

Sozial versus Politisch: divergierende Rollenbilder

Citizenship in Action: „Reading“ Sacrifice in Classical Athens*

Josine H. Blok

„It was we, men of Athens, who made Charidemos a citizen, and by that gift bestowed upon him a share in our *hiera kai hosia*, in our legal traditions, and in everything in which we ourselves participate.“¹ With these words, Demosthenes summarised what it meant to be a citizen of Athens. „A share in the *hiera* and *hosia*“ was no wording of his own, but a stock phrase, used frequently in discourse about citizenship.² Being an *Athenaios* or *Athenaia*, a citizen of Athens, entitled one to participation in the *hiera* and *hosia* of the city. And one could only be a citizen if born in an Athenian *oikos*,³ unless one was literally naturalised – changed to the condition *as if* one was born an Athenian and thus made a citizen (*dēmopoiêtos*). Considering that birth from two Athenian parents was the normal prerequisite for citizenship, it should come as no surprise that both men and women were counted as citizens, even if their respective roles in public and private life were different.⁴ Participation in the *hiera* and *hosia* of the *polis* concomitantly applied to male and female citizens alike.⁵ Conversely, by participating in the *hiera* and *hosia*, a citizen could demonstrate that he or she was a citizen. In this way, membership of the *polis* was put into practice.

* I am grateful to Christian Mann for inviting me to the conference at Freiburg i. Br. in November 2006, and to Stephen Lambert for continuous discussions, in particular for his comments on a concise version of this essay for the *Festschrift* for Herman Brijder (Blok 2008, in press). „Reading“ in the title pays tribute to the fundamental contributions made to our field by the late Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood. The study by Olaf Borgers referred to in this article is part of the project *Citizenship in classical Athens* based at Utrecht University.

1 Demosth. or. 23,65.

2 Participation (μετέχεν), in Pericles' Citizenship Law according to Aristot. Ath. pol. 26,3–4; participation in *hiera kai hosia* of *polis* and *oikos*: Is. 6,47; Demosth. or. 43,51; Schol. Aisch. 1,39; participation in *hiera* and *hosia* of the *polis* at naturalization: Apoll. *Neaira*, 94–106; *hiera* and *hosia* in the ephebic oath, Lykurg. 77; RO no. 88, l. 8–9, plus comm. *Hosia* is usually translated as „profane“, however, whereas I agree with Maffi 1982 that *hosios* does not include a notion of „secular“.

3 Until 451/0 from one Athenian parent and next, after Pericles' law of that year, from two Athenian parents. On these rules, Davies 1977, Patterson 2005.

4 On *Athenaios* and *Athenaia* and other citizenship vocabulary, Blok 2005; Patterson 2005.

5 Women's participation in *hiera*, *hosia* and *timai* of the *polis*: Apoll. *Neaira* 111–2.

But what are *hiera* and *hosia*? The meaning of *hosia* is a vexed and complicated problem, which deserves a separate discussion.⁶ *Hiera*, however, are relatively straightforward: „things of the gods“. *Hiera* included temples and the treasures stored there, sacred property such as lands and buildings belonging to the gods, votives and, last but not least, sacrifice. Whereas votives were usually given to the gods in fulfillment of a vow, either before or after receiving divine favour, sacrifice as a rule entailed gifts to which the gods were entitled by virtue of being the traditional protecting divinity. And while votives were objects intended to exist for a longer time, sacrifice was consumed, either by the gods alone or by humans and gods together. The most common sacrifices were animals, barley cakes and quantities of water or wine (libations).⁷ Notwithstanding the differences between sacrifice and votives, the two are structurally comparable as gifts to the gods. The procedure involved turning something that belonged to humans, either as common (*dêmosios*) or private (*idios*) property, into something belonging to the gods (*hieros*), (re)creating a bond between the mortals and immortals involved. In fact, both types of gift often happened together: many votives were clearly a remembrance of or a gift accompanying a sacrifice.⁸

Participation in *hiera*, then, would mainly imply participation in sacrifice, besides sharing in offering votives and taking care of the property of the gods.⁹ Many occasions of sacrifice, moreover, were a part of a festival also comprising a procession towards the sanctuary of the god(ess), dancing, praying or a nightly vigil (*pannychis*). Those who did not take part in the sacrifice proper participated by joining or watching the procession and other festivities.¹⁰ As consumption of the sacrifice by the gods alone occurred only rarely, a sacrifice would usually be concluded by a festive dinner for the human participants, the meat serving as main dish with additional foodstuffs like vegetables and lentils.¹¹

6 Blok 2010; the debate on the meaning of *hiera kai hosia*, Maffi 1982; the importance of the concept *hiera kai hosia* for the *polis*, Connor 1988.

7 Holocaust sacrifice was consumed by the gods in smoke, whereas some sacrifices were consumed by the gods or heroes below earth, such as piglets thrown into a pit for Demeter during the Thesmophoria and blood sacrifice for the dead heroes. For types of sacrifice in Greece, Burkert 1985 and the contributions to Hägg 2005; for Athens in particular Parker 2005.

8 Van Straten 1995, 53–4; Parker 2005, 37–49; Lambert 2005, 128–9.

9 Citizenship as participation in cult: Sourvinou-Inwood 1990; Rosivach 1994, 9–12 and passim; Jameson 1999; Blok 2007; handling the treasures of the gods at Athens, Linders 1975, Samons II 2000; lists of personnel in charge of the gods' property, Garland 1984; landed property of the gods, Horster 2004.

10 Jameson 1999, Evans 2004; different festivals catering meat to either small or to large groups of citizens, Rosivach 1994, 108.

11 On the proceedings and all foodstuffs consumed in the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth, Bookidis 1999. According to Jameson 1988, 105–6, (sacrificial) meat made up only a small portion of the entire average Athenian diet (ca. 4 kg. per person per year); Rosivach 1994, 60, 157–8 finds estimating the amount of meat practically impossible due to uncertain factors such as the size of animals, but arrives at an estimated 50 times per year for the average male to receive a portion. Beside immediate consumption, sacrificial meat could be taken home raw or be

All this evidence suggests that being a citizen of Athens principally meant participating in Athenian cults, religious festivities and sacrifice. Considering that Cleisthenes' political reorganization of Athens emphasised legitimate birth in an Athenian *oikos*, ritually confirmed by the phratry and in the case of men also scrutinised in the deme, and that it increased male citizens' active participation in political life, we can expect this comprehensive change to have affected the Athenians' awareness of their citizenship.¹² Moreover, the occasions of actual participation in such activities must have increased, as the Cleisthenic system added new social structures (deme, *trittys*, *phyle*) to the existing ones (*oikos*, „old“ deme, phratry, Ionian *phyle*), each with its own festivities and sacrifices.

