

ZEITSCHRIFT  
FÜR  
PAPYROLOGIE UND EPIGRAPHIK

*begründet von*

*Reinhold Merkelbach (†) und Ludwig Koenen*

*herausgegeben von*

*Werner Eck, Helmut Engelmann, Dieter Hagedorn, Jürgen Hammerstaedt, Andrea Jördens, Rudolf Kassel*

*Ludwig Koenen, Wolfgang Dieter Lebek, Klaus Maresch, Georg Petzl und Cornelia Römer*



BAND 169

2009

---

DR. RUDOLF HABELT GMBH · BONN

THE APPOINTMENT OF PRIESTS IN ATTIC *GENE*<sup>1</sup>

Since the practice of religion was central to the life of the Greek *polis*,<sup>2</sup> the attempt to discern and understand the method used by the *polis* to appoint its priests and any changes in that method that occurred over time is a topic of great interest in the history not only of ancient Greek religion, but of the *polis* more broadly. No single model of priestly appointment is applicable to the whole of Greece and various methods are attested in different places at different times, including election,<sup>3</sup> inheritance,<sup>4</sup> and purchase.<sup>5</sup>

In Attica *polis* priesthoods fell broadly into two categories depending on the group from which appointment was made: most common, found throughout antiquity, were priesthoods appointed from the descent groups known as *gene*,<sup>6</sup> but in the classical period from ca. 450, when the *polis* had occasion to create new priesthoods, they were appointed from the whole citizen body or the Cleisthenic tribes or demes.<sup>7</sup> An important question is the extent to which *gene* were exclusive or “aristocratic” groups. In 1976 Bourriot challenged the prevailing view that they were and Lambert’s subsequent work on *gene* and related institutions has broadly accepted the revisionist position, albeit with modifications.<sup>8</sup> This issue will not be discussed further in this paper, however. Instead, the focus will be on the mechanism used by *gene* to appoint to priesthoods. There has been no consensus on this topic, and earlier scholars have argued for a variety of methods, including election<sup>9</sup> and simple inheritance (perhaps with primogeniture).<sup>10</sup> Aleshire’s 1994 paper represented a significant advance and may conveniently be taken as our starting point. She pointed

<sup>1</sup> Josine Blok would like to thank the members of the European Network for the Study of Ancient Greek History for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper at the session in Athens, April 2007, and the Sara Aleshire Foundation, Berkeley, California, for permitting her access to the late Sara Aleshire’s stemma of the Eteoboutad priests. We should both like to thank the Fondation Hardt (Vandoeuvres) for its hospitality when we were doing the research for this article, Peter Rhodes and Sean Byrne for reading a draft, and, at a late stage, Paulin Ismard for showing us part of his forthcoming work on Athenian associations. We thank Georg Petzl for helpful suggestions as reader for *ZPE*. We adopt the abbreviations for standard epigraphical and other reference works used by *LGPN* II; additional abbreviations are listed at the end of the article.

<sup>2</sup> This is reflected in the widespread definition of citizenship in classical Athenian sources in terms of participation in the *hiera* and *hosia* of the *polis*. Cf. W. R. Connor, *Anc. Soc.* 19 (1988), 161–88; *Pericles’ Citizenship Law; Hiera kai Hosia*. For an example see the decree of 427 on the enfranchisement of the Plataians, quoted below.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. in Minoa on Amorgos in i BC for the priestess of the Mother (*LSCG* 103.B.16).

<sup>4</sup> E.g. in Gythion in i BC for the priest of Apollo (*IG* V 1 1144.23–30). Aleshire, *Demos* 326 n. 8 notes that this method is “surprisingly rare” in the classical and hellenistic periods, “and has been inferred where what evidence we have can more plausibly be interpreted in other ways”.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. in hellenistic Cos, R. Parker and D. Obbink, *Aus der Arbeit der Inscriptiones Graecae* VI. Sales of Priesthoods on Cos, *Chiron* 30 (2000), 415–49; 31 (2001), 229–52; B. Dignas, “Auf seine Kosten kommen” – ein Kriterium für Priester? Zum Verkauf von Priestertümern im hellenistischen Kleinasien, in: G. Heedemann, E. Winter eds., *Neue Forschungen zur Religionsgeschichte Kleinasiens* (Bonn, 2003 = *Asia Minor Studien* 49), 27–40; K. Buraselis, “Priesthoods for sale ...”, in: A. H. and S. W. Rasmussen eds., *Religion and Society*, 125–131 (Rome, 2008).

<sup>6</sup> On the formal Attic *gene*, normally subgroups of phratries, see Bourriot; *Genos; Aristocracy*. 47 “certain and probable” *gene* and 33 “uncertain and spurious *gene*” are listed by Parker, *Athenian Religion*, Appendix 2. Membership of a *genos* was determined by descent. On the principles of succession see below.

<sup>7</sup> The best known cults of this type are those of Athena Nike, Asklepios and Bendis. See Aleshire, *Demos* 326–27. In *Pericles’ Citizenship Law* Blok argues that Pericles’ law of 451/0, by requiring Athenians to be of citizen descent on both the mother’s and the father’s side, paved the way for the introduction of this type of “open” priesthood. Priests in Athenian *polis* cults had to be of citizen descent on both sides. Before the law this was guaranteed by the *gene* for those Athenians that belonged to *gene*; after 451/0 it was guaranteed for all citizens by Pericles’ law. Pericles had in a sense made a *genos* of the whole *polis*. See also *Aristocracy*.

<sup>8</sup> In particular in *Phratries* and *Genos*. In *Aristocracy* he argues that, while all *gennetai* could lay claim to be “super-citizens” in terms of their descent qualifications (*eugeneia*), the socio-political status of *gennetai* and of whole *gene* was variable and this can be detected in *genos* mythology.

<sup>9</sup> Clinton, 45 (hierophant, from ii BC), 67 (dadouch, at least from ii BC).

<sup>10</sup> Töpffer, 125–27, has been an influential voice for this method. Cf. e.g. *APF* 172–73; Aleshire, *Demos* 328 n. 17.



to evidence that, until a reform of the *gene* in 21 BC, allotment (*klerosis*) was widely used,<sup>11</sup> but she was also persuaded that simple allotment did not fully account for all the evidence, in particular for the succession of priests as it is documented in the major *gene*. She suggested that the solution might be that the *gene* operated a system of *klerosis ek prokriton*, that is use of the lot to select a priest from a pool of candidates pre-elected from and by the *gennetai*.

Our analysis leads us to accept Aleshire's case for allotment, but with some essential differences. We shall show why allotment was the means of selection for *genos* priesthoods, but also why *prokrisis*, in our view, was not involved. In some cases in the classical period and more generally in the hellenistic era it seems that there was a tendency for the pool of *gennetai* from which priests were appointed to be quite restricted, but we do not believe that the means of selection itself changed. In Part 1 we shall review the key items of evidence which bear explicitly on the appointment mechanism; then in Part 2 we shall look at the succession of the five most important *genos* priesthoods and consider the extent to which it is compatible with appointment by lot.

## PART ONE

### The case for allotment

The clearest statement in the literary record that *genos* priesthoods were appointed by lot is in a citation in the *Lexicon of Patmos* of the treatment of very early Athens in the lost beginning of the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia*:

... καὶ γένος ἕκαστον ἄνδρας εἶχε τριάκοντα τοὺς εἰς τὰ γένη τεταγμένους, οἵτινες γεννῆται ἐκαλοῦντο, <ἐξ> ὧν αἱ ἱερῶσύναι <αἱ> ἕκαστοις προσήκουσαι ἐκκληροῦντο, οἷον Εὐμολπίδαι καὶ Κήρυκες καὶ Ἐτεοβουτάδαι, ὡς ἵστορεῖ ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ Ἀριστοτέλης, λέγων οὕτως· φυλὰς δὲ ...<sup>12</sup>

“... and each *genos* had thirty men marshalled in the *gene* who were called *gennetai*, from whom the priesthoods that belonged to each of them were appointed by lot, such as the Eumolpidai, Kerykes and Eteoboutadai, as Aristotle relates in the *Constitution of the Athenians*, saying as follows: (*description of system of 4 tribes and their subdivision into trittyes, phratries and gene*).”

The statement in the *Patmos Lexicon* that the *genos* priests were appointed by lot is not confirmed in the direct quotation from the *Ath. Pol.* that follows, but the same information is given by Harpokration s.v. γεννῆται and both sources most likely derive ultimately from the *Ath. Pol.* The value of this part of the *Ath. Pol.* as evidence for the historical realities of early Athens is certainly doubtful: this fragment seems in large part to be a conflation of rationalisations of myth with Platonic theorising.<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, the statement about allotment is consistent with other evidence for the 4<sup>th</sup> century reality of how priests were appointed and, as Aleshire points out,<sup>14</sup> it was perhaps based on that reality. The *gene* were conceived of as immemorably ancient<sup>15</sup> and there is no indication that the author of the *Ath. Pol.* (or anyone else) thought that there had ever been a change in methods of appointment to *genos* priesthoods; in fact he says explicitly that Cleisthenes, the obvious candidate to have made such a change, left the *gene* and priesthoods

<sup>11</sup> The case for allotment is also briefly stated by Bourriot, 1342 with n. 593, can be found in earlier scholarship, e.g. Foucart, 191–94, Ferguson, 50–54, and finds an echo e.g. at Feaver, 128, and Garland, 84. Aleshire, *Demos* 335 believed that, by the *genos* reform of 21 BC the method was changed to election. She develops her view of this reform more fully in *Archaism*. See also Schmalz, 397–98.

<sup>12</sup> *Ath. Pol.* F3 (Kenyon) = F2 (Chambers) = *Lex. Patm.* s.v. γεννῆται. Same statement about appointment of priests by allotment, but without reference to specific *gene* or *Ath. Pol.*, at Harp. s.v. γεννῆται. The fragment perhaps relates to the time of Ion, cf. *Phratries* 371–80.

<sup>13</sup> *Phratries* 371–80.

<sup>14</sup> *Demos* 329.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Aristocracy; Gentrifying Genealogy*.

untouched.<sup>16</sup> In the 4<sup>th</sup> century the way that *gene* appointed priests in the time of Ion was very probably thought to be the same as the way they were appointed in the 4<sup>th</sup> century.

Confirmation that allotment was indeed the process used by *gene* in classical Athens comes from the inscription of 363/2 recording the settlement of a dispute between the two branches of the *genos* Salaminioi, the Salaminioi from Sounion and the Salaminioi of the Seven Tribes (RO 37):

τὰς ἱερεωσ-  
 ύνας κοινὰς εἶναι ἀμφοτέρων εἰς τὸν αἰεὶ χρόν-  
 10 ον τῆς Ἀθηνάας τῆς Σκιράδος καὶ τὴν τῷ Ἡρακλέο-  
 ς τῷ ἐπὶ Πορθμῶι, καὶ τὴν τῷ Εὐρυσάκος, καὶ τὴν τῆ-  
 ς Ἀγλαύρο καὶ Πανδρόσο καὶ τῆς Κοροτρόφο· καὶ κ-  
 ληρῶσθαι κοινῆι ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ἐπειδὰν τελευτ-  
 ήσει τις τῶν ἱερείων ἢ τῶν ἱερέων· τὸς δὲ λανχάν-  
 15 οντας ἱερεῶσθαι ἐφ' οἷσπερ καὶ οἱ πρότερον ἱερ-  
 έωντο·

“The priestships shall be common to both [branches] for all time, that of Athena Skiras, and that of Herakles at Porthmos, and that of Eurysakes, and that of Aglauros and Pandrosos and Kourotraphos; and an allotment shall be made jointly from both [branches] when one of the priestesses or priests dies; and those who obtain the office by lot shall serve as priests on the same terms as the earlier priests.”

Apparently there had been a dispute between the two branches of the *genos* as to which of them should supply the various *genos* priestships, but there is no issue about the *method* of appointment. It is taken for granted that it will be allotment after as before.<sup>17</sup> This passage does, however, show us something else important about *genos* priestships. It looks as if the *genos* had the scope to restrict eligibility to one of its branches. In the event the *genos* decided to appoint from the whole group, but it seems that a decision to distribute the priestships between its two branches had been a realistic possibility.

Our third item of evidence for allotment to *genos* priestships is from the *Life* of the orator Lykourgos attributed to Plutarch ([Plut.] *X Or.* 843 e–f, quoted more fully in Part 2). The subject is a *pinax* erected in the Erechtheum by Habron, son of the orator Lykourgos, illustrating the succession in the *genos* Eteoboutadaï of the priests of Poseidon:

τὸν δὲ πίνακα ἀνέθηκεν Ἄβρων ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ, λαχὼν ἐκ τοῦ γένους τὴν ἱερωσύνην καὶ παραχωρήσας τῷ ἀδελφῷ Λυκόφρονι· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πεποίηται ὁ Ἄβρων προσδιδούς αὐτῷ τὴν τρίαιναν.

“Habron, his (= Lykourgos’) son set up the *pinax*, having obtained the priesthood by lot from the *genos* and having yielded it to his brother Lykophron. And for this reason Habron is depicted passing the trident to him.”

Given the evidence for allotment to *genos* priestships cited above, it seems justifiable to take *λαχὼν* literally as meaning that Habron was appointed by lot to this priesthood.<sup>18</sup> There is nothing in what else we know about the Eteoboutad priestships that would contradict this, though, like the Salaminioi, it seems that the Eteoboutadaï were in (at least) two branches and (unlike the Salaminioi) eligibility for the two major priestships of the *genos*, those of Athena Polias and Poseidon Erechtheus, was restricted at this peri-

<sup>16</sup> *Ath. Pol.* 21.6. Cf. *Phratries* 245–48.

<sup>17</sup> In our view all the priestships listed were in *polis* cults. Aleshire, *Demos* 327–28, thought that only Athena Skiras might have been a *polis* cult and the others were private cults of the *genos*; contra, Lambert, *ZPE* 125 (1999), 114 with n. 11. Cf. Parker, *Athenian Religion* 311.

<sup>18</sup> Töpffer, 124–27, argued for the metaphorical sense here, “obtained” the priesthood by inheritance (cf. e.g. the sense of *λαγχάνειν* in the law on inheritance at Dem. 43.51, τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς μοῖραν λαγχάνειν). In that case, however, the succession would have been automatic and the words ἐκ τοῦ γένους in [Plut.] would be otiose. ἐκ τοῦ γένους suggests a process by which a *genos* member other than Habron *might* have been chosen. Even in the law at Dem. 43.51 μοῖραν λαγχάνειν connotes a literal allotment, in the sense that one was, or might be, used to apportion inherited property to heirs.



od to different branches.<sup>19</sup> The interesting point here, however, is the apparent breach of the normal rule of appointment: Lykophron was not allotted the priesthood, but was ceded it by his brother. The breach would be less severe if Lykophron were the only available and willing candidate from the Boutadai branch of the *genos*. That is possible in this case, and the availability of only one candidate may sometimes have rendered allotment redundant in other cases, especially in the hellenistic period as the number of candidates available to fill *genos* priesthoods became increasingly restricted (see below); but Habron's "retirement" was in any case irregular and special arrangements must have been made to facilitate it. Another *polis* priesthood, that of Asklepios, supplies a iv BC parallel. Normally this priesthood was appointed by lot from all Athenian men in rotation among the tribes, but in mid-iv BC Demon of Paiania was designated to be priest of Asklepios by the People in response to an oracle, in exchange for donating his house and garden to the god.<sup>20</sup> Rules of appointment could be broken if there was appropriate divine sanction. It is unclear whether in Habron's case – a priesthood appointed from the Eteoboutadai, not the People as a whole – this would have been within the power of the *genos* to decide (and the Salaminioi decree shows a *genos* exercising at least a measure of control over its own appointment system), or whether it would have required an Assembly decision and/or, like the Demon case, consultation of the Delphic oracle.

