

Joining the Athenian community
The participation of metics in Athenian polis religion
in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.

Toetreden tot de Atheense gemeenschap
De deelname van metoiken aan de Atheense polis religie
in de vijfde en vierde eeuw v. Chr.
(met een samenvatting in het Nederlands)

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Utrecht
op gezag van de rector magnificus, prof. dr. J.C. Stoof,
ingevolge het besluit van het college voor promoties
in het openbaar te verdedigen op woensdag 24 februari 2010
des middags te 4.15 uur

door

Sara Maria Wijma

geboren op 6 mei 1978 te Amsterdam

Promotor: Prof. dr. J.H. Blok

Co-promotor: Dr. S.D. Lambert

Table of contents

Table of contents	i
Preface.....	iv
Abbreviations	vi
Metics in history	1
1 Metics in classical Athens.....	1
2 Metics in modern times: from morality to ideology	7
3 Membership of the Athenian community: sharing in polis rites.....	10
4 Greek religion and society: from cult to polis community	13
5 Variety in membership: the negotiation of status	19
6 Metics in polis religion: some parameters	23
Metics at the Panathenaia	27
1 Resident foreigners at the Panathenaia	29
1.1 The Panathenaia	29
1.2 (Resident) foreigners at the Panathenaic <i>agones</i>	31
1.3 Resident foreigners and the Panathenaic sacrifices	32
2 The Panathenaic procession.....	36
2.1 The marching contingents in the Panathenaic procession	37
2.2 Inclusiveness vs. selective and differentiated participation.....	40
3 Metics at the Panathenaia.....	43
3.1 The testimonia.....	43
3.2 <i>Skaphephoroi</i>	45
3.3 <i>Hydriaphoroi</i>	48
3.4 <i>Skiadephoroi</i>	50
3.5 <i>Diphrophoroi</i>	51
4 Honour or humiliation?.....	54
5 What the future beholds - the metic promise	61
5.1 Groups in transition.....	61
5.2 With whom I march	63
5.3 <i>Kanephoroi</i>	65
5.4 <i>Thallophoroi</i>	69
5.5 Ephebes	72
5.6 Differentiation: the contributions of the metic population of Athens.....	76
6 Defining the new metic members of the Athenian community	78

Conclusion	83
Metics at other polis festivals	85
1 Metics at the Lenaia – a showcase of unity	87
1.1 The Lenaia – ancient, Athenian and intimate	88
1.2 Metics at the Lenaia – spectators, chorus-members, choregoi	92
1.3 The truth in Aristophanes: being amongst themselves	96
1.4 Aristophanes revisited: the lesser part of grain	101
1.5 Conclusion	103
2 Metics at the City Dionysia – the Athenians and other Greeks	104
2.1 The City Dionysia – Athenian competitors, Panhellenic crowd	106
2.2 Metics in the procession: <i>skaphephoroi</i>	113
2.3 Resident foreigners in the audience: the other Greeks	117
2.4 The <i>agones</i> : the exclusion of <i>xenoi</i> from the choral competitions	123
3 Metics at the Hephaisteia – the young, strong men of Athens	128
3.1 The Hephaisteia of 421: new, reorganised, or single celebration?	129
3.2 Metic participation in the Hephaisteia	135
3.3 The reorganisation of the Hephaisteia and the metics of Athens	143
4 Metics at the Eleusinian Mysteries	151
4.1 The Eleusinian Mysteries: Panhellenic attendance	152
4.2 The Mysteries in the classical period	156
4.3 The Mysteries: an Athenian affair	160
4.4 Lysias and his lover: metic μύησις	163
4.5 Conclusion	168
Immigrants in the demes	171
1 Deme membership: active participation in deme affairs	173
1.1 Demes before and after Kleisthenes	173
1.2 The constitutional deme	178
1.3 δημοτευόμενος: active participation in deme affairs	180
1.4 The deme and its “foreign” residents	184
2 Metics in the city deme Skambonidai	187
2.1 Resident foreigners in Skambonidai	188
2.2 A <i>lex sacra</i> from Skambonidai	189
2.3 A sacrifice to the hero Leos	194
2.4 The answer of the Skambonidai	198
3 The other residents in Ikarion and Phrearrhioi	200
3.1 The Ikarian <i>choregia</i> for Dionysos: IG I ³ 254	200
3.2 “Those living in Ikarion”	203
3.3 Dionysos in Ikarion	206
3.4 The rural Dionysia in Attica	208
3.5 The motivation of the Ikarieis	215
3.6 The others in Phrearrhioi	217

4	Awarding individual benefactors – a Theban in Eleusis	222
4.1	The Eleusinians honour Damasias son of Dionysos of Thebes	223
4.2	Demes honouring outsiders.....	229
4.3	νέμειν δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ μερίδα ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν: a means to integrate.....	231
4.4	“Granting” deme membership	236
	Conclusion	237
	Appendix: the rendering of the names of choregoi in demes	241
Bend it like Bendis.....		243
1	Thracians in Attika.....	245
1.1	From plague to συγγένεια.....	245
1.2	Thracian mercenaries: from Peisistratos onto the Parthenon Frieze.....	246
1.3	Athenian-Thracian marriages: Tereus and Prokne in real life	249
1.4	Thracians commemorated: slave or metic?.....	252
1.5	Thracian “metics”	254
2	The first steps of integration: a temple for Thracian Artemis.....	258
2.1	Kratinos’ <i>Thracian women</i>	258
2.2	Thracian Artemis, the first steps of acceptance	259
2.3	A treasury on the Akropolis: Bendis as an Other God.....	261
2.4	The Bendideion on Mounychia Hill and the grant of <i>enktesis</i>	264
3	A public festival and a public cult for Bendis.....	270
3.1	The reception of Bendis and her worshippers in the Prytaneion	270
3.2	The Bendideia: <i>epichorioi</i> and youthful Thracians	273
3.3	Polis and cult, money and priesthood	280
4	The <i>orgeones</i> of Bendis	286
4.1	The <i>orgeones</i> of Attica: Philochoros, <i>FGrH328 F35</i> and the phratries....	287
4.2	<i>Orgeones</i> and their role in polis religion	290
4.3	The Thracian <i>orgeones</i> of Bendis (I)	296
4.4	The Thracian <i>orgeones</i> of Bendis (II).....	300
	Conclusion	303
	Appendix: attested <i>orgeones</i> in Attica.....	305
Concluding remarks μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως		309
1	μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως: beyond religion.....	309
2	μετέχειν: beyond the polis.....	316
3	μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως: beyond metics.....	319
	Samenvatting.....	323
	Bibliography.....	331

Preface

I come from a family of story-tellers. As long as I can remember I am hearing stories, ranging from personal accounts of World War II in Krimpen aan den IJssel and Haaksbergen to family trips in a minivan and the dangers of the Old Rhine. From an early age, these stories gave me a sense of belonging; knowing them and hearing them at *every* occasion possible made me part of my (extended) family and I still feel the same way. When, in 1996, I decided I wanted to study History in Groningen (my Arcadia) this came to no one's surprise.

My family of story-tellers has been important in leading me to where I stand today. However, I could not have arrived at this without the many persons who have crossed my path while getting there. Unfortunately, only few can be mentioned by name. In Groningen I was supervised by Onno van Nijf, who learnt me about *lieux de memoires* and the power of the (adapted) past in the present. Here I also met Wim Jongman, who sent me further on my path into academics and to Robin Osborne in Cambridge in particular, who encouraged me to keep on working from different disciplines, art and archaeology specifically.

It was in 2004 when I started working on my PhD thesis that now lays before you, here in Utrecht. Looking back, I could not foresee how much I still needed to learn before calling myself an ancient historian. Two persons have been particularly important in this learning process: Josine Blok, my supervisor, and Stephen Lambert, my co-supervisor. Josine has taught me so many things I cannot begin to mention, except for her endless, and hopefully successful, attempts to make me a better thinker and writer; I had to stick to my focused path and not wander off into the, ever so attractive, woods. Stephen, both as an epigraphist and an historian, has taught me to ground my ideas in as much evidence as possible; at every turn he would ask me "How do we know this?".

In Utrecht I furthermore felt greatly supported by my direct colleagues, Floris van den Eijnde and Lina van 't Wout, and later Saskia Peels, who were or are still working on the same VICI-project on Athenian citizenship of Josine Blok

of which this thesis is also a part. Combining the perspectives of an archaeologist, a philologist and an historian, we came to sharpen our views on the role of religion in ancient Attica in a unique way. Also my other Utrecht colleagues need mentioning: Rolf Strootman, Diana Kretschmann, and Janneke de Jong, who, together with Floris, Lina, and Saskia, ever so kindly volunteered to read and correct several chapters of my thesis. Finally, I want to thank OIKOS, the National Research School in Classical Studies in the Netherlands, for providing a stimulating environment for all Dutch PhD students working on antiquity.

Wrapping up this preface, I want to remind the reader that any remaining errors, whether typos or wanderings in the woods, are my own. Still, I hope that the reader finds some new and stimulating ideas in the following.

Abbreviations

AAA	<i>Ἀρχαιολογικὰ ἀνάλεκτα ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν</i>
AC	<i>L'Antiquité Classique</i>
AE	<i>L'Année Epigraphique</i>
AHB	<i>Ancient History Bulletin</i>
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
AJP	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i>
ASAtene	<i>Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente</i>
AntK	<i>Antike Kunst</i>
Arch.Eph	<i>Ἀρχαιολογικὴ Ἐφημερίς</i>
BCH	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</i>
(A)BSA	<i>Annual of the British School at Athens</i>
C(l)A(nt)	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
CJ	<i>Classical Journal</i>
C&M	<i>Classica et Mediaevalia</i>
CP(h)	<i>Classical Philology</i>
CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CR	<i>Classical Review</i>
FGrH	Jacoby, F., <i>Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (Leiden 1923-1958)
FRA	Osborne, M.J and S.G. Byrne, <i>The foreign residents of Athens: an annex to the "Lexicon of Greek personal names: Attica"</i> (Leuven 1996).

<i>GRBS</i>	<i>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies</i>
<i>Hesp.</i>	<i>Hesperia: Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens</i>
<i>Hesp. Suppl.</i>	<i>Hesperia: Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Supplement</i>
<i>HSCP</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>HThR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>ICS</i>	<i>Illinois Classical Studies</i>
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones graecae</i>
<i>JCS</i>	<i>Journal of Classical Studies</i>
<i>JdAI</i>	<i>Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>JÖAI</i>	<i>Jahrhefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts</i>
<i>LGPN</i>	Osborne, M.J and S.G. Byrne, <i>A lexicon of Greek personal names. vol 2: Attica</i> (Oxford 1994)
<i>LSJ</i>	Liddell, H.G. and R. Scott, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> (9 th ed.) (Oxford 1940)
<i>MDAI (A)</i>	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Athen.Abt.)</i>
<i>MEFRA</i>	<i>Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École Française de Rome</i>
<i>M&L</i>	Meiggs, R. and D.M. Lewis, <i>A selection of Greek historical inscriptions to the end of the fifth century B.C.</i> (Oxford 1969)
<i>OJA</i>	<i>Oxford Journal of Archaeology</i>
<i>PA</i>	Kirchner, J., <i>Prosopographia Attica</i> (2 vols.) (Berlin 1901-1903)
<i>PCPhS</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society</i>
<i>PCPhS Suppl.</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society. Supplement</i>
<i>PP</i>	<i>La Parola del Passato: rivista di studi antichi</i>
<i>RA</i>	<i>Revue Archéologique</i>
<i>RBPhH</i>	<i>Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire</i>

<i>RE</i>	Pauly, A., G. Wissowa and W.Kroll (eds.), <i>Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> (Stuttgart and Munich 1893-1980)
<i>REA</i>	<i>Revue des études anciennes</i>
<i>REG</i>	<i>Revue des études grecques</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire des religions</i>
<i>RO</i>	Rhodes, P.J. and R. Osborne, <i>Greek historical inscriptions, 404-323 BC</i> (Oxford 2004)
<i>SEG</i>	<i>Supplementum epigraphicum graecum</i>
<i>SO</i>	<i>Symbolae Osloenses</i>
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>Thorikos</i>	<i>Thorikos: rapport préliminaire sur la campagne de fouilles/ Comité des Fouilles Belges en Grèce = Thorikos: voorlopig verslag over de opgravingscampagne vol. 9</i> (Brussels 1977-1982)
<i>YCS</i>	<i>Yale Classical Studies</i>
<i>ZPE</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

Metics in history

1 Metics in classical Athens

In this dissertation we will look at the incorporation of foreign immigrants into the Athenian community in the fifth and fourth centuries BC¹ by examining their participation as metics (*metoikoi*) in several Athenian festivals. By the classical period foreigners had long been visiting Athens as traders, diplomats, mercenaries, and travellers.² From the sixth century onwards, however, the Athenians also witnessed the arrival of many foreigners who came to Attica not only for a short visit but who instead decided to settle there to find a living in all sorts of trades.³ It is likely that most of these immigrants initially came from neighbouring Greek communities. It is also likely that as Athens' influence and wealth grew after the Persian Wars in the early fifth century, the Athenian polis became attractive to more people and to people from places further away; from the mid fifth century onwards we hear of immigrants from "Greek" regions like Sicily, Italy and Cyprus but also from more "exotic" places like Egypt, Thrace, Lydia, Phrygia, Syria and Pontus.⁴ Further adding to this range of backgrounds of

¹ All dates are before Christ unless stated otherwise.

² Cf. M.-F. Baslez, *L'étranger dans la Grèce antique* (Paris 1984); D. Whitehead, 'Immigrant communities in the classical polis: some principles for a synoptic treatment', *AC* 53 (1984) 47-59; P. Cartledge, *The Greeks* (Oxford 1993) 90-117, on foreigners in ancient Greece.

³ The main evidence for foreign immigrants in Attica before the classical period includes Plut. *Solon* 24.4; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 13.5, 21 and Aristot. *Pol.* 1275b32-37, with D. Whitehead, *The ideology of the Athenian metic* (Cambridge 1977) 140-5. Cf. P.J. Rhodes, *A commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (2nd ed.) (Oxford 1993) on 13.5, 21; P.B. Manville, *The origins of citizenship in ancient Athens* (Princeton 1990) 173-209.

⁴ E.g. [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 2.7 and Xen. *Ways* 2.3, on the presence of these foreigners in the Athenian army. Cf. R. Garland, *The Piraeus from the fifth to the first century BC* (2nd ed.) (London 2001) 62-7, who discusses the background of metics living in Piraeus from the Piraeian funerary inscriptions carrying an *ethnikon*. Also see my section on the presence of Thracian metics in classical Athens in chapter 4, 245-58.

the foreigners living in Attica were manumitted slaves. Many, if not most, of them had arrived in Athens as prisoners of war, mostly from the Levant but also from more nearby poleis with which Athens was at war. After their release they had to register as *metoikoi*, as free foreign polis residents became officially known in classical Athens.⁵

The numerical presence of all these Greek and non-Greek foreigners in Athens was impressive. Modern calculations make it a safe assumption that before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War in 431 there was approximately one metic to every four Athenians.⁶ Some scholars even give absolute numbers of ca. 28,000-30,000 immigrants living in Attica around 431.⁷ These numbers were probably smaller in the fourth century, after the hardships of the Peloponnesian War and the continuing struggles with Sparta and Thebes over Greek supremacy.⁸ Even so, a late fourth-century census of the Attic population held under the politician Demetrios of Phaleron still reports 10,000 metics next to 21,000 Athenians (Athen. 272c, quoting Ktesikles *FGrH* 245 F1), and there is even a chance these only included metics liable for military service.⁹ Throughout

⁵ Cf. S. Isager and M.H. Hansen, *Aspects of Athenian society in the fourth century: a historical introduction to and commentary on paragrafhe-speeches and the speech against Dionysodoros in the corpus Demosthenicum* (Odense 1975) 69. This process from former slave to metic is clearly illustrated in the so-called *exeleutherikai phialai*-lists of the 330s. These were lists of slaves whose masters had manumitted them after the dedication of a *phiale*. On them we find the name of the slave-owner, the name of the slave, and the recording of the *phiale* with its value (often 100 drachmas). The name of the slave is rendered with the *oikein en*-formula which gave a metic's deme of residence, thus signalling the ex-slave's new metic status. On these lists: D.M. Lewis, 'Attic manumissions', *Hesp.* 28 (1959) 208-38 and idem, 'Dedications of *phialai* at Athens', *Hesp.* 37 (1968) 368-80. For the inclusion of freed slaves among metics also see Dem. 22.61, on freedmen and metics paying *eisphora* together, and Harpokration and Suda, (s.v. μετοίκιον) on freedmen paying the metic tax. Cf. Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 16-7.

⁶ H. van Wees, *Greek warfare. Myths and realities* (London 2004) 241-3, calculates 1 metic to every 5.2 Athenians among the Athenian hoplite forces in the fifth century. M.H. Hansen, *Three studies in Athenian demography* (Copenhagen 1988) 11, proposed 1 metic to every 3 Athenians in the fourth century. J.H. Blok, 'Fremde, Bürger und Baupolitik im klassischen Athen', *Historische Anthropologie* 15 (2007) 311, n.7, concludes that an average ratio of 1:4 seems a safe estimate for the fifth century.

