigraphiques 4.* (Athens)
Price, S.R.F. (1984), *Rituals and Power* (Cambridge).
— (1999), *Religions of the Ancient Greeks* (Cambridge).
Pritchett, W.K. (1969), 'The Transfer of the Delian Treasury', *Historia* 18, 17-21.
— (1974-), *The Greek State at War* (Berkeley, London), vols. 1-5.
Pugliese Carratelli, G. (ed.), *The Western Greeks* (London).
Pulleyn, S. (1997), *Prayer in Greek Religion* (Oxford).
Purvis, A (2003), *Singular Dedications* (New York; London).

Quincey, J.H. (1966), 'Greek Expressions of Thanks', *JHS* 86, 133-58.
Raoul-Rochette, D. (1815), *Histoire critique de l'établissement des colonies grecques* (Paris).
Raubitschek, A.E. (1939), 'Reviewed work(s): *Datierung Attischer Inschriften* by Emanuel Loewy', *AJA* 43, 710-13.
— (1939-40), 'Early Attic Votive Monuments', *ABSA* 40, 16-37.
— (1942), 'An Original Work of Endoios', *JHS* 46, 245-53. Reprinted in Obbink and Vander Waerdt (eds.) (1991), 212-9.
— (1949), *Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis* (Cambridge, Mass).
— (1966), 'The Peace Policy of Pericles', *AJA* 70, 37-41. Reprinted in Obbink and Vander Waerdt (eds.) (1991), 16-23.
— and I.K. Raubitschek (1982), 'The Mission of Triptolemos' in H.A. Thompson (ed.) *Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture and Topography* (Princeton, N.J.), 109-17. Reprinted in Obbink and Vander Waerdt (eds.) (1991), 229-38.
Rawlinson, G. (ed.) (1862), *History of Herodotus. A New English Version* (London), vols. 1-4.
Redfield, R (1941), *The Folk Culture of Yucatan* (Chicago).
Reese. D.S. (1989), 'Faunal remains from the altar of Aphrodite Ourania, Athens', *Hesperia* 58, 63-70.
Reger, G. (2004), 'The Aegean', in Hansen and Nielsen (2004), 732-93.
Regnot, F. (ed.) (1995), *Entre public et privé en Grèce ancienne: lieux, objects, pratiques.* Ktema 23 (Strasbourg).
Renfrew, C. and J.F. Cherry (1986), *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change* (Cambridge).
Rhodes, P. J. (1981), *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford, New York).
— et al. (forthcoming), *Public Finance in Ancient Athens* (Oxford).
Rich, J. and G. Shipley (eds.) (1993), *War and Society in the Greek World* (London).
Richardson, N.J. (1974), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford)
Richter, G.M.A. (1937), 'Reviewed work(s): *Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis. A Photographic Catalogue* by Humfry Payne; Gerard Mackworth Young', *AJA* 41 (1937), 161-3.
Ridgway, B.S. (1987), 'Ancient Greek Women and Art: the Material Evidence', *AJA* 91, 399-409.
Rigsby, K.J. (1996), *Asylia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World.* (Berkeley; London).
— and Hallof, K. (2001), 'Aus der Arbeit der "Inscriptiones Graecae" X. Decrees of Inviolability for Kos', *Chiron* 31, 333-45.
Robert, L. (1938), *Études épigraphiques et philologiques* (Paris).
— (1978), 'Sur un Apollon oraculaire à Chypre', *CRAI* 1978, 338-44.
— (1985), 'Documents d'Asie Mineure XXXIV – XXXV', *BCH* 109, 467-84.
Roberts, E.S. and E.A. Gardner (1887-1905), *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy* (Cambridge), vols. 102.
Robertson, M. (1992), *The Art of Vase-Painting* (Cambridge).
Robertson, N. (1976), 'False Documents at Athens. Fifth Century History and Fourth Century Publicists', *Historical Reflections* 3, 1-25.
— (1987), 'Government and Society at Miletus, 525-442 B.C.', *Phoenix* 41, 356-98.
— (1996), 'New Light on Demeter's Mysteries: the Festival Proerosia', *GRBS* 37,

319-79.
Robertson Smith, W. (1889), *The Religion of the Semites* (Edinburgh).