Can this aspect of citizenship, consisting of participation in *hieria*, be traced in the historical records? And how can we assess the relation between public and private in civic cultic roles? Two kinds of evidence may allow such insights, on the one hand the imagery of sacrifice on vases with which Athenians surrounded themselves in their daily lives, on the other epigraphical evidence recording sacrificial practices by distinct Athenian groups and individuals. As each kind has its own qualities and limits, we need to read them separately first and then combined.¹³

Visual images obviously do not reflect the depicted phenomena in an unmediated way. The most famous representation of the central *polis* procession of Athens, the celebration depicted in the Parthenon friezes, is not a „real“ rendering of the Panathenaic procession as it took place every four years. The general set-up of the procession and many components such as specific figures carrying sacred objects and the line of sacrificial animals, appear to be a realistic mimesis of historical events, but many elements do not. Rather, the frieze *represents* – that is, it takes the place of the real event in a way suited to its purpose on the Parthenon. It sufficiently fits a general, even idealised, notion of the Panathenaic procession for it to have been recognised by onlookers familiar with the real event. It does not contain elements that would have upset or contradicted such a notion, for instance including women in the procession when in reality this was not the case. And it presents elements the human eye would never see but the mental eye would include in the celebration, namely the gods of Athens.¹⁴ The frieze shows us the visual mental world which

butchered and sold. Gallant 1991, 70–2 does not trust data indicating an even higher amount of meat and fish consumed by women in classical Athens; his doubt is in itself justified, but both he and Jameson underestimate the involvement of women in sacrificial actions, and in particular in the fish consumption at Demeter sanctuaries, as shown by Bookidis et al. 1999.

12 Citizenship depending on birth and confirmation in phratry: Lambert 1998², Patterson 1998; Gherchanoc 1998; Cleisthenes' revolution changing awareness of citizenship in political participation of men: Manville 1990, 173–209; Ober 1993; Walter 1993; Jones 1999.

13 On „reading“ visual evidence as a system in its own right, Sourvinou-Inwood 1991, 3–25; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995b.

14 For the debate on the meaning of the Parthenon frieze, Neils 2001, 173–201; Woodford 2003, 220–9; the frieze as *polis* ideal, Maurizio 1998; comparison with epigraphical evidence on Little Panathenaia, Brulé 1996.

refers to but does not copy the historical world. Understanding this representation requires reading it in the visual language inherent in these images, before comparing them with representations in written texts.

Compared with a unique object like the Parthenon frieze, vase paintings are an even more promising source for the visual mentality of the observers due to their sheer quantity and functions. Vase paintings were a generic genre: innovation and variety notwithstanding, they predominantly tended to create and use stock motifs, and, some clear exceptions apart, were made with an unspecified, general audience in mind.¹⁵ When a group of vase paintings can be connected with sufficient confidence to an Athenian audience, we may draw some inferences on what Athenians saw, expected to see or wanted to see when reminded of a phenomenon represented in a scene on their pottery. By reading the vase paintings made in Athens in this way, what can they tell us about citizens' participation in *hiera*?

The corpus of vase-paintings: main features

The present analysis of participation by citizen men and women in religious activities as represented in vase paintings is based on a corpus composed by Olaf Borgers.¹⁶ It includes all representations of men and women in scenes of sacrifice, libation and procession on Attic black- and red-figure pottery, totalling over a 1 000 vases and fragments dating from ca. 550 to 400 B. C.. Although it is not always possible to tell mortal and immortal figures clearly apart in these paintings, because the worlds of gods and humans were not fundamentally distinct in the Greek worldview either, scenes strongly ambiguous in this respect were left out, for instance those featuring a divinity and usually labelled „mythological“. Moreover, in order to assess the participation in *hiera* of men and women as citizens, their roles should be comparable. The selection is limited to types of scenes in which both sexes appear, leaving out those structurally featuring only one sex, such as the so-called Lenaia-vases showing an exclusively women's cult of Dionysos. I will first summarise Borgers' conclusions before turning to some considerations of my own.

a) Chronology and numbers

While most types of scenes representing religious activities are well attested in Attic vase painting from ca. 550 B. C. onwards, the numbers and the iconographic variety of religious scenes increase markedly by ca. 500. This is not only the case in absolute numbers, but also in proportion to the entire vase production. The latter fact can be gauged when black-figure scenes are taken into account, which

15 See also Van Straten 1995, 179.

16 Borgers 2008; all evidence and conclusions summarized in the section „The corpus of vase-paintings: main features (a-g)“ are expounded in detail in his article.

proportionally had to give way to red-figure pottery in the early decades of the fifth century. For instance, black-figure scenes of processions had been popular in the sixth century, but their number rises sharply between 500 and 475, indicating a significant increase of such scenes throughout. The greatest bulk of the entire corpus dates between 500 and 450 B. C., but various genres show different curves in popularity throughout the fifth century.¹⁷ This rise in the quantity and variety of scenes of religious activities in the first quarter of the fifth century suggests that the interest of the Athenians in such paintings did increase indeed.

b) Themes and numbers

The most numerous scenes within the corpus are, in absolute numbers:

- 1) figures standing near an altar (365)
- 2) sacrificial processions (252)
- 3) libations (200)
- 4) animal sacrifice (100)
- 5) (elements of) both libations and (animal) sacrifice (58)

c) Gender and numbers

As regards the representation of men and women, the corpus displays a proportion of roughly 3 : 2,2 : 1 for men, women, and men and women together, respectively. Within each group of scenes, however, the proportions vary to a quite remarkable extent (see below; figures are approximate).

d) Provenance and numbers

All vases were made in Athens, and the location where almost half these vases were found is known. Over a third of those vases were found in Athens and Attica, and slightly less than a third in northern and southern Italy; others were found elsewhere in Greece or outside Greece. As for the Athenian vases, most of them by far were found on the Akropolis and the Agora. Considering the shapes of the vases as well, the scenes are spread more or less evenly over various smaller types, with kraters (ca. 10% of the total) as a significant larger shape. When provenances are taken into account with reference to iconographical data, we find that scenes of processions are remarkably more numerous in Athens/Attica than anywhere else. Figures at altars, on the other hand, are far more frequent in Italy than elsewhere. Finally, gender representations also differ to a notable extent *qua* region.

¹⁷ Borgers presents both absolute numbers and percentages rendered in graphs.

A survey of the numbers expressed *in proportions* is as follows:

scene	men	women	men and women
figures at altars	6	5	1
sacrificial processions	2	1	1
libations	1	2,5	1
animal sacrifice	9	1,5	1
libation and animal sacrifice	9	3	1

provenance	men	women	men and women
Athens and Attica	4,5	3	2,5
Greece elsewhere	5,1	3,1	1,5
northern Italy	6	2,2	1,7
southern Italy	3,2	4,6	2

In other words, women outnumber men in southern Italy, men outnumber women and women & men everywhere else, but proportions are closer to each other in Athens/Attica, whereas the proportion of men to women is much higher elsewhere in Greece and in northern Italy than the other sets. To some extent, the peaks in numbers have to do with shapes: numerous cups from northern Italy show men at an altar, numerous *lekythoi* from southern Italy show women pouring libations. Yet several overall features are quite clear. Throughout the corpus there is a tendency to separate and highlight either men or women, even if the scenes are appropriate to both. A much smaller proportion of vases shows men and women acting together in religious scenes. Yet in Athens/Attica this group is more richly represented than elsewhere.

e) *Local environment*

The peaks in the evidence are, at least in part, due to a high proportion of a certain shape which was often popular in a particular area for reasons of size and use, with a certain type of scene. For instance, the peak in numbers of men-only scenes in northern Italy can be explained by the rising popularity of the *symposion* in Etruria from the sixth century onwards. It created a great demand for cups, decorated – notably by several specific workshops – with figures at altars, many of them men.¹⁸ Mutatis mutandis, the numbers in southern Italy probably have more to do with a demand for *lekythoi* than with a demand for representations of women pouring

18 Borgers discusses named painters and workshops specializing in specific scenes.

libations, although the two elements are closely connected (see also below). Taking, therefore, the effects of symposiastic fashion in Etruria and of funerary customs in southern Italy on the general tendencies in the corpus into account, we can detect a connection between *peaks* in the evidence and a *specific* market. Beyond such peaks, a firm basis for analysis of the generic production is provided by the larger tendencies within the entire corpus.