⁷ Garland, *Piraeus* (2001) 61, following M.I. Finley, *Studies in land and credit in ancient Athens, 500-200 BC; the horos inscriptions* (New Jersey 1951) 64.

⁸ Although Isokrates' emphatic claim (8.21) that Athens was "bereft of *emporoi*, *xenoi* and metics" in 355 is surely an exaggeration.

⁹ See Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 97-8, who thinks it included all metics, *contra* Garland, *Piraeus* (2001) 67, who argues for a selection.

the classical period the Athenians were thus faced with the arrival and presence of many foreign immigrants.

These foreigners became essential to Athenian society, constituting a vital, almost inexhaustible pool of independent and often skilled labour. To give a few examples: the building accounts of some of the famous temples of the mid fifth century, like the Erechtheion on the Akropolis (*IG I³ 474-478 + IG II² 1654*) or the sanctuary of Demeter in Eleusis (*IG II² 1672*), demonstrate that most of the skilled workmen building these structures were metics.¹⁰ In Thucydides (2.31.2) we read that no less than 3,000 metic hoplites were present among the Athenian forces on their way to invade Megaris in 431, next to 10,000 Athenian hoplites, and a naval catalogue (*IG I³ 1032*) of the late fifth, early fourth century indicates that many metics rowed in the Athenian fleet as well.¹¹

Metics also contributed in a more ideological way to the well-being of the polis: during the oligarchic coup in 404, many metics seem to have joined the democratic forces in Piraeus led by Thrasyboulos to resist the Thirty Tyrants. In Xenophon's account of the struggle (*Hell.* 2.4.25), in Lysias' funeral oration for those who died fighting on the side of the democrats (2.66), and in a decree that was probably proposed by Thrasyboulos granting awards to the supporters of democracy (*IG II² 10+2401 = RO 4*) we find many foreigners, most likely metics next to some (for the occasion freed) slaves.¹² The decree provides us with an

¹⁰ Erechtheion accounts: *IG I³ 474-478 + II²1654* (ca. 430-400). Of the 100 names that can be made out 42 certainly belong to metics. Eleusis: *IG II² 1672* (329), on which 54 of the 94 listed workmen can be identified as metics. On the Erechtheion accounts see most importantly: R.H. Randall Jr., 'The Erechtheum workmen', *AJA* 57 (1953) 199-210 and most recently S.D. Lambert, 'The Erechtheum workers of *IG II²1654*', *ZPE* 132 (2000) 157-60, who convincingly argues that *IG II² 1654* belongs to the main set in *IG I³* and should therefore also be dated to ca. 406. Many foreign immigrants were also working as potters in Athens, on which see: J. Boardman, *Athenian red figure vases: the archaic period* (London 1975) 9-10.

¹¹ On metics in the Athenian army see *supra* n. 6. The naval catalogue (*IG I³ 1032*, ca. 410-390) is divided into four categories: citizen, metic, mercenary, and slave. Also see Thucydides' comments (1.143.1) on the presence of metics in the Athenian fleet. Cf. R.P. Duncan-Jones, 'Metic numbers in Periclean Athens', *Chiron* 10 (1980) 101-9, who argued that metics constituted at least 43% of Athenian hoplite forces and suggested an even greater proportion rowed in the fleet.

¹² On Thrasyboulos' decree see M.J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens II: Commentaries on the decrees granting citizenship* (Brussels 1982) 26-43, no. D6. Also see D.F. Middleton, 'Thrasyboulos' Thracian support', *CQ* 32 (1982) 298-303. On slaves among those who returned from Piraeus: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 40.2. Cf. P. Krentz, 'Foreigners against the Thirty: *IG II² 10* again', *Phoenix* 34 (1980) 298-306, who thinks Thrasyboulos' forces were overwhelmingly foreign and M.C. Taylor, 'One hundred heroes of Phyle', *Hesp.* 71 (2002) 377-97, who argues for the opposite.

unique insight into the background of a more or less random sample of metics; in the fragmentary inscription we come across tanners, barley groats-sellers, retailers, sail-makers, leather-workers, table-makers, shoe-sellers, vegetable-sellers, onion-sellers, traders, tilers, heralds, porters, nut-sellers, farm workers, bronze smiths, fishers, wool-sellers, fullers, incense-dealers, ass-herds, butchers, carpenters, muleteers, builders, gardeners, olive-sellers, fig-seller, hired labour and a sculptor.¹³

Next to these metics with relatively humble occupations, we hear of several wealthy and influential metics in Attica. Famous among these is the orator Lysias whose family had come to Athens from Syracuse on the invitation of Perikles and who wrote some of the most eloquent court speeches ever written and owned a weapon factory with his brother Polemarchos, which played an important role in the overthrow of the Thirty (cf. Lysias' *Speech against Eratosthenes* (12)). The fourth-century orators Isaeus and Deinarchos were also Athenian metics: Isaeus was from Chalkis and Deinarchos from Corinth. Aristotle came from Chalcidice and spent a great deal of his life in Athens, that is, as a metic. And the best known fourth-century banker in Athens, who went by the name of Pasion, was a rich and active former slave and therefore also a metic (cf. Dem. 36.5).

In addition, we have the names of many metics who were inscribed on official polis records – building accounts, naval catalogues, manumission lists etc. – with their deme of residence, as οἰκεῖν ἐν (living in) deme X, which signalled their metic status. We find, for instance, the metic Kephisodoros who lived in Piraeus (ἐμ Περα[ιέ] οἰκοντος) and whose possessions had been confiscated after participating in the mutilation of Herms in 415 (*IG I³ 421.33*) or the manumitted Hestiaios who lived in Skambonidai (ἐν [Σ]καμβω οἰκ.) as a cobbler of shoes around 320 (*IG II² 1557.80-81*). At present, around 366 of these metics are known and their number is still growing.¹⁴ There must, in addition,

¹³ M.H. Jameson, 'Agriculture and slavery in classical Athens', *CJ* (1977-78) 134-6, compared the occupations listed in this decree with those, allegedly slave occupations, in the *exeleutherikai phialai*-lists and argued that the foreigners honoured by Thrasyboulos' proposal were slaves and freedmen rather than (immigrant) metics. However, the freed people listed in the *exeleutherikai phialai*-lists appear to have been recorded with their new occupation and new (metic) status, on which see supra n. 5. Cf. S.C. Todd, 'Status and gender in Athenian public records' in: *Symposium 1995: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (Cologne 1997) 120-4, who examined the gender, occupation and names of the 375 ex-slaves mentioned in these catalogues.

¹⁴ A list of individual metics was first published by A. Diller, *Race mixture among the Greeks before Alexander* (Urbana 1937) 161-79. Although the absolute number of known inscriptions has grown tremendously since 1937, because of the extremely limited types of

have been many more metics (among them probably many female metics) whose names and occupations have not made it into our records and who did not possess the wealth and fame of a Lysias or a Pasion but who contributed to Athenian society no less. As Xenophon (*Ways* 2.1) wrote so aptly about these immigrants:

αὕτη γὰρ ἡ πρόσσδος τῶν καλλίστων ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ εἶναι, ἐπεὶ περ αὐτοὺς
τρέφοντες καὶ πολλὰ ὠφελούντες τὰς πόλεις οὐ λαμβάνουσι μισθόν, ἀλλὰ
μετοίκιον προσθήρουσιν.

For in them we have one of the very best sources of income, in my opinion, for they are self-supporting and, so far from receiving payment for the many services they render to poleis, they contribute by paying the immigrant tax.

Even the grouchy Old Oligarch ([Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.12) acknowledged the importance of Athens' metic population for the well-being of the democratic polis. When he discusses the in his eyes shocking equality between Athenians and metics in the streets of Athens, he states that this is perhaps understandable if one considered that “the city needs metics in view of the many different trades and the fleet”.

It was to be expected that the growing, vital and permanent presence of all these foreign immigrants in Attica sooner or later required a basic recognition from the side of the Athenians, since these people were neither to be treated as citizens nor could they be excluded from all aspects of Athenian society as foreigners (*xenoi*) normally were. Significantly, the Athenians came to conceptualise all these foreign residents, whose background and occupations differed greatly, as forming a single coherent group. Whether banker or onion-seller, whether immigrated to Athens by free will or freed by an Athenian slave master after being brought to Athens as a prisoner of war, in the classical period these foreigners living in the Athenian polis could all be designated as *metoikoi*.

records in which we come across metics with their demes of residence, D. Whitehead, *The demes of Attica, 508/7 - ca. 250 BC. A political and social study* (Princeton 1986) 83 could only give 36 new names in 1986. Since then only few individual metics have come up, for instance one in Halai Aixonides and one in Anagyrous, on which see G. Steinhower, ‘Παρατηρήσεις στην οικιστική μορφή των αττικών δήμων’ in: W.D.E. Coulson et al. (eds.), *The archaeology of Athens and Attica under the democracy* (Oxford 1994) 189, n. 51. For a comprehensive collection of all known foreigners who spent some time in ancient Athens: M.J. Osborne and S.G. Byrne, *The foreign residents of Athens: an annex to the “Lexicon of Greek personal names: Attica”* (= *FRA*) (Leuven 1996).

The widely differing social positions of metics, and perhaps the fact that many of them worked in banal occupations, probably explains the differing and sometimes demeaning opinions about metics found in ancient sources. Roman authors appear especially denigrating *vis-à-vis* metics, perhaps because of the unmarked inclusion of freedmen among metics, whereas in Rome freedmen constituted a clearly identifiable class. But despite the widely differing social backgrounds of all the free foreigners living in Athens, the Athenian *demos* nevertheless came to perceive them as constituting a single, coherent group of special foreigners.

An early sign of this development is found on a late sixth-century epigram in the Athenian cemetery the Kerameikos for the Naxian Anaxilas (*SEG* 22.79). In this epigram we read that “of the Naxians the Athenians highly esteemed particularly the *μετάοικον* for his prudence and *arete*” (Ναχσιόου τίεσκον Ἀθηναῖοι μετάοικον ἔχσοχα σοφροσύνης ἔνεκεν ἐδ’ ἀρετῆς – 3-4).¹⁵ Significantly, Anaxilas is designated as a *μετάοικον*, a completely novel term at this time (and unique in retaining the alpha of *μετὰ*). This epigram contains the first attested expression of an Athenian awareness of a special group of foreigners who could be distinguished from Athenian citizens on the one hand and from merely visiting *xenoi* on the other. At this early date the term *μετάοικον* is probably best translated as “immigrant”, as someone who had literally moved house (*μετὰ οἰκεῖν*), while in the course of the fifth and fourth centuries *metoikos* usually simply referred to “someone who was a metic”.¹⁶

In the following centuries this notion of a special group of immigrant *xenoi* who could be commonly designated as metics was further developed and given shape by decisions of the Athenian *demos*, with important steps marked by Perikles’ Citizenship Law in 451/0, practically excluding metics from marrying native Athenians, the institution of a special metic tax (the so-called *metoikion*) that can roughly be dated to the late fifth, early fourth century, and the first occurrence of the “*oikein en...*” formula in a decree of 413/2 (*IG* I³ 421.33), indicating some form of separate registration of metics in demes, perhaps for

¹⁵ K. Baba, ‘On Kerameikos inv. I 388 (*SEG* xxii, 79). A note on the formation of the Athenian metic-status’, *BSA* 79 (1984) 1-5.

¹⁶ Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 6-7 and Ed. Levy, ‘Métèques et droit de résidence’ in: R. Lonis (ed.), *L’ étranger dans le monde grec* (Nancy 1988) 47-52, on the early fifth-century meaning of “*metoikos*” as “he/she who has changed residence”, although Levy shows that in some cases, e.g. Plato, *Laws* 8.848a and Ar. *Birds* 1345, *meta-oikein* terms could incur a sense of association or participation, as “living with”.

military or fiscal purposes.¹⁷ We also hear that metics had access to a special court at the Polemarchos', who heard cases involving metics ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 58.3, cf. Lys. 23.2), although it is not entirely clear whether they had to present a legal guardian (a *prostates*), who would present and defend a case involving metics, as is often assumed.¹⁸

All these laws and regulations added to the development of a special metic status, either directly, like the institution of the *metoikion* tax, or indirectly, like Perikles' Citizenship Law. But it was not only through these fiscal, political and administrative demarcations that metics came to be organised and recognised as a special group of *xenoi* in Athens. This dissertation aims to demonstrate how the participation of metics in Athenian polis religion also played a pivotal role in the Athenian conceptualisation of a separate metic status, first in incorporating metics into the Athenian community by having them share in the rites of the Athenians, and secondly in articulating their position in that community by having them participate in a specific way.

2 Metics in modern times: from morality to ideology

Several scholars have written on the position of metics in classical Athens and the development of a separate metic status. The late nineteenth century witnessed two comprehensive accounts with an overall positive evaluation of the position of metics in Athenian society. In 1887, after almost two centuries during which the Athenian metic was seen as a humiliated being, the German scholar U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff presented his view on metics.¹⁹ In his key publication he placed great emphasis on the “*oikein en...*” formula in inscriptions, which

¹⁷ On the development of metic status in the fifth century from an institutional perspective: Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 140-59. That a special metic tax was instituted in this period is based on Harpokration's gloss on μετοίκιον in which he refers to the comic poet Aristomenes, whose career covered ca. 439-388.

¹⁸ Our main source is Aristotle, *Pol.* 1275a, who writes that “in many places even the right of legal action is not shared completely by metics, but they are obliged to produce a *prostates*”. However, Aristotle is not talking about Athenian conditions specifically and there is not a single scrap of positive evidence for an Athenian *prostates* for a (male) metic. It seems therefore that metics living in Attica, at least the men, did not have to present an Athenian *prostates*. From Hypereides' *Speech against Aristagora* it appears that female metics probably *did* have to present a *prostates* in court, but so did Athenian women. The only evidence on male metics presenting a *prostates* concerns metics living in Oropos (Lys. 31.9, 14) and Megara (Lyk. 1.21).

¹⁹ U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, ‘Demotika der attischen Metoeken’, *Hermes* 22 (1887) 107-28; 211-59. Around 150 individual metics were known in his time.

gave a metic's deme of residence and designated him or her as a metic. He argued that these "Demotika der attischen Metoeken" demonstrated that metics stood in an official and legal relation ("Rechtsverhältnisse") to the demes and, according to Wilamowitz, therefore to the ten Attic *phylai* in which the demes were grouped, and therefore eventually to the polis. This rather extreme interpretation made Wilamowitz famously describe metics as quasi-citizens and metic status as a privileged status of quasi-citizenship.²⁰

Six years later the Frenchman Michel Clerc published his *opus magnum* *Les métèques de athéniens: étude sur la condition légale, la situation morale et le rôle social et économique des étrangers domiciliés à Athènes* in which he meticulously discussed the Athenian *metoikia* and evidence pertaining to *metoikia* in other *poleis*. One of his main conclusions was that the typical Athenian *philoxenia* was probably the most important factor for the good moral situation of Athenian metics.²¹

Both these accounts were largely superseded in 1977 when David Whitehead published *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*. In this excellent monograph Whitehead tried "to remove the discussion from the area of morality altogether" and focus instead on the often divergent Athenian opinions found in our ancient sources, which were all part of the Athenian discourse on The Athenian Metic.²² This discourse eventually led to the institutionalisation of metic status through various demarcating measures issued by the Athenian *demos*. Taking thus account of divergent voices, Whitehead nevertheless attributed most weight to political and legal aspects and consequently defined metics in opposition to the politically and legally privileged Athenians, making denied or restricted access to political institutions and law courts pivotal aspects of the ideology and therefore status of metics. According to Whitehead, who defined Athenian citizens as politically active, Athenian born men, metics could by contrast be seen as non-citizens, or even as anti-citizens.²³

²⁰ Wilamowitz (1887) 213-5. Cf. Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 72-4, for a firm rebuttal of these "claims which stuck in the throats of his contemporaries".

²¹ M. Clerc, *Les métèques de athéniens: étude sur la condition légale la situation morale et le rôle social et économique des étrangers domiciliés à Athènes* (Paris 1893). For a critique on Clerc's Atheno-centric approach and his application of the "Athenian model" to *metoikia* elsewhere: Whitehead (1984) 47-59.

²² Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 1-5.

²³ *Ibidem*, 69-70.

Despite the recent attempts of Edward Cohen to demonstrate how Athenian society was often not as strictly demarcated along political and juridical lines as is often assumed, Whitehead's view of metics as non-citizens is still predominant.²⁴ His view is mainly derived from Aristotle's *Politics* (1275a-1278b), in which the philosopher tries to define citizenship according to a set of clearly defined political rights. Aristotle starts his exposé on citizenship by establishing several criteria that, in his eyes, can *not* be used to define a citizen as they cause confusion between citizens and other polis inhabitants.