Roesch, P. (1984), 'L'Amphiaraion d'Oropos', in G. Roux (ed.), *Temples et Sanctuaires* (Lyon; Paris), 173-84.
Rogers, B.B. (1910), *Aristophanous Hippeis* (London).
Rolley, C. (1994), *La sculpture grecque* (Paris).
Romm, J. (1992), *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Tradition* (Princeton; Oxford).
Rosivach, V.J. (1994), *The System of Public Sacrifice in Fourth-century Athens* (Atlanta).
Rougemont, G. (1977-), *Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes* (Paris), vol. 1.
Rouse, W.H.D. (1902), 'Tithes, First-fruits, and Kindred Offerings', in *Greek Votive Offerings* (Cambridge), 39-94.
— (1908-26a), 'Firstfruits (Greek)', in Hastings (ed.) (1908-26), vol. 6, 45-6.
— (1908-26b), 'Tithes (Greek)', in Hastings (ed.) (1908-26), vol. 12, 350-1.
Roux, G. (1955), 'Le "passage" des théores et le problème du prytanée thasien', *BCH* 79, 353-64.
— (1979), *L'Amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon au IVe siècle* (Paris).
Rubinstein, L. (2004), 'Ionia', in Hansen and Nielsen (2004), 1053-1107.
Ruck, C.A.P. (1988), 'The Offerings of the Hyperboreans', in R.G. Wasson et al. (1988), *Persephone's Quest* (New Haven, London), 225-56.
Rudhardt, J. (1970), 'Les mythes grecs relatifs à l'instauration du sacrifice: Prométhée et Deucalion', *MH* 27, 1-15.
— (1992), *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce classique*, (Paris), 2nd ed.
Rups, M. (1986), *Thesauros. A Study of the Treasury Building as found in Greek Sanctuaries* (diss., Johns Hopkins University).
Rutherford, I. (1995), 'Theoric Crisis: The Dangers of Pilgrimage in Greek Religion and Society', *SMSR* 61, 276-92.
— (2000), *'Theoria and Darśan: Pilgrimage and Vision in Greece and India*', *CQ* 50, 131-46.
— (2004), 'The Keian Theoria to Delphi: Neglected Data from the Accounts of the Delphic Naopoioi (CID 2.1-28)', *ZPE* 147, 107-114.
— (2009), 'Network Theory and Theoric Network', in I. Malkin, C. Constantakopoulou and K Panagopoulou (eds.), *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean* (London), 24-38.
Sabin, P.A.G., H. van Wees and M. Whitby (2007), *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare* (Cambridge), vol. 1.
Sahlins, M. (1974), 'On the Sociology of Primitive Exchange", in M. Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics* (London), 185-275.
Sakellariou, M.B. (1958), *La migration grecque en Ionie* (Athens).
Sallares, R. (1991), *The Ecology of the Ancient Greek World* (London).
Salviat, F. (1956), 'Monuments de l'agora, le "passage"', *BCH* 80, 418-20.
— (1977), 'La dédicace du trésor de Cnide à Delphes', *Etudes delphiques. BCH Suppl. 4* (Athens, Paris), 23-35.
— (1979), 'Les colonnes initiales du catalogue des théores et les institutions thasiennes archaïques', *Thasiaca* (*BCH Suppl*. 5), 107-27.
— (1983), 'Catalogues des théores à Thasos: objections et résponses', *BCH* 107, 181-7.

— (1984), ‘Les archontes de Thasos’, *Πρακτικά του η΄ διεθνούς συνεδρίου ελληνικής και λατινικής εριγραφικής* (Athens), vol. 1, 233-58.
Samons, L. K. (2000), *Empire of the Owl* (Stuttgart).
Sánchez, P. (2001), *L’Amphictionie des Pyles et de Delphes* (Stuttgart).
Satlow, M.L. (2005), ‘Giving for a Return: Jewish Votive Offerings in Late Antiquity’, in D. Brakker, M.L. Satlow and S. Weitzman (eds.), *Religion and the Self in Antiquity* (Bloomington; IN), 91-108.
Savary, C. (1991-2), ‘Rites des prémices d'igname en Afrique de l'ouest’, *Bulletin du Centre genevoise d'anthropologie* 3, 133-145.