It is possible that the verb λαγχάνω was also used of appointment to the Eteoboutad priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus in ll. 1–6 of a fragmentary decree of ca. first half of iv BC, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1146 = LSCG 31 (SEG XXV 140)*:<sup>21</sup>

Θεοί.  
 Φίλων εἶπεν· I [- - -<sup>ca. 7</sup> - - τῶι Ποσειδῶ]- non-stoich. ca. 29  
 νι καὶ τῶι Ἐρε[χθεῖ - - -<sup>ca. 14</sup> - - - - -]  
 λαχόντα τύχ[ηι ἀγαθῆι τῆς βουλῆς καὶ]  
 5 τοῦ δήμο το[ῦ Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῆς φυλῆς?]  
 τῆς Ἐρεχθη[ίδος - - - - - - - - - - -]  
*Sacrificial provisions follow*

2–3 [ἐρεῖσθαι τῶι Ποσειδῶ]νι καὶ τῶι Ἐρε[χθεῖ τὸν ἱερέα τὸν ἀεὶ] and 4 fin. Ziehen, partly following Foucart, [ἐρεῖα θύειν Sokolowski, [τὸν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀεὶ] λαχόντα Jeppesen ll 5 fin. Wilamowitz, καὶ τῶν φυλετῶν | τῆς Ἐρεχθη[ίδος φυλῆς Sokolowski.

"Gods. Philon proposed. [- - - Poseid]on and Ere[chtheus - -] allotted [- -, for the good fortune of the Council and] People of [Athens and the tribe?] Erechtheis ..."

ll. 5–6 tend to confirm the usual view that this is a decree of the tribe Erechtheis.<sup>22</sup> Now apart from the *polis* priest of Poseidon Erechtheus there was also a priest "of the eponymous" (hero) of the tribe Erechtheis. This priest appears also to have been supplied by the Eteoboutadai and in at least one (late hellenistic) case he appears to be the same man as the *polis* priest.<sup>23</sup> It is a possible interpretation of this decree that the tribe was providing (or confirming, or at least implying) that the man allotted (*scil.* from the Eteoboutadai) to be priest of Poseidon (and) Erechtheus was also to serve as priest (*scil.* "of the eponymous") for the tribe. Whether or not this is the correct interpretation, the reference to *Poseidon and Erechtheus* makes it attractive to refer λαχόντα to the Eteoboutad priest rather than specifically the priest of the eponymous, as Poseidon was not "eponymous" for Erechtheis.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>19</sup> See further Part 2, on the Eteoboutad priesthoods.

<sup>20</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4969; APF* pp. 117–18.

<sup>21</sup> See also K. Jeppesen, *The Theory of the Alternative Erechtheion* (Aarhus, 1987), 28–33 and E. Kearns, *The Heroes of Attica* (London, 1989), 210–11 (*SEG XXXIX 144*).

<sup>22</sup> These lines, and the fact that, while inscribed decrees of this and other tribes are common (e.g. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1165*, found on the acropolis), there is no extant decree of the Eteoboutadai, go against the suggestion of Jeppesen, that this was a decree of the Eteoboutadai (cf. Aleshire, *Demos* 331 n. 32). It appears that this *genos* did not inscribe its decrees on stone on the acropolis.

<sup>23</sup> See Part 2, on Eteoboutad priests.

<sup>24</sup> The combination/separation of Poseidon and Erechtheus may also in some way have been at issue in this decree, cf. Kearns.



Taken as a whole, this evidence is sufficient to indicate that allotment was the normal method of appointment to *genos* priesthoods.<sup>25</sup> This is also consistent with what we know of the system for appointing to the new priesthoods open to all Athenians created in the classical period. Here too the mechanism used was allotment<sup>26</sup> and on this point it seems that we can understand these new priesthoods to have been created on the pattern of the old *genos* priesthoods.

What is the ideological weight of allotment in this context? Use of the lot is sometimes regarded by scholars as an essentially democratic means of selection and as belonging to the profane sphere of politics;<sup>27</sup> and the allotment of priesthoods has often been conceived as secondary and/or subsequent to the allotment of the public magistracies, notably the archons.<sup>28</sup> Both assumptions, however, are questionable. In archaic and classical Greece the lot could be a divine means to settle a matter in which a human decision was either impossible or undesirable.<sup>29</sup> Such a matter might be the selection among candidates who were considered equal in human eyes. In this way, the lot was essentially connected with human equality, but the composition of the group of candidates could make the procedure democratic, aristocratic or oligarchic.<sup>30</sup> In the archaic age, the candidate selected by lot was understood to be the one among human equals whom the gods had in mind.<sup>31</sup> This was particularly relevant for religious personnel: the gods were to appoint those who would be in charge of the exchange between the human community and themselves.<sup>32</sup> Selection of one among the equal members of a *genos* to serve the gods made use of the 'divine *kleros*' in the *gene* the appropriate procedure.<sup>33</sup>

#### Was *prokrisis* used?

But was the use of the lot in *gene* preceded by *prokrisis*? Aleshire was induced to suggest this in part because we know of one case of such a procedure being applied to a deme priesthood. We shall consider

<sup>25</sup> One should perhaps also mention in this connection the epigram on the statue of Syeris, *diakonos* of Lysimache, priestess of Athena Polias, in which the dedicant states that μοῖρα guided her selection for office (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3464, cf. below on Eteoboutad priests). μοῖρα might imply κλήρωσις, but need not do so, and in any case Syeris, though priestly personnel, was not strictly a *genos* priestess.

<sup>26</sup> [τῆι Ἀθηναίαι τῆι Νί]κει ἠέρεαν ἡ ἄγ [κλερομένη λάχε] ἔχς Ἀθηναίων ἡπα[σδὸν καθίστα]σθαι, *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 35.3–6. The first priestess, Myrrhine, held office ἐκ πάντων κλήρωι (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 1330.13–14). Cf. Parker, *Athenian Religion* 125–27.

<sup>27</sup> See especially M. H. Hansen, *Cl. & Med.* 41 (1990), 55–61 and *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes* (Oxford, 1991), 49–52.

<sup>28</sup> E.g. Aleshire, *Demos* 334. For an attempt (unpersuasive in our view) to underplay the significance of the early use of allotment in religious contexts in relation to the development of allotment in the *polis* more broadly see De Ste. Croix, 94–96. On the use of the lot for appointment of archons see also Staveley, 34; Rhodes *ad Ath. Pol.* 8.1, pp. 146–48; Develin.

<sup>29</sup> The religious aspect of allotment was stressed, influentially, by Fustel de Coulanges, *Nouv. rev. hist. de droit français et étr.* 12 (1878), 616–43 and in book 3, chapter 10 of *La Cité Antique* (1864); cf. Staveley, 56.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Aristotle, for whom allotment may be oligarchic or democratic, depending on the group from which the allotment is made, and whether it is limited by factors such as *prokrisis* or property qualifications (*Pol.* 3.1266a7–10, cf. 4.1294b7–10, 1298b5–11, 1300a20–1300b5). On the essential relation between lot and equality see J. W. Headlam, *Election by Lot at Athens* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Cambridge, 1933); B. Manin, *The Principles of Representative Government* (Cambridge, 1997), ch. 1–2; on the significance of the composition of the group among whom allotment is made, Demont; in general on the applicability of allotment not only to democracies, but any regime where positions were to be shared out among men considered equally eligible, Rhodes *ad Ath. Pol.* 115–16.

<sup>31</sup> Divine selection by lot among the Homeric heroes, e.g. *Hom. Il.* 3.314–339; 7.161–89; among the nobles of Persia, *Hdt.* 3.83; *klerosis* of Theseus among the nobles of Attica to be sent to Crete, *FGrH* 3 Pherekydes F 148.

<sup>32</sup> Thus e.g. the eponymous heroes were chosen by *klerosis ek prokriton* (*Ath. Pol.* 21.6), carried out by Apollo. *Ath. Pol.* 8.1 (cf. 47.1) asserts that there was a law of Solon providing for treasurers of Athena to be appointed by lot from among the *pentakosiomedimnoi*: the treasurers of the Other Gods were also to be appointed by lot, *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 52A, 13–15 (434/3).

<sup>33</sup> Appointment by lot as a mark of divine favour: Plato *Laws* 3.690c, 5.741b; specifically appropriate for priests, 6.759b. This conception of the lot as divine selection might explain why Solon applied it to the appointment of archons from among the newly created equals of the highest property class; and a case can be made that selection of priests by lot did not follow, but rather preceded and inspired its application to other offices of the *polis*. Cf. Develin, 461: "The lot had perhaps been used with other offices before Solon, so that its extension to the archonship is not so drastic a measure as it has seemed."



below whether this is a persuasive parallel. We doubt that *prokrisis* applied in *gene* in part because it is never mentioned in our sources in connection with a *genos*. Details of this sort can be omitted or taken for granted; but we do not find that a wholly satisfactory explanation. If there had been *prokrisis* one might have expected at least one of the four sources noted above to have mentioned it. The absence of any mention of *prokrisis* in the Salaminioi inscription is particularly striking. In circumstances where appointment to the *genos* priesthoods has been at issue between the two branches of the *genos* one might expect the detail of future procedure to be spelled out in full.

We doubt *prokrisis* also because we doubt that it would have been felt appropriate in a *genos*. If allotment was used to determine the divine will, election, or pre-election, was about selecting those who were considered by humans to be best qualified for office.<sup>34</sup> This is apparent, for example, in Isocrates' favourable remarks on Athens' ancient, Solonian, constitution:

οὐκ ἐξ ἀπάντων τὰς ἀρχὰς κληροῦντες, ἀλλὰ τοὺς βελτίστους καὶ τοὺς ἰκανωτάτους ἐφ' ἕκαστον τῶν ἔργων προκρίνοντες.<sup>35</sup>

'They did not select by lot from all for the offices, but chose those who were the best and most able to do each of the tasks.'

The relevant point about *genos* membership here is that it was felt, by itself, to guarantee the sort of quality of birth that qualified someone to hold a priesthood. There may have been differences in socio-political status between *gene* and between individual *gennetai*, but in the classical and hellenistic periods all *gene* were in principle conceived of as of immemorial antiquity, all their members defined as of "straight descent" (i.e. of secured, pure Athenian descent on both sides), and there was a close connection between the myth of Athenian citizen autochthony and *genos* ideology.<sup>36</sup> *Gennetai* therefore had, in principle, rock-solid citizen qualifications and, as such, enjoyed automatic access to phratries;<sup>37</sup> and when citizenship or other rights based on descent were called into question in the courts, *genos* membership supplied the litigant with a powerful argument.<sup>38</sup>

One such case is Demosthenes 57, a speech which also supplies a clear case of *klerosis ek prokriton* for a deme priesthood. The speaker, Euxitheos, is appealing against his ejection from his deme, Halimous, at the deme scrutiny of 346. After supporting his claim to citizenship by claiming membership of a *genos*, Euxitheos explains that he was also elected to stand for allotment for the priesthood of Herakles in his deme (46–48). Euxitheos was elected (he claims) because he was *eugenes*, being a *gennetes* on his father's side, although the family was so poor that his mother had to work as a wet-nurse and in the market. His opponent Euboulides was pre-elected too (48), a wealthy man and a prominent citizen who was later also elected to be *demarch*. This case does not concern *prokrisis* in a *genos* for a *genos* priesthood, but by demesmen for a deme priesthood; and it was a process in which *eugeneia*, a quality intimately connected, linguistically and conceptually, with *genos* membership, could be presented as qualifying a candidate for

<sup>34</sup> On *prokrisis* as selection of the best-qualified see Demont. *Prokrisis* is not, however, to be confused with *dokimasia*. This scrutiny as to descent, past behaviour and physical condition of prospective priests took place subsequent to selection in the state of Plato's *Laws* 759c, though we are in the dark about how far this corresponded with actual Athenian practice, cf. Garland, 85. On specific physical requirements cf. Part 2, s.v. hierophant. On the sociology of lot (equality) versus election (inequality) at Athens see also C. Taylor, *Hesperia* 76 (2007), 323–45.

<sup>35</sup> Isoc. 7 *Areop.* 22. De Ste. Croix, 101–3, argues persuasively that Isocrates uses προκρίνειν here in the more common sense, "prefer, select", rather than the technical sense, "elect prior to allotment", but whether as election or pre-election, the idea that it involves selecting the most suitable, in human eyes, is clear. See also [Dem.] 59.75.

<sup>36</sup> Immemorial antiquity: implicit in *Ath. Pol.* F 3 (see above) and a uniform feature of the mythology of individual *gene* (see *Aristocracy*). "Straight descent": note especially Hesychius' use of the term, γένος ἰθαγενῶν, and his definition s.v. ἰθαγενής: αὐτόχθων, γνήσιος (discussed briefly by Parker, *Athenian Religion* 284–85, more fully in *Gentrifying Genealogy*). On the intimate connection between the *gene* and the Athenian autochthony myth see Lambert, Aglauros, the Euenoridai and the Autochthon of Atlantis, *ZPE* 167 (2008), 22–26; *Aristocracy*; *Gentrifying Genealogy*.

<sup>37</sup> *FGrH* 328 Philochoros F 35 with *Phratries* 46–49.

<sup>38</sup> Isae. 7.15–17; Dem. 57. Cf. also Dem. 59.59–61; And. 1.125–27; *Phratries* chapter 2.



election.<sup>39</sup> Demes contained all sorts of people, including naturalized citizens who were never admitted to *gene* and might be thought unsuitable to hold priesthoods (see further below), and many who might be suspected of having obtained the citizenship improperly;<sup>40</sup> but *gennetai* were super-citizens whose suitability to hold a priesthood was beyond doubt. The essential function of *gene* in the classical *polis* was precisely to supply suitably qualified priests for *polis* cults. *Prokrisis* within a *genos* was unnecessary, for a *genos* was a society of peers as far as suitability for a priesthood was concerned.

### Hellenistic Developments

In the classical period there are two instances where the succession of priests seems restricted to a narrower group of families than one might expect from a random allotment of candidates (for detail see below, on the relevant priesthood). In the case of the priestesses of Athena Polias, this is best explained by the hypothesis that eligibility for this priesthood was restricted to a rather tightly defined branch of the Eteoboutadai, based in the deme Bate. Such an explanation works less well for the tenure of the dadouchy in v BC by two members of the family of Kallias of Alopeke, not only because indications that the Kerykes were divided into branches are lacking but also since, from the later succession to this priesthood, it is clear that other families were eligible. In this case one suspects that the explanation of Foucart may be close to the mark: the Kerykes, while using the lot, could “par une abstention volontaire laisser aux membres d’une famille plus riche ou plus influente une sorte de possession exclusive de la dadouchie”.<sup>41</sup> It is indeed an important point about allotment that not everyone who was formally eligible was expected to put themselves forward. One can scarcely imagine, for example, that every citizen woman of Attica presented herself for allotment as priestess of Athena Nike; and there were, of course, various ways that otherwise eligible Kerykes might be dissuaded from participating in an allotment for the dadouchy when one of the candidates was the wealthiest man in Attica.

In the hellenistic period one gains the impression that *genos* priests were generally being appointed from a tighter pool of candidates, but there is no indication that the system of appointment itself underwent radical change before the reforms of the Augustan period. Social, political and economic developments, however, meant that, in the late hellenistic period especially, political and religious office-holding was becoming restricted to an increasingly narrow elite of wealth.<sup>42</sup> This process is not easy to analyse and the necessary research to determine e.g. whether the free population of Attica as a whole was in decline and whether the distribution of wealth was becoming increasingly uneven, is only now getting underway.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, given the poverty of our sources for Athenian constitutional developments at this time, what precisely were the formal mechanisms determining the narrowing of the elite are difficult to assess. We do, however, know that the hellenistic period was inaugurated by the formal introduction of property qualifications, which may in effect have limited the number of *gennetai*, or the number of *gennetai* eligible to hold public office as priests – we do not know how the system worked in this respect.<sup>44</sup> These formal qualifications may have been lifted in 307/6 and during later periods of “democracy” (we have no specific evidence on

<sup>39</sup> ὑπ’ αὐτῶν τούτων (i.e. the demesmen) προεκρίθην ἐν τοῖς εὐγενεστάτοις κληροῦσθαι τῆς ἱερωσύνης τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ, Dem. 57.46.