τίνα χρῆ καλεῖν πολίτην καὶ τίς ὁ πολίτης ἐστὶ σκεπτέον. καὶ γὰρ ὁ πολίτης ἀμφισβητεῖται πολλάκις· οὐ γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογοῦσι πάντες εἶναι πολίτην· ἔστι γὰρ ὅστις ἐν δημοκρατία πολίτης ὢν ἐν ὀλιγαρχία πολλάκις[...] ὁ δὲ πολίτης οὐ τῷ οἰκεῖν που πολίτης ἐστίν (καὶ γὰρ μέτοικοι καὶ δοῦλοι κοινωνοῦσι τῆς οἰκίσεως), οὐδ' οἱ τῶν δικαίων μετέχοντες οὕτως ὥστε καὶ δίκην ὑπέχειν καὶ δικάζεσθαι[...] πολλαχοῦ μενοῦν οὐδὲ τούτων τελέως οἱ μέτοικοι μετέχουσιν, ἀλλὰ νέμειν ἀνάγκη προστάτην, ὥστε ἀτελῶς πως μετεχουσι τῆς τοιαύτης κοινωνίας, ἀλλὰ καθάπερ καὶ παῖδας τοὺς μήπω δι' ἡλικίαν ἐγγεγραμμένους καὶ τοὺς γέροντας τοὺς ἀφειμένους φατέον εἶναι μὲν πως πολίτας, οὐχ ἀπλῶς δὲ λίαν ἀλλὰ προστιθέντας τοὺς μὲν πως πολίτας, οὐχ ἀπλῶς δὲ λίαν ἀλλὰ προστιθέντας τοὺς μὲν ἀτελεῖς τοὺς δὲ παρηκμακότας ἢ τι τοιοῦτον ἕτερον (οὐδὲν γὰρ διαφέρει· δῆλον γὰρ τὸ λεγόμενον).

We have to consider who to call a citizen and what the essential nature of a citizen is. For there is often a difference of opinion as to this: people do not all agree that the same person is a citizen; often somebody who would be a citizen in a democracy is not a citizen under an oligarchy. [...] The citizen is not a citizen by domicile in a certain place, for metics and slaves share his domicile. Nor are those citizens who share a common system of justice, conferring the right to defend an action and to bring one in the law-courts [...]; in many places the right of legal action is not shared completely by metics, but they are obliged to produce a *prostates*, so that they only share in a common legal procedure to an incomplete degree, but these are only citizens in the manner in which children who are as yet too young to have been enrolled in the (deme) list and old men who have been discharged must

²⁴ E.E. Cohen, *The Athenian Nation* (Princeton 2000). One of the main flaws of Cohen's thesis is that, although he convincingly emphasises the heterogeneity of Attic society, he fails to offer an alternative model based on which social distinctions in Attica were commonly conceptualised. See, e.g., K. Vlassopoulos, 'Free spaces: identity, experience and democracy in classical Athens', *CQ* 57 (2007) 33-52, for such an alternative model.

be pronounced to be citizens in a sense, yet not quite absolutely (*Pol.* 1275a).²⁵

It is clear from this passage that Aristotle is struggling to define what the parameters of Greek citizenship should be, dismissing several criteria on account of the participation of non-citizens in these areas. He is articulating what he considered to be an ideal definition of citizenship, one that is based on clarity concerning who was to participate in political deliberation as ambiguity concerning the division of political rights had led to *stasis* in many *poleis*. In the end, the only area which mattered to Aristotle was politics and he accordingly states that “a citizen (πολίτης) pure and simple is defined by nothing else so much as by the right to participate in judicial functions (*krisis*) and in political office (*arche*)” (1275a). Other evidence that would seem to define metics in contrast with citizens is a passage from Demosthenes, who in his speech *Against Euboulides* (57.48) explains that “surely Euboulides would never have suffered the foreigner or metic, as he now calls me [i.e. Euxitheus], either to hold offices or to draw lots with himself as a nominee for the priesthood”.

3 Membership of the Athenian community: sharing in polis rites

From these sources it would seem that metics should indeed be understood as non-citizens or perhaps even as anti-citizens. However, to use Aristotle to define Athenian citizens as politically active men and metics accordingly as non-citizens is highly problematic. Significantly, when we consider how the Athenians themselves conceptualised their citizenship we get a rather different view, one in which active participation not only in *krisis* and *arche* but above all in polis religion constituted Athenian citizenship, as we will soon see. This discrepancy can be explained if we consider that Aristotle was a philosopher interested in a purely theoretical definition of citizenship that he could use for his political theory, with no interest in the role of polis religion in defining and articulating the polis community.²⁶ That Aristotle might even have been aware of this discrepancy between his theoretical and narrow political interpretation of

²⁵ The translation comes from: H. Rackham, *Aristotle XXI Politics* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1982) *ad loc.*

²⁶ On the “use and abuse” of these passages (most importantly *Pol.* 1275a-b and *Pol.* 1278a): J.H. Blok, ‘Becoming citizens. Some notes on the semantics of “citizen” in archaic and classical Athens’, *Klio* 87 (2005) 31-5, with full bibliography.

citizenship and polis community and the notions of his contemporaries is perhaps indicated by his twofold use of the term “*polis*”. Josiah Ober has argued that Aristotle uses the word “*polis*” not only to denote a political community of male adult citizens, the politico-polis, but also to describe the community living on its territory, the so-called geo-polis or, as Josine Blok suggested, the socio-polis, which included many people who Aristotle did not strictly consider to be citizens. This indicates a tension between Aristotle’s theoretical ideas on polis and citizenship and the realities of his time.²⁷

Most significant for our understanding of Athenian citizenship is the fact that many ancient sources show that the Athenians considered their polis to be first and foremost a participatory community, in which membership constituted of participating in the polis (μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως), most importantly in the ritual obligations (the *hiera*) of the Athenian polis. Being an Athenian or being an Athenian citizen is often described in terms of sharing in the *hiera* of the polis. For instance, in Demosthenes’ speech *Against Aristokrates* (23.65) the prosecutor reminds the Athenian jurors that

ἡμεῖς, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, Χαρίδημον ἐποιησάμεθα πολίτην, καὶ διὰ τῆς δωρεῖας ταύτης μετεδώκαμεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ ὀσίων καὶ νομίμων καὶ πάντων ὅσων περ αὐτοῖς μέτεστιν ἡμῖν.

It was we, men of Athens, who made Charidemus a citizen, and by that gift bestowed him a share in our *hiera*, our *hosia*, our laws, and everything else in which we ourselves participate.

Other examples can be added, among them famously (but also problematically concerning questions of historical authenticity) the mass grant of citizenship which a group of Plataean refugees received from the Athenians in 427 after their city had been sacked by the Spartans and Thebans.²⁸ According to Apollodoros ([Dem.] 59.104) this grant included the statement that “the Plataians shall be Athenians from this day, and shall have the same rights as the other Athenians,

²⁷ J. Ober, ‘The polis as a society: Aristotle, John Rawls, and the Athenian social contract’ in: idem (ed.), *The Athenian revolution. Essays on ancient Greek democracy and political theory* (Princeton 1996) 107-22. On the term socio-polis see: Blok (2005) 33.

²⁸ For a discussion of this grant see most importantly: Osborne, *Naturalization* (1982) 28, no. D1. Cf. K. Kapparis, ‘The Athenian decree for the naturalisation of the Plataeans’, *GRBS* 36 (1995) 359-81.

and shall share in everything in which the Athenians share, both in the *hiera* and the *hosia*".

Being an Athenian citizen can thus be understood as consisting of active participation in the polis, often rendered as μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως, above all as μετέχειν τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν ὀσίων, as sharing in the *hiera* and the *hosia* of the Athenian polis.²⁹ What did this mean? The plural noun ἱερά can be translated as "the things belonging to the gods", which meant both things in their possession, like shrines and treasure, and things humans traditionally owed to the gods that were consecrated in a gift-giving process, most importantly in the form of (animal) sacrifice. But also other offerings like votive statues and more ephemeral gifts like processions, athletic competitions and choruses could be considered ἱερα. The plural noun ὀσια is considerably more difficult to understand and has given rise to an intense debate.³⁰ The term always seems to possess positive connotations and roughly means "the things concerning a good order between gods and humans and a good order among humans that is pleasing to the gods".³¹ The term ὀσιος always appears to reflect an aspect of divine approval, while its frequent juxtaposition with ἱερός seems to indicate human ownership, responsibility or behaviour in contrast to divine ownership.³² ὀσια could thus, for instance, encompass both laws concerning human behaviour towards other humans and laws governing human behaviour towards the gods, so-called "sacred" laws.³³

²⁹ E.g. Lys. 6.48; [Dem.] 59.111-112; Dem. 23.65; Dem. 57.1, 3, 47; Lyk. 1.77; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 8.5, 26.3; Arist. *Pol.* 1316b. Cf. J.H. Blok, 'Oude en nieuwe burgers', *Lampas* 36 (2003) 5-26 (with english summary) (2003); idem, 'Recht und Ritus der Polis. Zu Bürgerstatus und Geschlechterverhältnissen im klassischen Athen', *Historische Zeitschrift* 278 (2004) 1-24; idem (2005) 7-40; idem, 'A covenant between gods and men: *hiera kai hosia* and the Greek polis' in: C. Rapp (ed.), *City - Empire - Christendom: changing context of power and identity in antiquity* (Cambridge and New York 2010) forthcoming; idem, 'Citizenship in action: "reading" sacrifice in classical Athens' in: C. Mann and R. von den Hoff (eds.), *Rollenbilder und Bürger im demokratischen Athen* (2009) forthcoming; N. Evans, 'Feasts, citizens, and cultic democracy in classical Athens', *Ancient Society* 34 (2004) 1-25.

³⁰ For a summary of the debate with full bibliography: J.H. Blok, 'Deme accounts and the meaning of *hosion* money in fifth-century Athens', *Mnemosyne* (2009) forthcoming.

³¹ W.R. Connor, "'Sacred" and "secular": *Hiera kai hosia* and the classical Athenian concept of the State', *Ancient Society* 19 (1988) 161-88.

³² *Supra* n. 30. Fellow PhD student Saskia Peels is currently working on the complex and changing meaning of *hosios* in Athenian discourse.

³³ On "sacred laws": R. Parker, 'What are sacred laws?' in: E.M. Harris and L. Rubinstein (eds.), *The law and the courts in ancient Athens* (London 2004) 57-70; E. Lupu, *Greek Sacred Law. A Collection of New Documents* (Leiden 2005) 3-112.

Belonging to the Athenian polis, in sum, appears to have consisted of 1) sharing in the gifts that were traditionally owed to the gods by means of a consecrating process of gift-giving and 2) abiding by the rules that governed this process. It is one of the main aims of Josine Blok's VICI-project on Athenian citizenship at Utrecht University, of which this dissertation is part, to explore this notion and redefine Athenian citizenship with a focus on the formative role of Athenian polis religion.³⁴ I for my part will focus on what the inclusion of metics in several polis *hiera* can tell us about their qualified membership of the Athenian polis. Even though it is true that metics were excluded from Athenian *archai* and *timai*, as Demosthenes (57.48) states, this now appears to represent only part of the picture. Defining metics as outsiders, as non-members of the Athenian polis, we would expect them to be excluded not only from Athenian *archai* and *timai* but also from sharing in the *hiera* of the polis. This, however, was not the case.³⁵ Metics shared in many *hiera* and to arrive at a better understanding of the polis membership of these foreign immigrants it is necessary we also take these instances of metic participation in Athenian polis religion into consideration.

4 Greek religion and society: from cult to polis community

Of course the important social aspects of ancient Greek religion have long been acknowledged. Ancient religion is now commonly understood as essential in creating, expressing, articulating and negotiating group cohesion and identity. This seems to apply especially to the cohesion and identity of the polis. In her important article "What is polis religion?" of 1990, Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood argued that the basic framework through which ancient Greek religion was experienced was the polis and stated that "ritual reinforces group solidarity, and this process is of fundamental importance in establishing and perpetuating civic and cultural, as well as, religious identities [i.e. on polis level]." She admits that

³⁴ The results of which will be published in J.H. Blok, *Citizenship, cult and community in classical Athens* (Cambridge 2011), forthcoming.

³⁵ Over a hundred years ago Clerc, *Métèques* (1893) 176, already wrote: "C'est donc qu'ils avaient dans la cité leur place nettement déterminée, et rien ne les distingue plus nettement des étrangers que leurs admission à la religion de la cité". It is typical that Whitehead *Ideology* (1977) 86-9, only devotes four pages to the religious activities of Athens' metic population.

in essence this view goes back to Durkheim's work, though it does not depend on acceptance of it *in toto*.³⁶

Emile Durkheim's *The elementary forms of religious life* of 1912 has indeed been crucial in understanding religion as something essentially social. But it was not until the 1980s that ancient historians started to acknowledge the embeddedness of ancient Greek religion in Greek society. Although the work of both Walter Burkert and Jan Bremmer has been pivotal in understanding the sociological and (pre)historical origins of certain rites, like animal sacrifice or scapegoat rituals, it is above all Robert Parker who has become one of the most important advocates of the social embeddedness of ancient religion.³⁷ In his contribution to the *Oxford history of the classical world* of 1986 he already stated that "since religion was thus embedded, social and religious history are virtually inseparable". In what follows he gives numerous examples of this embeddedness including the transformation of religious life after the institution of democracy in Athens in 508, the rites of passage accompanying the many transitions in an Athenian's life, and the rites marking important events in the agricultural year.³⁸ In his subsequent work on *Athenian religion* of 1996 and *Polytheism and society* of 2005 he is still defending and illuminating these social aspects of ancient Greek religion with a focus on the social groups participating in (Athenian) polis religion.

Other important contributions have been made by W.R. Connor. In 1987 he argued for the application to ancient Greece of anthropological theories about the role of ritual and ceremonial life in civic life in other (pre-modern) societies. In his article on "civic ceremonial and political manipulation" he skilfully demonstrated how ancient civic rituals should be seen as an (ever changing) commentary on the polis community, as an important medium to discuss the (new) arrangements of human relationships in which all participants took part

³⁶ C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'What is polis religion?' in: O. Murray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek city from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990) 295-322, reprinted in R. Buxton (ed.), *Oxford readings in Greek religion* (Oxford 2000) 13-37.

³⁷ W. Burkert, *Homo Necans: Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen* (Berlin 1972) and his phenomenal *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Stuttgart 1977). J.N. Bremmer, 'Scapegoat rituals in ancient Greece', *HSCP* 87 (1983) 299-320, reprinted in R. Buxton (ed.), *Oxford readings in Greek religion* (Oxford 2000) 271-93. Also see Bremmer's excellent, concise introduction to ancient Greek religion: *Greek religion* (Oxford 1994).

³⁸ R. Parker, 'Greek religion' in: J. Boardman, J. Griffin and O. Murray (eds.), *The Oxford history of the classical world* (Oxford and New York 1986) 265-7.

and not as political manipulation by political leaders, who used civic rituals to oppress their subjects and propagate totalitarian views.³⁹ In a later article on “The problems of Athenian civic identity” he even suggests that civic ritual was not simply one strand of communal discourse on polis society, instead participation in polis cults, festivals and ceremonies was quintessential in constructing and reconstructing civic identity.⁴⁰

Significant insights have also been reached on the social context and implications of specific rituals, most importantly concerning the central act of Greek religion: animal sacrifice. The structuralist scholars of the so-called Paris-school, most notably Marcel Detienne and Jean-Pierre Vernant, saw the symbolic system of Greek religion, as reflected most importantly in ancient myth, as intertwined with other important structural systems in ancient Greek society.⁴¹ The in their eyes standard exclusion of women from sacrifice could accordingly be explained with reference to their exclusion from other important areas of polis life, most importantly politics.⁴² Robin Osborne, however, convincingly argued that matters were not as clear cut as structuralism implies. He stated that women were not excluded (or included) as a rule. Instead each case of inclusion or exclusion of certain social groupings from certain rites should be seen against the nature of these specific rites. The Panathenaia, for instance, were a civic festival following political lines and therefore, according to Osborne, excluding women, metics, and allies from the sacrifices to Athena Polias. Each cult, rite or festival should thus be seen as creating as many different worshipping groups and thus as many different identities.⁴³ This does not mean, however, that each worshipping

³⁹ W.R. Connor, ‘Tribes, festivals, and processions; civic ceremonial and political manipulation in archaic Greece’, *JHS* 107 (1987) 40-50.

⁴⁰ Idem, ‘The problem of Athenian civic identity’ in: A.L. Boegehold and A.C. Scafuro (eds.), *Athenian identity and civic ideology* (Baltimore and London 1994) 40-1.

⁴¹ For a concise description of this approach see Paul Cartledge’s introduction to his English translation of L. Bruit Zaidman and P. Schmitt Pantel, *La religion grecque* (Paris 1989), *Religion in the ancient Greek city* (Cambridge 1992) 20-3.

⁴² M. Detienne, ‘The violence of wellborn ladies: women in the Thesmophoria’ in: M. Detienne and J.-P. Vernant (eds.), *The cuisine of sacrifice among the Greeks* (Chicago 1989) 129-47.