Schlaifer, R. (1940), ‘Notes on Athenian Public Cults’, *HSCP* 51, 233-60.
Schuler, C. (ed.) (2007), *Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien* (Wien).
Scott, M. (2010), *Delphi and Olympia* (Cambridge).
Scullion, S. (1994), ‘Olympian and Chthonian’, *ClAnt* 13, 76-119.
— (2000), ‘Heroic and Chthonian Sacrifice: New Evidence from Selinous’, *ZPE* 132,163-71.
— (2005), ‘“Pilgrimage” and Greek Religion’, in Elsner and Rutherford (eds.) (2005), 111-30.
— (2009), ‘Holocausts and Hides in a Sacred Law of Aixone’, in Brulé (ed.) (2009), 153-69.
Seaford, R. (1989), ‘Homeric and Tragic Sacrifice’, *TAPA* 119, 87-95.
— (2004), *Money and the Early Greek Mind* (Cambridge).
Seager, R (1969), ‘The Congress Decree: some Doubts and a Hypothesis’, *Historia* 18, 129-41.
Sedley, D.N. (2007), *Creationism and its Critics in Antiquity* (Berkeley, California; London).
Sherwin-White, S. (1978), *Ancient Cos* (Göttingen).
— (1985), ‘Ancient Archives: the edit of Alexander to Priene, a Reappraisal’, *JHS* 105, 69-89.
Shipley, G. (1987), *A History of Samos, 800-188 B.C.* (Oxford).
Simms, R.M. (1975), ‘The Eleusinia in the Sixth to Fourth Centuries B.C.’, *GRBS* 16 (1975), 269-79.
Sinclair, T.A. (ed.) (1932), *Hesiod. Works and Days* (London).
Slater, W.J. and D. Summa (2006), ‘Crowns at Magnesia’, *GRBS* 46, 275-99.
Smarczyk, B. (1990), *Untersuchungen zur Religionspolitik und politischen Propaganda Athens im Delisch-Attischen Seebund* (Munich).
Smith, C.F. (1928-35) (tr.), *History of the Peloponnesian War* (Cambridge, Mass; London), vols. 1-3.
Smith, R.R.R. (2007), ‘Pindar, Athletes and the Early Greek Statue Habit’, in Hornblower and Morgan, (eds.) (2007), 83-139.
Snedegar, K. (1998), ‘First Fruits Celebrations among the Nguni peoples of Southern Africa’, *Archaeoastronomy* 23, 31-8.
Snodgrass, A.M. (1971), *The Dark Age of Greece* (Edinburgh).
— (1989-90), ‘The Economics of Dedication at Greek Sanctuaries’, *ScAnt* 3-4, 287-94.
Sokolowski, F. (1954), ‘Fees and taxes in Greek Cults’, *HThR* 47, 153-64.
— (1955), *Lois sacrées de l’Asie Mineure* (Paris).
— (1962), *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplement* (Paris).
— (1969), *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris).

Sommerstein, A.H. (ed.) (1981), *Aristophanes. Knghts* (Warminster).
— (ed.) (1985), *Aristophanes. Peace* (Warminster).
— (ed.) (1989), *Aeschylus. Eumenides* (Cambridge).
Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1988a), 'Further Aspects of Polis Religion', in *AnnArchStorAnt* 10, 259-74. Reprinted in R. Buxton (ed.) (2000), 38-55.
— (1988b), *Studies in Girls' Transitions* (Athens).
— (1990), 'What is Polis Religion', in O. Murray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City. From Homer to Alexander* (Oxford), 295-322. Reprinted in R. Buxton (ed.) (2000), 13-37.
— (1997a), 'Tragedy and Religion: Constructs and Readings', in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford), 161-81.
— (1997b), 'Reconstructing change: ideology and the Eleusinian Mysteries,' in M. Golden and P. Toohey (eds.), *Inventing Ancient Culture* (London), 132-64.
Spawforth, A.J. and S. Walker (1985), 'The World of the Panhellenion. I. Athens and Eleusis', in *JRS* 75 (1985), 78-104.
Stadter, P.A. (1989), *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles* (Chapel Hill; London).