Let us keep in mind that vase paintings as a rule are a generic genre, representing scenes reflecting generally occurring social situations, popular visual motifs or well-known stories, and aiming at an unspecified, general audience. Painters would have made scenes which would appeal to the users. In this way, we can reasonably suppose a connection between daily life and the mental world of the buyers and the scenes they preferred. This social and mental world was in the first place the one surrounding the potters and painters at Athens, where the pots were made: it was there that the iconographical themes were created.

f) Gender and religious practice: general patterns

In this corpus of vase paintings, the regular religious activities of sacrifice, processions with a sacrificial purpose and libations are not represented as the exclusive domain of either men or women, but as performed by either sex and also by women and men together. Yet some distinct, gendered patterns catch the eye. Libation was primarily associated with women, animal sacrifice primarily with men. These connections are not just due to the gendered use of specific vases: the sample includes over seventeen different shapes used by men and women. Nor can they be attributed to the frequency of stock motifs: the correlations between gender and types of sacrifice occur in a varied range of iconographical motifs. The same gender distinctions in the performance of sacrifice are found in scenes combining elements of animal sacrifice and libations. Vases showing men in such combined sacrificial scenes outnumber those with women in the same type, and both again outnumber those with mixed groups. Comparing this result next with the proportions in libation scenes on the one hand and animal sacrifice on the other, and combining the two sets, we find that the vase scenes show men involved in libation more frequently than women in animal sacrifice.

Sacrifices of different kinds at altars are offered by women and men alike in almost equal numbers. In the case of sacrifice at an altar, men and women are portrayed more often acting separately and only rarely the two sexes are depicted together. Again, the latter tendency in the visual material is to some extent due to the small size of the shapes: when a small cup has space for one figure plus an altar only, it is either a man or a woman. Yet the occurrence of single sex groups on larger shapes indicates that size is not the main cause of this type of representation. Apparently, sacrificial practice in Athens was perceived as performed predominantly either by men or by women and less frequently by women and men together. This fact would fit well the highly valued separate socializing of the sexes in ancient

Greece.¹⁹ Nevertheless, the vases found at Athens show markedly more interaction of men and women in religious practices than those in other regions of Greece and Italy. This is most clearly the case in scenes with processions heading towards a sacrifice: mixed groups in such processions are far more numerous on vases found at Athens than elsewhere.²⁰

g) *Frameworks: public and private, male and female*

Whereas Borgers is the first to have made a systematic overview of men and women in religious representations in vase paintings, comprehensive studies of religious scenes have recently been provided by F. Van Straten, *Hiera kalà* (1995), on animal sacrifice, and J. Gebauer, *Pompe und Thysia* (2002), on sacrificial processions. Besides these iconographical studies, men's and women's roles in religious practice are studied in the broader context of Athenian society.

Van Straten and Gebauer have both proposed to classify scenes by making a distinction between public and private occasions, also labelled official and unofficial, to be deduced from the pictorial evidence itself. Van Straten suggests three iconographical criteria for a public occasion: the presence of a female *kanephoros*, musicians and a large number of participants.²¹ Each of the three is highly problematic, however. A *kanephoros*, a girl (or, occasionally, a young man) carrying the *kanoun* with sacrificial tools, played an indispensable role in animal sacrifice, whether public or private. Scenes with males only and with a male *kanephoros* would be private occasions, according to Van Straten, but we do not really know if that was the case. Few festivals are known to have been exclusively for men, but one such was perhaps the Olympieia, hosting *agones* with horses and a cavalry procession in honour of Zeus Olympios.²² Would the procession of this festival be headed by a female *kanephoros*, or rather a male one? The latter seems more likely, but, lacking evidence, we cannot use the gender of the *kanephoros* as a criterion. Large numbers of participants are equally unhelpful, because they indicate the idea of „a large group“ in so far as the picture space allowed. A vase painting cannot represent the numerical difference between the spectators of the Panathenaia and a large family. Musicians, finally, are also present in small scenes with few participants, notably in the set „figures at altars“, which of all the groups of vases discussed here is the most suggestive of being „private“, lacking attributes like priests, temples or other indications of a grander scale.

19 On separation and interaction of men and women Schnurr-Redford 1996 and with particular interest in religious activities Sourvinou-Inwood 1995a; Blok 2001; extensively on separate religious actions Parker 2005, 165–6, 270–89.

20 Borgers 2008, combination of his graphs 22 and 23.

21 Van Straten 1995, 13.

22 Few men-only festivals, Parker 2005, 165 and the Olympieia, 477; animal sacrifice at Olympieia indicated by sale of skins, IG II² 1496, A 82–3, 113–4.

Gebauer, dismissing Van Straten's criteria, sees no clear iconographical indications to decide on the status of the occasion.²³ Instead, he assumes differences in status in sacrificial acts. Libation scenes are basically private, and the female *kanephoroi* present at such scenes cannot be „official“ *kanephoroi*, while the libations themselves are predominantly performed by „Opferherren“, according to Gebauer.²⁴ However, women are represented as performing such libations on numerous vases, and libations were a part of public festivals. The Panathenaia are a conspicuous example, as the Parthenon frieze shows several pairs of women with *phialai* and *lekythoi*.²⁵ Carrying the libation utensils usually included also actually making the libation, in particular by cult personnel such as priestesses and women participating in formal roles in the *pompe*.²⁶

In sum, there are no iconographical criteria which can be applied to classify a scene as public or private. A combination of features, for instance scenes featuring many attendants, sacrificial animals and the image of a deity or temple, is highly suggestive of an official occasion. But one cannot be sure it is „public“, beyond the fact that the scene takes place outdoors near a temple. It is equally impossible to classify a scene as unequivocally „private“, unless attributes indicate that it takes place indoors in a private house. Neither is the presence of men or women a sign of the public or private character of the scene. A women-only group as such is no indication of a private event. Even if citizen women were expected to behave „privately“ in daily life, this is not to say that they always remained indoors, and women-only festivals, like the Thesmophoria, Stenia and Haloa, were *polis* festivals, as public or „official“ as any other.²⁷

Clearly, the pictures themselves rarely offer sufficiently eloquent clues as to the public or private character of the religious occasion. Gebauer in particular is influenced by judgements derived elsewhere on gendered aspects of sacrificial behaviour. A standard view holds that women were not involved in animal sacrifice, least of all as the ones carrying out the ritual, and as onlookers they were only allowed to give the required cry on the moment of killing. Libations likewise were allegedly mainly performed by men and only rarely by women, certainly in public. The reasons for this exclusion from public sacrifice would be women's exclusion from citizenship first of all, augmented with the prohibition to wield weapons in the case of animal killing.²⁸

23 Gebauer 2002, 487–8.

24 Ibid.169–70; 444.

25 Libation bearers in Parthenon frieze, figures no. 2–12 and 55–63 (East frieze), see Jenkins 1994. Similar contradictory statements on libations are abundant in Dillon 2001, 39, 43, 49, who states first that women were not allowed to pour libations, and next shows them busy doing so.

26 Connelly 2007, 167–79.

27 On indoors and outdoors in relation to female and male and public and private, Blok 2001; women's festivals, Parker 2005, ch. 13.