⁴³ R. Osborne, ‘Women and sacrifice in classical Greece’ *CQ* 43 (1993) 392-405, reprinted in R. Buxton (ed.), *Oxford readings in Greek religion* (Oxford 2000) 294-313. On ancient sacrifice also see the recent contributions of Stella Georgoudi, e.g. her ‘Sacrifices dans le monde grec: de la cité aux particuliers. Quelques remarques’, *Ktema* 23 (1998) 325-34, on the many inscriptions that show that private sacrifices were practised along with the

group or rite should be treated in isolation; in the end all polis cults, rites and festivals were part of the single overarching polis structure. Together the deities of a polis safeguarded the well-being of the community, each in its own way, and together the members of that community attended to the rites of these deities to safeguard divine sanction, also each in their own ways.⁴⁴ This is what is reflected in the shared obligation of all Athenians to take care of the *hiera* and the *hosia* of the Athenian polis community.

That shared rites created and maintained collective identities and cohesive communities is clear from the many ancient sources in which the cohesion among the members of a particular group is described in terms of communal participation in particular rites. Herodotus' claim (8.144.2) that a sense of communality between the inhabitants of the Greek world was based on "the kinship of all Greeks in blood and speech, and the shrines of gods and the sacrifices that we have in common, and the likeness of our way of life" is perhaps the most famous expression of this notion. Through collective worship at Panhellenic centres like Olympia and Delphi cohesion among Greeks – whether from Sparta, Athens or Thebes – was displayed and strengthened. These Panhellenic festivals and sites formed the main context in which male inhabitants from the many *poleis* (and *ethne*⁴⁵) of the Greek world came together. It is not surprising, then, that the notion of a Panhellenic identity was largely based on this collective worship.

The most basic framework, however, through which ancient Greek religion was experienced, mediated and organised was, as Sourvinou-Inwood argued, the polis; it was above all the polis community and its members who were defined and articulated by a shared responsibility for rites and cults.⁴⁶ This intertwining of polis community and polis religion is already evident from the fact that common cults and sanctuaries played important roles in the rise of polis communities throughout Greece from the eighth century onwards. In this early

collective sacrifices during some major public festivals, showing different groups, including non-citizens, jointly acting in these celebrations.

⁴⁴ Cf. S.G. Cole, 'Civic cult and civic identity' in: M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium August, 24-27 1994. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre vol. 2* (Copenhagen 1995) 292-325.

⁴⁵ On *ethne* see: C.A. Morgan, *Early Greek states beyond the polis* (London 2003).

⁴⁶ Sourvinou-Inwood (2000).

period, shared cults brought together widely dispersed living people within a single community, while the locations of many important sanctuaries seem to express a new sense of territorialism, as François de Polignac has shown.⁴⁷

In the classical period the cohesion and identity of a polis community were still largely based on shared religious responsibility. “The Athenians”, the members of the polis community about which we are best informed, were first and foremost those people who collectively shared in the ancestral rites of the Athenian polis – most famously in the rites of Athena Polias, but ultimately all common rites mattered to the cohesion and identity of “the Athenians”.⁴⁸ So, in what was perhaps the greatest crisis in the history of the democratic polis, during the oligarchic coup of the Thirty Tyrants in 404, the herald of the Mysteries in Eleusis emphasised the shared rites of all Athenians in an attempt to reconcile democrats and oligarchs when he addresses, according to the historian Xenophon (*Hell.* 2.4.20), the oligarchic supporters with the following words:

Ἄνδρες πολῖται, τί ἡμᾶς ἐξελαύνετε; τί ἀποκτεῖναι βούλεσθε; ἡμεῖς γὰρ ὑμᾶς κακὸν μὲν οὐδὲν πώποτε ἐποιήσαμεν, μετεσχῆκαμεν δὲ ὑμῖν καὶ ἱερῶν τῶν σεμνοτάτων καὶ θυσιῶν καὶ ἑορτῶν τῶν καλλίστων, καὶ συγχορευταὶ καὶ συμφοιτηταὶ γεγενήμεθα καὶ συστρατιῶται, καὶ πολλὰ μεθ’ ὑμῶν κекινδυνεύκαμεν καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς ἀμφοτέρων ἡμῶν σωτηρίας τε καὶ ἐλευθερίας.

“Fellow citizens, why do you drive us out of the city? Why do you wish to kill us? For we never did you any harm, but we have shared with you in the most solemn rites and sacrifices and the most beautiful festivals, we have been companions in choruses and in school and the army, and we have

⁴⁷ On this topic see most importantly the work of F. de Polignac, *Cults, territory and the origin of the Greek city-state* (translated by J. Lloyd) (Chicago 1995); idem, ‘Repenser la “cité”? Rituels et société en Grèce archaïque’ in: M.H. Hansen and K.A. Raaflaub (eds.), *Studies in the ancient Greek polis (Historia Einzelschriften 95)* (Stuttgart 1995) 7-19; and the forthcoming dissertation of Floris van den Eijnde at Utrecht University. Other important studies that explore this trend include: R. Osborne, ‘Archaeology, the Salaminioi, and the politics of sacred space in archaic Attica’ in: S.E. Alcock and R. Osborne (eds.), *Placing the gods. Sanctuaries and sacred space in ancient Greece* (Oxford 1994) 143-60; C.A. Morgan, ‘Ritual and society in Early Iron Age Corinthia’ in: R. Hägg (ed.) *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical* (Stockholm 1994) 73-90; idem, ‘The Evolution of a Sacral “Landscape”: Isthmia, Perachora and the early Corinthian state’ in: S.E. Alcock and R. Osborne (eds.), *Placing the Gods, Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece* (Oxford 1996) 105-42.

⁴⁸ Cf. Cole (1995), with the response by Walter Burkert, ‘Greek poleis and civic cults: some further thoughts’ in: M.H. Hansen and K.A. Raaflaub (eds.), *Studies in the ancient Greek polis (Historia Einzelschriften 95)* (Stuttgart 1995) 201-10.

braved many dangers with you, both by land and by sea, in defence of the common safety and freedom of us both.”

It was thus, in this ultimate moment of *stasis* among the Athenians, that their shared cultic activities could be presented as one of main cohesive forces in the Athenian polis, binding even democratic and oligarchic Athenians.

By that same token, being an outsider to the Athenian community or becoming one because of unacceptable behaviour resulted in exclusion from the rites of the Athenians.⁴⁹ Foreigners (*xenoi*) were therefore automatically excluded from the rites of the Athenians.⁵⁰ Collective participation in polis religion thus functioned both as a defining platform for the free members of the Athenian polis and as a dividing line between Athenian insiders and outsiders. We have furthermore already seen that polis religion was not simply one ingredient in the glue that kept together the Athenian community. Membership of the polis community indeed *consisted of* taking care of the rites of the polis. When Charidemus received Athenian citizenship, the Athenians granted him “a share in our *hiera*, our *hosia*, our laws, and everything else in which we ourselves participate” (Dem. 23.65).

⁴⁹ On *atimia* resulting in the exclusion from the *hiera* of the polis see, e.g., Andokides (1.33) (“Should Kephisios here [...] fail to gain one-fifth of the votes and so be subject to *atimia*, he is forbidden to enter the temple of the Two Goddesses under pain of death”). For impiety: Andokides 1.71 (“Isotimides proposed to exclude from the *hiera* all who had committed an act of impiety”). For murder: Antiphon 5.62 (“if discovered (i.e. the murder) he would have deprived me of my country and himself of [his share] in the *hiera*, the *hosia* and in all great and many things that are to men”); Antiphon 6.4 (“the law banishes [the murderer] from his city, its temples, its games, and its sacrifices, the greatest and most ancient things that are to men”). For outrageous behaviour in general: Lykourgos 1.6 (“of course I found it outrageous to watch this man enter the Agora and share in our common rites, while he had been a disgrace to his country and to you all”). On the changing concept of *atimia* see the forthcoming dissertation of P.E. van ‘t Wout, at Utrecht University.

⁵⁰ See, for instance, Demosthenes 57.4 (“I am of the opinion you should be angry with proven *xenoi* if they, without consent or without asking for it, have shared in our rites and *koina*, with slyness and force”). On the exclusion of *xenoi* from polis-defining rites: P.A. Butz, ‘Prohibitionary inscriptions, *Ξένοι*, and the influence of the early Greek polis’ in: R. Hägg (ed.), *The role of religion in the early Greek polis* (Stockholm 1996) 75-95 and P. Funke, ‘Fremde und nicht-Bürger in den griechischen Heiligtümern der antiken Mittelmeerwelt. Ein historische Einführung’ in: A. Naso (ed.), *Stranieri e non cittadini nei santuari Greci* (Firenze 2006) 1-12. Similar rules applied in Panhellenic sanctuaries concerning the exclusion of transgressive persons and *barbaroi*, on which see Sourvinou-Inwood (2000) 13-8 and H. Bowden, *Classical Athens and the Delphic oracle: divination and democracy* (Cambridge 2005) 21.

5 Variety in membership: the negotiation of status

When we understand polis membership as consisting of sharing in the *hiera* and *hosia* of the polis it becomes necessary to re-examine the position of those people who are traditionally labelled “non-citizens” by ancient historians but who should now instead be considered polis members as they participated in the ritual obligations of the polis. The first group that immediately springs to mind is Athenian women, who played prominent roles in the religion of the polis both as participants in several polis *hiera* and as priestesses of several polis cults.⁵¹ Athenian women should on account of their, often leading, role in polis religion be understood as members of the Athenian polis and many ancient sources demonstrate that they were indeed acknowledged as citizens, that is, as *politides* and as *astai*.⁵² Similarly, not being a citizen woman meant being excluded from the *hiera* of the polis. So, when Apollodoros ([Dem.] 59.111) tries to convince the Athenian jury not to acquit the foreign woman (*xene*) Neaira on the charge that she was illegitimately living with an Athenian and had her daughter Phano illegitimately perform one of the holiest offices in Athens, that of Dionysos’ wife, he predicts to the Athenian jurors that

αἱ μὲν σωφρονέσταται τῶν γυναικῶν ὀργισθήσονται ὑμῖν, διότι ὁμοίως
αὐταῖς ταύτην κατηξιούτε μετέχειν τῶν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν

the most virtuous of [i.e. citizen] women will be angry at you for having deemed it right that this woman should share in like manner with them in the polis and its *hiera*.

So, both Athenian men and Athenian women should be understood as members, as citizens of the polis on account of their Athenian descent, whose most defining

⁵¹ C. Sourvinou-Inwood, ‘Male and female, public and private, ancient and modern’ in: E. D. Reeder and S.C. Humphreys (eds.), *Pandora. Women in Classical Greece* (Baltimore 1995) 111-22; U. Kron, ‘Priesthoods, dedications and euergetism: what part did religion play in the political and social status of women?’ in: P. Hellström and B. Alroth (eds.), *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World* (Uppsala 1996) 139-82; J.H. Blok, ‘Virtual voices. Toward a choreography of women’s speech in classical Athens’ in: A. Lardinois and L. McClure (eds.), *Making silence speak. Women’s voices in Greek literature and society* (Princeton and Oxford 2001) 95-116, esp. 112-5; M.P. J. Dillon, *Girls and women in classical Greek religion* (London 2002); J.B. Connelly, *Portrait of a priestess: women and ritual in ancient Greece* (Princeton 2007).

⁵² Examples are cited and treated in Blok (2005), who also discusses the possible reasons for the rare occurrences of the female *Athenaiiai*, next to the much more common term *Athenaioi*, which could be used both for “Athenian men” and “Athenian men and women”.

activity consisted of sharing in the *hiera* of the polis.⁵³ This is not to say that Athenian men and women held identical memberships, though this should not tempt us to think about these variations in hierarchical terms either. Rather, differences in participation expressed different responsibilities for the worship of the gods and thus for securing divine support for the polis community. As Osborne already emphasised, every polis cult and festival was attended by a different composition of participants and every rite, cult and festival accordingly created and strengthened cohesion among the members of a different group within the Attic polis community.⁵⁴

This creation and recreation of a group's cohesion and identity occurred both in connection with particular rites and in relation to other participants. It was, for instance, at the polis festival called the Thesmophoria that legitimately married, Athenian women came together to worship Demeter and her daughter Persephone with what seem to have been fertility rites, including a procession, rites of mourning, the offering of animal flesh mixed with seeds on the altars of Demeter and Persephone, fasting, sexual abstinence and eventually a sacrificial feast.⁵⁵ The Thesmophoria and other polis festivals exclusively attended by Athenian women, like the Skira or the Haloa, constituted the main contexts in which adult Athenian wives came together to fulfil their polis membership, that is, to share in the *hiera* of the polis, in that way presenting themselves as a coherent collective and constituent part of the polis community that was in charge of these particular polis rites.

The City Dionysia, in the same way, constituted a context in which Athenian and other Greek men came together to participate in a polis festival, which focused on civic, competitive and military virtues, with some festival events focusing on the Greek men gathered in the theatre, while others were more

⁵³ I prefer to use the terms “polis member” and “polis membership” since the terms “citizenship” and “citizen” are rich with modern and often anachronistic connotations. Cf. Connor (1994) and P.B. Manville, ‘Toward a new paradigm of Athenian citizenship’ in: A.L. Boegehold and A.C. Scafuro (eds.), *Athenian identity and civic ideology* (Baltimore and London 1994) 21-33, on the anachronistic, modern understanding of Athenian citizenship. The two terms, *i.e.* polis membership and citizenship, do not, however, overlap completely. Metics, for instance, should, on account of their participation in Athenian *hiera*, be considered polis members but never citizens as they lacked Athenian descent.

⁵⁴ Osborne (2000).

⁵⁵ Every investigation into an Athenian festival should start with L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1932, reprinted in 1966), on the Thesmophoria see: 50-60. More recently: R. Parker, *Polytheism and society at Athens* (Oxford 2005) 270-83, with bibliography.

specifically concerned with the Athenian men among these Greeks.⁵⁶ At other polis festivals – and their number was impressive as in the fourth century ca. 170 days per year were “ festival days”⁵⁷ – different groups of participants came together that were likewise articulated and demarcated as constituent parts of the polis community in relation to specific ritual obligations. In other words: while membership of the Athenian polis consisted of sharing in the *hiera* and *hosia* of the polis, differentiated participation had the ability to demarcate and articulate the different components of that community in relation to particular rites, deities, and other groups. Differences in ritual obligations in that way created, reflected and negotiated a wide variety of memberships, a sliding scale of membership, so to say, on which every person held a specific position on account of his or her share in the *hiera* of the polis.

Originally only Athenians held a position on this “scale” as they were the full polis members who on account of their Athenian birth had access to the *hiera* of the polis. All other persons, like slaves, visiting foreigners, immigrants, and Athenians who had forfeited their membership, were simply excluded from the *hiera* of the polis. As Athenian society grew more complex, the rites of the polis and the laws governing these rites became more complex too, thus reflecting and articulating the more complex composition of the polis community. A fine example of this development is provided by the *demotai*, the hereditary members of the ca. 139 subdivisions of Attica, who with Kleisthenes’ reforms of 508 received a new position in Attic society that was soon negotiated in cultic terms. This can be seen, for instance, in their participation in the Panathenaic procession as a separate contingent, their sharing in the Panathenaic sacrifices as a separate group and in the quickly rising popularity of dithyrambic competitions after 508 in which Athenian men participated with their tribes (*phylai*), the ten larger administrative units that contained the ca. 139 deme communities.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ The City Dionysia as a civic festival was first proposed and fervently defended by: S. Goldhill, ‘The Great Dionysia and civic ideology’, *JHS* 107 (1987) 58-76 and idem, ‘Civic ideology and the problem of difference. The politics of Aeschylean tragedy, once again’, *JHS* 120 (2000) 34-56. Also see my section below on the participation of metics in the City Dionysia, 104-27.

⁵⁷ J.D. Mikalson, *The sacred and civil calendar of the Athenian year* (Princeton 1975).

⁵⁸ In a Lykurgan law concerning the Little Panathenaia (*IG* II² 334) it is stated that demesmen received a share of the sacrifice to Athena Polias “to each deme according to the number of people that each deme provides in the *pompe*” (26-27). This implies that demesmen marched together which is corroborated by Dem. 44.37 and the deme calendars of Skambonidai (*IG* I³ 244 A19) and Thorikos (*SEG* 33.147 with Michael Jameson’s

Significantly, as the polis came to encompass large groups of foreign immigrants who became indispensable to the polis, the Athenians conceptualised a separate membership for them too, commonly known as metic status, which granted these immigrants a special position in Athens as a special group of *xenoi*. In what follows it will become clear that the Athenian conceptualisation of this separate status for foreign immigrants not only took shape by means of legal and fiscal measures and political exclusion but also, and I think especially so, through the differentiated inclusion of metics in some of the cults and festivals of the Athenians, which gave shape to the new, qualified membership of these immigrants. Although these “outsiders” would never become full “insiders”, or citizens of the polis community as the Athenians were by descent, their sharing in the *hiera* of the polis nevertheless signalled their newly acquired membership, while the particular ways in which they participated as a coherent group gave expression to their specific membership, to their new metic status.