<sup>40</sup> Including those alleged to have been dubiously enfranchised by Cleisthenes, *Ath. Pol.* 21.4.

<sup>41</sup> Foucart, 192, and cf. below n. 115.

<sup>42</sup> On this see e.g. Lambert’s remarks, *ZPE* 142 (2003), 85–86.

<sup>43</sup> On the complex interrelated topics of the demography of early hellenistic Attica and economic “decline” see most recently G. Oliver, *War, Food and Politics in Early Hellenistic Athens* (Oxford, 2007), 74–110.

<sup>44</sup> In 322, following Athens’ defeat in the Lamian War, those with more than 2,000 drachmas (about 9,000) became κυρίου τοῦ πολιτεύματος καὶ τῆς χειροτονίας, and those with less than this (about 12,000) were excluded (Diod. 18.18.4–5, cf. Plut. *Phok.* 27). This system was abolished in 318 (Diod. 18.56), but in 317 the property qualification was re-introduced at the level of 1,000 drachmas (Diod. 18.74.3, presumably abolished on the re-introduction of “democracy” in 307/6). What exactly these qualifications meant in practice is obscure, but it seems probable that they at least applied to candidates for political office, and, formally or informally, one might expect this to have included eligibility for allotment to *polis* priesthoods.



the point), but, whether or not it was enshrined in constitutional rules, in practice a link between possession of wealth and office-holding became embedded. This tendency can be observed clearly in the best documented *polis* priesthood of the hellenistic period, that of Asklepios, which was appointed by lot from the tribes in rotation: in iv BC prominent and wealthy priests are rare; in iii BC they are much more common; and by ii BC priests can be spoken of as having “submitted” to holding the priesthood, which has now come to be conceptualised as a “liturgy”.<sup>45</sup> The same dynamic can be observed in the *genos* priesthoods: in a way that would be inconceivable in the classical democracy, a iii BC priestess of Athena Polias is praised for “donating to the Praxiergidai [a *genos* with duties relating to Athena’s vestments<sup>46</sup>], a hundred drachmas from her own resources for their ancestral sacrifice”.<sup>47</sup> The implication is clear: you will be a more praiseworthy priest if you dispose of your personal wealth in the exercise of your duties, and disposal of wealth presupposes its possession. Against this background a decline in the number of candidates for allotments to *genos* priesthoods is precisely what we should expect, but there is no reason to suppose that it affected the means of selection.<sup>48</sup>

### Transmission of Eligibility

One aspect of the system remains to be discussed: how was eligibility for a priesthood, that is to say membership of the relevant *genos* (or *genos* branch), transmitted from generation to generation?

It is best conceived of squarely within the framework of the normal Athenian system of inheritance, which embraced all *hiera kai hosia* of the *oikos*,<sup>49</sup> including, we suggest, *genos* membership and the eligibility for priesthoods that it entailed.<sup>50</sup> The system combined bilateral kinship and inheritance with a preference for males over females and of descendants over collaterals.<sup>51</sup> This meant that inheritance first devolved on sons and their descendants (male line), and in the absence of sons, on daughters and their descendants (female line); in the latter case, the daughter became an *epikleros*, i.e. carrier of the estate of her father.<sup>52</sup> The principles were embedded in the system of the *anchisteia*, whereby in the absence of male and female descendants and heirs on the paternal side of the deceased (probably to the degree of first cousins once removed) kin on the maternal side would inherit, i.e. maternal uncle and descendants and maternal aunt and descendants. When an inheritance devolved on an *epikleros*, ideally her father had, when still alive, made arrangements such that the property remained within his *oikos*. Thus, of the three sons of the orator Lykourgos, two (Habron and Lykourgos) died childless and one, Lykophon, had only a daughter surviving, Kallisto. Lykophon accordingly adopted his grandson, also called Lykophon, his daughter’s son by Kleombrotos son of Deinokrates of Acharnai, thereby endeavouring to ensure the continuity of the family line.<sup>53</sup> Normally, the *epikleros* would be married to a male kinsman,<sup>54</sup> but this does not seem

<sup>45</sup> Parker, *Athenian Religion* 269.

<sup>46</sup> Parker, *Athenian Religion* 307–8.

<sup>47</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 776, 18–20. In the late hellenistic period the *genos* Theoinidai also praised its priestess of the Nymph for donating ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων, *SEG XXIX* 135.11.

<sup>48</sup> On the Attic *gene* in the hellenistic period see now the suggestive study of Ismard (useful observations also in Perrin-Saminadayar); Aleshire, *Archaism* with Lambert’s Foreword and Afterword. There was a renaissance of the *gene* in late-ii BC, but it is not clear that this had an impact on the method of selection of priests.

<sup>49</sup> Dem. 43.51; 39.35; Isae. 6.47; 9.13, cf. Harrison I 123.

<sup>50</sup> Attention to legitimacy is deeply embedded in the ideology of the *gene* (cf. above). The issue was played out on a mythical plane in a legal context in the famous iv BC dispute about a priesthood between the *gene* Krokonidai and Koironidai, in which the Krokonidai apparently argued that the archegete of the Koironidai was a bastard, the Koironidai that Krokon’s claim was based only on a marriage link and not direct descent. See Parker, *Athenian Religion* 302–3; cf. *Aristocracy*.

<sup>51</sup> Harrison I chapter 5; C. Patterson, *The Family in Greek History* (Cambridge Mass., 1998), 85–100.

<sup>52</sup> Harrison I 132–38. On the epiklerate see more recently Patterson, 91–103; A.-M. Vérilhac, C. Vial, *Le mariage grec du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C. à l’époque d’Auguste* (Paris, 1998), 101–7.

<sup>53</sup> On the descendants of Lykourgos see [Plut.] *X Or.* 843a–c (quoted in full in Part 2, s.v. Eteoboutadai).

<sup>54</sup> Harrison I 9–12.



to have happened in Kallisto's case, perhaps for the reason that there were no surviving male kin. In any case, under this system the *kleros* went with the *epikleros* into the family of her husband. This too can be illustrated by the case of Kallisto. All three male members of her family predeceased her leaving no heirs: her father, her husband and the son whom her father had adopted. The *oikos* of Lykourgos was accordingly in danger of extinction. This, however, was prevented by Kallisto's second marriage, to Sokrates (probably of Pithos<sup>55</sup>). The entire heritage of Lykourgos' line went with her into this marriage and was continued by her son Symmachos, whose descendants became the sole legitimate heirs of the orator Lykourgos. This heritage appears to have included membership of the *genos* Eteoboutadai, for later generations of this family produced (probably) at least two priests of Poseidon Erechtheus and at least two priestesses of Athena Polias, one of whom publicly claimed descent from Lykourgos.<sup>56</sup>

It is also very attractive to see this system in operation in the succession of priestesses of Athena Polias in iii BC. Down to priestess no. 4, [-]te daughter of Polyuktos of Bate (in office, 237/6?), all known priestesses inherited their eligibility in the male line as daughters of men who belonged to an (apparently quite narrow) branch of the Eteoboutadai from the deme Bate. With no. 5, however, Theodote daughter of Polyuktos of Amphitrope, we encounter for the first time a priestess from a different deme, and we happen also to know that this was the deme of no. 4's husband, Arcestratos son of Euthykrates of Amphitrope. It is an attractive hypothesis that the branch of the Eteoboutadai which supplied the priestesses of Athena ran out of male heirs at this point and the entire Eteoboutad heritage of this branch therefore came to be transmitted by priestess no. 4 into the *oikos* of her husband. It appears, however, that this line also failed, as no. 6, Penteteris daughter of Hierokles of Phlya (who must have succeeded no. 5 directly or at most at a very short interval), was from a different deme again, and it is an attractive supposition that this priestess traced her eligibility all the way back to the [-]es of Phlya who was the son of the famous 5<sup>th</sup> century priestess, Lysimache. It may be that this line also failed and that this failure effectively caused a merging of the two branches of the Eteoboutadai (see further below, Part 2).

In general, therefore, the system for inheriting *genos* membership was based on the same principles as that for other types of inheritance, appropriately enough given the character of the *genos* as descent group; but there were at least two important differences: as the chief official of Athenian religion the *basileus* was responsible for adjudicating disputes involving *gene* and priesthoods,<sup>57</sup> whereas normal inheritance disputes were heard by the eponymous archon.<sup>58</sup> The second difference was a consequence of the fact that priesthoods were gendered. In the normal inheritance system a *kleros* could devolve on a male or female, though the system gave clear preference to males, with females inheriting only in the absence of male heirs. For a male priesthood, however, only a male heir would do and for a female one only a female heir. This factor will have contributed to the difficulties *gene* had in supplying suitable candidates for priests in the hellenistic period.

This way of articulating the rules of transmission of eligibility for *genos* priesthoods perhaps enables us to resolve the puzzlement that has been caused in earlier scholarship by the apparent phenomenon of dual *genos* membership. How could Medeios, exegete of the Eumolpidai, have a daughter who was (Eteoboutad) priestess of Athena Polias? The answer is not that rules of transmission of *genos* membership were systematically loosened in the hellenistic period, nor that some priesthoods could be supplied by more than

<sup>55</sup> The demotic is derived from that of the priest of the eponymous of Erechtheis, Aristonymos of Pithos, who was perhaps a descendant of Sokrates in the male line, see Part 2 s.v. Eteoboutadai.

<sup>56</sup> Priests: Aristonymos, perhaps paternal grandson of Symmachos, and Medeios. Priestesses: Philtera and Philippe. The priestesses should have belonged to the Bate branch of the *genos* and not Lykourgos' Boutadai branch, but this distinction of branches may have ceased to be operative by this period. See below s.v. Eteoboutadai.

<sup>57</sup> *Ath. Pol.* 57.2. On litigation among *gene* see Feaver, 145–47.

<sup>58</sup> *Ath. Pol.* 56.6–7.



one *genos*,<sup>59</sup> nor that the Eteoboutadai and the Eumolpidai were *gene* of fundamentally different type,<sup>60</sup> nor that at this period (or any other) *genos* membership could be inherited willy-nilly in the female line.<sup>61</sup> Instead what we observe is *genos* membership being transmitted in the female line in cases of failure of the male line in a manner that is wholly consistent with the normal Athenian inheritance system. And the reason why this appears to occur more frequently in the hellenistic period is because, as discussed above, it was at this period that the *gene* were becoming underpopulated with persons eligible to fill priesthoods.

Finally, we suggest that there is a document which may reflect an awareness already in v BC of the real possibility of inheritance of *genos* priesthoods in the female line, namely the decree which awarded Athenian citizenship to the Plataians who escaped to Athens in 427, as preserved in [Dem.] 59.88–106. While questions may be raised about the precise wording of this decree as reported in this speech by Apollodoros, in substance it seems to be authentic.<sup>62</sup> It includes the following clause (104):

“... μετεῖναι αὐτοῖς ὄνπερ Ἀθηναίοις μέτεστι πάντων, καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ ὀσίων, πλὴν εἴ τις ἱερωσύνη ἢ τελετὴ ἐστὶν ἐκ γένους, μηδὲ τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων, τοῖς δ’ ἐκ τούτων.”

“... they shall share in everything in which the Athenians share, both *hiera* and *hosia*, except any priesthood or rite which is from a *genos*, and the nine archons, but their descendants may (so share)”.

A Plataian who became an Athenian citizen was prohibited from inheriting a *genos* priesthood. However, his descendants were to be eligible for such priesthoods. But how, one might ask, would a Plataian or his descendants have become eligible for a *genos* priesthood, if this stipulation had not been made? In the normal course of events such eligibility would not be inherited in the male line, since no Plataian was or would ever become a member of an Attic *genos*.<sup>63</sup> Kapparis has suggested that an enfranchised Plataian (or one of his male descendants) might be adopted by a man who was a *genos* member and thereby become eligible for a *genos* priesthood.<sup>64</sup> As Kapparis notes this is theoretically possible, but an adoption of this type would be unusual in the Athenian system, in which adoptions were generally made from among the members of the adopter’s own *oikos*, and we doubt whether this was in the front of the drafter’s mind. We suspect that he was thinking rather of the real potential for inheritance of *genos* membership by the descendants of an enfranchised Plataian *in the female line*. The intention of this clause, we suggest, was to clarify that the offspring (male or female) of a Plataian enfranchised under this decree and an Athenian wife whose father was a *genos* member would be eligible for a *genos* priesthood, in the case of failure of the male line of descent in the *genos*.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>59</sup> “The priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus ... evidently did not belong to any one *genos*; Eteoboutadai held it as well as Eumolpidai”, Clinton, 56.

<sup>60</sup> Bourriot, 1344–45. Bourriot believed that there was a difference between “sacerdotal” *gene* like the Eumolpidai, and *gene* which were based on local communities, like the Eteoboutadai (“une sorte d’unité villageoise préclsthénienne”). The distinction is not entirely convincing; see *Genos*.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Ferguson, 50–54, who argued for a loosening of rules after ca. 150 BC to permit eligibility “on the basis of matrilinear connection”; Parker, *Athenian Religion* 292.

<sup>62</sup> We agree on this point with the analyses of Osborne, *Naturalization*, commentary on D1, and Kapparis. There has been a tendency to suppose that some text has fallen out of the decree as preserved, but the laconic style of this decree is not uncharacteristic of inscribed decrees (compare e.g. *Naturalization* D21) and we doubt if anything essential has been omitted. This doubt extends both to Osborne’s insertion, ἀλλὰ μὴ τῶν ἱερωσυνῶν after ἐκ γένους (doubted also by Kapparis) and to ἂν ὄσιν ἐξ ἀστῆς γυναικὸς καὶ ἐγγυητῆς κατὰ τὸν νόμον, inserted by Osborne after ἐκ τούτων from Apollodoros’ discussion of the decree at 105–6. Kapparis is more sympathetic to this insertion, but in our view the text at 105–6 may be Apollodoros’ gloss and not derive directly from the wording of the decree. On this decree see also *Pericles’ Citizenship Law*.

<sup>63</sup> The decree specifies that the Plataians were to be admitted to demes and tribes, and in other cases enfranchised foreigners are admitted to phratries, but neither this decree nor any other extant naturalization decree grants enfranchised foreigners admission to *gene*.

<sup>64</sup> Kapparis, 369.

<sup>65</sup> If this is right, it would follow that the possibility of an enfranchised (male) Plataian becoming a *genos* priest is raised not because it is realistic, but solely to pave the way for the permission granted to descendants in the second part of the clause, i.e. it would be a consequence of the drafter’s desire for laconic expression and the convenience linguistically of grouping access to *genos* priesthoods with access to *genos* rites and the archonship, to which enfranchised Plataians *might* realistically

## PART TWO

In the following we list the attested tenants of the five major Attic *genos* priesthoods who held office before the apparent Augustan reform of the *gene*, ca. 21 BC, and discuss the pattern of succession.

ETEBOUADAI<sup>66</sup>Priestess of Athena Polias<sup>67</sup>

The most important bibliography is: Töpffer, 113–33; Lewis; *APF* 4549; Turner, 247–84; Aleshire, *Demos* 336–37.