Stanford, W.B. (1958-9 [1947-8]), *The Odyssey of Homer* (London; New York), second edition, vols.1-2.
Stein, H. (1893-1908), *Herodotos* (Berlin).
Steiner, F. (1956), *Taboo* (London).
Steinmetz, P. (ed.) (1960-2), *Theophrast. Characktere* (Munich).
Stengel, P. (1894), '*Ἀπαρχαί*', *RE* 1, 2666-8.
— (1908), '*κατάρχεσθαι* und *ἐνάρχεσθαι*', *Hermes* 43, 456-67. Reprinted in P. Stengel (1910), *Opferbräuche der Griechen* (Berlin), 40-49.
— (1910), '*ἐπάρξασθαι δεπάεσσιν*', in P. Stengel (1910), *Opferbräuche der Griechen* (Berlin), 50-58.
— (1920), *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer* (Munich).
Stissi, V.V. (2002), *Pottery to the People. The Production, Distribution and Consumption of Decorated Pottery in the Greek World in the Archaic Period* (650-480 BC) (diss., University of Amsterdam).
Strom, I. (1992), '*Obeloi* of Pre- and Proto-Monetary value in Greek Sanctuaries', in T. Linders and B. Alroth (eds), *Economics of Cult in the Ancient World*, Boreas 21 (Uppsala), 41-51.
Stroud, R.S. (1998), *The Athenian Grain-Tax Law of 374/3 B.C.* (Princeton, N.J.)
— (2006), *The Athenian Empire on Stone* (Athens).
Strubbe, J.H.M. (1987), 'The Sitonia in the cities of Asia Minor under the Principate (I)' *EA* 10, 45-82.
Strubbe, J.H.M. (1989), 'The Sitonia in the cities of Asia Minor under the Principate (II)' *EA* 13, 99-122.
Tarn, W.W. and G.T. Griffith (1952), *Hellenistic Civilization* (London).
Taylor, T. (tr.) (1994 [1804]), *The Dissertations of Maximus Tyrius* (Frome).
Teske, R.T. (1985), 'Votive Offerings and the Belief System of Greek-Philadelphians', *Western Folklore* 44, 208-224.
Tsetskhladze, G.R. (ed.) (2006-8), *Greek colonization an account of Greek colonies and other settlements overseas* (Leiden; Boston), vols. 1-2.
Themelis, P. (2007), 'Panathenaic prizes and dedications', in O. Palagia and A. Spetsieri-Choremi (eds.), The *Panathenaic Games* (Oxford), 21-32.
Thonemann, P. (2007), 'Magnesia and the Greeks of Asia (I. Magnesia 16.16)', *GRBS*

47, 151-60.
Tod, M.N. (1950), 'Reviewed work(s): Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: a Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C. by A. E. Raubitschek', *JHS* 70, 97-8.
Todd, S.C. (1993), *The Shape of Athenian Law* (Oxford).
Tolles, D. (1943), *The Banquet-Libations of the Greeks* (diss., Bryn Mawr College).
Tracy, S.V. (1969), 'Notes on the Inscriptions of the Pythaïs of 98/7', *BCH* 93, 371-95.
— (1975), 'Notes on the Pythaïs Inscriptions', *BCH* 99, 185-218.
— (1979), 'Athens in 100B.C.', *HSCP* 83, 213-35.
— (1982), *IG II² 2336, Contributors of First Fruits for the Pythaïs* (Meisenheim).
— (1990), 'The Date of the Grain Decree from Samos: the Prosopographical Indicators', *Chiron* 20, 97-100.
Trapp. M.B. (1994). *Dissertationes* (Stuttgart).
Tréheux. J.T. (1953), 'La réalité historique des offrandes hyperboréennes', in D.M. Robinson, G.E. Mylonas, and D Raymond (eds.), *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson on his Seventieth Birthday* (Saint Louis)
Tronson, A. (2000), 'The History and Mythology of "Pericles' Panhellenic Congress" in Plutarch's *Life of Pericles* 17', *EMC* 19, 359-93.
Tsakos, K. (1990-1), '*Θησαυρός Αφροδίτης Ουρανίας· η επιγραφή*', *Horos* 8-9, 17-28.