Before we continue, let me explain what I mean by the term “status”. I am aware that the term is problematic as it means different things to different people. The Compact Oxford English Dictionary offers four definitions of “status”: 1) relative social or professional standing, 2) high rank or social standing, 3) the position of affairs at a particular time, and 4) official classification. In this dissertation I will stay close to the fourth definition and use the term to refer to *the conventional classifications in which the Athenians commonly divided their community on polis level*. These classifications were demarcated along lines of gender, age/marital position, descent, ethnic background, and the freedom one did or did not enjoy, resulting accordingly in categories like free male polis inhabitants, female citizen, ephebe, *parthenos*, metic, foreigner or slave, to name but a few. These classifications did not divide Attic society into a fixed number of absolute and mutually exclusive categories; the term “metic status” is rather part of one set of classifications in which the Athenians divided their society on polis level. It is important to realise that the classification “metic” thus presented only one, albeit fairly dominant, perspective of Athenian society; someone who was a metic

restoration of an addendum mentioning the sacrifice of an ewe in the context of the Panathenaia in ‘The spectacular and the obscure in Athenian religion’ in: S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance culture and Athenian democracy* (Cambridge 1999) 330 n.32). Σ Ar. *Clouds* 37 implies a role for demarchs in mustering the *pompe*.

could also be seen as “a Theban living in Eleusis” (e.g. *IG II² 1186.2-3*) or as a foreigner (*xenos*) in the Athenian army (e.g. Thucydides 4.90.1 vs. 4.94.1).

Significant in this context is the fact that metics never seem to refer to themselves as such. For instance, on the numerous grave-monuments for foreigners in the Athenian Kerameikos cemetery, among them most certainly many metics, we only find ethnics referring to the deceased’s (citizen) position in his or her native homeland and not to his or her position in Athens.⁵⁹ The classification “metic” thus represents an essentially Athenian perspective on the Athenian polis community.

Behind the façade of unity that was created by a single status for the foreign immigrants in Attica stood an immensely varied community of immigrants, who only had in common that they were free non-Athenians living in Attica. This plurality would seem to defy a single, comprehensive definition. But even though the differences between, for instance, the metic Kephalos, Sokrates’ sophisticated and close friend in Plato’s *Republic* (327b-331d), and the ferocious, metic Thracian soldier in the Agora in Aristophanes’ *Lysistrata* (563-564) could not be more pronounced, on polis level, the Athenian *demos* nevertheless conceptualised these foreigners as constituting a clearly definable and coherent group of polis inhabitants.⁶⁰ And it was above all through the regulated and differentiated participation of metics in several polis *hiera* that the Athenians could express and negotiate the particular polis membership of these foreign immigrants.

6 Metics in polis religion: some parameters

In 1977 David Whitehead wrote that “to study the Athenian metic requires no justification. The mere numerical importance of the immigrant community in Athens during the classical period demands attention of itself, and the *metoikia*

⁵⁹ *IG I³ 1340-1381* and *IG II² 7882-10530* with the addenda in W. Peek, *Attische Grabschriften* (Berlin 1954-1957) and Osborne and Byrne, *FRA* (1996). On this trend see: Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 33-4 and P.M. Fraser, ‘Citizens, demesmen and metics in Athens and elsewhere’ in: M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the ancient Greek city-state* (Copenhagen 1995) 64-90, esp. 65-8.

⁶⁰ See, however, the famous claims in the *Old Oligarch* (*Ath. Pol.* 1.10-12) that there was no way to distinguish slaves, metics and citizens from each other in the streets of Athens. See especially Cohen, *Athenian nation* (2000) 49-78, on the lack of social markers in daily life, though he is overstating his argument when he claims that metics could be included among the *astoi*, on which see the earlier claims by Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 60-1.

constitutes a major subject for the historian of the period”.⁶¹ I agree, and, in addition, I hope to offer some convincing reasons why it would be necessary to look at Athenian metics again. Once we understand membership of the Athenian polis community as consisting of active participation in the *hiera* of the polis, it becomes urgent to examine the membership metics held on account of their participation in Athenian polis religion. I will do this by looking at the details of the differentiated participation of foreign residents *qua* metics in rites of the Athenian polis or its subdivisions in the classical period. Let me elucidate some of the parameters of my research.

My chronology is informed by the period in which metic status originated and mattered. This period happens to roughly coincide with what scholars commonly label “the classical period”, which conventionally runs from Kleisthenes’ reforms in 508 until Alexander’s death in 323. The first we hear of a metic is in the late sixth-century epigram for the Naxian Anaxilas (*SEG* 22.79), while metic-related terms by and large disappear from our records around the turn of the fourth century – although, admittedly, this was a period that has left us with few records generally.⁶² When I refer to the classical period I am therefore referring to the period in which we find foreign immigrants designated as metics.

I will focus on those polis *hiera* in which metics or subgroups of metics, notably the Thracians, participated as a coherent and clearly identifiable group of polis inhabitants, often collectively referred to as *metoikoi*. Cases in which metics participated in Athenian religion but not *as metics*, for instance among the non-Athenian Greek athletes in the Panathenaic competitions, or on their own initiative, for instance by making an individual dedication or by founding a cult, will be left out.⁶³ We are dealing with the Athenian conceptualisation of metic status and not with the actions of individual immigrants or with the status of foreigners in Athens in general, who formed the much larger group of *xenoi*. The chapter on the participation of metics in the subdivisions of the polis is in that

⁶¹ Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 1.

⁶² *Ibidem*, 163-7, suggests that the *metoikos* disappeared around the turn of the fourth century.

⁶³ On the participation of metics in the Panathenaic competitions see below, 31-2. For metics making dedications see the metic Archias living in the deme Piraeus who dedicated a gold elephantine *paladion* to Athena (*IG* II² 1400.59) and Dorkas, also living in Piraeus, who dedicated a golden ring to Artemis Brauronia (*IG* II² 1401.32). On the metic Archedemos from Thera, who founded a cult for the Nymphs in a cave near Vari: W.R. Connor, ‘Seized by the Nymphs: nympholepsy and symbolic expression in classical Greece’, *CA* 7 (1988) 166-74.

sense somewhat of an exception as the incorporation of immigrants into the religious activities of these communities sometimes resulted in the inclusion of both foreign immigrants (i.e. metics) and Athenian immigrants from other communities under the general heading of “other inhabitants” or simply “others”.

Importantly, I will look at metic participation in polis religion within three interpretative frameworks. The first will be the context of the festival or rite in which metics participated as seen from a participatory perspective. This means we shall explore who else participated beside metics and what this tells us about the social focus of the rite in which metics were invited to share. The Hephaisteia, for instance, will turn out to have been a competitive festival of youthful, strong men, which after 421 included metics. To understand the main connotations of the participation of metics in certain *hiera* we will first have to account for this participatory context.

In addition, we will investigate the differences being articulated between participants, emphasising the different positions of these participants both in the festival and in Athenian society at large. While all participants in the Hephaisteia were youths actively defending and rebuilding the city, Athenian youths took the lion’s share of Hephaistos’ *hiera*. This is not to say that differentiation always led to hierarchical perspectives; in the Panathenaia, for instance, a group of metic girls and a group of Athenian girls both participated as a “transitional group”, conceived as those who were to contribute to society. Differences in participation, in turn, highlighted the fact that both groups would contribute in their own way. In that case, differentiation highlighted the different memberships of the participants without any sign of a hierarchy. To understand the specific membership of metic participants we thus have to account for the ways in which they were differentiated from other participants.

Finally, the participation of metics will be placed in its historical context. Although most of the time we cannot exactly determine the date when metics first shared in the *hiera*, of say, Dionysos Eleuthereus, approximate estimations can nevertheless be made. These can often elucidate why the Athenian *demos* decided to incorporate metics in some of their *hiera* in a particular way at a particular time.

In sum: I will focus on the incorporation and participation of metics in several polis *hiera* and investigate how this participation was informed 1) by the participatory community and the social focus of the rite, 2) by the way in which

the other participants participated, and 3) by the historical circumstances surrounding the incorporation. This means that I will focus on the socially defining implications of the participation of metics in polis rites, while the specific religious meaning of these rites will not always be relevant. Considering a torch-race, for instance, I will emphasise the competitive aspects of this race often associated with youths, while the associations of this competition with Prometheus and his stealing of divine fire will be left out. On the other hand, the emphasis on the individual in the Mysteries can be convincingly explained by the festival's focus on the underworld, which was to be entered alone. But even in the latter case the point of reference will be how Athenian society and its social groupings were organised and articulated in polis religion.

In what follows, then, we will first consider the participation of metics in the Panathenaia, the Athenian festival *par excellence* in honour of Athena Polias. Since this festival provides us with most information about the participation of metics in any polis festival by far, I will treat this instance more extensively than the succeeding ones. It will, in that way, also serve to clarify some of the basic tenets of my approach in more detail. Next, we will take a look at the incorporation of metics into several other polis festivals, including the Lenaia, the City Dionysia, the Hephaisteia and the Eleusinian Mysteries, each instance adding another layer to the Athenian conceptualisation of a separate metic status in the second half of the fifth century. In the third chapter we will examine how several subdivisions of the Athenian polis dealt with the presence of foreign immigrants by regulating how they participated in the rites of those communities in a specific way. Finally, we will consider one particular group of metics, namely those from Thrace, who were especially important to the Athenians and whose incorporation and “special” membership appears to have been largely expressed and articulated through the gradual acceptance and meticulous organisation of the cult and festival of the Thracian goddess Bendis.

Chapter 1

Metics at the Panathenaia

Joining the Athenian community in the early fifth century

In the 330s, a certain Agasikles was accused of having bribed the demesmen of the deme Halimous to include him and his sons in their deme list. The prosecutors claimed that Agasikles was not a demesman of Halimous at all but a foreigner who lived in Piraeus as a metic.¹ Only fragments of the speech against Agasikles, written by Deinarchos, survive. It seems the prosecutors tried to arouse the jury's anger by pointing out the wrongful participation of Agasikles and his sons in the Panathenaia where they had participated not as metics, as the prosecutors expected them to do, but as native Athenians: Agasikles himself had participated in the *euandria*², a kind of beauty contest restricted to Athenian men, while his sons

οἱ ἀντὶ σκαφηφόρων ἔφηβοι εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀναβήσονται, οὐχ ὑμῖν
ἔχοντες χάριν τῆς πολιτείας ἀλλὰ τῷ τούτου ἀργυρίῳ.

will ascend the Akropolis as ephebes instead of *skaphephoroi* [i.e. metic basin carriers], not because they are grateful to you for their citizenship but because of this man's [i.e. Agasikles'] money. (Dein. fr.16.3 = Harp. s.v. Σκαφηφόροι)

In ancient Athens, sharing in the *hiera* of the polis was a defining activity of the members of the Athenian community, as we saw in the introduction. Everybody who participated in polis religion was a member of that community, ephebes and

¹ The case is also referred to in Hypereides, *Defence of Euxenippos* 3 and Harpokration s.v. Ἀγασικλῆς.

² Harpokration s.v. εὐανδρία.

skaphephoroi alike. Differentiated participation, in turn, did not reflect a strictly segregated society of insiders and outsiders as Athenian society is so often described in modern historiography, but rather created, maintained and negotiated a sliding scale of membership on which all members held a specific position in accordance with their specific sharing in the *hiera* of the polis. By including people in their religious activities the Athenians could both incorporate these people into the Athenian community and negotiate a particular status for them by regulating their differentiated sharing in their *hiera*. According to the prosecution, Agasikles and his sons were metics who should act accordingly within certain public contexts. Agasikles and his sons should not share in the *hiera* of Athena Polias as Athenians but as metics. But what was the role of metics in the Panathenaia and what does this tell us about the position of metics in the Athenian community?

There are several reasons for discussing the participation of metics in the Panathenaia. The Panathenaic procession, with its wide attendance, is traditionally understood as projecting an extremely open, inclusive and idealised image of the Athenian community. Recently, this inclusiveness has been explained as a relic from archaic times when religious acts constituted key occasions for a community to achieve and display cohesion and a shared identity.³ I, on the other hand, am of the opinion that the Panathenaic *pompe* should not be understood as reflecting an archaic notion of polis membership. Rather, in classical times sharing in the religious obligations of the polis was still a pivotal aspect of belonging to the Athenian polis and demarcated participation (of young girls, epebes, adult men, adult women, metic youths etc.) still negotiated and maintained a sliding scale of membership, while “correct” participation was essential in demonstrating who held what kind of membership, as is illustrated by the case against Agasikles. With this notion, it becomes important to look at the differentiated participation of different groups in the Panathenaia to investigate what the details of that participation can tell us about the conceptualisation of the Athenian community and its members on that occasion. To focus on metics is even more urgent as most scholars still describe this large group of resident foreigners as standing outside the Athenian

³ L. Maurizio, ‘The Panathenaic procession: Athens participatory democracy on display?’ in: D. Boedeker and K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Democracy, Empire and the Arts in fifth-century Athens* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1998) 297-317.

community, while their participation in the Panathenaia *de facto* made them members of it.

A second reason for looking at metics at the Panathenaia is that the regulated participation of metics in the *hiera* of Athena constituted an important and early phase in the development of metic status. In the modern debate on metic status, religious aspects are largely ignored.⁴ In the time of Deinarchos, metic status evoked many associations: they were foreigners living in Attika who were excluded from political deliberation and who had their own court, they paid a specific metic tax, were excluded from marrying a native Athenian, they fought side by side with Athenians, were liable to several liturgies and participated in several religious rites. This metic status was of course not created over night. For most of the sixth century we do not hear of metics as a group of its own separate from either *xenoi* or Athenians. In the last decade of that century we come across the epigram (*SEG* 22.79) honouring the Naxian Anaxilas who is designated as a μετάραικον.⁵ This epigram reflects an early notion of a distinct group and the term is probably best translated literally as an immigrant. Between this epigram and Deinarchos' *Speech against Agasikles* lay almost two centuries during which some labels were added onto metic status, while others moved to the background. In this process of creating and negotiating metic status, the participation of metics in the Panathenaia was probably one of the first public contexts where metics were presented as a coherent and distinct group within the Athenian community; it seems they were incorporated in the Panathenaic *pompe* in the first decades of the fifth century, i.e. several decades before other regulations further formalised metic status, as we will see in the final section of this chapter.

1 Resident foreigners at the Panathenaia

1.1 The Panathenaia

Every summer, around the 28th of Hekatombaion, the Athenians worshipped their city's patron-goddess, Athena Polias, with the grandest of their festivals: the Panathenaia. From all over Attika people flocked together in the city of Athens to worship Athena with a night-festival and a procession that led from the Dipylon

⁴ Introduction, footnote 35.

⁵ K. Baba, 'On Kerameikos inv. I 388 (*SEG* xxii, 79). A note on the formation of the Athenian metic-status', *BSA* 79 (1984) 1-5.

Gate in the Kerameikos district up to the Akropolis where many animals were sacrificed on the Great Altar. Every four years Athena was worshipped with extra pomp. These Greater Panathenaia were probably instituted in the 560s when athletic and equestrian contests seem to have become part of a special four-yearly festival program. Not long afterwards musical competitions were added.⁶ Some of these competitions were open to all Greek-speaking males, which created a Panhellenic appeal for the Greater Panathenaia. In the fifth century, in addition, representatives of Athenian allies and colonies were expected to participate in the procession of the Greater Panathenaia, bringing with them cows and panoplies.⁷ On this “Greater” occasion the sacrifices to Athena were probably also of a larger scale, perhaps consisting of a hundred cows.⁸

Finally, the famous dedication of the *peplos*, the new, richly-woven robe for Athena that was escorted to the Akropolis on a ship-cart and offered to the goddess’ old wooden cult statue in the Erechtheion, needs mentioning as it was probably the most characteristic aspects of this festival. Unfortunately it is not entirely clear whether the *peplos* was dedicated to Athena every year or only every four years. The Aristotelean *Ath. Pol.* (60.1) seems to associate the dedication of a new *peplos* exclusively with the Greater Panathenaia: the author mentions it in one breath with the gymnastic, equestrian, and musical *agones*, all of which were supervised by the ten *athlotetai* who were chosen by lot every four years. However, in Hellenistic times the girls responsible for weaving the robe were honoured annually.⁹

⁶ Cf. R. Parker, *Athenian religion: a history* (Oxford 1996) 89-92 and G. Anderson, *The Athenian experiment: building an imagined political community in ancient Attica 508-490 BC* (Ann Arbor 2003) 165-74, who uses depictions on Panathenaic amphorae to date these events. Also see H. Kotsidu, *Die musischen Agone der Panathenäen in archaischer und klassischer Zeit (Quellen und Forschungen zur Antiken Welt 8)* (Munich 1991) and H.A. Shapiro, ‘*Mousikoi agones: music and poetry at the Panathenaia*’ in: J. Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis. The Panathenaic festival in ancient Athens* (Princeton 1992) 53-76. On the history of the Panathenaia see Julia Shear’s 2001 dissertation (University of Pennsylvania), *Polis and Panathenaia: the history and development of Athena’s festival*.

⁷ *IG I³* 46.15-17 (M&L 49); *IG I³* 34.41-42 (M&L 46); *IG I³* 71.56-58 (M&L 69).

⁸ The only datable evidence mentioning a hecatomb (*IG I³* 375.7 = M&L 84.6-7) is dated to a Greater Panathenaic year (410/9) but see V.J. Rosivach, ‘*IG II²* 334 and the Panathenaic hecatomb’, *PP* 46 (1991) 430-42.