28 Women's exclusion from animal sacrifice related to their exclusion from citizenship, Loraux 1993; Detienne 1989; exclusion from libation as a rule, though exceptions accepted, Dillon 2001, cf. note 25; emphasis on exclusion from public ritual, Cole 1992; exclusion from citizenship

However, these views are untenable. Although women were definitely not expected to use weapons in combat, written and other visual evidence shows that they did perform animal sacrifice, if less frequently than men, and that they often performed libations.²⁹ The corpus of vases discussed here confirms this conclusion. Likewise, women were citizens of Athens, even if they did not participate in public decision making. Precisely in the area of cult, public and private, their roles as citizens were conspicuous and indispensable.³⁰ It still makes sense, therefore, to interpret the evidence of cultic behaviour in the framework of citizenship, but with different parameters than of a division between men as included and women as excluded, or a fixed gendered relation of public and private. Instead, we need to look at the variety of civic roles and cultic contexts in which men and women performed their membership as citizens of Athens. This world of civic practice needs to be reconstructed with other evidence than the corpus of vase paintings.

Public and private sacrifice: reading written evidence

In an attempt to identify social patterns in sacrificial practice, we need to combine two lines of inquiry. The first is to define the element „public“ more precisely by tracing the means by which a sacrifice or cult might be qualified as public, and, similarly, „private“ should be defined adequately. This is not to say that the distinction was always clear-cut. Membership of an *oikos* was fundamental to membership of the *polis* and rules of the *polis* interfered with the *oikos*, introducing a private element in every public event and vice versa.³¹ A private sacrifice would get a communal aspect when friends were invited to share the meal and the host displayed his wealth by laying it all out.³² Nevertheless, the Athenians made a distinction between *idia* and *dêmosia*, and this also applied to cult and sacrifice. Second, we need to identify the people actually involved in sacrifice and the occasions in which they did so.

Both lines of inquiry require written evidence; the epigraphical evidence of votives in particular, testifying which people made the sacrifices, may help envisage the connections between male and female, public and private in participation in *hiera*. The important variables in this evidence are the dedicator's access to durable writing in stone or on potshards, and the historical contingencies which preserved

underlying the Thesmophoria, Versnel 1993, ch. 4. The idea of citizenship as an exclusively male status and animal sacrifice as an exclusively male right obviously cannot be reconciled with Van Straten's view that an all-male sacrificial group would by definition be a private occasion.

29 Performance of animal sacrifice by women: Kron 1992; Osborne 1993; role of women in sacrifice in general, Connelly 2007, 179–90, pointing out that modern historians' perspective of ancient ritual has been heavily influenced by Christian values regarding sacrifice and priestly roles.

30 Sourvinou-Inwood 1995a.

31 Although MacDowell 1989 argues that the *oikos* was not a legal entity, laws of the *polis* on inheritance and on citizenship had a deep impact on the composition of the *oikos*.

32 Rosivach 1994, 9.

such texts for us to read. I will focus on the material which is roughly contemporary with the vase scenes, from the mid-sixth to the end of the fifth century, with an occasional excursion into the fourth century.³³

Based on Greek vocabulary and practices, we can classify as public (*dêmosios*) a cult for which the responsibility lay in some way or other with the *polis* or one of its subgroups (*deme*, *trittys*, *phyle*). The scope of this responsibility ranged from organizing and financing the entire festival to appointing a board of cult personnel to manage parts of the cult and the sanctuary (such as *hieropoioi*, *epimeletai* and others), listing the accounts of the sale of skins of sacrificial victims, paying for the wood or seeing to just a part of the sacrificial procedure.³⁴ Some cults can be recognised as public due to the officiating priest(esse)s. At *polis* level, the priesthoods filled by the traditional priestly families (*genê*) and those, beginning in the second half of the fifth century, filled by ordinary citizens, male or female, appointed by lot for a year, served the communal sacrifice for other citizens than of the particular subgroup to which he or she belonged. In the *polis* subgroups, one of the group members would be appointed, usually for a year, as priest.³⁵

Public cults figured in the sacrificial calendars of the *polis* and of the demes regulating the gifts owed by the community to the gods. The calendars ordered and fixed in writing the days of the year, kinds, prices, revenues and ways in which these gifts were to be offered.³⁶ The actual performance of these regular sacrifices fell to priests and priestesses, often assisted by citizen *hieropoioi*. The calendars listed occasions when animal sacrifice was the main or only event, and it depended on the divinity and the rules of the cult whether men or women or men and women were involved. Some of the vase scenes with processions could evoke such festivals with either one single sex or both sexes as participants. The calendars, combined with other epigraphical evidence on public sacrifice at festivals such as the fourth-century Regulations on the Little Panathenaia (IG II²

33 My discussion is based on votive evidence from IG I³, compared with Parker 2005, ch. 2 and his lists on 45–49, and informed by an unpublished overview of „state-cults“ made by Stephen Lambert in the context of the Utrecht project. The dates given in IG are generally retained, clear shifts in opinions excepted, as more precise dates are not essential to the present analysis. For discussion of similar questions Sourvinou-Inwood 1990, Aleshire 1994b and Georgoudi 1998.

34 The adjective *dêmosios* (on which Fouchar 1998) is used most frequently for the financing of (parts of) the cult, on which also Pirenne-Delforge 2005, but this does not fully cover the practice of public cults, many of which were financed by the gods themselves (*hieros* money), managed by public officials: Whitehead 1986, ch. 6 and 7; Rosivach 1994, 107–42; Horster 2004, 72–9.

35 On public priesthoods Feaver 1957, Aleshire 1994a, Parker 1996, ch. 5 and 8; on priestesses Georgoudi 1993; Connelly 2007. An exception to the rule that a member of a *polis* sub-group served as its priest concerns the cults of those tribal eponymous heroes who enjoyed a cult with a *genos* priest already before Cleisthenes, Schlaifer 1940; Parker 1996, 292–3.

36 For the sacrificial *polis*-calendar of Athens, Lambert 2002; sacrificial practices in extant local calendars of Eleusis, Erchia, Teithras, the Marathonian Tetrapolis, Thorikos and of the Salaminioid *genos*, Van Straten 1995; Rosivach 1994.

334, RO 81) and the Skin Sale Accounts (IG II² 1496), reveal that cattle (ox, cow, bull) were predominantly slaughtered at public and rarely at private sacrifices.³⁷ Presence of cattle in sacrificial scenes is therefore a strong, albeit not watertight, criterion of a public cultic event. The remarkably huge proportion of these scenes in vase paintings compared with pictures of sacrifice of other animals (sheep, pigs) indicates the high value of public sacrifice as a topic among Athenian buyers of vases, as Van Straten rightly observes.³⁸

Sacrifice could also accompany a public action of a different kind, the success of which was due to the help of the gods and celebrated accordingly, such as an *agon* or a military campaign. In such cases, the actors were usually groups of citizen men in their political and military roles, occasionally accompanied by a priest(ess). In both cases it was the community as a whole, as a public body, which was represented in the officiants performing the sacrifice.