	Date <sup>68</sup>	Name <sup>69</sup>	Key references and relations <sup>70</sup>
1	Ca. 421–360	Λυσιμάχη 7 Δρακοντίδου 9 [Βατήθεν]	Priestess for 64 years (cf. Plin. <i>NH</i> 34.76) and had 4 children, according to <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 3453 = <i>CEG</i> II 757, base of statue sculpted by Demetrios ca. 400–360 (date: Lewis, 4), dedicated by her son, [-]ῆς Φλυεὺς; perhaps alluded to, Ar. <i>Peace</i> 992 (produced 421), cf. N. Dunbar, <i>CR</i> 20, 1970, 270–72, and Ar. <i>Lys.</i> 554 (produced 411); bon mot attributed to her, Plut. <i>Mor.</i> 534c; C. Lawton, <i>Attic Document Reliefs</i> (Oxford, 1995) no. 91 is a relief from the top of a decree of first quarter of iv BC which perhaps honoured her; <sup>71</sup> <i>PAA</i> 615640. ? Sister of Λυσικλῆς 20 Δ. B., secretary of treasurers of Athena, 416/5, <i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 306.24 etc.
2	341/0	Φανοστράτη 5 Δ(ρ)ακο[ντίδου <sup>72</sup> Βατήθεν ?]	Dedicator of two objects in acropolis inventory, 341/0, <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1456.31, 36; cf. 1463.10?

otherwise have had access (*genos* “rites” would include those performed by *gene*, but in which other Athenians participated). In our view the archonship is included here because it had semi-priestly functions and, as such, two genuine citizen parents were a prerequisite, as they were for *genos* priesthoods (see further, *Pericles’ Citizenship Law*).

<sup>66</sup> On other priesthoods that may have been supplied by this *genos* see Lambert, *The Priesthoods of the Eteoboutadai*, in: G. J. Oliver and Z. Archibald eds., *The Power of the Individual in Ancient Greece. Essays in Honour of J. K. Davies* (forthcoming). It is not clear whether all Eteoboutadai belonged to one of the two “branches” of the *genos* that seem to have supplied the priesthoods of Athena Polias and Poseidon Erechtheus.

<sup>67</sup> In myth early priestesses of Athena included Praxithea wife of Erechtheus (Eur. *Erechth.* F65.95–97) and Aglauros (*FGrH* 328 Philochoros F 106; Phot. s.v. Καλλυντήρια καὶ Πλυντήρια). The priestesses who appear in anecdotes in Hdt. 5.72 (on which see R. Parker, *Cleomenes on the Acropolis*, Oxford, 1998) and 8.41, are unfortunately unnamed (cf. n. 119).

<sup>68</sup> A span indicates a range of possible dates for item(s) of evidence for a priest(ess), not duration of tenure.

<sup>69</sup> A number next to a name is that allocated to the person by *LGNP* II.

<sup>70</sup> Fuller references to persons mentioned can be found in *LGNP* II and *PAA*.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Lambert, *ZPE* 154 (2006), 125; 159 (2007), 130. Lawton no. 164 (Lykourgan period?), probably honoured a priestess of Athena Nike, not Polias (*ZPE* 159, 2007, 130).

<sup>72</sup> Lambert confirms from the stone that Aleshire’s reading from a squeeze of the initial letter as Δ is preferable to the A read by previous editors (Ἀνακο[- Lewis]). The second letter is N on the stone.



3	Ca. late iv–early iii	[Λυσιμάχη?] 8 [Λυ?]σιστράτου 38 Βατῆθεν	Statue made by Kephisodotos and Timarchos late iv–early iii BC <sup>73</sup> dedicated by her son?, -ος Πολυεύκτου 30 Ἐρ[χιδεύς], <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3455</i> (cf. <i>PAA 730430</i> ); ? served by <i>diakonos</i> , Syeris, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3464</i> , cf. <i>Paus. 1.27.4</i> . <sup>74</sup> <i>PAA 615620</i> . ? Dau. of Λυσίστρατος 38 Πολυεύκτου 27 Βατῆθεν, councillor, 341/0, <i>Ag. XV 38.34</i> . ? Sister of Πολυεύκτος 28 Λυσιστράτου Βατῆθεν, archon of the Mesogeioi, 275/4 (archon Olbios <sup>75</sup> ), <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 1245</i> .
4	237/6?	[–]τη Πολυεύκτου 28 Βατῆθεν	Honoured by <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 776</i> (archon Alkibiades, 237/6? <sup>76</sup> ). <i>PAA 617650</i> . Wife of Ἀρχέστρατος 42 Εὐθυκράτους 12 Ἀμφιτροπῆθεν (l. 27, of a wealthy family, see <i>APF 2419</i> ). ? Dau. of Πολυεύκτος 28 Λυσιστράτου Βατῆθεν, archon of the Mesogeioi, 275/4 (archon Olbios) and brother of no. 3.
5	Ca. 260–220?	Θεοδότη 3 Πολυόκτου 2 Ἀμφιτροπῆθεν	Dates dedication for an <i>arrhephoros</i> , sculpted by Kaikosthenes, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3472</i> (ca. 260–220?). <sup>77</sup> <i>PAA 505065</i> . <i>APF 2419</i> . Related to no. 4?
6	Ca. 260–220?	Πεντετηρὶς 3 Ἱεροκλέους 52 Φλυέως	Honoured by <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 928</i> (ca. 260–220); <sup>78</sup> dates dedication for an <i>arrhephoros</i> sculpted by Kaikosthenes and Dies, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3470</i> (ca. 260–220?); <sup>79</sup> dates dedication for an <i>arrhephoros</i> , 3471. <i>PAA 772030</i> . ? Descendant of no. 1.
7	219/8	Καλλι- ? <sup>80</sup>	Dates dedication for an <i>arrhephoros</i> , <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3461</i> + Lewis, 9 (archon Menekrates, 219/8. Year: <i>ZPE 164</i> , 2008, 89). <i>PAA 552640</i> .
8	226/5–ca. 190	Φιλωτέρα 2	Dates dedication for an <i>arrhephoros</i> , <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3473</i> (226/5–ca. 190). <sup>81</sup>

<sup>73</sup> Sons of Praxiteles, they also made the wooden statues of the orator Lykourgos and his sons (*Plut. X Or.* 843e–f, quoted below on Priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus). Other statues bearing the names of both brothers are also datable to end-iv or early-iii BC, A. P. Matthaiou, “Two New Attic Inscriptions” in: R. Osborne and S. Hornblower eds., *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts presented to David Lewis*, (Oxford, 1994), 182 with n. 20. Cf. Hoff, 179 n. 58.

<sup>74</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup> 3464* is the base of a statue of Ση[ρις], Λυσ[μάχ]ης διά[κο]νος, seen by Pausanias, and is usually referred to this priestess. C. Keesling, however, in *Acts of the 13<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy* (Oxford, 2007), argued that Syeris served no. 1, in which case the name of priestess no. 3 would be unknown.

<sup>75</sup> Date: *ZPE 78* (1989), 221 n. 65.

<sup>76</sup> Work of Tracy’s “Cutter of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 776*”, ca. 255–ca. 240 (*A&M 112–17*). Year: M. Osborne, *ZPE 164* (2008), 85–89.

<sup>77</sup> Same range as 3470, made by Kaikosthenes and Dies (see next note). Kaikosthenes is named first elsewhere, so was perhaps the older brother, and Aleshire, *Demos 337*, inferred from the absence of Dies on 3472 that it was earlier (though one could not rule out that Kaikosthenes was simply commissioned separately on this occasion. Note also Köhler’s observation that the sculptor’s name may have been inscribed later than the rest of 3472).

<sup>78</sup> “In style of” Tracy’s “Cutter of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 788*” (*A&M 133* and 141), active ca. 260–235 according to Tracy. Sean Byrne, however, kindly advises per ep. that two or three inscriptions of this cutter may date to after 229: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 693* (as responsibility for making and announcing the crown is given to the generals rather than the officer in charge of the administration); *Ag. XV 116* (Antigonids not among beneficiaries of sacrifices); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 845*.

<sup>79</sup> These sculptors can not be dated more precisely than by the fact that they were contemporary with no. 5 and no. 6 (Tracy, *A&M 141*).

<sup>80</sup> Aleshire, *Demos 337* raised the attractive possibility of restoring Καλλι[στώ] and connecting her with the family of Lykourgos (name of his wife and granddaughter, cf. below under priests of Poseidon Erechtheus).

<sup>81</sup> Work of Tracy’s “Cutter of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 912*” (*ALC 60*). This dating undermines the identification of this priestess with no. 9 which was commonly made by earlier scholars.

9	Ca. 130	Φιλτέρα 1	Dedicates <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3474</i> , sculpted by Eucheir and Euboulides (ca. 130), <sup>82</sup> on which she claims, in verse, Eteoboutad blood (Βουταδέων ἐτύμων ἐξ αἰ[ματος]), that her father or ancestor was a Pausimachos, apparently general five times (γενέτωρ μὲν ταγὸς ἔφω στρατιᾶς πεντάκι), <sup>83</sup> that among her ancestors in the tribe Aegeis was Lykourgos (τοὶ πρόγονοι δ' ἄνθησαν ἐν Αἰγείδαισι Λυκοῦργος) the orator (τῶι μὲ[v] ρήτωρ λόγος ἄνδανεν) and Diogenes, honoured in the land of Attica (χῶ χθονὶ τιμάεις Ἀτθίδι), through whose works the fatherland obtained its ancient freedom (οὗ δι' ἔργα ἔδρακεν ἄρχαίαν πατρίς ἐλευθερίαν); <sup>84</sup> dates a dedication, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3870</i> . Cf. Humphreys.
10	106/5	Χρυσὶς 5 Νικήτου 26 Περγασῆθεν	Honoured by decree of Delphi, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 1136</i> (archonship in Delphi of Xenokrates, cf. Tracy, <i>ALC</i> 183); dedications: 3484; 3485 (ca. 106/5, cf. Tracy, <i>ALC</i> 211); dates dedication for an <i>arrhephoros</i> , 3486. Cf. <i>PAA</i> 711235; Humphreys 69–70.
11	End-ii/ early i	Φιλίππη 9 Μηδείου 6 Πειραιεύς	Basket-bearer at Delia, and sub-priestess of Artemis on Delos?, <i>ID</i> 1869 a 1 (120–110?, cf. Lewis, 9); priestess of Athena, sister of Μήδειος, priest of Poseidon Erechtheus, [Plut.] <i>X Or.</i> 843b (quoted below, priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus); daughter of Μήδειος (Eumolpid exegete, son of Lysandros and Philippe, descendant of Lykourgos the orator, <i>PAA</i> 648030) and Τιμοθέα Γλαύκου Πειρ., <i>PAA</i> 885845.
12	i?	Στρατόκλεια 4 [-] Φιλαΐδου	Dates dedication for an <i>arrhephoros</i> , <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3497</i> (cf. 3554, also dated by a priestess Stratokleia, ? i AD in the Corpus, but should perhaps be brought back to i BC). <i>PAA</i> 837250 ? = 837210.
13	27–18 (? 20–19) <sup>85</sup>	Μεγίστη 2 Ἀσκληπιάδου 107 Ἀλαιεύς	Dates inscription on epistyle of temple of Roma and Augustus, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3173</i> .

Excluded from the above list are:

1. [-]υλλης, priestess on the dedication from the acropolis “post med. s. IV”, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4601* (Aleshire no. 3). The nominative ought to be in -λα (cf. O. Masson, *Femmes donatrices à l’Asklepieion d’Athènes* in: P. Brulé et J. Oulhen eds., *Esclavage, guerre, économie ... hommages à Yvon Garlan*, Rennes, 1997, 88) and Köhler (ad *IG*) tentatively connected this priestess with the Νίκυλλα Πρεσβίου who was a dedicator to Athena at *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1472.9*. She, however, is not named as priestess. Moreover a priestess on a dedication from the acropolis may be, but was not necessarily, priestess of Athena Polias. There are numerous possible restorations of the name on 4601 (cf. *LGPN* II p. 484).

<sup>82</sup> Work of Tracy’s “Cutter of Agora I 286” (130/29–117/6) and dated by him towards the end of Eucheir’s career, ca. 130 (*ALC* 189–91).

<sup>83</sup> This man is not otherwise known. Osborne, *Naturalization* T100 suggests that he was Philtera’s father, was married to an Eteoboutad woman, was a son of Diogenes and a daughter of the Pausimachos of Kolonos (in Aegeis), named in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 791* = Ag. XVI 213 II 50 in the 240s, but this is all highly speculative, cf. *PAA* 770155 and next note.

<sup>84</sup> Diogenes was the Macedonian commander who returned Piraeus to Athens in 229, cf. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 834* and 5080, Plut. *Aratos* 34.4, Paus. 2.8.6. It appears from this text that he was naturalized as an Athenian (it has been thought in the Aegeid deme Kolonos, see previous note). For our purposes the stated connection of Lykourgos with Aegeis is more significant, since he was in fact of the deme Boutadai, in the tribe Oineis. The speculation that Diogenes was naturalized in the deme Kolonos does not resolve the problem, since no connection can be made between Diogenes or Pausimachos (of Kolonos?) and Lykourgos. As Turner, 258, saw, the significance of Aegeis in this context ought to be that this was the tribe of Bate, deme of the branch of the Eteoboutadai which traditionally supplied the priestesses of Athena. See further below, discussion of succession.

<sup>85</sup> Date: Schmalz, 398.



2. Ἀβρυλλίς Μικίωνος Κηφισιέως θυγάτηρ, attested as a late-ii BC priestess by *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 3477.8–10 (where she dates a base commemorating service as hearth-initiate at Eleusis, as basket-bearer on a Pythais and as basket-bearer at the Panathenaia) and on 6398 (funerary monument showing key with *tainiai*). Aleshire no. 19. Now known to have been priestess of Demeter and Kore (below no. 6, see *PAA* 101405) and, as Lambert observed, *ZPE* 142 (2003), 80–81 and 84, there is no longer good reason to identify her as also priestess of Athena Polias. For the priestess of Demeter dating dedications commemorating service to multiple deities cf. e.g. *I.Eleus.* 267 with n. 121 below; *I.Eleus.* 282 (s.v. priestess of Demeter no. 9).

3. As Lambert noted, *ZPE* 142 (2003), 80–81, 84, there is no good reason to identify Μνησὸν Κριτοδήμου Θορικού θυγάτηρ, Ἀσκληπιάδου Βερενικίδου γυνή, attested as priestess in late ii BC by *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 6232 (funerary monument showing key with *tainiai*, cf. above no. 2), as a priestess of Athena Polias (Aleshire no. 13).

4. Aleshire, *Demos*, includes as her no. 15 a ii/i BC priestess of Athena, - - Φιλέου Φυλασίου, who dates a very fragmentary dedication from the acropolis, now lost. It is uncertain whether she was priestess of Athena, cf. *SEG XXI* 799.

### Succession

Since Töpffer the prevailing view has been that this priesthood was transmitted by hereditary succession in the male line, and in the strongest statements of the system of succession, it includes primogeniture: “the priesthood was passed through the eldest Eteoboutad male who carried the blood for the priesthood to his eldest daughter who became the priestess”.<sup>86</sup> In Part 1 we argued that, while membership of a *genos* was transmitted by hereditary succession, appointment to *genos* priesthoods was by allotment from the sons or daughters of *genos* members. What does the actual succession of the priestesses suggest about the way they were appointed? Some of the epigraphical name restorations and stemma reconstructions made by earlier scholars have assumed direct hereditary transmission. We have sought to avoid such an assumption in the table of priestesses set out above.