⁹ [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 60.1: “They also elect by lot ten men as *athlotetai*, one from each *phyle*, who, when passed as qualified to, hold office for four years, and administer the *pompe* of the Panathenaia, and the contest in music, the gymnastic contest and the horse-race and have the *peplos* made, and in conjunction with the *Boule* have the vases made, and assign the olive-oil to the competitors” (translation comes from: H. Rackham, *Aristotle The Athenian*

1.2 (Resident) foreigners at the Panathenaic *agones*

At all these Panathenaic events, different perspectives on the worshipping community were expressed through regulated divisions of the large and heterogeneous body of participants. Since our concern here is with the conceptualisation of metic status in the context of the Panathenaia most of the following will deal with the procession, the one occasion where metics participated in demarcated groups that consisted solely of resident foreigners. But let us briefly consider the other Panathenaic events in which individual metics might have participated but where they were not singled out as a distinct group, i.e. the competitions and the sacrifices.¹⁰

The competitions (*agones*) of the Greater Panathenaia were restricted to men and divided, first of all, in two groups: *agones* that were open to all Greek-speaking men and *agones* that were restricted to Athenian men. Most *agones* were further subdivided according to the respective age of the contestants: adult men competed separate from boys, while a further division separated the young boys from the beardless youths (*ageneioi*), as demonstrated by an early fourth-century Panathenaic prize list (*IG II² 2311*).¹¹

constitution ; The Eudemian ethics ; On virtues and vices (Cambridge [MA] and London 1961). On the Hellenistic honorary decrees for the so-called *erganistai*: S.B. Aleshire and S.D. Lambert, 'Making the Peplos for Athena: A New Edition of *IG II² 1060+1036*', *ZPE* 142 (2003) 65-86. E.J.W. Barber, 'The peplos of Athena' in: J. Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis. The Panathenaic festival in ancient Athens* (Princeton 1992) 103-17 follows John Mansfield's 1985 dissertation (University of Berkeley), *The robe of Athena and the Panathenaic peplos*, in arguing there were two *peploi*: a small one for the cult statue of Athena and an additional, much larger, one used as a sail on a ship-cart escorting the *peplos* to the Akropolis.

¹⁰ Female metics were perhaps present at the Panathenaic night festival (*pannychis*). *Pannychides* were in general a female affair, with choruses of *parthenoi*, *ololygmata*, dancing and singing. Unfortunately, we do not know for certain who participated and in what way. On *pannychides* see most importantly: W.K. Pritchett, 'The Παννυχίς of the Panathenaia', in: ΦΙΛΙΑ ΕΠΗ ΕΙΣ ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΝ Ε. ΜΥΛΩΝΑΝ ii (1987) 179-87. Cf. R. Parker, *Polytheism and society at Athens* (Oxford 2005) 166, 182-3 and 257.

¹¹ In the classical period we hear of *agones* that were organised on a *phyletic* basis, like the *euandria*, boat-race and torch-race, and that were thus restricted to Athenians (e.g. *IG II² 2311.75-81*). Cf. J. Shear, 'Prizes from Athens: the list of Panathenaic prizes and the sacred oil', *ZPE* 142 (2003) 87-108. In Hellenistic sources several more competitions, including several chariot races, are described as ἐκ τῶν πολιτῶν: *IG II² 2315.9* (170BC), 2317.19 (150 or 146 BC) *IG II² 2316.54* (158 BC), and *SEG 41.115 II.34* (166/5 BC) and III.23 (162/1 BC). Cf. S.V. Tracy and C. Habicht, 'New and old Panathenaic victor lists', *Hesp.* 60 (1991) 187-236, especially 217-33 for these inscriptions, and S.V. Tracy, 'The Panathenaic festival and games: an epigraphic enquiry', *Nikephoros* 4 (1991) 133-53.

There seems to have been no obvious barrier for Greek metics to participate in the competitions that were open to all Greeks but no attempt was made to mark a distinct status for them. Emphasis was instead placed on a Panhellenic, male, competitive identity, thus trying to associate the Athenian Panathenaia with the Crown Games held at Olympia, Nemea, Delphi and Isthmia. Within this Panhellenic collective, special attention was reserved for Athenian men who, as Greg Anderson has noted, competed in *agones* that seem to have been linked with more martial activities, like the armed (*Phyrric*) dance or the *apobates*-race, where Athenians in full armour mounted and dismounted a chariot in full speed. The Greek competitions, by contrast, were of a more “Olympic” nature, like wrestling and the pentathlon.¹² Athenian men were moreover often competing in a tribal arrangement, for instance in the torch-race and the *euandria*, thereby underscoring the Kleisthenic units as significant for their identity. In addition, age was displayed as an important marker.¹³ In sum: the *agones* focused on Greek (Olympic) and Athenian (martial, democratic) men, not on metics.

1.3 Resident foreigners and the Panathenaic sacrifices

The distribution of shares from the official sacrifices to Athena reveals a different concern with Athena’s community. Among the groups singled out to receive a share, metics are never mentioned separately. In our most important source only *Athenaioi* are referred to as recipients. However, it is not entirely impossible that metics received meat from the sacrifices. But even if they did, they did not do so as metics.

Our most important evidence on the sacrificial community of the Panathenaia consists of two fragments of a law and a decree dated to the Lykourgan period (*IG II² 334 = RO 81*).¹⁴ The law states that the income from a newly acquired area (enigmatically referred to as ἡ νέα, perhaps referring to Oropos which came into Athenian possession around this time¹⁵) should be given

¹² Anderson, *Experiment* (2003) 165-74.

¹³ The Panathenaia were quite unique in demarcating three separate age groups. The Crown Games only knew two age groups in classical times. I will return to this later on.

¹⁴ On the date see S.D. Lambert, ‘Athenian State Laws and Decrees 352/1–322/1: II. Religious regulations’, *ZPE* 154 (2005) 144-7, no. 7, who concludes that the date is most likely controlled by one’s view on the still uncertain identification of the area called Nea.

¹⁵ On the acquisition of Oropos by Athens in the late fourth century see now: D. Knoepfler, *Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté (Érétria. Fouilles et recherches XI)*

to the *hieropoioi* “in order that the sacrifice to Athena at the Little Panathenaia may be as fine as possible and the income of the *hieropoioi* as great as possible” (5-7). The decree sets out regulations for the festival, which the *hieropoioi* have to carry out. We come across two sets of sacrifices and their respective divisions of meat. The first set of sacrifices consists of a sacrifice to Athena Hygieia and a sacrifice in the Old Temple (i.e. the Erechtheion). The *hieropoioi* are to sacrifice these

10. [...] καθάπερ πρότερον καὶ νείμαντ-
[ας τοῖς πρυτάν]εσιν πέντε μερίδας καὶ τοῖς ἐννέα ἄρ-
[χουσιν τρεῖς] καὶ ταμίαις τῆς θεοῦ μίαν καὶ τοῖς ἱερ-
[οποιοῖς μίαν] καὶ τοῖς στ[ρα]τηγοῖς καὶ τοῖς ταξιάρχ-
[οις τρεῖς καὶ τ]οῖς πομπ[εῦσι]ν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καὶ τα-
15. [ις κανηφόροι]ς κατὰ (τὰ) εἰω[θότα], τὰ δὲ ἄλλα κρέα Ἀθηναίο-
[ις μερίζειν.]

as previously and after giving to the prytaneis ten shares, and to the nine archons three, and to the treasurers of the goddess one and to the *hieropoioi* one, to the generals and the *taxiarchs* three and to the Athenians walking in procession and the *kanephoroi* the usual (share), they are to divide the rest of the meat among the Athenians (10-16)

The second set of sacrifices consists of (approximately 40 to 50) cows to be bought from the 41 minas rent of the *νέα* and sacrificed on the Great Altar to Athena after the most beautiful cow had been sacrificed on the altar of Athena Nike.¹⁶ Meat was to be distributed to the Athenian *demos* “to each deme according to the number of people that each deme provides in the *pompe*” (26-7).¹⁷

(Lausanne 2001) 367-89, who has convincingly argued that the gift of Oropos should not be associated with Philip but rather with Alexander. Other suggestions have been made. For instance, M.K. Langdon, ‘An Attic decree concerning Oropos’, *Hesp.* 56 (1987) 54-8, referring to Hypereides 4.16 in which it is stated that the territory of Oropos was divided between the ten *phylai*, suggested that ἡ *νέα* might have been an island lying between Lemnos and the Hellespont, which had emerged from the sea around this time.

¹⁶ V.J. Rosivach, *The system of public sacrifice in fourth-century Athens* (Atlanta 1994) 71 n.11, calculates 41 oxen on the basis of the highest reliable amount (i.e. 100 drachma) for a single ox given in our sources (*IG II²* 2311.72-76). RO 81, 401 arrive at a higher number of cows, ca. 50, by taking into consideration the price of 70 drachma for an ox given in a decree of the Salaminioi (*SEG* 21.527. 86 = RO 37).

¹⁷ Usually the Kerameikos (ἐν | [Κεραμεικῶ]ι- 24-25) is restored as the location for this distribution. Other possibilities are the theatre or the stadium for which see the forthcoming

Throughout the decree, the exact background of the sacrifices remains unclear especially concerning the second set of sacrifices: was the new income from the *νέα* spent on traditional arrangements, like on the famous hekatomb, or on a completely new set of sacrifices now added to the festival programme, as Vincent Rosivach has suggested?¹⁸ The first set of sacrifices to Athena Hygieia and in the Old Temple seems concerned with traditional sacrifices; “as previously” and “the usual” implies a certain tradition in general and the shares for the *kanephoroi* and the processing Athenians specifically. However, the level of detail concerning the shares for officials might suggest some innovation. Still, it remains a possibility that these specifications were merely given to emphasise that regarding these traditional sacrifices nothing fundamental has been changed as only the second set seems affected by the income from the *νέα*.¹⁹

What, then, does this decree tell us about the incorporation of metics in the Panathenaia? At first sight the answer seems obvious: they were excluded from the sacrifices to Athena. In both sets of sacrifices only Athenian recipients are mentioned, be it the officials, the *kanephoroi*, the Athenians walking in procession, the Athenians in general or the *demos* of the Athenians, the three latter groups being specifically referred to as *Athenaioi*. However, recently some doubt has, quite unintentionally, been cast on this view by Pierre Brulé who noticed the seemingly strange overlap between “the Athenians walking in procession” (τ]οῖς πομπ[εῦσι]ν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις - 14) and “the Athenians” (Ἀθηναίο[ις - 15-16), who are both mentioned as recipients of the first sacrifice. He argues that the distribution of shares to officials, *kanephoroi* and to the *pompeusin Athenaiois* should be interpreted as a distribution of *gera*, i.e. honorary parts of a sacrifice reserved for honorary groups within the sacrificial community at large. According to Brulé the recipients of these *gera* are to be identified with the groups in the front part of the Panathenaic procession who carried ritual objects and, in addition to “canéphores”, he explicitly refers to

IG II³. On the Kerameikos in the context of the growing metic population see: J.H. Blok, ‘Fremde, Bürger und Baupolitik im klassischen Athen’, *Historische Anthropologie* 15 (2007) 309-26.

¹⁸ Rosivach (1991).

¹⁹ This is corroborated by a fragmentary law (*SEG* 13.18), found in the Agora and dated to either 336/5 or 335/4, which has been linked with *IG II²* 334 by David Lewis, ‘Law on the Lesser Panathenaia’, *Hesp.* 28 (1959) 239-47. The law probably originally stood at the top of the stele on which *IG II²* 334 was inscribed and stipulated the use of the money of the income, through both leases and taxes of the *νέα*, to fund sacrifices of the Lesser Panathenaia. Cf. J.D. Sosin, ‘Two Attic endowments’, *ZPE* 138 (2002) 123-5.

“skaphéphores, hydriaphores thallophores...”, the first two of which are groups of metics carrying basins and water jars.²⁰

Brulé’s interpretation of the first part of the first meat distribution (*kreanomía*) as a distribution of *gera* in comparison to the undifferentiated distribution to the Athenians *en masse* seems convincing; τ]οῖς πομπ[εῦσι]ν could indeed refer to those groups with a specific role in the procession escorting the animals to the Akropolis. Also, Nicole Loraux has suggested that the term *Athenaioi* could sometimes include foreigners as is perhaps shown on some fifth-century casualty lists where foreigners are listed together with native Athenians under the general heading of ἸΑθηναίων ἠοῖδε ἀπέθανον (“of the Athenians the following died”).²¹ This would support Brulé’s claim that metic *skaphephoroi* and *hydriaphoroi* could notionally be included among the processing *Athenaioi* as recipients of meat. However, even though they were buried and commemorated together, on the casualty lists foreigners are still distinguished from Athenians as χσένοι, while the Athenians are separately listed by their respective tribes.²² More significantly, the Panathenaia inscription never mentions metics explicitly, only *Athenaioi* are referred to. The groups that *are* demarcated in the sacrifices are the *Athenaioi* walking in procession with ritual items, the *kanephoroi*, officials, *Athenaioi* in general and the Athenian *demos* consisting of the individual demes. Therefore, even if Brulé’s suggestion would hold true that metics shared in the Panathenaic sacrifices, the extreme emphasis on the

²⁰ Brulé, ‘La cité en ses composantes; remarques sur les sacrifices et la procession des Panathénées’, *Kernos* 9 (1996) 37-63, esp. 50-1. If these groups of metics indeed received shares of meat then the groups of metic girls carrying stools (*diphrophoroi*) and parasols (*skiadephoroi*) should also be included.

²¹ N. Loraux, *The invention of Athens: the funeral oration in the classical city* (transl. by Alan Sheridan)(Cambridge [MA] 1986) 32-7. She even wants to include metics among the *Athenaioi* listed under the ten tribes. Lysias (2.66) testifies to the burial of foreigners in the *demosion sema* together with Athenians when he says that “it is right that we should also praise the strangers (ξένους) who lie here, who came to the support of the people and fought for our salvation”. Of course the battlefield was an important context in which metics and Athenian citizens co-operated; R.P. Duncan-Jones, ‘Metic numbers in Periclean Athens’, *Chiron* 10 (1980) 101-9 has estimated, based on Thucydides’ numbers on the Athenian army at the outset of the Peloponnesian War (2.13.6-7), that in the fifth century around 42% of the Athenian hoplite forces consisted of metics, while an even greater percentage must have rowed in the fleet

²² The term χσένοι appears on three separate lists: *IG* I³ 1180.5; 1184.89; 1190.65. D.W. Bradeen, ‘The Athenian casualty lists’, *CQ* 19 (1969) 149-51, thinks these *xenoi* were probably metics.

“Athenianness” of the recipients –*Athenaioi* are referred to thrice!– shows that the sacrifices were considered to be a predominantly Athenian affair.

There is, however, other evidence which suggests that metics shared in the sacrifices to Athena Polias: Hesychius (s.v. σκαφηφόροι), referring to Deinarchos’ fr. 16.3, informs us that metics “carried basins in the Panathenaia, in order that, through sharing in the sacrifices, they would seem well-disposed” (ὡς εὖνοι ἀριθμῶνται μετέ[ρ]χοντες τῶν θυσιῶν). This could mean that metics received sacrificial meat as a defined group but in absence of any corroborating evidence this seems unlikely.²³ Hesychius could also be referring to the presence of metics among the group of processing *Athenaioi* who received a share of the sacrifices, as discussed above. I find it more likely, however, that the grammarian used a broader concept of θυσία, including the escorting of animals to the altar, the actual killing and the subsequent distribution of meat, perhaps even embracing the whole festival.²⁴ This is supported by the fact that in the law of *IG II² 334* it is stated that the income of the *νέα* is to be used “in order that the θυσία to Athena may be as fine as possible” (5-6) and the decree continues to stipulate not only sacrifice but also a night festival (*pannychis*) and the dispatch of the procession at sunrise (27-35). The metics walking in procession escorting the animals up to the Akropolis could thus indeed be considered as μετέχοντες τῶν θυσιῶν.

2 The Panathenaic procession

In ancient Greece, the offering of a gift to a god, often in the form of animal sacrifice, was generally the focal point of a religious act. The collective escorting of this gift to an altar could in addition be considered one of the most spectacular aspects of Greek religion. The Panathenaic *pompe* was in this sense probably the most famous example: starting from the Dipylon Gate in the Kerameikos district the procession crossed the Agora to continue its way down the Panathenaic way

²³ Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 261 raises the possibility that metics were perhaps entitled to “ordinary, non-honorific shares”. What these ordinary, non-honorific shares consisted of is unclear. The arrangement in the Lykourgan decree that τὰ δέ ἄλλα κρέα Ἀθηναίους μερίζειν (15-16) even seems to indicate an attempt to limit leftovers. For similar arrangements see *IG II² 47.38-9* on the distribution of the meat of an ox sacrificed to Asklepios.