With these parameters of „public“ sacrifice in mind, a small group (5 pieces) in the corpus of votive inscriptions is now immediately identifiable as such: dedications set up by a group of men, who identify themselves as acting in a public quality, for instance the *hieropoioi* who laid out the *dromos* (for the Panathenaia?) in the mid-sixth century, or the *prytaneis* of the *phyle* Erechtheis who made a gift to Athena after a victory in 408/7.³⁹ Another seventeen votives were dedicated on behalf of „all Athenians“, such as dedications of war booty to Athena, that do not mention specific actors.⁴⁰ The situation suggests that the spoils were dedicated by the *strategoï* on behalf of the Athenian victorious contingents, under the guidance of the priestess of Athena Polias, but this must remain undecided. Some of the vase paintings in the corpus with only men could refer to public occasions of this kind.

„Private“ (*idios*, one's own) was used in opposition to *dêmosios*, referring to individuals or families. The adjective itself is not used in votive inscriptions, but a large group of dedications made in the fifth century by individuals or small groups as a gift to Athena – rarely to another deity, as the majority concerns votives found on the Akropolis – can confidently be identified as „private“. ⁴¹ The reason for the dedication as stated in the inscription are fulfilling a vow, or giving first fruits, or as the gift of a tenth, or not given at all. Selecting those with names that can be clearly identified, and leaving out the far more numerous ones with only the word „... has set up as a votive ...“, we can get some idea of the gendered patterns of votive

37 Rosivach 1994, 68–78, 107–113; Van Straten 1995, 170–81, pointing out that the (rare) fourth-century votive reliefs with cattle refer to private sacrifice.

38 Van Straten 1995, 178–80, emphasizing the high monetary value of cattle.

39 Public groups: IG I³ 507–515.

40 IG I³ 517–522bis.

41 Inscribed votives to Asklepios and other gods are dated to the fourth century and later, Aleshire 1989; copies of records of votives to Artemis Brauronia were kept on the Akropolis, but the objects were at Brauron, Linders 1972.

behaviour. Among the inscribed dedications made by one person alone, 165 were made by a single man and 30 by a single woman. Small groups can also be classified: 36 male groups of two or a few more, often identifying themselves as brothers or a father with his sons, and 5 small female groups, consisting of two women, often including their children (and once a husband) in the favour asked of the goddess. Robert Parker, listing nearly all these votives in his recent study, rightly observes that some family connection between the dedicators is also highly likely in the cases where no family relationship is mentioned. Similarly, a single dedicator can also be offering on behalf of others, notably of his or her family.⁴² These dedications were all found on or very near to the Akropolis; outside that area, four more male and one female group of dedicators left written traces.

The group as a whole yields quite a clear result: within the set of private dedications, the proportion of women to men, either single or in groups, is roughly 1 : 5. Far fewer women than men made private dedications with inscriptions, although this private gift-giving to the gods was neither a typically male nor a typically female activity. Again, the fewest cases are those involving men and women together: in the selection discussed here, we find only two examples of a husband and wife dedicating together, both dating to the early fifth century.⁴³ In the fourth century, the number of joint dedications by entire families increases greatly.⁴⁴

The dedications made by single men or women can be compared with the vase scenes of figures at altars on the one hand and libations on the other. As we saw, the occurrence of women and men together in this group of scenes is rare, though less rare than in the epigraphical evidence. The proportions of men and women in visual scenes at altars is far closer to equal (6 : 5) than in the epigraphical record of private dedications. Assuming that the vase painters reflected practices considered general and normal, we may deduce that women's sacrificial behaviour was more frequent than the epigraphical record indicates. The differences between the two types of evidence may be explained, first of all, by the fact that women's access to writing in stone and costly votives was more limited than men's due to constraints on women's spending of money.⁴⁵ Only a small minority of extant

42 Parker 2005, 47–8; to his lists may be added for the fifth century IG I³ 820 (brothers), 850, 1014; on the votive statues Keesling 2003.

43 IG I³ 644 (also in Parker 2005, 48); IG I³ 705.

44 Parker 2005, 37–49; not all votive gifts (reliefs, figurines) carry inscriptions.

45 In law, women were not allowed to spend more than the value of a medimne barley of the *oikos*' wealth without its *kyrios*' consent, although the effects of this law may have been slight in practice, Schaps 1979, 52–8. Foxhall 1989 shows that the wealth of an *oikos* was common property under supervision of the male head of the household rather than his private property. A woman's own wealth usually consisted of her dowry, which could range from just a few trinkets to extensive land property, money and herds (Harrison 1971, I, 236–7). *Stelai* ordered by the *polis* with much larger inscriptions than the average votive gift would cost 20–30 dr. (Loomis 1998, 121–3), a modest grave *stela* with inscription would cost 10–20 dr. (Oliver 2000).

votive inscriptions concerns pots instead of stone or other less expensive gifts.⁴⁶ Many offerings at altars, moreover, were small or perishable gifts, such as sacrificial cakes (*pelanoi*), wreaths, boughs, terracotta figurines and textiles. Most gifts were burned and thus left no trace. Many of women's sacrifices, finally, would concern small offerings at the home altars – they would be a familiar sight to all Athenians, but not likely to be remembered in stone.⁴⁷

Libations could also be offered at an altar, but were a different kind of sacrifice than animal sacrifice or cakes and similar modest gifts at altars. The liquid could be wine, oil, milk, or water; libations could be part of a larger ritual or just a quick sign of reverence to the gods. Among the most common occasions in a private context were spending a little wine for the gods before dinner, ritual cleansing with water after pollution due to birth or death, and the observance of death rituals by pouring libations at the grave. Precisely the latter two were predominantly – again, not exclusively – the responsibility of women. They, too, are the kind of sacrifices which would leave no trace in the epigraphical record, but are represented profusely in vase paintings.⁴⁸ Libations as part of a larger ritual were performed by men or women, depending on the occasion. The most prominent public event in which women performed this role were the Panathenaia, as we saw above, a festival for both men and women. The public burial of the war dead, on the other hand, would probably feature men pouring libations on the common *polis* grave, although no evidence tells us so unequivocally.⁴⁹ In sum, a vase painting showing one man or one woman pouring a libation may be either a single, independent action or an excerpt of a larger event, and may be either public or private.

Sacrifice between public and private

The notion „private“ applied to all inscribed dedications by individuals should be qualified to some extent. They were private in so far as the giver did not act in an official *polis*-capacity (for instance, as magistrate or priest(ess)) but as a member of a family or on his/her own account. Likewise, the intended beneficiaries of the gift to the gods were ultimately the giver and his or her family. The gifts were public, however, in being displayed for all to see on a conspicuous place. Moreover, dedications on behalf of the family may have been made in the context of a *polis*-

46 IG I³ 561 – 583, some of which include multiple fragments; many refer to dedications by women, for instance the *oinochoai* nos. 571 and 572. On women's dedications in Athens and elsewhere, Kron 1996.

47 On home altars, Parker 2005, ch. 1.

48 Beside the corpus collected by Borgers, Oakley 2003 analyses representations of burial rites on white *lekythoi*: offerings at the grave, notably baskets with gifts and *lekythoi*, 203–12; predominance of women in domestic care of the dead and at graves, 74–7, 213–4.

49 Oakley 2003, 216 supposes that white *lekythoi* in particular may have served this purpose.

festival, for instance the Apatouria, a large-scale *polis*-festival celebrating the acceptance of new citizens. The sacrifices offered at this occasion and commemorated in permanent votive gifts included animal sacrifice.⁵⁰ In this context, public and private were fundamentally connected in a way which has no equivalent in modern society. Indeed, a very large group of dedications and sacrificial activities is recorded in epigraphical evidence and literary records that cannot be classified as clearly public or private and in fact defies such a distinction entirely.