Tuchelt, K. (1970), *Die archaischen Skulpturen von Didyma* (Berlin).
— (1988), 'Die Perserzerstörung von Branchidai-Didyma und ihre Folgen, archäologisch betrachtet', *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, 427-38.
Tuplin, C. (2004), 'Xenophon, Artemis and Scillus', in T. J. Figueira and P. Brulé (eds.), *Spartan Society* (Swansea), 251-81.
Turner, J.W. (1984), '"True Food" and First Fruits: Rituals of Increase in Fiji', *Ethnology* 23, 133-42.
Turner, V.W. (1969), *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (London).
Tylor, E. (1871), *Primit*ive *Culture* (London), vols. 1-2.
Ussher, R.G. (1960), *The Character of Theophrastus* (London).
Van Berchem, D. (1970), 'Alexandre et la restauration de Priene', *MusHelv* 27, 198-205.
Van den Berge, S. (1957), 'Ghazali on "Gratitude Towards God" and its Greek Sources', *Studia Islamica* 7, 77-98.
Van Keuren, F.D. (1989), *The Frieze from the Hera I Temple at Foce del Sele* (Rome).
Van Liefferinge, C (2000), 'Auditions et conférences à Delphes', *AC* 69, 149-64.
Van Straten, F.T. (1981), 'Gifts for the Gods', in Versnel (ed.) (1981b), 65-105.
— (1988), 'The God's Portion in Greek Sacrificial Representations: Is the Tail doing Nicely?', in Hägg, Marinatos and Nordquist (eds.) (1988), 51-61.
— (1992), 'Votives and Votaries in Greek Sanctuaries', in Bingen and Schachter (eds.) (1992), 247-90.
— (1993), 'Images of Gods and Men in a Changing Society: Self-identity in Hellenistic Religion', in A. Bulloch et al., *Images and Ideologies* (Berkeley, London), 248-64.
— (1995), *Hiera Kala* (Leiden).
Vatin, C. (1981), 'Monuments votifs de Delphes', *BCH* 105 (1981), 429-59.
Vernant, J.-P. (1980), 'The Myth of Prometheus in Hesiod', *Myth and Society in*

Ancient Greece (Sussex), 168-85. (Tr. J. Lloyd, orig. Paris, 1974).
— (1983a), 'Some Psychological Aspects of Work in Ancient Greece', in Vernant (1983d), 271-8.
— (1983b), 'Some Remarks on the Forms and Limitations of Technological Thought among the Greeks', in Vernant (1983d), 279-301.
— (1983c), 'Work and Nature in Ancient Greece', in Vernant (1983d), 248-70.
— (1983d), *Myth and Thought among the Greeks* (London). (Orig. Paris, 1965).
— (1989), 'At Man's Table: Hesiod's Foundation Myth of Sacrifice', in Detienne and Vernant (eds.) (1989), 21-86.
— (2001), 'Forms of Belief and Rationality in Greece', in J.P. Arnason and P. Murphy (eds.), *Agon, Logos, Polis: the Greek Achievement and its Aftermath* (Stuttgart), 118-26.
Versnel, H.S. (1981a), 'Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer', in Versnel (1981b), 1-64.
— (1981b), *Faith, Hope and Worship* (Leiden).
— (1990), *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion I: Ter Unus: Isis, Dionysos, Hermes: Three Studies in Henotheism.* (Leiden).
— (1993), *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion II: Transition and Reversal in Myth and Rituals.* (Leiden; New York).
Veyne, P. (1976), *La pain et le cirque* (Paris).
— (1983), '"Titulus praelatus": offrande, solennisation et publicité dans les ex-voto Gréco-Romans', *RA*, 281-300.
— (2000), 'Inviter les dieux, sacrifier, banqueter: quelques nuances de la religiosité gréco-romaine', *Annales*, 3-42.
Vickers, M. (1985), 'Artful Crafts: The Influence of Metal Work on Athenian Painted Pottery', *JHS* 105, 108-128.
Vidal-Naquet, P. (1986), 'Recipes for Greek Adolescence', in *The Black-Hunter* (Baltimore; London), 129-56. (Tr. A. Szegedy-Maszak, orig. Paris, 1981).