²⁴ On this broader conceptualisation of θυσία: R. Osborne, ‘Women and sacrifice in classical Greece’ in: R. Buxton (ed.), *Oxford readings in Greek religion* (Oxford 2000) 306-8 (first published in *CQ* 43 (1993) 392-405).

up to the Akropolis, sometimes escorting as many as a hundred cows with thousands of people from all over Attika and beyond joining the *pompe* to worship Athena.²⁵ This large and heterogeneous group of worshippers was divided among several lines: Attic demesmen marched together, as did groups of representatives of Athenian allies and colonists (at least in the fifth century) and groups of ephebes (probably from the fourth century onwards), while a select group of Athenian girls headed the procession carrying baskets with sacrificial paraphernalia. In the classical period we find among these demarcated groups also four groups of metics, each with its own responsibilities.

The inclusion of all these different groups in the Panathenaic procession has been commonly understood as reflecting an open and inclusive perspective on the Athenian community, allowing anyone with ties to Athens a share in the worship of Athena Polias. Thus, the synoikism of Attica, the political and territorial unification of Attica traditionally associated with the Attic hero Theseus, who was also sometimes seen as the mythological founder of the Panathenaia, was extended to include all people and territories related to Athens.²⁶ In the following I shall argue that the way in which the Athenian community was presented in the Panathenaic procession was not as straightforward as has often been suggested but rather represented a selective presentation of specific groups. Instead of emphasising a general (archaic) inclusivity, we will focus on the ways in which differentiated participation reflected current, fifth- and fourth-century Athenian preoccupations with the different statuses of the participants, among them metics.

2.1 The marching contingents in the Panathenaic procession

Who do we see in a procession at the Little Panathenaia in the classical period? We come across a wide array of groups articulated by their different functions, positions and appearances. Later on in this chapter we will look at some of these groups in more detail, but for now it will suffice to grasp the impressive range of

²⁵ RO 81, 403 estimate that the income of the *νέα* (i.e. 41 minas) mentioned in the Lykourgan decree (*IG II² 334.16*) could have bought around 50 cows. This would have provided 20.000 people with 275g. of meat each. Rosivach, *Public Sacrifice* (1994) 71 n. 11, 156-7 suggests that ca. 40 cows could be bought for 41 minas and that each cow probably yielded 100-120kg of meat.

²⁶ On Theseus' role in the synoikism of Attica see most famously: Thuc. 2. 15. On Theseus as the founder of the Panathenaia: Plut. *Thes.* 24.3; Paus. 7.2; Σ Plato, *Parm.* 127a.

different groups present in the Panathenaic procession.²⁷ Heading the *pompe* was a group of perhaps one hundred *kanephoroi*: Athenian girls wearing white make-up and golden ornaments who carried the sacrificial baskets that contained the knife and other sacrificial paraphernalia, such as barley and fillets.²⁸ These *kanephoroi* were accompanied by metic *skiadephoroi*, who shaded the Athenian girls with parasols, as is nicely illustrated in Aristophanes' depiction of Prometheus as a *skiadephoros* in his *Birds* (1550-1552). From Aristophanes' mockery of the Panathenaic procession in his *Ekklesiazusai* (730-45) we can further construe that these pairs were most likely followed by metic girls who carried stools in the procession, the so-called *diphrophoroi*.²⁹ Next, if the Parthenon Frieze can be used as an indication to the order in a regular Panathenaic *pompe*, it seems probable that these groups were followed by the

²⁷ The following derives from: L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1966) 22-35; L. Ziehen, 'Panathenaia', *RE* 36 (1949) 457-93; J. Neils, 'Pride, pomp, and circumstance the iconography of procession' in: idem (ed.), *Goddess and polis: the Panathenaic festival in ancient Athens* (Hanover and Princeton 1992) 177-97; idem (ed.), *Worshipping Athena Panathenaia and Parthenon* (Wisconsin 1996); Maurizio (1998); Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 253-69. Only the groups for which presence in the procession is attested are included. The *arrephoroi*, although concerned with the weaving of Athena's *peplos*, are therefore left out. It is unclear whether the so-called *ergastinai*, who also worked on the *peplos*, walked in the classical procession. They are first attested in decrees of the first century BC in which they (and their fathers) are honoured for their work: *IG II² 1036+1060* (108/7 BC) with: Aleshire and Lambert (2003) 68-70; *IG II² 1034+1943* (103/2 BC); *IG II² 1942* (ca. 100 BC).

²⁸ These *kanephoroi* are often described as aristocratic girls; Bekker, *Anecd.*, 270, 32 refers to "well-born *astai*" and Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F 8 to "*parthenoi* of distinction". This tradition seems to stem from Thucydides' account (6.56.1) of the exclusion of Harmodios' sister from the *kanephoros* as she was not worthy ($\mu\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\alpha\nu$). However, this need not be because she lacked aristocratic roots, as is commonly assumed, but rather because Harmodios belonged to the "foreign" *genos* of the Gephyraioi who, as Herodotus (5.57) informs us, were excluded from "numerous privileges" and perhaps *kanephoros* was one of these privileges, on which see S.D. Lambert, 'Aristocracy and the Attic *gene*: a mythological perspective' 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)* forthcoming. On the Gephyraioi also see: Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 288-9. For the white make-up: Hermippus fr. 25 and A.H. Sommerstein, *Ecclesiazusae* (Warminster 1998) 204, on Ar. *Ekk.* 730-733. Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 225 n. 35, suggests the ceremonial whiteness could evoke "good upbringing" ($\sigma\kappa\iota\alpha\tau\rho\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$). It could equally well represent purity. Also see Aristophanes' description of Dikaiopolis' daughter as *kanephoros* in *Ach.* 253-258. Lykourgos provided gold ornaments for a hundred *kanephoroi* (*IG II² 457*; [Plut.], *Vit. X orat.* 852B). On *kanephoros* in general: F. van Straten, *Hiera Kala. Images of animal sacrifice in archaic and classical Greece* (Leiden 1995) 10-2, 31-42; M.P.J. Dillon, *Girls and women in classical Greek religion* (London 2002) 37-41; Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 223-6; J.B. Connelly, *Portrait of a priestess: women and ritual in ancient Greece* (Princeton 2007) 33-9.

²⁹ Cf. S.I. Rotroff, 'The Parthenon frieze and the sacrifice to Athena', *AJA* 81 (1977) 379-82.

animals that were escorted up the Akropolis to be sacrificed to Athena Polias, Athena Hygieia and Athena Nike. Next in line were metic *skaphephoroi*, who carried large basins filled with honey combs and cakes, and metic *hydriaphoroi*, who carried water jars. They were followed by musicians, among them *auletai* and *kitharodes*, and so-called *thallophoroi*, old men carrying olive branches.³⁰ After this the order of participants is even more uncertain but we know that hoplites, *apobatai*, and horsemen also participated in the *pompe*.³¹ After these clearly defined groups probably came the large group of Attic demesmen, who most likely marched with their respective demes.³² The probable participation of “freed slaves and other barbarians” should also be mentioned, who, according to Bekker, *Anecdota* (242, 2), “each carry an oak branch through the agora” during the Panathenaia.

In addition, ephebes were ordered to march in the Panathenaic *pompe* as a closed group of youths under the supervision of a so-called *kosmetes*, but we cannot be certain as to whether this participation predates the reorganisation of the *ephebeia* under Lykourgos.³³ Also, the Lykourgan decree on the Little Panathenaia (*IG II² 334*) implies that groups of officials perhaps also marched separately, while the degree of detail concerning the shares they received (10-14) might suggest these were recently, i.e. in the 330s, demarcated groups.

³⁰ On the order see Ar. *Ekk.* 738-745, who refers respectively to a *hydriaphoros*, a kithara-player, a *skaphe*, a fair musician, olive branches and athletic prizes. *Skaphephoroi*, *hydriaphoroi* and *thallophoroi* will be discussed in detail later on. On musicians in cult: G.C. Nordquist, ‘Some notes on musicians in Greek cult’ in: R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Stockholm 1994) 81-93. They are also depicted on the Parthenon Frieze (S107-114, N20-2) on which see: J. Neils, *The Parthenon Frieze* (Cambridge 2001) 142-6.

³¹ Thucydides (6.56) famously states that the Panathenaia provided an excellent opportunity for the attack on the tyrants since the Greater Panathenaia was “the sole day upon which the citizens (*politai*) who were part of the procession could meet together in arms without suspicion”. He also tells us that it was customary for marchers to participate only with shield and spear (6.58). However [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 18.2-4, corrects the story on the murder of Hipparchos exactly on this point stating that “the current story that Hippias made the people in the procession fall out away from their arms and searched for those that retained their daggers is not true, for in those days they did not walk in the procession armed (μὲθ’ ὄπλων), this custom was instituted later by the democracy” (the translation comes from: Rackham, *Aristotle* (1961) *ad loc.*). On hoplites see further the sixth-century cup (private collection Basel = *LIMC* s.v. Athena no. 574) and [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 18.4. *Apobatai*: Men. fr. 384. Horsemen: *LIMC* s.v. Athena no. 574; Xen. *Hipp.* 3.1-2; Dem. 21.171 and 174.

³² Introduction, n. 58.

³³ Cf. *IG II² 1028*. Deinarchos fr.16.3 indicates that ephebes were an integrated part of the Panathenaic procession in the second half of the fourth century.

The procession at the Greater Panathenaia would have included several additional groups. Most famous among these are the representatives of Athenian allies and colonists. In the so-called Kleinias decree (*IG I³ 71.54-58*) it is stated that the allies of Athens were to send a cow and panoply to the Panathenaia and that this has to be done in the same manner as the *apoikoi*, i.e. Athenian colonists. The decree is dated either to the 440s or to 426/5. It suggests that *apoikoi* were part of the Greater Procession from an earlier date and we have decrees from the 450s and 440s confirming this.³⁴ The representatives of allies were probably no longer part of the procession after the defeat of the Athenian Empire in 404/3, although an attempt to revive the fifth-century custom is perhaps reflected in a decree of 372 (*SEG 31.67*) in which the Parians are requested “to bring a cow and panoply to the Panathenaia and a cow and phallus to the Dionysia [...] as being colonists of the *demos* of Athens”. Whether colonists continued to participate is unclear though not unlikely. Finally, it is possible that the competitors in the *agones* of the Greater Panathenaia were included in the procession.³⁵

2.2 Inclusiveness vs. selective and differentiated participation

Most scholars describe the Panathenaic procession in general terms as “open” and “inclusive”. Robert Parker, for instance, has stated:

The procession is the supreme example in the Greek world of a civic pageantry, of a society on display before itself and the rest of Greece. And

³⁴ Allies: *IG I³ 34.41-3* (M&L 46) and *IG I³ 71.56-8* (M&L 69). R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 293-305 dates the decree to 448/7, H. Mattingly, *The Athenian Empire restored. Epigraphic and historical studies* (Michigan 1996) 281-314 to 426/5. From the 440s it is attested that colonies “are to send a cow and panoply to the Greater Panathenaia and a phallus to the Dionysia” (*IG I³ 46.11-3* (M&L 49)). A fragmentary decree concerning the Erythreans dated to around the 450s (*IG I³ 14.2-4* (M&L 40)) alludes to an obligation to bring grain to the Greater Panathenaia. Cf. Σ Ar. *Clouds* 386. Brulé (1996) 60-1 suggests that Hdt 5.82 perhaps alludes to this practice in the sixth century.

³⁵ Tracy (1991) 149-51 argues that the Parthenon Frieze is full of references to Panathenaic competitions. E. Simon, *Festivals of Attica. An archaeological commentary* (Wisconsin 1983) 63-4, suggests that the men carrying *hydriai* on the Parthenon Frieze (N16-19, S115-118) are victors in torch-races. I shall argue below they are to be understood as metic *hydriaphoroi* instead. Cf. B. Nagy, ‘Athenian officials on the Parthenon Frieze’, *AJA* 96 (1992) 55-69, who identifies the nine non-processional figures on the east frieze on either side of the gods as nine of the ten *athlothetai*, who were in charge of the *agones*. His identification of the “*athlothete*” on the central slab as Perikles seems too specific.

that society displayed itself comprehensively, since this was the “all-Athenian” festival.³⁶

Modern accounts, almost without exception, focus on the extreme inclusiveness of the festival that seems to be reflected in the various groups included in the procession, among them even girls, allies and metics! In their eyes, the Panathenaia provided a stage for the Athenians to present an idealised image of the Athenian community as open and inclusive, with all important segments represented. However, this interpretation of the Panathenaia as reflecting the Athenian community in the widest sense does not account for the absence of important groups and the predominance of others in the *pompe*. For instance, why were the hoplites and not the rowers represented as a separate group? And why are Athenian women absent as a group while a large group of well-born girls headed the procession? Surely rowers and Athenian women had a share in the polis? And if the Athenians indeed wanted to express all-Athenian inclusiveness, why did they demarcate the processing collective among particular lines at all?

Accordingly, several scholars have suggested that a meaningful selection must lie behind the parading of particular groups in the procession, most importantly Lisa Maurizio. She has argued that Athenian citizenship and Athens’ participatory democracy was at issue. She conceptualises democracy and citizenship as the equal right of every Athenian-born man to political deliberation and legal protection and notes that many of the groups in the front part of the procession can be considered non-citizens or outsiders, among them metics. In her view, these groups stand in sharp contrast to the Athenian citizens marching *en bloc* as demesmen and marching in the capacity of hoplites and horsemen. Maurizio explains this perceived contrast between politically active Athenian men and the non-citizen participants in the *pompe* as a result of the increased friction between an inclusive archaic “religious citizenship” and a politically defined “democratic citizenship”. She concludes that:

[...] the Panathenaia’s inclusiveness, then, was decidedly not the result of a democratic impulse but, rather, it was typical of Archaic processions

³⁶ Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 91. But see Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 253-69, for a more nuanced view.

wherein all residents of a territory marched in a display of social solidarity marshalled in honor of a goddess.³⁷

Contrary to Maurizio, I propose that this “discourse on citizenship” and the more flexible notion of membership were not an unforeseen consequence of a clash between a lingering archaic tradition and a new focus on a strictly “political” community, but rather the core of all official religious activities in the polis. Sharing in the *hiera* of the polis, worshipping polis deities, still constituted an important aspect of membership of the Athenian community in the classical period. The inclusive membership reflected in the Panathenaia *pompe* should therefore not be perceived either as an archaic relic or as constant and clear-cut, reflecting an unchanging black-and-white community of insiders and outsiders. Rather, differentiated cultic participation maintained and constantly negotiated a sliding scale of membership. Participation in polis *hiera* constituted one of the most important features of the participatory community which Athens was in both archaic and classical times.

While I thus believe that Kleisthenes’ reforms did not involve the triumph of a political community over a religious one, the year 508 obviously entailed a changing perspective on Athens’ participatory community; political and legal deliberations now became another significant form of participation in the Athenian community for a large group of people: the demesmen of Attica. This was a newly demarcated group whose membership of the Athenian community was up to an important degree also negotiated in cultic terms: in the context of the Panathenaia the demesmen of Attica were singled out in the second complex of sacrifices, most of the *agones* limited to Athenian men were organized along the lines of the ten new *phylai*, like the torch-race and the *euandria*, and it was the demarch who had a role in marshalling the procession. And in other festivals, too, the tribal organisation was applied to traditional or new competitions, perhaps most notably in the context of the dithyrambic choruses at the City Dionysia. After Kleisthenes’ reforms, membership of a deme and *phyle* became important aspects of an Athenian’s identity and this was *inter alia* expressed and negotiated in differentiated sharing in the *hiera* of the polis.

The Panathenaia thus became an important occasion for the presentation and negotiation of the identity of the newly created group of demesmen. But what

³⁷ Maurizio (1998) 316.

about the identity of metics? Resident foreigners were only recently thought of as constituting a separate group in Athenian society, as shown in the late sixth-century epigram to the Naxian Anaxilas (*SEG* 22.79), which refers to him as a *μετάοικον*.³⁸ We will see that the Panathenaia constituted one of the first public contexts where foreign residents were presented as a coherent group. But how was this done? What was the layout of their duties and what can this tell us about the Athenian conceptualisation of a separate metic status?

3 Metics at the Panathenaia

3.1 The testimonia

Most of our knowledge of metics walking in procession in honour of Athena Polias derives from late lexicographic sources like Harpokration, Hesychius, and the quotations in the Byzantine lexicon the Suda. The entries in these lexicons are often short and without context, and therefore difficult to interpret. For example, Photius, who lived in the ninth century AD, tells us (*s.v.* Σκάφας) that basins (*σκάφας*) were “carried by metics in the Panathenaic *pompe*, some were bronze and some silver, filled with honeycombs and cakes; they [i.e. the metics] were dressed in crimson chitons”. He names Menander as his source. Under a later entry Photius (*s.v.* Σκαφηφόρειν) explains that *σκαφηφόρειν* was “to carry plates full with offerings by metics at the *pompai*. This was the duty of the metics for the polis”.

Although these two short entries already provide us with a wealth of information, they also confront us with the difficulties of these sources. For instance, only when explaining *skaphas* Photius gives his source and this is also the only entry where he specifies the *pompe* as the Panathenaic one, for under *skaphephorein* he speaks of *pompai* in general. Given the similarity of the two entries it is likely that Photius is speaking of the Panathenaic *pompe* in both instances. However, in other cases it is far from certain whether only the Panathenaia are referred to when lexicographers speak of “*pompai*” in general or “the *pompai* paid for by the polis” (αἱ δημοτέλαι πομπαί).³⁹ Especially in the

³⁸ Baba (1984).