A conspicuous series of dedications concerns commemorations of choral victories.⁵¹ As a monument to the victorious performance of the tribal choral competition, the choregic dedication was a truly public celebration of a public event. Yet the *choregos* paying for the costs of training and performance did so as an individual responding to social expectations, spending private money representing the wealth and prestige of his *oikos* and including his family in his public honour by his patronymic in the inscription.⁵² The choregic enterprise entailed sacrifice before and after the performance with all the men or boys who made up the chorus. The same would be the case, of course, with choral and dramatic festivities in the demes.⁵³ The whole system of *leitourgiai* revolved around the principle of infusing public benefits with private interests as a mark of civic commitment.⁵⁴

A small sample of epigraphical records features groups of people dedicating to the gods as a local community: the inhabitants of Sounion, for instance, or the inhabitants of the deme Halai Aixonidai.⁵⁵ They are public dedications made by (representatives of) a collective, but there is no indication of a publicly acknowledged occasion or funding – the sacrifice and dedication seem to have been a „private“ initiative by a public body or vice versa.

If the public aspect somewhat dominates the private in these two series, the two spheres are essentially intertwined in a third and highly important group of events: the gatherings of the phratries. The main sacrificial activities of the phratries took place during the Apatouria, mentioned briefly before. After Cleisthenes' reorganization of Athens' political structure and its extension of citizenship, the phratries gained in importance, to be further enhanced after Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451/0, as they controlled entry into citizenship by descent. The phratries

50 A possible dedication of this kind: Acropolis Museum no. 581 (ca. 500 B. C.), Palagia 1995.

51 Seventeen inscribed extant cases in the present sample, IG I³ 957–970, several numbers consisting of several items.

52 On the public and private honour involved in carrying out the *choregia*, Wilson 2000, 22ff., 46. In the fourth century, the use of demotics as well as patronymics in such inscriptions becomes frequent.

53 For instance the *choregoi* mentioned in the decree of Ikarion (IG I³ 254, later fifth century).

54 Officials providing sacrificial animals out of their own means and being praised for the same in honorific decrees appear in the last third of the fourth century and therefore beyond the time boundaries of this article, but they are a telling expansion of the *leitourgia*-system, Rosivach 1994, 128–31.

55 IG I³ 1024: the inhabitants of Sounion, ca. 550 B. C.; IG I³ 1013, three votive inscriptions by the demesmen of Halai Aixonidai, ca. 475? B. C.

thus guaranteed the essential connection between participation in the *hiera* and *hosia* of the *oikos* and those of the *polis*, underlying the notion of legitimate citizenship.⁵⁶ Precisely in the decades between 500 and 450, the phratries must have played a crucial role in the newly democratic society of Athens. It is not inconceivable that the remarkably numerous vase scenes dating to 500–475 featuring men, both older and younger, involved in sacrifice of smaller animals and sacrificial processions, recalled the activities of the phratries to the viewers and buyers.

The Apatouria were an ancient festival well-known for abundant festivities. They included a festivity on the first evening, next a day of sacrifices to Zeus Phratrios and Athena Phratria, and on the third day sacrifices accompanying the acceptance of young infants (*meion*) and adolescents (*koureion*). In some phratries, girls were included in the procedure and women were celebrated as mothers of new-born citizens. Nevertheless, the core of the festival clearly concerned the male *phrateres* as guardians of citizenship of both men and women. Some epigraphical documents register details of the procedure and the role of the phratry priest.⁵⁷ Literary records, notably fourth-century forensic speeches on legitimate birth due to contested citizenship or inheritances, are particularly eloquent. Swearing on the legitimacy of children by their fathers or representative kinsmen required putting one's hand on the slaughtered animal provided by the father and lying on the altar. Especially in case of doubt, the *phrateres* had to cast votes near the altar, as recalled in a dispute on legitimacy:

„... I introduced this boy to the *phrateres* of Hagnias and Euboulides [...] And the *phrateres* [...], who knew most about this family, seeing that he [the defendant's father] did not wish to risk a dispute and did not remove the sacrificial victim from the altar, as he should have done if the boy was not introduced as befits legitimacy, but insisted that they would commit perjury, took the ballot while the sacrifice was still burning, carried it from the altar of Zeus Phratrios in the presence of [the defendant] and voted justly, that this boy was correctly and legitimately introduced as the adopted son of Euboulides into the family of Hagnias.“ (Demosth. or 43,14).

56 Is. 6,47; Demosth.. or. 43,51; Schol. Aisch. 1,39: ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ ἔστι νόθῳ μὴδὲ νόθῃ εἶναι ἀγχιστέραν μὴθ' ἱερῶν μὴθ' ὀσίων ἀπ' Εὐκλείδου ἄρχοντος. „for according to the law no male or female bastard has any right, based on kinship, to participate in the *hiera kai hosia*, as of the archonship of Euclides“ (403/2).

57 On the phratries and particularly the Apatouria, Lambert 1998², 143–89, on women's roles in the Apatouria, 36–37, 178–88; Schmitt-Pantel 1977. Important epigraphical documents on the phratries' sacrificial activities all date to the fourth century: the Demotionidai decree, IG II² 1237 (Lambert 1998², T 3); the Dekeleis decree, IG II² 1242 (T 4). Phratries were particularly important for safeguarding the citizenship rights of girls, whose legitimacy was not, like that of boys, reinstated at deme level; Isaeus 3 presents a legal case concerning a girl's rights.

The practice of drawing up lists of deme members and even phratry members was added to, but never supplanted the personal overseeing of membership by the *phrateres*.⁵⁸

A fourth series of activities on the crossroads of public and private concerns the sacrificial performances by the *genê*. We saw them briefly before as the traditional priests and priestesses officiating on behalf of the *polis*, that is in a public capacity. Serving these cults was claimed as the heritage of the *genê* since time immemorial, however, and some cults are hard to identify as either truly public (of the *polis*) or private (of the *genos*). The illustrious Eteoboutadai, who supplied the priest of Poseidon Erechtheus, sacrificed to their family *heros* Boutes in the sacred *polis*-area of the Akropolis and displayed an overview of their family, in names or in portraits, in the Erechtheion.⁵⁹ The Salaminioi were in charge of a range of cults in some of which apparently the priests received their perquisites from the *genos* and the priestesses from the *polis* – once again evidence refuting the all too easy equivalence of male with the public and female with the private sphere.⁶⁰ In fact, the *genos* members consumed some of the meat of a sacrifice made by the *genos* on behalf of the *polis* and provided by the *polis* among themselves – which was not a private meal but not a clearly public one either.⁶¹ It probably goes too far to look for visual clues of *genos* activity in the vase scenes, but like the phratries the *genê* were an important group with prominent sacrificial duties embodying the essential connection between public and private in the sphere of citizenship.

Finally, religious groups which are usually labelled „private“ should be mentioned: *orgeones*, *thiasotai*, *eranistai*, *theastai* and many more. Their rules regarding membership – one sex only, or both sexes; citizens or metics only, or the two of them combined; the gods they worshipped; the regulation of the costs involved – varied considerably.⁶² They were certainly private in so far as their activities were not included in or regulated by public prescriptions such as fixed days in the calendar of a deme or scrutiny by a *polis* or deme body. Many such groups were traditional, with more or less hereditary membership. Yet some operated on the borderline between private and public: membership of *orgeones* implied membership of phratries and hence citizenship by law, probably Pericles' Law of 451/0.⁶³ Maybe we should envisage groups like the *thiasos* of Etionidai,

58 The relative scarcity of phratry documents compared to their fundamental role in society exemplifies that social significance and the use of writing were far from being equivalent phenomena in archaic and classical Athens.