From late-v BC to 237/6? we have the names, or parts of the names, of four priestesses. No. 3 and no. 4 were daughters of men of the deme Bate. The deme of no. 1's father is not directly attested, but Lewis' identification of him as the Drakontides of Bate who was father of Lysikles, secretary of the treasurers of Athena in 416/5, is persuasive. The father's name and demotic of no. 2 was probably the same as no. 1's. Given the tendency for grandsons to be named for their grandfathers, the father of no. 2 may have been a son of a brother of no. 1. We can not tell exactly how no. 3 was related to no. 1 and no. 2. No. 4 can plausibly be identified as daughter of no. 3's brother. We can not infer from this succession that there was a system of hereditary transmission of the priesthood, let alone that there was primogeniture (we do not know how many siblings each relevant individual had, or their relative seniority).<sup>87</sup> We can infer that eligibility was traced in the male line of descent in a family of the deme Bate, and it is an attractive hypothesis that this family was, in effect, a quite narrowly defined branch of the *genos* Eteoboutadai analogous to the branches explicitly attested for the *genos* Salaminioi.

We can not determine independently the order of the priestesses 4, 5 and 6. One was daughter of a man from Bate, but the other two were daughters of men from other demes, Amphitrope and Phlya, and this is consistent with the order shown and a hypothesis that the Bate branch of the Eteoboutadai ran out of male heirs and that, by default, eligibility was twice traced in the female line according to normal principles of inheritance.<sup>88</sup> On this hypothesis no. 4 was a priestly *epikleros*, who, in the absence of surviving male members of the branch, carried the blood line of this branch of the Eteoboutadai into her husband's family and deme, Amphitrope. After no. 5 the succession failed again and the blood line had to be traced all the

<sup>86</sup> Turner, 249.

<sup>87</sup> Except in relation to *sitesis*, we would question whether primogeniture was a recognised principle of succession in relation to priesthoods or in any other respect in archaic and classical Athens. For a recent discussion see D. W. Berman, *Myth and Culture in Aeschylus' Seven Against Thebes* (Rome, 2007), 128–33.

<sup>88</sup> This order and the underlying reasoning were also perceived by Turner, 255.



way back to no. 1 to find an eligible candidate, for no. 6's father was a man from Phlya and might therefore have been a descendant of one of the sons of no. 1, who were also from that deme.

The extent of the conjecture here is clear, but the hypothesis of female-line succession in circumstances of failure of the male line is consistent with the impression created by the succession of no. 1–4 that the number of families eligible for the priesthood in the classical period had been rather limited. Possibly Drakontides, father of no. 1, or his wife, was the sole carrier of the line and all subsequent priestesses to this point were his or her descendants.

We do not have father's names or demes for the next two attested priestesses, 7 and 8, and it is unclear how they were eligible.

With no. 9, Philtera, we come down to the late second century. On the interpretation of the reference to the tribe Aegeis in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 3474* offered above, her eligibility for the priesthood also arose from a connection with the Bate branch of the Eteoboutadai, though we do not know enough to pinpoint the connection. Lykourgos the orator, from whom she claimed descent, was a member of the other Eteoboutad branch, based in Boutadai in Oeneis, but he might have generated Philtera's connection with the Bate branch via his wife, Kallisto daughter of Habron of Bate, or his own maternal ancestry (though his mother's demotic was perhaps in -σιος, not Βατηθεν, see below on priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus, Stele A), or by marriage of a descendant into that branch.

It is unclear how no. 10 acquired her eligibility for the priesthood. Her father was from Pergase, not a deme which features in the prosopography of earlier known priestesses of Athena, and Turner, 265–68, plausibly suggests a matrilineal connection to the Eteoboutadai.<sup>89</sup> Since no. 11's father was Eumolpid exegete, her eligibility will again have been acquired in the female line, most likely, as Turner, 271–76, saw, via her father's mother, Philippe, for whom she was named and who, as we know from [Plut.] *X Or.* 843 a–c, was descended from Lykourgos, and was therefore related (though we can not tell how) to no. 9. Neither no. 12 nor no. 13 were certainly in office before the *genos* reform of ca. 21 BC and their demotics are unattested among earlier priestesses of Athena.

### Priest of Poseidon Erechtheus

Key recent bibliography: *APF* 9251; Aleshire, *Demos* 328–32.

#### Preliminaries

Two passages of the *Life of Lykourgos* attributed to Plutarch are fundamental:

“His [sc. Lykourgos IV, the orator's] children were Habron (II), Lykourgos (V) and Lykophron (III), of whom Habron and Lykourgos died childless. Habron at least had a distinguished political career before he died; but Lykophron, having married Kallistomache daughter of Philippos of Aixone, bore Kallisto. Kleombrotos son of Deinokrates of Acharnai married her and bore Lykophron (IV), who was adopted by

<sup>89</sup> The succession of no. 9 and no. 10 emphasises the incompleteness of our knowledge of members of the Bate branch of the Eteoboutadai. Possibly to be connected with this branch are: (a) the family of Lykourgos' wife, Kallisto daughter of Habron of Bate, in which the names Habron and Kallias were common, and which was prominent in vi–iv BC and again in ii BC, see *APF* 7856 with Lambert, *ZPE* 142, 2003, 82 no. 43 (given the prevalence of matrilinear *genos* connections at this period, the fact that a ii BC son of Habron of this family was of the *genos* Intidai does not preclude connection with the Bate branch of the Eteoboutadai); (b) Aristodemos 31 of Bate, who was responsible for the execution of Lykourgos, grandfather of the orator, by the Thirty, [Plut.] *X Or.* 841a–b, cf. *APF* p. 350 (though he might simply have come into conflict with the Eteoboutadai as a fellow-demesman of members of one of its branches); (c) the writer *περὶ γενῶν FGrH* Drakon 344 (cf. the family name Drakontides, ? = Drakon 5 of Bate (ii BC), a member of the Habron of Bate family); (d) Lysistrate 26 and Panathenais 1, named together on *IG II<sup>2</sup> 12013*, a mid-iv BC funerary stele now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (G. M. A. Richter, *Catalogue of Greek Sculptures in the Metropolitan Museum*, New York, 1954, no. 86 (ph.)). Lysistrate is a common name, but this is the only occurrence in the Attic onomasticon before the Christian era of a woman named Panathenais (in ii AD a daughter of Herodes Atticus was so called according to Philost. *Vit. Soph.* 557–8, cf. *LGPN II* Athenais 16) a name which, like Penteteris (priestess no. 6), would be eminently suitable for a potential priestess of Athena Polias; (e) the other attested Athenian woman or women named Penteteris, dedicant(s?) at Brauron, mid-iv BC, *LGPN II* no. 1, *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1514.36, 1515.29, 1516.15, 1517.141, and no. 2 dau. of Theophemos and ? Nikostrate, 1524.56; for the name Nikostrate in this family see below, [Plut.] *X Or.* 843a–c.



his grandfather, Lykophron (III); but he died childless. After the death of Lykophron Sokrates married Kalisto and had a son Symmachos; he had a son Aristonymos, who had a son Charmides, who had a daughter, Philippe. She and Lysandros had a son Medeios, who was also exegete of the Eumolpidae. The children of him and Timothea daughter of Glaukos were Laodameia and Medeios, who also held the priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus, and Philippe, who was later priestess of Athena; but first Diokles of Melite married her and bore Diokles, who was general in command of the hoplites; and he having married Hediste daughter of Habron bore Philippides and Nikostrate; and Themistokles the dadouch, son of Theophrastos, having married Nikostrate, bore Theophrastos and Diokles. He also reorganized the priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus<sup>90</sup> [Plut.] *X Orat. Vitae* 843a–c (Teubner ed. Mau).

“The *genos* was descended ultimately from Boutes and Erechtheus the son of Ge and Hephaistos and immediately from Lykomedes [I, great-grandfather of the orator] and Lykourgos [III, grandfather of the orator], whom the People honoured by public burial [cf. 852a]; and this succession in the *genos* of those who have been priests of Poseidon is on a complete tablet (*pinax*), set up in the Erechtheum, painted by Ismenias of Chalkis [ca. 307–304, Hoff, 180]; and there are wooden statues of Lykourgos and his sons, Habron, Lykourgos and Lykophron, which Timarchos and Kephisodotos made, the sons of Praxiteles;<sup>91</sup> and the *pinax* was dedicated by Habron, his son, having been allotted the priesthood from the *genos* and having yielded it to his brother Lykophron; and for this reason Habron is portrayed passing the trident to him<sup>92</sup> [Plut.] *X Orat. Vitae* 843e–f (ed. Mau).

The son of Lykourgos (III), Lykophron (I) father of the orator Lykourgos (IV) was an unknown before 1987 (cf. *APF*), but our knowledge of him and other members of the family was expanded by Matthaïou’s publication in 1987 of several of their funerary monuments,<sup>93</sup> as follows:

Stele A. Commemorates Lykophron son of Lykourgos of Boutadai (1–3) and [-c. 3–4-]νη [-c. 4–5-κ]λέος [-c. 4–5-]σίου (4–6), whom Matthaïou attractively identifies as father and ? mother of the orator, and possibly another [-c. 6–8-]ος, 7).

Stele B. Commemorates Lykophron (II) son of Lykeias (I) of Boutadai (1–3), his two sons, Lykomedes (II) (4–6) and Lykeias (II) (7–9), and a female relation, [-c. 4–5-]στράτη [Λυκομ?]ήδου (II?) [θυγάτηρ? γυνή?] (10–12). The style of the monument and the lettering suggested to Matthaïou that Lykophron was inscribed ca. mid-iv BC and the latest name, -strate, in late-iv. How exactly the family related to that of the orator is uncertain. Matthaïou suggests that Lykeias (I) was the brother of the orator’s grandfather, Lykourgos (III) “the Egyptian”, but there are other possibilities, e.g. he might be a son of a Lykophron, whom one might

<sup>90</sup> κατέλιπε δὲ παῖδας Ἄβρωνα Λυκοῦργον Λυκόφρονα· ὧν ὁ Ἄβρων καὶ ὁ Λυκοῦργος ἀπαιδες μετήλλαξαν· ἀλλ’ ὁ γ’ Ἄβρων καὶ πολιτευσάμενος ἐπιφανῶς μετήλλαξε, Λυκόφρων δὲ γήμας Καλλιστομάχην Φιλίππου Αἰξωνέως ἐγέννησε Καλλιστώ. ταύτην δὲ γήμας Κλεόμβροτος Δεινοκράτους Ἀχαρνεὺς ἐγέννησε Λυκόφρονα· τοῦτον δ’ ὁ πάππος εἰσεποιήσατο Λυκόφρων· οὗτος δ’ ἐτελεύτησεν ἄπαις· μετὰ δὲ τὴν Λυκόφρονος τελευτὴν ἔγημε τὴν Καλλιστῶ Σωκράτης καὶ ἔσχεν υἱὸν Σύμμαχον· τοῦ δ’ ἐγένετο Ἀριστόνυμος, τοῦ δὲ Χαρμίδης, τοῦ δὲ Φιλίππης· ταύτης δὲ καὶ Λυσάνδρου Μήδειος, ὁ καὶ ἐξηγητὴς ἐξ Εὐμολπιδῶν γενόμενος· τοῦτου δὲ καὶ Τιμοθέας τῆς Γλαύκου παῖδες Λαοδάμεια καὶ Μήδειος, ὅς τὴν ἱερωσύνην Ποσειδῶνος Ἐρεχθέως εἶχε, καὶ Φιλίππη, ἣτις ἱεράσατο τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ὕστερον· πρότερον δ’ αὐτὴν γήμας Διοκλῆς ὁ Μελιτεὺς ἐγέννησε Διοκλέα τὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλίτας στρατηγήσαντα· γήμας δ’ οὗτος Ἡδίστην Ἄβρωνος Φιλίππιδην καὶ Νικοστράτην ἐγέννησε· γήμας δὲ τὴν Νικοστράτην Θεμιστοκλῆς ὁ Θεοφράστου ὁ δαδούχος ἐγέννησε Θεόφραστον καὶ Διοκλέα· διετάξατο δὲ καὶ τὴν ἱερωσύνην τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος Ἐρεχθέως.

<sup>91</sup> On these statues see Hoff, 179–80 (date: before 290, perhaps shortly after 307?).

<sup>92</sup> κατήγον δὲ τὸ γένος ἀπὸ Βούτου καὶ Ἐρεχθέως τοῦ Γῆς καὶ Ἡφαίστου, τὰ δ’ ἐγγυτάτω ἀπὸ Λυκομήδους καὶ Λυκοῦργου, οὓς ὁ δῆμος ταφαῖς ἐτίμησε δημοσίᾳ· καὶ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ καταγωγὴ τοῦ γένους τῶν ἱερασαμένων τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ἐν πίνακι τελείῳ, ὃς ἀνάκειται ἐν Ἐρεχθεῖῳ, γεγραμμένος ὑπ’ Ἰσμηνίου τοῦ Χαλκιδίδεως· καὶ εἰκόνες ξύλιναι τοῦ τε Λυκοῦργου καὶ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ, Ἄβρωνος Λυκοῦργου Λυκόφρονος, ἃς εἰργάσαντο Τιμαρχος καὶ Κηφισόδοτος, οἱ Πραξιτέλους υἱεῖς· τὸν δὲ πίνακα ἀνέθηκεν Ἄβρων ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ, λαχὼν ἐκ τοῦ γένους τὴν ἱερωσύνην καὶ παραχωρήσας τῷ ἀδελφῷ Λυκόφρονι· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πεποιήται ὁ Ἄβρων προσιδίους αὐτῷ τὴν τρίαιναν.

<sup>93</sup> Ἡρίον Λυκοῦργου Λυκόφρονος Βουτάδου, *Horos* 5 (1987), 31–44, cf. *SEG* XXXVII 160–62. These seem not to belong to the group of monuments mentioned by [Plut.] *X Orat.* 842e: “He (Lykourgos) and some of his descendants were given public burial; and their monuments are opposite Athena Paionia in the garden of Melanthos the philosopher, made as tables (τράπεζαι), and those of Lykourgos and his children have inscriptions and are preserved until our days.”



postulate as brother of Lykomedes (I). In that case Lykeias (I) would have named his eldest son for his grandfather, according to the normal convention.

Lekythos. Commemorates Lykophron son of Lykourgos of Boutadai. Matthaiou identifies him as Lykophron (III), the orator's son, but, though separate "private" commemoration can not be ruled out, [Plut.] *X Or.* 842e (see n. 93) would lead one to suppose that he was commemorated with his father in public ground by a *trapeza* and the apparent use of -o for -ou in Λυκούργω (see Matthaiou's note and photograph, pl. 10), would be more consistent with an earlier date. This might therefore be e.g. a descendant of Lykeias (I), or even perhaps another monument commemorating the orator's father.

Apart from Lykeias' family, attested by Stele B, it is very possible that there were other descendants of Lykomedes (I) and Lykourgos (III), e.g. Lykourgos (III) might plausibly have had sons beside Lykophron (I) the orator's father. The iv BC priests before Habron may be unattested individuals.

In addition to the *polis* priest of Poseidon Erechtheus, the Eteoboutadai seem also to have supplied the tribal priest, or "priest of the eponymous", of Erechtheis.<sup>94</sup> It is not entirely clear whether the two priest-hoods were formally identical, or always held by the same person, but it is a possible interpretation of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1146* (discussed above, Part 1), that from at least ca. 400–350, the *polis* priest was the tribal priest, and Medeios of Piraeus (no. 7), who held the *polis* priesthood ca. 100 BC, is probably also attested as tribal priest. All three attested "priests of the eponymous" are therefore included in the list of *polis* priests, below (nos. 5, 6, 7).