Viviers, D. (1992), *Recherches sur les ateliers de sculpteurs et la cité d'Athènes à l'époque archaique: Endoios, Philergos, Aristokles* (Bruxelles).
Von Reden, S. (1997), 'Money, Law and Exchange: Coinage in the Greek Polis', *JHS* 107, 154-76.
— (2010), *Money in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge).
Voutiras, E. (1982), 'A Dedication of the *Hebdomaistai* to the Pythian Apollo', *AJA* 86, 229-33.
Wagner, C. (1997), *Dedication practices on the Athenian acropolis* (diss. University of Oxford).
— (2000), 'The Potters and Athena. Dedications on the Athenian Acropolis', in G. R. Tsetskhladze, A.J.N.W Prag and A.M. Snodgrass (eds.), *Periplous. Papers on Classical Art and Archaeology presented to Sir John Boardman*, 383-7.
Walbank, F.W. (1957-79), *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (Oxford), vols. 1-3.
Walcot, P. (1978), *Envy and the Greeks* (Warminister).
Walsh, J. (1981), 'The Peace of Callias and the Congress Decree', *Chiron* 11, 31-63.
Walton, F. (1952), 'Athens, Eleusis and the Homeric Hymn to Demeter,' *HThR* 45, 105-14.
Warner, R. (ed.) (1954), *History of the Peloponnesian War* (Harmondsworth).
Waterfield, R. (tr.) (1998), *The Histories* (Oxford).
Webster, H. (1942), *Taboo. A Sociological Study* (Stanford; London).

Webster, T.B.L. (1972), *Potter and Patron in Classical Athens* (London).
Wees, H. van (1992), *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and Society* (Amsterdam).
West, M.L. (ed.) (1978), *Hesiod. Works and Days* (Oxford).
— (ed.) (1988), *Hesiod. Theogony and Works and Days* (Oxford).
Whatmough, J. (1927), 'Oscan Deketasio – "Decentarius"', *Language* 3, 105-8.
Whitehead, D. (1986), *The Demes of Attica, 508/7-ca. 150 B.C.* (Princeton).
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1906), 'Milet, Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen für das Jahr 1899', *GAA*, 635-40.
— (1931-2), *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (Berlin), vols.1-2.
Wilkins, J. (2000), *The Boastful Chef* (Oxford).
Williams, D. (1990), 'Euphronios: du peintre au potier', in Pasquier and Denoyelle et al., 33-7.
— (1995), 'Potters, Painters, Purchasers', in A. Verbanck-Piérard and D. Vivers (eds.), *Culture et Cité* (Bruxelles), 139-60.
Wilson, M. H. (1936), *Reaction to Conquest* (London).
Wilson, P. (ed.) (2007), *The Greek Theatre and Festivals* (Oxford).
Wynne-Thomas, R.J.L. (1978), *The Legacy of Thasos* (London).
Xanthoudides, S. (1905-6), 'Cretan Kernoi', *BSA* 12, 9-23.
Yavis, C.G. (1949), *Greek Altars*, *Origins and Topography* (St. Louis).
Young, D. (1984), *The Olympic Myth of Greek Athletics* (Chicago).
Yunis, H. (1988), *A New Creed* (Göttingen).
Zaidman, L.B. (1989), 'Les dieux aux festins des mortels: Théoxénies et xeniai', in A.F. Laurens (ed.), *Entre hommes et dieux* (Paris), 13-25.
— (2001), *Le commerce des dieux* (Paris).
— (2005a), 'Xénophon entre dévotion privée et dévotion prblique. L'exemple de l'*Anabase*', in Dasen and Piérart (eds.) (2005), 99-111.
— (2005b), 'Offrandes et nourritures: repas des dieux et repas des hommes en Grèce ancienne', in Georgoudi, Piettre and Schmidt (eds.) (2005), 31-46.
Zelnick-Abramovitz, R. (2005), *Not Wholly Free: the concept of Manumission and the Status of the Manumitted Slave in the Ancient Greek World* (Leiden).
Ziehen, L. (1934), '*Theoroi'*, *RE* 5 A, 2239-44.
— (1939), 'Opfer', *RE* 18, 579-627.