59 [Plut.] Vitae X Or., 843 E-F; the *graphai* mentioned in the text could be either paintings or inscribed names; LSJ s. v. γραφή. The shrine of Boutes in the Erechtheion on the Akropolis, Jeppesen 1987. On the Eteoboutad priesthoods, Lambert forthcoming (in *Festschrift* John Davies).

60 See Parker 1996, 311; Lambert 1997; RO no. 37 and commentary on 188–192 on the distribution of roles and perquisites of Salaminioi priests and priestesses.

61 RO 37, ll. 19–26; see also Rosivach 1994, 132.

62 A clear overview of these groups in the classical period, Parker 1996, 333–8.

63 On the *orgeones* and citizenship, Philochoros FGrHist 328 F 35 a and b; Lambert 1998², 46–9. In the grey area between citizen and metic, the acceptance of the cult of Bendis as a *polis* cult before

who made a dedication to Herakles before the mid-fifth century, and, as their name indicates, perceived themselves as a strongly knit, quasi-kin group.⁶⁴ The degree to which such religious groups were private or public cannot be ascertained by the gender of the participants, but by the contingencies of extant documents only. The vase scenes featuring single sex or mixed groups involved in animal sacrifice, with or without libations, and processions, either with or without elements of animal sacrifice, may well reflect the actions of such groups, predominantly private in nature but not without public overtones.

Conclusions

The increasing importance of citizenship following the reforms of Cleisthenes, involving a rising number of cultic activities in which legitimate membership of the *polis* was put into practice and publicly demonstrated, seems to be reflected in the imagery on Athenian pottery. Attic black-figure and red-figure vase paintings with men and women in religious activities show a significant increase in quantity and variety in the first decades of the fifth century. Compared with pottery exported to Etruria, Magna Graecia and other regions outside Attica, the vases catered to Athens itself in the fifth century portray a markedly larger proportion of processions, sacrifices and mixed groups of men and women involved in such activities. Although all Greek evidence clearly points to preferred separation of the sexes in social events including religious activities, the proportionally higher frequency of women and men acting together in the Athenian visual material reveals a commonality superseding or, rather, underlying this separation. This commonality makes sense in the context of shared citizenship based on legitimate descent. Membership of citizen subgroups, ranging from families as involved in the *Apatouria* to demes and to large-scale subgroups comprising of all men or all women or indeed the entire citizen population, was defined and celebrated by participation in *hierai*, notably sacrifice.

Consistent attempts to define iconographic criteria distinguishing public and private occasions in this corpus of religious scenes, for instance by using the participation of men or women in the depicted activities as a yardstick, have not been successful. Instead, a large proportion of religious citizen activities have been shown to be essentially neither public nor private, but both or neither. Moreover, numerous unequivocally public occasions of sacrifice and processions featured men, women or both. The only means to decide on the public or private qualities of a particular event are criteria attested in written evidence, much of it epigraphical.

429 materialized, sustained by the *orgeones* of the goddess, Parker 2005, 170–5; Sara Wijma is preparing a publication on this issue.

64 IG I³ 1016.

Men and women were citizens, but their roles as citizens differed in some important respects. No form of participation in *hieria* was the exclusive prerogative of one sex, but men were far more frequently involved in animal sacrifice, and women far more in libations. Similarly, men and women were both involved in public, civic religious activities and in private ones. Yet men were involved far more frequently than women in public activities. Men's participation in political bodies, each with their own regime of ritual practices, the increasing influence of the *polis* on existing cult practices by assigning selected *hieropoioi* and other male citizen personnel, and the gradual extension of cult practice to political and military subgroups along the lines of *phyle* and *deme*, made the range of men's public subgroups and concomitant religious practices larger, more frequent and varied than women's in the course of the fifth century. This divergence in civic roles is reflected in the different degrees of involvement of men and women in animal sacrifice as represented in Attic painted pottery.

Bibliography:

- Aleshire, S. B. 1989. *The Athenian Asclepieion. The People, their Dedications and the Inventories*. Amsterdam.
- Aleshire, S. B. 1994a. *The Demos and the Priests: The Selection of Sacred Officials at Athens from Cleisthenes to Augustus*, in: Osborne, R. – Hornblower, S. (Hgg.), *Ritual, Finance, Politics. Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*. Oxford, 325–337.
- Aleshire, S. B. 1994b. *Towards a Definition of „State Cult“ for Ancient Athens*, in: Hägg, R. (Hg.), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*. Stockholm, 9–16.
- Blok, J. H. 2001. *Virtual Voices. Towards a Choreography of Women's Speech in Classical Athens*, in: Lardinois, A. – McClure, L. (Hgg.), *Making Silence Speak. Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton, 95–116.
- Blok, J. H. 2005. *Becoming Citizens. Some Notes on the Semantics of „Citizen“ in Archaic Greece and Classical Athens*, *Klio* 87, 7–40.
- Blok, J. H. 2007. *Fremde, Bürger und Baupolitik im klassischen Athen*, *Historische Anthropologie* 15, 309–326
- Blok, J. H. 2010. *Deme Accounts and the Meaning of hosiou Money, Mnemosyne* (in print).
- Bookidis, N. – Hansen, J. – Snyder, L. – Goldberg, P. 1999. *Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth*, *Hesperia* 68, 1–54.
- Borgers, O. 2008. *Religious Citizenship in Classical Athens: Men and Women in Religious Representations on Athenian Vase-painting*, *BABesch* 83, 73–97.
- Brulé, P. 1996. *La cité en ses composantes: remarques sur les sacrifices et la procession des Panathénées*, *Kernos* 6, 37–63.

- Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Cole, S. G. 1992. Gynaiki ou themis: Gender Difference in the Greek Leges Sacrae, *Helios* 19, 105–122.
- Connelly, J. B. 2007. *Portrait of a Priestess. Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*. Princeton – Oxford.
- Connor, W. R. 1988. ‚Sacred‘ and ‚secular‘: Hiera kai hestia and the Classical Athenian Concept of the State, *AncSoc* 19, 161–188.
- Davies, J. 1977. Athenian Citizenship: The Descent Group and the Alternatives, *CJ* 73, 105–21.
- Detienne, M. 1989. The Violence of Wellborn ladies: Women at the Thesmophoria, in: Detienne, M. – Vernant, J.-P. (Hgg.), *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks*. Chicago – London, 129–147.
- Dillon, M. 2001. *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion*. London – New York.
- Evans, N. 2004. Feasts, Citizens, and Cultic Democracy in Classical Athens, *AncSoc* 34, 1–25.
- Feaver, D. D. 1957. Historical Development in the Priesthoods of Athens, *YCLS* 15, 123–58.
- Fouchard, A. 1998. Dèmosios et dèmos: sur l'État grec, *Ktèma* 23, 59–69.
- Foxhall, L. 1989. Household, Gender and Property in Classical Athens, *CQ* 39, 22–44.
- Gallant, T. W. 1991. *Risk and Survival in Ancient Greece*. Stanford.
- Garland, R. S. J. 1984. Religious Authority in Archaic and Classical Athens, *BSA* 79, 75–124.
- Gebauer, J. 2002. *Pompe und Thysia. Attische Tieropferdarstellungen auf schwarz- und rotfigurigen Vasen*. Münster.
- Georgoudi, S. 1993. Lisimaca, la sacerdotessa, in: Loraux, N. (Hg.), *Grecia al femminile*. Rome, 155–196.
- Georgoudi, S. 1998. Sacrifices dans le monde grec: de la cité aux particuliers: quelques remarques, *Ktèma* 23, 325–334.
- Gherchanoc, F. 1998. Le lien filial dans l'Athènes classique: pratiques et acteurs de sa reconnaissance, *Mètis* 13, 313–344.
- Hägg, R. – Alroth, B. (Hgg.) 2005. *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian*. Proceedings of the Sixth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Göteborg University, 25–27 April 1997. Stockholm.
- Harrison, A. R. W. 1971. *The Law of Athens*. 2 vols. Oxford – London – Indianapolis.
- Horster, M. 2004. *Landbesitz griechischer Heiligtümer in archaischer und klassischer Zeit*. Berlin – New York.
- Jameson, M. H. 1988. Sacrifice and Animal Husbandry in Classical Greece, in: Whittaker, C. R. (Hg.), *Pastoral Economics in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, 87–119.