	Date	Name	Key references and relations
1	Mid-v	Λυκομήδης I 6 Βουτάδης	Referred to in decree of 307/6 honouring Lykourgos the orator as his ancestor, honoured by the people and given public burial in the Kera-meikos, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 457</i> + [Plut.] <i>X Or.</i> 851f–852e; 843e (see above). Father of 2. <i>PAA</i> 610955; <i>APF</i> 9251. Identification as priest uncertain (see below).
2	Late-v	Λυκοῦργος III 3 Λυκομήδους I 6 Βουτάδης	Referred to in decree of 307/6 honouring Lykourgos the orator as his ancestor, honoured by the people and given public burial in the Kera-meikos, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 457</i> + [Plut.] <i>X Or.</i> 851f–852e; 843e (see above). Killed by Thirty by agency of Aristodemos of Bate, [Plut.] <i>X Or.</i> 841a–b; satirised by Ar. <i>Birds</i> 1296 as "Egyptian", cf. Kratinos F 32 K–A, Pherekrates F 11 K–A. <i>PAA</i> 611325 = 611320; <i>APF</i> 9251. Son of 1. Great-grandfather of 3. Identification as priest uncertain (see below)
3	330– 305	Ἀβρων II 18 Λυκούργου IV 4 Βουτάδης	Son of Lykourgos the orator and Kallisto (I) daughter of Habron (I) of Bate, [Plut.] <i>X Or.</i> 842f, cf. <i>APF</i> 7856. ? Ephebe ca. 330, Reinmuth, <i>Ephebic Inscr.</i> 12.8, 73. Prosecuted with brothers by Menesaichmos after death of father, defended by Demosthenes from exile and released, Dem. <i>Ep.</i> 3; Hyp. F118; [Plut.] <i>X Or.</i> 842e. Politically active, 843e; ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει, 307/6, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 463.36</i> ; treasurer of stratiotic fund, 306/5, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 1492.123</i> . Allotted priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus, but ceded to brother, Lykophron, [Plut.] <i>X Or.</i> 843f. <i>PAA</i> 101575 ? = 101570. <i>APF</i> 9251. Younger brother of no. 4.

<sup>94</sup> Of the ten tribal priesthoods, three (Erechtheis, Kekropis and Hippothontis) were held by men who were not members of the relevant tribe and, as R. Schlaifer first suggested (*HSCP* 51, 1940, 251–57, cf. Aleshire, *Demos* 331–32, Parker, *Athenian Religion* 285–86, 293), this can be accounted for on the assumption that the priests continued to be supplied by the *genos* that had been responsible for cult of the relevant hero before the tribal priest-hoods were created.



4	Ca. 325– 305	Λυκόφρων III 13 Λυκούργου IV 4 Βουτάδης	See above on no. 3. PAA 611545. As the eldest son of Lykourgos the orator (explicitly at 843c) he applied (851f) for the <i>sitesis</i> to which he was entitled according to the terms of Stratokles' decree of 307/6 honouring Lykourgos (852e). Older brother of no. 3.
5	Ca. 215– 205	Ἀριστόνυμος 31 Ἀριστωνύμου 32 Πιθεύς	Priest of eponymous of Erechtheis, Ag. XV 98.23, 99.1, ca. 215–205 BC (Date: Tracy, <i>ALC</i> 67). Cf. Aleshire, <i>Demos</i> 331 n. 31. Parker, <i>Athenian Religion</i> 293 notes that Aristonymos, named among the descendants of Lykourgos at [Plut.] <i>X Or.</i> 843b (above), might have been the priest's father. PAA 202220.
6	Ca. 200– 150	Καλλίας 61	Priest of eponymous of Erechtheis, Ag. XV 231.32, ca. 200–150 (Date: Tracy, <i>ALC</i> 104, Style of "Cutter of Agora I 247", 194/3–148/7 BC). <sup>95</sup> Cf. Aleshire, <i>Demos</i> 331 n. 31. PAA 553700.
7	ii/i	Μήδειος 8 Μηδείου 6 Πειραιέως	Prominent politician, PAA 648035. Priesthood: [Plut.] <i>X Or.</i> 843b. Probably honoured as priest of the eponymous of Erechtheis ca. 100 in Ag. XV 257. <sup>96</sup> His sister, Philippe, was priestess of Athena Polias (no. 11, above). Cf. n. 100.

### Succession

In earlier discussions (including *APF* 9251) it was assumed that this priesthood, like that of Athena Polias, was transmitted by inheritance from father to eldest son. However, in this case there is clear evidence to the contrary. [Plut.] *X Or.* 843f states that Habron was *allotted* the priesthood from the *genos* (discussed above, Part 1); 843c states that Lykophron applied for *sitesis* as Lykourgos' eldest son; and 843f states that Habron ceded the priesthood to Lykophron, i.e. older brother succeeded younger.<sup>97</sup> Moreover the *καταγωγή* τοῦ γένους of the priests illustrated on the *pinax* painted by Ismenias does not mean "succession from father to son" (misleading translation of H. N. Fowler in the Loeb), but "succession in the *genos*".<sup>98</sup> Exactly how the *pinax* was designed, and whether it illustrated *genos* members who were not priests, but may have been closely related to priests (e.g. fathers or brothers), is unclear. It is also unclear whether we can press the apparent implication of *αὐτῆ* ἢ *καταγωγή* at 843e that Lykourgos' two ancestors mentioned in the preceding text, Lykomedes (I) and his son Lykourgos (III), were shown on the *pinax* and were themselves priests and/or ancestors of all subsequent priests on the *pinax*. This is the *prima facie* implication of [Plut.]'s words, but it can not be ruled out that [Plut.]'s information about them derives not from the *pinax*, but from the statement about their receiving honours and public burial in Stratokles' decree of 307/6 honouring Lykourgos (852a, the relevant passage of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 457 is not preserved), where there is no implication that they were priests. It is nowhere stated that either Lykophron (I), son of Lykourgos "the Egyptian" and father of

<sup>95</sup> There seems no good reason to identify this man with the Kallias at Ag. XV 226.8 and 77 (Hippothontis).

<sup>96</sup> This interpretation of Ag. XV 257 was suggested to us by Sean Byrne per ep.

<sup>97</sup> The argument of *APF* pp. 351–52 that [Plut.] was mistaken and that Habron was the eldest son is driven by the unsubstantiated assumption that the priesthood was transmitted by primogeniture. The order of the sons in [Plut.] is also supported by its correspondence to the onomastic norm: eldest son named for paternal grandfather, second son for maternal grandfather, third son for father. The naming of Habron first at 843a has to do not with the relative ages of the brothers, but the fact that Habron was the only brother who was politically prominent and is therefore dealt with first in the text that follows. The genuineness of Lykophron's claim to *sitesis*, transcribed at 851e–852e, is supported by the correspondence, in substance, if not precise wording, of the text of the decree honouring Lykourgos which it quotes with the epigraphic version, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 457. It is unnecessary, and to our minds an unwarranted scepticism, to suppose, with *APF*, that "the sentence [introducing the claim for *sitesis* and attributing it to Lykophron] was written as editorial work by some περιγητής". Cf. M. Faraguna, *I Documenti nelle "Vite dei X Oratori"*, in: A. M. Biraschi et al., *L'Uso dei Documenti nella Storiografia Antica*, Perugia–Naples, 2003, 479–503, especially 487–91.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. *Ath. Pol.* 42.5, where ephebes are prohibited from absenting themselves for litigation, unless concerning an inheritance or *epikleros* κἄν τι κατὰ γένος ἱερῶσύνῃ γέννηται, which does not mean "or concerning an inherited priesthood", but "or concerning a *genos* priesthood".



the orator, or the orator himself, were priests,<sup>99</sup> and it is quite possible that, in the generations before Habron, the priesthood was held by other members of the Boutadai branch of the *genos*.

The earliest firmly attested priest, therefore, is the orator's son, Habron. He voluntarily ceded the priesthood to his brother, Lykophron.<sup>100</sup> This will have required special dispensation from the *genos* and/or the *polis* (see discussion above, Part 1).

A number of the individuals named in the genealogy of Lykourgos' descendants at [Plut.] 843a–c are known from the epigraphical record (see above on priests no. 5 and no. 7; *APF* p. 353; Perrin-Saminadayar). Only Medeios (no. 7) is stated to have been priest and neither no. 5 or no. 6 are mentioned in the genealogy; it is not a genealogy of priests, but a genealogy showing how Themistokles, dadouch in the Augustan period, traced his ancestry to Lykourgos. Themistokles "reorganized" (διετέταξε) the priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus ca. 21 BC,<sup>101</sup> it seems as part of a wider reform of the *gene*.<sup>102</sup>

It is clear from this genealogy that the line of descent after Lykourgos became attenuated and was traced in the female line, similar to the pattern that can be observed in the Bate branch of the *genos*. We can not be certain how far this affected the transmission of the priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus, since we have a much less clear idea than with the Bate branch how many families belonged to the Boutadai branch. It is noteworthy, however, that no. 5 seems to have been a descendant of Lykourgos through his granddaughter Kallisto's marriage to Sokrates (of Pithos?); that the name of no. 6, Kallias, was common in the prominent family of Lykourgos's wife, Kallisto (cf. n. 89); and that the father of priest no. 5 was Eumolpid exegete, suggesting that Medeios did not inherit his eligibility in the male line, but via his father's mother, Philippe, who was a descendant of Lykourgos. It may be, therefore, that, from no. 5, if not before, all priests were descendants of Lykourgos' granddaughter, Kallisto.

#### Succession – both Eteoboutad priesthoods

The evidence for both Eteoboutad priesthoods, taken together, suggests that the system was one of appointment to the priesthood by allotment among eligible members of the *genos* of the appropriate gender. In the early period, at least, eligibility was restricted to distinct branches of the *genos*: for Athena Polias the branch was quite tightly defined and may have included (only?) descendants of Drakontides of Bate, father of the v BC priestess, Lysimache. The *pinax* of Habron, which apparently made no reference to the priestesses of Athena, tends to confirm that the priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus was vested in a different branch, based in Boutadai. It may have traced its descent from ancestors who were roughly contemporary with Drakontides: Lykomedes [I] and Lykourgos [III].<sup>103</sup> In the hellenistic period there are signs that both

<sup>99</sup> The strong religious sense that infuses Lykourgos' words and actions does not imply that he was priest of Poseidon Erechtheus; he might equally have acquired it as a conscientious *genos* member. Compare the rather similar intensity of religious feeling expressed by the speaker of Lys. 6, who was (probably) a Eumolpid, but was not himself the hierophant (cf. n. 108).

<sup>100</sup> The reason for this is obscure. Perhaps he regarded tenure of such a major priesthood as incompatible with an active career in public life. Athenian priests were not generally active politicians, a topic which Josine Blok plans to explore elsewhere. Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 291b–c.

<sup>101</sup> [Plut.] *X Or.* 843e (referred by *PAA* 611335, p. 200, to Lykourgos the orator, incorrectly in our view). For this interpretation of διετέταξε see Aleshire, *Archaism*.

<sup>102</sup> Argued by Aleshire, *Archaism*. See also Schmalz, 397–98. Among its products is the list of the *genos* Amyndridai, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2338, cf. also *BCH* 51 (1927), 246 (*SEG* XXX 99) and the reform of the Kerykes implicit in the decree honouring Themistokles, *I.Eleus.* 300. Pace Clinton, 56, and Perrin-Saminadayar, we doubt that Themistokles actually held the priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus in addition to the dadouchy.

<sup>103</sup> If Davies, *APF* p. 350, is correct to identify a "vendetta" underlying the prosecution of Lykourgos III of Boutadai by Aristodemos of Bate (cf. n. 89), this might have supplied an occasion for the division into branches, though it is also possible that the division was much older. The silence of Habron's *pinax* about the priestesses of Athena is deafening; but interestingly it is the priesthood of Athena Polias and not that of Poseidon Erechtheus which, in ii BC, Drakon (of Bate?) linked specifically to the Eteoboutadai in his treatise *περὶ γενῶν* (*FGrH* 344 F1), as in iv BC had the orator Aeschines, who was a member of the phratry to which the Eteoboutadai belonged (2.147), and indeed while the priesthood of Athena was prominent from early on (cf. n. 67), there is scarcely a reference to the priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus in literary sources before its acquisition by Lykourgos' sons.



branches ran short of suitably qualified male heirs; eligibility was increasingly traced via the female side; and it is possible that the branches were combined or became obsolete, whether by explicit decision or natural process.

## EUMOLPIDAI

### Hierophant

Key bibliography: Clinton, 10–47.

	Date	Name	Key references and relations
1	Early-v	Ζάκορος 1	Great-grandfather of speaker of Lysias 6 (6.54). Clinton no. 1. PAA 460110.
2	415–408	Θεόδωρος 12	Required to curse and later un-curse Alcibiades, Plut. <i>Alk.</i> 33. Clinton no. 2. PAA 505995.
3	379	Ἀρχίας 14	Warns friend, an oligarch at Thebes, of Pelopidas' impending coup, Plut. <i>Pelop.</i> 10, <i>Mor.</i> 596e; <i>Nepos Pelop.</i> 3.2; condemned for making a sacrifice at Haloa which was right of priestess of Demeter, Dem. 59.116. Clinton no. 3. PAA 212235.
4	Ca. 350	Λακρατείδης <sup>104</sup> 4	Betrothed to half-sister of Apollodoros, daughter of Archedamos of Oion, Isae. 7.9; with dadouch, determined boundaries of sacred orgas, <i>FGrH</i> 324 Androtion F30; <i>FGrH</i> 328 Philochoros F155. Clinton no. 4. <i>APF</i> 1395. PAA 600845.
5	Ca. 350	Ἴεροκλείδης 16 Τεισαμενοῦ 22 Παιανιεύς	Honoured by deme Eleusis, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> 1188 = <i>I.Eleus.</i> 72.3–5, 17; ? on fun. mon., <i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> 7057. Clinton no. 5. PAA 531995.
6	336/5– 333/2	[Βί?]οττος 1	Named as hierophant in inventory, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> 1544 = <i>I.Eleus.</i> 158.36. Clinton no. 6. PAA 266115.
7	323	Εὐρυμέδων 3 <sup>105</sup>	Charges Aristotle with impiety, D. L. 5.5; Ath. 15.696b. Clinton no. 7. PAA 444992.
8	317–307	Εὐρυκλείδης 4 <sup>106</sup>	Charges philosopher Theodoros with impiety, D. L. 2.101. Clinton no. 8. PAA 444765.
9	Ca. 229/8– ca. 203	Χαιρήτιος 1 Προφήτου 1 Ἐλευσίνιος	Honoured by Eumolpidae and Kerykes, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> 1235 = <i>I.Eleus.</i> 201 (by Tracy's "Cutter of <i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> 1706", 229/8–ca. 203, <i>ALC</i> 47). Clinton no. 10.

<sup>104</sup> It is uncertain whether he is to be identified with the dedicator (to Demeter and Kore?), [Λα]κρατείδης [. . . .<sup>s</sup>. . . . Πα]πανιεύς, *SEG* XVII 86.

<sup>105</sup> It is striking that this hierophant has a similar name to no. 8 and that both appear in anecdotes about their intolerance of impiety which are set in closely adjacent chronological contexts. The historicity of these men is questionable; in any case they may be conflation of a single individual.

<sup>106</sup> See previous note.

10	Ca. 210–150. Hierophant: 183/2 – ca. 148	Ἀριστοκλῆς 69 Νουφράδου 3 Περιθοίδης <sup>107</sup>	Ephebe 210/9 (archon Sostratos), <i>SEG</i> XXII 101.25; donor, also on behalf of son, Eukles, and brother, Amynomachos of Halai, <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 2332.49 (archon Hermogenes, 183/2); son referred to as Eukles son of Aristokles of Perithoidai, <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 961.21, ca. 140 (Tracy, <i>ALC</i> 148) and as “Eukles son of Hierophantes” on Panathenaic victor-list, 166/5, <i>SEG</i> XLI 115 II 37, 53; honoured in decree (of Eumolpidai?), <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1045 = <i>I.Eleus.</i> 234.5, 9 (by “Cutter of Ag. I 6006”, 169/8–135/4, <i>ALC</i> 149); honoured in Athenian decree of archon Lysiades, c. 149/8, as hierophant since archon Hermogenes, 183/2, Ag. XVI 306.5; inscribes (as “Hierophantes son of N. of P.”) list of men chosen by him to perform rites for Pluto, <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1934 with Tracy, <i>ALC</i> 149, 155–56 (ca. 170–135). Clinton no. 9 + no. 11. <i>PAA</i> 170470 = 170465. Natural brother of no. 11.
11	183/2– 135. Hierophant: from ca. 148	Ἀμυνόμαχος 5 brother of no. 10 (but adop- tively Εὐκλέους 54 Ἄλαιεύς)	See no. 10, <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 2332.52 (183/2); dedicator (?) on 3469 = <i>I.Eleus.</i> 235 (by “Cutter of <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 3479”, 175/4–135, <i>ALC</i> 138); proposer of Ag. XVI 306.3 (see under no. 10); dedicator on <i>SEG</i> XXI 809 + Tracy, <i>ALC</i> 141 (175/4–135, cutter as <i>I.Eleus.</i> 235, <i>ALC</i> 139, 141). Clinton no. 12. <i>PAA</i> 124595. Natural brother of no. 10.
12	Late-ii	Μενεκλείδης 10 Θεοφήμου 7 Κυδαθηναιεύς	Hierophantes son of Theo[ph. of K.] on list of prominent men, <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 2452.48, 59 (ca. end-ii BC, cf. Tracy, <i>ALC</i> 214–5); wife, S- dau. of a man from Acharnai, dedicates 3512 = <i>I.Eleus.</i> 242; ? son = Metrodoros 35, 103–55 BC, <i>ID</i> 1927, 3 etc. Clinton no. 13. <i>PAA</i> 643080 = 643083 =? 643085. Father of no. 14. Ismard would place after no. 13.
13	End-ii	[Θεόδοτος 78?] Εὐστρόφου 7 Πειραιεύς	Hierophantes son of E. of P. on list of prominent men, <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 2452.53 (ca. end-ii BC, cf. Tracy, <i>ALC</i> 214–5); he or brother (Th. son of E. of P.) honoured by cleruchy Salaminioi as gymnasiarch, <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1227.3, 27, 42 (archon Ergokles, 132/1); ? he or brother honoured by cleruchy Salaminioi for sacred works, <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1228.19, 22 (archon Sarapion, 116/5). Clinton no. 14. <i>PAA</i> 532945 ? = 505560. Ismard would place before no. 12.
14	ii/i	[Θεόφημος 8?] Μενεκλείδου 10 Κυδαθηναιεύς	Hierophantes son of M. of K. on list of prominent men, <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 2452.59 (ca. end-ii BC, cf. Tracy, <i>ALC</i> 214–5). Clinton no. 15. <i>PAA</i> 510890. Son of no. 12.

No further hierophants are known by name before i AD (see Clinton, 28–9).

### Succession

This succession is consistent with appointment of the hierophant by lot from the male members of the *genos* Eumolpidai. As Clinton notes (p. 10), it is apparent from Lysias 6.54 that, while the speaker’s great-grandfather, Zakoros, was hierophant, neither Zakoros’ son, Diokles, the speaker’s grandfather, nor the speaker himself, held that office. This is suggestive that the office was not heritable.<sup>108</sup> Moreover, before ca. 150 BC, with the possible exception of no. 4 and no. 5, no two hierophants are demonstrably from the

<sup>107</sup> On this man see now especially Tracy, *ALC* 155–56. He is the first hierophant for whom hieronymy is attested.

<sup>108</sup> It does not prove it, as Diokles might have had a brother who was hierophant and, as S. Todd points out, *A Commentary on Lysias 1–11* (Oxford, 2007), 474, he might have been the speaker’s maternal grandfather (though in the latter case the speaker would not necessarily have been a Eumolpid). Cf. n. 99.



same deme; nor are there prosopographical or onomastic indications of close family relationships. After ca. 150, however, there are two clear cases of family connections between hierophants. No. 11 was the natural brother of, and close successor to, no. 10. Moreover, ca. 149/8, before he became hierophant, no. 11 proposed a decree honouring no. 10, *Ag. XVI* 306. As Woodhead notes *ad loc.*, no. 10 had been in office for about 35 years by this time<sup>109</sup> and will have been ca. 80 years old. Woodhead also raises the possibility that the decree marks his “retirement” in favour of his brother. *Genos* priests normally served for life and did not retire, though the case of Habron, who had resigned his priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus in favour of his brother a century and a half earlier, shows that this was possible and would have supplied a precedent, even if special dispensation may have been necessary. A little later, it seems, we have a father and son serving as hierophants, no. 12 and no. 14, though another, apparently unrelated, hierophant intervened (no. 13, though Ismard would place no. 13 before no. 12). Clinton, 45, supposed that these two cases indicate that, by this period, hierophants were elected, but there is no evidence for this mode of selection of a *genos* priest before 21 BC, nor, we think, is it necessary to posit such a divergence from the ancestral method of allotment. As noted above (Part 1), the pool of qualified candidates for priestly office seems to have become more restricted in the hellenistic period: *de facto* or *de iure* there were financial qualifications. Moreover, as Clinton notes (p. 45), at least in the Roman period, a hierophant could be thought to require personal qualities, such as a good voice,<sup>110</sup> and an imposing presence.<sup>111</sup> Use of the lot did not imply that all members of the *genos* would actually have stood for appointment; and in a relatively small group,<sup>112</sup> with an even smaller number of willing and qualified candidates, one can quite easily imagine the processes by which brother might be allotted to succeed brother and a son be allotted to follow in the footsteps of his father (cf. n. 117).

## KERYKES

### Dadouch

The most important bibliography is: Clinton, 47–68.

	Date	Name	Key references and relations
1	Lived ca. 520–445. Dadouch, 490.	Καλλίας 82 Ἰππονίκου 12 Ἄλωπεκῆθεν	Prominent and extremely wealthy. Clinton no. 1. Full references at: <i>APF</i> 7826; <i>PAA</i> 554480. Grandfather of no. 2.
2	Lived ca. 450–365. Dadouch from before 400 ( <i>And.</i> 1 <i>Myst.</i> 124).	Καλλίας 84 Ἰππονίκου 13 Ἄλωπεκῆθεν	Prominent and initially wealthy, but allegedly worth less than 2 tal. by 387, <i>Lys.</i> 19.48, and at end of life could be called a “beggar-priest” (μητραγύρτης) <i>Arist. Rhet.</i> 1405a 19–20. Clinton no. 2. <i>APF</i> 7826. <i>PAA</i> 554500. Grandson of no. 1.
3	Ca. 350	Ἱεροκλείδης 3	With hierophant determined boundaries of sacred organ, <i>FGrH</i> 324 Androtion F30; <i>FGrH</i> 328 Philochoros F155. Clinton no. 3. <i>PAA</i> 531885.

<sup>109</sup> κατασταθεὶς δὲ ἱερο[φάντης ἐπ]ὶ Ἑρμογέν[ου ἄρχοντος], l. 7. Unfortunately the choice of verb, *κατασταθεὶς*, leaves the mode of appointment obscure.

<sup>110</sup> Arrian, *Discourses of Epictetus* 3.21.16 ed. Schenkl; Philostratos, *Lives of Sophists* 2.20 p. 600.

<sup>111</sup> Clinton, 44, suggests that this may be why hierophants were generally at least 45–50 years old at the time of appointment (though, in the classical and early hellenistic period, age at appointment can not be determined).

<sup>112</sup> It is difficult to determine the size of any *genos* in the hellenistic period. The Amyndridai had about 100 members in *JG* II<sup>2</sup> 2338, but this was perhaps following a reform ca. 21 BC in which all Athenian citizens were reorganised into *gene* (see Aleshire, *Archaism*). Depletion of *genos* numbers may be one reason why the Kerykes and Eumolpidai took to passing joint decrees in the hellenistic period (e.g. late-iii BC, *JG* II<sup>2</sup> 1235 = *I.Eleus.* 201).

4	302	Πυθόδωρος 17	Resisted improper admission of Demetrios Poliorketes to Mysteries, Plut. <i>Demetr.</i> 26. Clinton no. 4. PAA 794250.
5	Before end-iii	Ἑρμότιμος 2	In office before no. 7 and “before the writing up of the Kerykes in the register”, <i>I.Eleus.</i> 300.53. Clinton no. 5. PAA 421942.
6	Before end-iii	Ἱεροκλείδης 4 (unless identical with no. 3?)	In office before no. 7 and “before the writing up of the Kerykes in the register”, <i>I.Eleus.</i> 300.53. Clinton no. 6. PAA 531890.
7	Early-ii	Λεόντιος 4 Ἀχαρνεύς	Dadouch, great-grandfather of Akestion, whose father, Xenokles (no. 12) and grandfather Sophokles (no. 10), brother Sophokles (no. 13), husband Themistokles (no. 14) and son Theophrastos (no. 15) were also dadouchs, Paus. 1.37.1 (“Ἀέων”). Named in catalogue of dadouchs, <i>I.Eleus.</i> 300.51. Clinton no. 7. PAA 603170. Father of no. 10.
8	Early-ii	Ἀντιφῶν 27	Altar-priest, then succeeded no. 7 as dadouch, Ἀντιφῶντος, ὅς ἦν μὲν ἐξ ἀνεπιτῶν παίδων γεγωνὸς Φιλιστίδῃ, interpreted by Clinton to mean that the men were “second cousins” (i.e. in same generation), <i>I.Eleus.</i> 300.49–51. Clinton no. 8. PAA 138280. (Second) cousin of no. 9.
9	Early-ii	Φιλιστίδης 25 Ἄγνούσιος	Altar-priest, then succeeded no. 8 as dadouch. <i>I.Eleus.</i> 300.46. Clinton no. 9. (Second) cousin of no. 8. Father of no. 11. PAA 931440.
10	Ca. 200–150	Σοφοκλῆς 7 Λεοντίου 4 Ἀχαρνεύς	Succeeded no. 9. Paus. 1.37.1 (see on no. 7); <i>I.Eleus.</i> 300.45, 51. Clinton no. 10. PAA 829085. Son of no. 7. Father of no. 12.
11	Ca. 150–125	Φιλοξενίδης 7 Φιλιστίδου 25 Ἄγνούσιος	Altar-priest, then succeeded no. 10. <i>I.Eleus.</i> 300.42, 46. Clinton no. 11. Son of no. 9. Brother of Kephisodoros 72 (altar-priest, <i>I.Eleus.</i> 300.44, 47), who was ? father of Theophrastos 20 ( <i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> 1937.11; <i>FD III</i> 2.13, 10) the father of no. 14 (see Clinton’s stemma, p. 58). PAA 940650.
12	Ca. 125–100	Ξενοκλῆς 29 Σοφοκλέους 7 Ἀχαρνεύς	Succeeded no. 11. Paus. 1.37.1 (see on no. 7); <i>I.Eleus.</i> 300.40, 52; Named on list of prominent men, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> 2452.7 (ca. end-ii BC, cf. Tracy, <i>ALC</i> 214–5). Clinton no. 12. Son of no. 10. Father of no. 13. PAA 732110.
13	Ca. 100–75	Σοφοκλῆς 9 Ξενοκλέους 29 Ἀχαρνεύς	Succeeded no. 12. Paus. 1.37.1 (see on no. 7); <i>I.Eleus.</i> 300.39; statues dedicated by wife, Ktesikleia dau. of Apollonios of Acharnai, <i>I.Eleus.</i> 277 and 278; on Pythais, 106/5, <i>FD III</i> 2.15, 17. Clinton no. 13. Son of no. 12. Brother of wife of no. 14. PAA 829095.
14	Ca. 75	Θεμιστοκλῆς 16 Θεοφράστου 20 Ἄγνούσιος	Succeeded no. 13. Paus. 1.37.1 (see on no. 7); <i>I.Eleus.</i> 300.39, 47, 56–61; ? <i>agonothetes</i> at Panathenaia, 108/7, <i>ZPE</i> 142 (2003), 68 f. l. 23 with note, p. 78; pythaist of Kerykes, 106/5, <i>FD III</i> 2.13, 10; ? mint-magistrate, 78/7 and 75/4, <i>Chiron</i> 21 (1991), 13 f. <sup>25</sup> PAA 502440 ? = 502435 ? = 502450. Grandson of no. 11’s brother. Married Akestion, sister of no. 13. Father of no. 15.

<sup>113</sup> Most likely this dadouch performed the other roles attested for him, mint-magistracy etc., before his appointment as dadouch. As Clinton observes (p. 54) in relation to the mint-magistracy, it is “improbable that the co-administrator of the Eleusinian sanctuary would have had time to carry out satisfactorily both administrative offices.”



15	Ca. 75–50	Θεόφραστος 21 Θεμιστοκλέους 16 Ἄγνούσιος	Succeeded no. 14. Paus. 1.37.1 (see on no. 7); <i>I.Eleus.</i> 300.32, 39; mint-magistrate, 75/4?, <i>Chiron</i> 21 (1991), 13 f. Clinton no. 15. <i>PAA</i> 512550. Son of no. 14. Father of no. 16.
16	Ca. 50– at least 20/19	Θεμιστοκλῆς 17 Θεοφράστου 21 Ἄγνούσιος	Succeeded no. 15. Honoured by People in <i>I.Eleus.</i> 300 (20/19 BC); Married Nikostrate, descendant of Lykourgos, and reorganised priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus, [Plut.] <i>X Or.</i> 843 c (see above on priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus); statue, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> 3510 = <i>I.Eleus.</i> 301. Clinton no. 16. <i>PAA</i> 502445. Son of no. 15.

### Succession

The succession to this priesthood falls into three phases. In the first it is known to have been held by a grandfather and grandson (no. 1 and no. 2) from one of the wealthiest and most prominent families of classical Athens. As Clinton has convincingly argued (pp. 47–48, cf. 66–67), following Foucart (pp. 191–3), this does not demonstrate that the office was hereditary in this family, for the following reasons: (a) it can not be demonstrated that Hipponikos, son of no. 1 and father of no. 2, was dadouch. As Clinton notes, the allegation that he “expounded (ἐξηγήσατο) this to the Athenians” (And. 1 *Myst.* 115), may suggest that he had illegitimately usurped the Eumolpid right of *exegesis*, but it does not imply that he was dadouch; (b) the direct descendants of no. 2, Hipponikos III, Kallias IV and Hipponikos IV, are known, but it appears that none of them was dadouch. Moreover the attested mid-late iv BC dadouchs, no. 3 and no. 4, have names, Hierokleides and Pythodoros, which are not attested in the family of Kallias and Hipponikos and they probably did not belong to it.<sup>114</sup> Allotment from the *genos* to the dadouchy did not mean that every *genos* member put themselves forward and it is not difficult to imagine the processes by which a family as wealthy and prominent as that of Kallias (and, on some accounts, one not averse to sharp practice) might have arranged their appointment.<sup>115</sup> It may not be coincidental that it was at the point when, under no. 2, the family had apparently lost its vast wealth, that it lost its hold on the dadouchy. In the second phase (to end-iii BC) we know too little about the dadouchs to determine any family relations, though there is nothing in their names to suggest close connection (unless no. 3 and no. 6 are not the same person). In the third phase, from early-ii BC through to the tenure of no. 16 in the Augustan period, we are fortunate enough to be fully informed of the complete succession of 10 dadouchs. There is not a single line of direct succession from father to son; rather there are two separate families in play, with no. 7, 10, 12 and 13 in father-to-son succession in a family of Acharnai, no. 8, 9 and 11 relating respectively as second cousin, father and son in a family of Hagnous, and no. 14 (apparently grandson of no. 11’s brother), 15 and 16 in direct father-to-son succession in the same family.<sup>116</sup> Clinton noted that this succession could be explained on the hypothesis that the dadouchy was restricted to these two families and that “there was probably an understanding between them that the most suitable candidate available from either family would succeed to the office” (p. 53). That there was some sort of arrangement to this effect within the Kerykes seems clear enough, but we hesitate to agree with Clinton that this shows that the lot was not still formally in operation. The succession of no. 7 to no. 16 in ii–i BC is as compatible with allotment to office as the succession of no. 1 and no. 2 in v BC, and for the same reasons, though by the later period a contraction in the size of the *genos*, a stronger application of property qualifications (whether *de facto* or *de iure*) and an increasingly “aristocratic” ideol-

<sup>114</sup> Clinton also argues that at Lysias 19.48, i.e. in 387, Hipponikos is said to have died “recently”, whereas his son, no. 2, must have been in office by at least 400, i.e. before his father’s death. However, ὅτε νεωστὶ ἐτεθνήκει ὁ πατήρ, perhaps means not “when his father died recently”, but (as S. Todd, *Lysias*, Austin 2000, p. 212, sees) “recently after his father died”, as it is implicit here that there was at least some passage of time between no. 2’s inheritance of vast wealth on the death of his father and its reduction “now” to less than 2 talents.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Bourriot, 1342–44 n. 593: where a *genos* contained persons of prominence “un consensus quasi général pouvait se produire en faveur d’un personnage éminent, et le tirage au sort n’était plus qu’une formalité”.