- Jameson, M. H. 1999. The Spectacular and the Obscure in Athenian Religion, in: Goldhill, S. – Osborne, R. (Hgg.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge, 321–340.
- Jenkins, I. 1994. *The Parthenon Frieze*. London.
- Jeppesen, K. 1987. *The Theory of the Alternative Erechtheion. Premises, Definition, and Implications*. Aarhus.
- Jones, N. F. 1999. *The Associations of Classical Athens. The Response to Democracy*. New York – Oxford.
- Keesling, C. 2003. *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge.
- Kron, U. 1992. Frauenfeste in Demeterheiligtümern: das Thesmophorion von Bitalemi. Eine archäologische Fallstudie, *AA*, 611–650.
- Kron, U. 1996. Priesthoods, Dedications and Euergetism: What Part Did Religion Play in the Political and Social Status of Women?, in: Hellström, P. – Alroth, B. (Hgg.), *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World. Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium of 1993*. Uppsala, 139–182.
- Lambert, S. D. 1998². *The Phratries of Attica*. Ann Arbor.
- Lambert, S. D. 1997. The Attic Genos Salaminioi and the Island of Salamis, *ZPE* 119, 85–106.
- Lambert, S. D. 2002. The Sacrificial Calendar of Athens, *BSA* 97, 353–99.
- Lambert, S. D. 2005. Athenian State Laws and Decrees, 352/1–322/1: Religious Regulations, *ZPE* 154, 125–159.
- Lambert, S. D. forthcoming. The Priesthoods of the Eteoboutadai. *Festschrift John Davies* (in press).
- Linders, T. 1972. *Studies in the Treasure Records of Artemis Brauronia Found in Athens*. Stockholm.
- Linders, T. 1975. *The Treasurers of the Other Gods in Athens and their Functions*. Meisenheim am Glan.
- Loomis, W. T. 1998. *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens*. Ann Arbor.
- Loroux, N. 1993. *The Children of Athena: Athenian Ideas about Citizenship and the Division between the Sexes*. Princeton.
- MacDowell, D. M. 1989. The Oikos in Athenian Law, *CQ* 39, 10–21.
- Maffi, A. 1982. Ta hiera kai ta hosia. Contributo alla studio della terminologia giuridico-sacrale greca, in: Modrzejewski, J. – Liebs, D. (Hgg.), *Symposion 1977*. Cologne, 33–53.
- Manville, P. B. 1990. *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens*. Princeton.
- Maurizio, L. 1998. The Panathenaic Procession: Athens' Participatory Democracy on Display? in: Boedeker, D. – Raaflaub, K. A. (Hgg.), *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-century Athens*. Cambridge, Ma. – London, 297–317.

- Neils, J. 2001. *The Parthenon Frieze*. Cambridge.
- Oakley, J. 2003. *Picturing Death in Classical Athens. The Evidence of the White Lekythoi*. Cambridge.
- Ober, J. 1993. The Athenian Revolution of 508/7 B. C. E.: Violence, Authority, and the Origins of Democracy, in: Dougherty, C. – Kurke, L. (Hgg.), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece. Cult, Performance, Politics*. Cambridge, 215–32.
- Oliver, G. 2000. Athenian Funerary Monuments: Style, Grandeur, and Costs, in: Oliver, G. J. (Hg.), *The Epigraphy of Death. Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome*. Liverpool, 59–80.
- Osborne, R. 1993. Women and Sacrifice in Classical Greece, *CQ* 43, 392–405.
- Palagia, O. 1995. Akropolis Museum 581; a Family at the Apaturia? *Hesperia* 64, 493–501.
- Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion. A History*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. 2005. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford.
- Patterson, C. 1998. *The Family in Greek History*. Cambridge, Mass. – London.
- Patterson, C. 2005. Athenian Citizenship Law, in: Gagarin, M. – Cohen, D. (Hgg.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*. Cambridge, 267–89.
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. 2005. La cité, les dêmotelê hiera et les prêtres, in: Dasen, V. – Piérart, M. (Hgg.), *Idia kai demosia. Les cadres „privés“ et „publics“ de la religion grecque antique. Actes colloque CIERGA, Fribourg, Sept. 2003. Liège*, 55–68.
- RO = Rhodes, P. J. – Osborne, R. (Hgg.) 2003, *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 B. C.*. Oxford.
- Rosivach, V. 1994. *The System of Public Sacrifice in Fourth-century Athens*. Atlanta.
- Samons II, L.J. 2000. *Empire of the Owl. Athenian Imperial Finance*. Stuttgart.
- Schaps, D.M. 1979. *Economic Rights of Women in Ancient Greece*. Edinburgh.
- Schlaifer, R. 1940. Notes on Athenian Public Cults, *HSCP* 51, 241–260.
- Schmitt-Pantel, P. 1977. Athéna Apatouria et la ceinture: les aspects féminins des Apatouries à Athènes, *Annales ESC* 32, 1059–1073.
- Schnurr-Redford, C. 1996. *Frauen im klassischen Altertum*. Berlin.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1990. What is Polis Religion?, in: Murray, O. – Price, S. (Hgg.), *The Greek City. From Homer to Alexander*. Oxford, 295–322.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1991. ‚Reading‘ Greek Culture, Texts and Images, Rituals and Myths. Oxford.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1995a. Male and Female, Public and Private, Ancient and Modern, in: Reeder, E. D. (Hg.), *Pandora. Women in Classical Greece*. Princeton, 111–120.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1995b. ‚Reading‘ Greek Death to the End of the Classical Period. Oxford.

- Straten, F. T. van. 1995. *Hiera kala. Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece.* Leiden – New York.
- Versnel, H. S. 1993. *Inconsistencies in Greek & Roman Religion. 2. Transition and Reversal in Myth & Ritual.* Leiden – New York.
- Walter, U. 1993. *An der Polis teilhaben. Bürgerstaat und Zugehörigkeit im archaischen Griechenland.* Stuttgart.
- Whitehead, D. 1986. *The Demes of Attica, 508/7–ca. 250 B. C.: A Social and Political Study.* Princeton.
- Wilson, P. 2000. *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia. The Chorus, the City and the Stage.* Cambridge.
- Woodford, S. 2003. *Images of Myths in Classical Antiquity.* Cambridge.