<sup>116</sup> A link between the Hagnous and Acharnai families was made (if it did not exist before) by the marriage to 14 of Akestion, sister of 13.



ogy of priestly and secular office-holding may have smoothed the path to “arranged” allotments and quasi-hereditary succession.<sup>117</sup>

## PHILLEIDAI

Priestess of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis<sup>118</sup>

Key bibliography: Clinton, 68–76; Turner, 285–300.

	Date	Name	Key references and relations
1	Ca. mid-v	Λυσιστράτη 1	Dedicated <i>IG I<sup>3</sup> 953</i> to Demeter and Kore. Clinton no. 1. <i>PAA</i> 617545.
2	415	Θεανὼ 7 Μένωνος 21 Ἀγρυλῆθεν	Refuses to curse Alcibiades. <i>Plut. Alk.</i> 22, 33. Clinton no. 2. <i>PAA</i> 501915. The family is unidentifiable. <sup>119</sup>
3	Ca. 360	Χαιρίππη Φιλόφρονος Κηφισιέως	Base of her statue by Praxiteles, dedicated by her brothers, Aristodemus and Philophron, B. Orphanou-Phlorake, <i>Horos</i> 14–16 (2000–2003), 113–17 ( <i>SEG</i> LI 215; see also A. Corso, <i>The Art of Praxiteles II: the Mature Years</i> , Rome, 2007, 202–3; N. Kaltsas and G. Despinis, <i>Praxiteles</i> , Athens, 2007, no. 8). Family: <i>APF</i> 743.
4	Ca. 400–350	Mother of Ἐπιγένης 19 Ἀχαρνεύς	Dedicated <i>SEG XVI 160</i> as priestess of Demeter (at Eleusis?). Clinton no. 3. <i>PAA</i> 391570. <sup>120</sup>
5	Ca. 200	[-] Ἀπολλωνίου 12 -]	? dates dedication on behalf of a hearth-initiate, <i>Hesp.</i> 37 (1968), 289–90 no. 29. Clinton no. 4. Cf. <i>PAA</i> 145765.
6	Late-ii	Ἄβρυλλίς 1 Μικίωνος 21 Κηφισιέως	Dates dedication for a hearth-initiate who had also served as basket-bearer on a Pythais and as basket-bearer at Panathenaia, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3477</i> ; Mikion and Eurykleides of Kephisia and Kichesias son of Leon of Aixone dedicate statue of her as priestess of Demeter and Kore, unpubl. inscription ap. <i>PAA</i> 101405; fun. mon., <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 6398</i> . See also above on priestesses of Athena Polias.
7	End-ii/ early-i	Γλαύκη 4 Μενεδήμου 19 Κυδαθηναίως	Dates dedication for a hearth-initiate, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3475+3476 = I.Eleus.</i> 244; dedicates <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 4690 = I.Eleus.</i> 243; archon Theodosios (100/99) and Chairestrate dau. of Kallimachos of Philaidai dedicate her statue, <i>I.Eleus.</i> 266. Clinton no. 5. <i>PAA</i> 274925.

<sup>117</sup> At *I.Eleus.* 300.37–39, it is said of no. 16 that he *παρειληφότα τὴν εὐγένειαν καὶ τὴν ἀπ’ αὐτῆς ἱερωσύνην ἐν διαδοχῆς παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς Θεοφράστου καὶ τοῦ πάππου Θεμιστοκλέους κτλ.* This is an interesting expression of the ideological connection between inherited transmission of *eugeneia* and the priesthood in which Themistokles also in fact succeeded his father, but does not in our view imply a formal change from the system of appointment by lot. On the increasingly exclusive and aristocratic character of the *gene* in ii BC see now the valuable discussion of Ismard; Lambert, Foreword and Afterword to Aleshire, *Archaism*.

<sup>118</sup> This priesthood was supplied by the *genos* Philleidai (Phot. s.v. Φιλλεῖδαι, *Suda* φ 319; Clinton, 74, unjustifiably interprets an overrestored *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2954* to imply that it could be appointed from other *gene*).

<sup>119</sup> The historicity of this priestess is perhaps questionable, though the case against her made by C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Greece and Rome* 35 (1988), 29–39, is not entirely convincing. The anecdote shows her acting within the sphere of her religious authority, speaking up for her goddess and for the right conduct of her city in the religious sphere in a way which was arguably quite consistent with the classical Greek idea of priestesses. They were expected to be feisty, cf. e.g. the priestess of Athena who faces off the Spartan king Cleomenes on the acropolis, *Hdt.* 5.72, and the later one (if it wasn’t the same) intervening subtly but decisively in the “wooden walls” debate, *Hdt.* 8.41. The fact that she has the name of the priestess of Athena at Troy (*Hom. Il.* 6.297–300) is not indicative one way or the other. It was a real-life feature of *gene* that girls born into them might be given appropriate priestly names, cf. Penteteris, priestess of Athena, above no. 6.

<sup>120</sup> *PAA* notes possible identity with the Eumolpid Epigenes, 391400, but see now *Ag. XVI 48* with note, p. 78. Unusually this priestess is defined by her relationship to her son rather than her father or husband. One wonders if the latter two were dead and her son was her *kyrios*.



8	Early-i	Ἀμεινόκλεια 4 Φιλάνθου 7 Φυλασίου	Dates a dedication, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3220 = I.Eleus. 267</i> ; <sup>121</sup> sons Theophilos, Philanthes [and Diopeithes] and daughter Eur[ydike] (of Halai Aix-onides?) dedicate her statue, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3495 = I.Eleus. 268</i> . Clinton no. 6. <i>PAA 123430</i> .
9	Mid-i?	Χαίριον Διονυσίου Μαραθωνίου	Dates a dedication for a hearth-initiate and basket-bearer for Sarapis, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3498 = I.Eleus. 282</i> . Clinton no. 7.
10	Mid-i	Κλεοκράτεια 2 Οἰνοφίλου 8 Ἀφιδναίου	Dates a statue of Medeios son of Medeios of Piraeus, exegete of the Eumolpidae (son of priest of Poseidon Erechtheus, no. 7), ca. 60 BC, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 3490 = I.Eleus. 275</i> ; dates a statue, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 4704 = I.Eleus. 279</i> ; dates a statue, <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 4716 = I.Eleus. 281</i> . Clinton no. 8. <i>PAA 576780</i> .

Clinton, 71, notes that Phileto daughter of Dexikles, a priestess of Demeter on the early-iv BC dedication, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4560*, might have been the Eleusinian priestess, but the stone is apparently from Keos, cf. *IG XII 5.575* with *SEG III 746, XLII 181*.

Mneso daughter of Kritodemos of Thorikos and wife of Asklepiades of Berenikidae (ii BC) might have been priestess of Demeter and Kore or of another deity. See above on priestesses of Athena Polias.

#### Succession

This is the most straightforward of the priesthoods for our purposes. No family relationships between the priestesses are apparent; remarkably, where the paternal demotic is known it was different in every case, with the exception of no. 3 and no. 6, both from Kephisia; and not even onomastic connections are identifiable. This is entirely consistent with appointment of this priestess by lot from a *genos*, the Philleidai, in which it does not seem that any family managed to achieve the sort of predominance in tenure of the priesthood that can be observed, e.g. for the families headed by Leontios of Acharnai and Philistides and Themistokles of Hagnous that held the dadouchy in ii and i BC.<sup>122</sup>

#### Abbreviations

Aleshire, *Archaism*: S. B. Aleshire, *Archaism and the Athenian Religious Reform of 21 BC*, in: J. H. Richardson and F. Santangelo eds., *Priests and State in the Roman World* (forthcoming)

Aleshire, *Demos*: S. B. Aleshire, *The Demos and the Priests: The Selection of Sacred Officials at Athens from Cleisthenes to Augustus*, in: R. Osborne, S. Hornblower eds., *Ritual, Finance, Politics. Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis* (Oxford, 1994), 325–37

*Aristocracy*: S. D. Lambert, *Aristocracy and the Attic Gene: a Mythological Perspective*, forthcoming in: N. Fisher and H. van Wees eds., *Aristocracy, Elites and Social Mobility in Ancient Societies*, Proceedings of the Aristocracy Panel at the Celtic Classics Conference, Cork, July 2008. In the meantime see Lampeter Working Papers in Classics, at [http://www.lamp.ac.uk/ric/workin\\_papers](http://www.lamp.ac.uk/ric/workin_papers)

Bourriot: F. Bourriot, *Recherches sur la nature du génos. Étude d'histoire sociale athénienne – périodes archaïque et classique* (Lille, 1976)

*Pericles' Citizenship Law*: J. Blok, *Pericles' Citizenship Law: A New Perspective*, *Historia* (forthcoming)

<sup>121</sup> According to the inscriptions in the three preserved crowns the honorand had been basket-bearer for the Mother of the Gods, Asklepios and Aphrodite in Alopeke. Clinton in *I.Eleus.* restores the first crown, [ἡ βουλῆ] | [ὁ δῆμος] | [κανηφο] | [ρήσσασαν] | [- -] | [.]Σ ' | ], but we need a service to Demeter and Kore to justify the dating of the whole by her priestess and the parallel with *IG II<sup>2</sup> 3477* suggests that the first crown should be restored. [ἡ βουλῆ] | [ὁ δῆμος] | [μνηθεῖσαν] | [ἀφ' ἔστί] | [α]ζ.

<sup>122</sup> The tenure of no. 6 might suggest that the family of the famous brothers, Eurykleides and Mikion of Kephisia, who were responsible for the liberation of Athens in 229, were members of the *genos* Philleidai; and the common demotic with no. 3 might suggest a connection between that family and the propertied family of iv and iii BC to which no. 3 was connected (*APF* 743, Amynomenos of Kephisia). However, it is possible that, as with hellenistic priestesses of Athena Polias, Habryllis acquired her eligibility for this priesthood in the female line. On the family see C. Habicht, *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit* (Göttingen, 1982), 179–85.

- Clinton: K. Clinton, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Philadelphia, 1974)
- De Ste. Croix: G. De Ste. Croix, *Athenian Democratic Origins* (Oxford, 2004)
- Demont: P. Demont, Le tirage au sort des magistrats à Athènes: un problème historique et historiographique, in: F. Cordano, C. Grottanelli eds., *Sorteggio pubblico e cleromanzia dall'antichità all'Età moderna* (Milan, 2001), 63–82
- Develin: R. Develin, The Election of Archons from Solon to Telesinos, *Ant. Class.* 48 (1979), 455–68
- Feaver: D. D. Feaver, Historical Development in the Priesthoods of Athens, *Yale Classical Studies* 15 (1957), 123–58
- Ferguson: W. S. Ferguson, The Salaminioid of Heptaphylai and Sounion, *Hesp.* 7 (1938), 1–74
- Foucart: P. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis* (Paris, 1914)
- Garland: R. S. J. Garland, Religious Authority in Archaic and Classical Athens, *ABSA* 79 (1984), 75–123
- Genos: S. D. Lambert, The Attic Genos, *CQ* 49 (1999), 484–89
- Gentrifying Genealogy*: J. Blok, Gentrifying Genealogy: on the Genesis of the Athenian Autochthony myth, forthcoming in *Festschrift Fritz Graf*
- Harrison: A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* (Oxford, 1968)
- Hiera kai Hestia*: J. Blok, A covenant between gods and men: *hiera kai hestia* and the Greek polis, forthcoming in: Claudia Rapp ed., *City – Empire – Christendom: Changing Contexts of Power and Identity in Antiquity* (Cambridge)
- Hoff: R. von den Hoff, Tradition and Innovation: Portraits and Dedications on the early Hellenistic Akropolis, in: O. Palagia, S. V. Tracy eds., *The Macedonians in Athens, 322–229 BC* (Oxford, 2003), 173–85
- Humphreys: S. Humphreys, Notes on Attic Prosopography, *ZPE* 160 (2007), 68–70
- I.Eleus.*: K. Clinton, *Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone. IA Text* (Athens, 2005)
- Ismard: P. Ismard, *La communauté des communautés. Les associations à Athènes VI–Ier siècle* (Paris, forthcoming)
- Kapparis: K. Kapparis, The Athenian Decree for the Naturalisation of the Plataeans, *GRBS* 36 (1995), 359–78
- Lewis: D. M. Lewis, Notes on Attic Inscriptions. XXIII Who was Lysistrata?, *ABSA* 50 (1955), 1–12
- LGPN II*: M. Osborne and S. Byrne, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. II Attica* (Oxford, 1994)
- LSCG*: F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris, 1969)
- PAA*: J. S. Traill, *Persons of Ancient Athens*, vols. 1–17 (Toronto, 1994–2008)
- Parker, *Athenian Religion*: R. Parker, *Athenian Religion. A History* (Oxford, 1996)
- Perrin-Saminadayar: E. Perrin-Saminadayar, Traditions Religieuses et Stratégies Familiales, in: M.-F. Baslez, F. Prévot eds., *Prosopographie et Histoire Religieuse* (Paris, 2005), 51–67
- Phratries*: S. D. Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Ann Arbor, 1998)
- RO: P. J. Rhodes and Robin Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC* (corrected edition, Oxford, 2007)
- Schmalz: G. C. R. Schmalz, Athens, Augustus and the Settlement of 21 BC, *GRBS* 37 (1996), 381–98
- Staveley: E. S. Staveley, *Greek and Roman Voting and Elections* (London, 1972)
- Töpffer: J. Töpffer, *Attische Genealogie* (Berlin, 1889)
- Tracy, *ADT*: S. V. Tracy, *Athenian Democracy in Transition. Attic Letter-Cutters of 340 to 290 BC* (Berkeley, 1995)
- Tracy, *ALC*: S. V. Tracy, *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 BC* (Berkeley, 1990)
- Tracy, *A&M*: S. V. Tracy, *Athens and Macedon. Attic Letter-Cutters of 300 to 229 BC* (Berkeley, 2003)
- Turner: J. A. Turner, *Hiereiai: Acquisition of Feminine Priesthoods in Ancient Greece* (PhD Diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1983).

Josine H. Blok, Utrecht University, Department of History and Art History, Drift 10, 3512 BS Utrecht, Netherlands. j.h.blok@uu.nl

Stephen D. Lambert, Cardiff University, School of History and Archaeology, Humanities Building, Colum Drive, Cardiff CF10 3EU, United Kingdom. lamberts@cardiff.ac.uk