³⁹ Most scholars nevertheless assume they do, e.g. M. Clerc, *Les métèques athéniens: étude sur la condition légale, la situation morale et le rôle social et économique des étrangers*

case of *skaphephorein* there is strong evidence that suggests that metics fulfilled this role at other festivals as well. *Skaphephoroi* are, for instance, also mentioned by lexicographers in the context of Dionysian festivals (ἐν ταῖς Διονυσιακαῖς πομπαῖς – Suda α 4177; Bekker's *Anecd.* 214, 3), where they participated next to wineskin-carrying *astoi*.⁴⁰ While thus leaving open the interesting possibility that metics performed the duties described in the lexicons at several other festivals, it is safe to assume that processions referred to in general will probably have included the Panathenaic procession, the Athenian *pompe par excellence*.

Besides the lexicons, we also have snippets of information from fifth- and fourth-century sources, though these are often even more difficult to grasp. Most famous is the Parthenon Frieze, which seems to depict three of the four metic duties that are described in lexicographic sources. Although the exact nature of the depicted procession on the Frieze remains a subject of heated controversy – was it a mythological procession, an idealistic version, or was it the historical *pompe* after Marathon?⁴¹ – there now seems to be a general agreement that it at least refers to a Panathenaic *pompe*. Although it cannot be used as an exact reproduction of a *pompe* at a specific date, it nonetheless probably reflects general ideas about the Panathenaic *pompe* in the second half of the fifth century. At the very least it can be stated that if there had not been a group of metic *skaphephoroi* marching in polis *pompai* they could not have appeared on the frieze.

In addition, we have generic descriptions of *pompai* in Aristophanes and Aeschylus in which scholars have seen general allusions to the Panathenaia and more specifically to the participation of metics in this festival.⁴² And last but not least, there are several vases depicting metic duties in the context of a procession.

domiciliés à Athènes (Paris 1893) 159-160; Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 88; Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 170 n. 56.

⁴⁰ Cf. C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Something to do with Athens: tragedy and ritual' in: R. Osborne and S. Goldhill (eds.), *Ritual, finance, politics. Athenian democratic accounts presented to David Lewis* (Oxford 1994) 270-1 with n. 9. What the other processions could have been, if any besides the Dionysian ones, is uncertain. On *astoi*, a term denoting Athenians often in contrast to outsiders (*xenoi*): E.E. Cohen, *The Athenian Nation* (Princeton 2000) 50-63 and for a more balanced view: J.H. Blok, 'Becoming citizens. Some notes on the semantics of "citizen" in archaic and classical Athens', *Klio* 87 (2005) 7-40, esp. 15-7.

⁴¹ An overview of the different theories is given in Neils, *Frieze* (2001) 173-201.

⁴² Comparing Aristophanes and the Frieze: Rotroff (1977) 379-82. Comparing Aeschylus and the lexicons: W. Headlam, 'The last scene of the Eumenides', *JHS* 26 (1906) 268-77 and G. Thomson, *The Oresteia of Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1938) 314-21.

These vases are sometimes taken into account though merely as illustrations of our written sources. In what follows I shall present a comprehensive collection of these vases and incorporate them more fully in the discussion as sources in their own right.

3.2 *Skaphephoroi*

What do we read and see in these very diverse sources? The lexicons inform us on four duties that were performed by metics in the Panathenaic *pompe*: the carrying of basins, stools, water pitchers, and parasols. Let us first consider the metic basin-carriers, the so-called *skaphephoroi*. We already saw in Photios that at least in Menander's time, i.e. in the second half of the fourth century, it was the duty of metics to carry *skaphai* of silver and bronze filled with honeycombs and cakes in the Panathenaic *pompe* while dressed in crimson cloaks.⁴³ Harpokration (s.v. σκαφηφόροι) adds that

Δημήτριος γοῦν ἐν ἡ Νομοθεσίᾳ φησὶν ὅτι προσέταπτεν ὁ νόμος τοῖς μετοίκοις ἐν ταῖς πομπαῖς αὐτοὺς μὲν σκάφας φέρειν, τὰς δὲ θυγατέρας αὐτῶν ὑδρεῖα καὶ σκιάδια. διείλεκται περὶ τούτων καὶ Θεόφραστος ἐν ἰ Νόμων.

Demetrios (i.e. of Phaleron, who ruled in Athens in the late fourth century), said in his *Laws* (3) that the law used to instruct metics to carry basins in the *pompai* and their daughters to carry *hydria* and parasols. Theophrastus also spoke of these things in his *Laws* (9).

Demetrios, who revised Athenian law and perhaps systematised it, is known to have abolished liturgies as he thought the liturgy-system drained the Athenian elite of its wealth.⁴⁴ In that context it is interesting to observe that Bekker's *Anecdota* twice (280, 1 and 304, 7) explicitly describes the *skaphephoria* as a

⁴³ These cakes were probably to be placed on the altar as offerings in their own right. On sacrificial cakes: E. Kearns, 'Cakes in Greek sacrifice regulations' in: R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Stockholm 1994) 65-70. Other ancient examples are: Ar. *Wealth* 659-661 (at the Asklepieion in Piraeus); Ar. *Clouds* 507-508 (to the hero Trophonios in Boeotia); Hdt. 8.41.2-3 (to a sacred snake on Akropolis).

⁴⁴ For changes instituted by Demetrios of Phaleron: C. Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Anthony* (Cambridge [MA] 1997) 54-9, and for his religious reforms: J.D. Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (Berkeley 1998) 53-62, and Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 268 and 271. Demetrios had famously stated that many lavish tripods, won after the completion of a successful *choregia*, were monuments only to the ruin of the families that had overspent their resources in commissioning them (*FGrH* 228F25).

liturgy, as a typical μετοίκων λειτουργία. This probably meant that some wealthy metics were expected to look after the basins and pay for the crimson cloaks the *skaphephoroi* had to wear. These cloaks were especially expensive garments as crimson (or Phoenician or Tyrian crimson as it was known in antiquity) was by far the most costly colour in antiquity.⁴⁵ It seems likely, then, that by the late fourth century the classical law which ordered metics to carry basins in the Panathenaic *pompe* dressed in crimson cloaks was no longer in force after Demetrios had abolished all liturgies, including the *skaphephoria*.⁴⁶

Whether or not abolished by Demetrios, we know for a fact that in the classical period metics walked in the Panathenaic procession as *skaphephoroi*. Our main source for this is Aeschylus' *Eumenides* (1029-1032), first performed in 458, in which, in the grand finale of the play, the Eumenides walk in procession together with Athena, donned in crimson cloaks and explicitly referred to as metics. Aristophanes also refers to a *skaphephoros* in the mock procession in his *Ekklesiazusai* (742), which was probably performed in the 390s.⁴⁷ And *skaphephoroi* are also depicted on the Parthenon Frieze: three *skaphephoroi* are restored on each long side of the frieze (N13-15, S119-121) of which two are partly preserved (N 13, S120).⁴⁸ They are depicted as young, unbearded men clad in richly draped, heavy cloaks, so-called *himations*, and they carry large basins on their shoulders. We also come across *skaphephoroi* on several early to mid fifth-century vases. Again we see young and unbearded men carrying *skaphai*. They are dressed either in long and heavy *himations* or in short ones that were tied around the waist. One of the vases shows that *skaphai* could also be carried in front of the body.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ The expensiveness of crimson was mainly due to the extremely laborious method for producing purple dye from marine snails famously described by Pliny the Elder (*NH* 9.60-65). Cf. M. Reinhold, *History of purple as a status symbol in antiquity. Collection Latomus* 16 (Brussels 1970), esp. 1-28 and H. Stulz, *Die Farbe Purpur in frühen Griechentum beobachtet in der Literatur und in der bildenden Kunst* (Stuttgart 1990).

⁴⁶ This is perhaps also borne out by the past tense used in Harpokration.

⁴⁷ On the metic Eumenides as *skaphephoroi*: Headlam (1906) and Thomson (1938) 314-21.

⁴⁸ Neils, *Frieze* (2001) 150 and I. Jenkins, *The Parthenon Frieze* (London 1994) 71.

⁴⁹ Oxford, *Ashmolean Museum* 1911.617; New York, *Metropolitan Museum* 20.244; S.I. Rotroff and J.H. Oakley, *Debris from a public dining place in the Athenian Agora, Hesp. Suppl* 25 (1992) no.113; M. Robertson, 'The South Metopes: Theseus and Daidalos' in: E. Berger (ed.), *Der Parthenon-Kongreß Basel* (Mainz 1984) 206, pl. 15.2.

In an inventory of the Parthenon (*IG I³ 342.24*) we moreover come across one hundred bronze *skaphai* that were recorded shortly after 404.⁵⁰ These *skaphai* were permanently kept with other cult equipment in the Parthenon to leave only for ritual use. Were they the ones carried by metics in the Panathenaic *pompe*? The fact that these inventories were taken at the time of the Panathenaia points to a strong connection with this festival and it is likely that they took place shortly after, when ritual objects used in the festival had to be returned and accounted for.⁵¹ Also, the fact that the basins in the inventory were made of bronze corresponds with what we are told by Photios and we can probably conclude that the *skaphai* in the inventory were those carried in the Panathenaic procession.

Can we say anything about the number of metics annually carrying *skaphai* in procession for Athena from these inventories? Diane Harris suggests that after the (plausible) melting down of treasure during the Peloponnesian War and the ensuing upheaval of the Thirty, the Athenians probably felt a strong need to quickly replenish their cult equipment on the Akropolis. It appears the *skaphai* were restored *en bloc* shortly after 404; except for a smaller σκάφιον χαλκοῦν dedicated in 304 this is the only group of *skaphai* to occur in the inventories.⁵² The number of one hundred therefore almost certainly indicates the number of metic *skaphephoroi* annually participating in the Panathenaia, at least from 404 onwards. Interestingly, this number matches the number of *kanephoroi* for whom Lykourgos provided gold ornaments and who marched further up in the front of the procession.⁵³

⁵⁰ D. Harris, *The treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion* (Oxford 1995) 155, V229 (= *IG I³ 342.24*).

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, 10.

⁵² *Ibidem*, 28-9. Smaller *skaphion*: 155, V228 (= *IG II² 1467.5-6*)

⁵³ *IG II² 457* and echoed in [Plut.] *Vit. X orat.* 852B. Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 224, is sceptical about the use of these ornaments on a single occasion. On Lykourgos' policy of religious conservatism and of revitalizing traditional rites: B. Hintzen-Bohlen, *Kulturpolitik des Eubolos und des Lykurgs: die Denkmäler und Bauprojecten in Athen zwischen 355 und 322 v. Chr.* (Berlin 1997) and Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 242-55. Perhaps Lykourgos was reaching back to a fifth-century tradition concerning the number of Panathenaic *kanephoroi*.

3.3 *Hydriaphoroi*

Hydriaphoroi were metics who carried large water-jars (*hydriai*) up the Akropolis.⁵⁴ The sex of these *hydriaphoroi* is the subject of an ongoing debate. In lexicons we find *hydriaphoroi* being described as metic women or girls who carried water-pitchers in processions. Demetrios of Phaleron, as we already saw in the previous section, stated in his *Laws* (3) that the daughters of metics had to carry *hydriai* “in the *pompai*” (apud Harpokration *s.v.* σκαφηφόροι). Demetrios is probably the source for all entries on *hydriaphoroi*; Pollux (III.5) informs us they were the wives of metics and Photios (*s.v.* ὑδριαφόροι) describes them as “the female metics”. However, on the Parthenon Frieze those who carry *hydriai* are clearly men (N16-19 and restored on S115-118): on the north side of the Frieze we see four beardless youths clad in *himations*, three of whom carry heavy *hydriai* on their shoulders while the fourth is shown picking up his pitcher from the ground. Because *hydriaphoroi* are described as female in later sources, it has been suggested that the youths on the frieze should not be understood as *hydriaphoroi* but as victorious athletes or as allies presenting tribute instead.⁵⁵ However, when we take into account two fifth-century vase depictions of male *hydriaphoroi*, one in the Louvre (Cp 10793) and one in a private collection of Herbert Cahn in Basel (no. 23), and a reference to a *hydriaphoros* in Aristophanes (*Ekk.* 738) we can probably conclude that in the fifth and early fourth century metic *hydriaphoroi* were male, that we can identify the jar carriers on the Frieze as *hydriaphoroi*. Perhaps regulations had changed under Demetrios.

In her important monograph on the Parthenon Frieze, Jenifer Neils presented evidence in addition to the frieze for the existence of male *hydriaphoroi*.⁵⁶ She refers to a fragmentary red-figure *pelike* dated to ca. 440 and attributed to the Pan Painter (Louvre Cp 10793). On it we see a *kanephoros* with a sacrificial basket, a *kanoun*, on her head moving towards the left, while more to the right a youth picks up a large *hydria*. On the other side we come across three

⁵⁴ For the many uses of water in sacrifices see: Van Straten, *Hiera Kala* (1995) 31-42 and S. Cole, ‘The uses of water in Greek sanctuaries’ in: R. Hägg, N. Marinatos and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), *Early Greek cult practice* (Stockholm 1988) 161-5.

⁵⁵ Victorious athletes: Simon, *Festivals* (1983) 63-4, who refers to the *hydriai* that were awarded as prizes for the Panathenaic torch-race in an early fourth-century prize list (*IG II²* 2311.77). *Hydriai* filled with tribute were suggested by B. Wesenberg, ‘Panathenäische Peplosededication und Arrephorie. Zur Thematik des Parthenonfriezes’, *JdI* 110 (1995) 149-78. Tribute was, however, presented at the City Dionysia, not at the Panathenaia.

⁵⁶ Neils, *Frieze* (2001) 146-50.

Hermes, perhaps indicating the location as the Area of the Herms in the northwest corner of the Agora where the Panathenaic *pompe* passed.⁵⁷ We also have a fragment of a red-figure vase attributed to the Dinos Painter and dated to around 420 (Private collection Herbert Cahn Collection, Basel 23), which seems to copy the pose of the fourth figure on the Frieze. The date of the fragment around 420 makes a copying of the Frieze by the painter a fair assumption and renders the fragment less suitable as independent evidence on the sex of the *hydriaphoroi*. This would mean that we only have one additional source that can support the depiction on the Frieze, perhaps a rather flimsy argument in favour of the male sex of the *hydriaphoroi*. So should we explain the sex of the *hydriaphoroi* on the Frieze in terms of artistic freedom? Perhaps not.

Near contemporary textual evidence is perhaps provided by Aristophanes. In his *Ekklesiazuzai* (730-745) we find a certain Chremes staging a mock (Panthenaic) procession with household utensils, which are set in place with the help of his slaves Sikon and Parmenon. The flour-sieve, which is brought out first, represents the *kanephoros*, probably because it recalls the powdering of the young girls who carried the sacrificial baskets. After the *kanephoros*, the stool-carrier, and perhaps the parasol-carrier (here addressed as ἡ κομμώτρια), a *hydria* is placed in line. Here, Chremes, for the first and only time, directly addresses one of his slaves and orders him to bring out a *hydria* by saying: “bring that *hydria* over here, *hydriaphoros!*” (φέρε δεῦρο ταύτην ὑδρίαν, ὑδριαφόρε – 738). Commenting on this line Alan Sommerstein suggested that

it is possibly significant that in our passage the jar-bearer is distinguished from the jar itself and presumably therefore is, for once, to be identified not with the (grammatically feminine) utensil but with the (male) slave who brings it out, even though it is of course the jar, not the slave, that is set down as part of the mock procession.⁵⁸

Taking into account the *hydriaphoroi* on the Parthenon Frieze, the two vase-depictions and the reference in Aristophanes we can probably conclude that in the fifth and early fourth century *hydriaphoroi* were most likely male metics. Perhaps regulations had changed by the time Demetrios wrote his *Laws* in the late fourth

⁵⁷ Van Straten, *Hiera Kala* (1995) 29, with V308, objects to identifying these generic images of Herms as the ones dedicated by Kimon after his victory in Eion in 476/5.

⁵⁸ Sommerstein, *Ecclesiazuzae* (1998) 205.

century. We know of one other instance where the required sex of ritual personnel changed over the course of time: while only boys are known to have performed the role of hearth-initiate at the Mysteries in the classical period, all but one of the hearth-initiates in the Hellenistic period are girls.⁵⁹

Unfortunately the Parthenon inventories give no clue as regards to the number of Panathenaic *hydriaphoroi*. The records of 402/1 show the dedication of a group of twenty-seven new silver *hydriai*, each weighing around 1000 drachmas, i.e. around 4.3 kg.⁶⁰ However, unlike with the *skaphai*, we also come across a mix of personal and official polis dedications of *hydriai*, some of them not even dedicated to Athena.⁶¹

3.4 *Skiadephoroi*

Skiadephoroi were metic girls who carried parasols in the Panathenaic procession. Harpokration (s.v. σκαφηφόροι) is again our main source. He informs us that according to Demetrios the daughters of metics had to carry parasols.⁶² Aristophanes further indicates that these parasols were carried for the comfort of the *kanephoroi*, who were accompanied and shaded by these metic girls during the procession. In his *Birds* (1494-1552), performed in 414, we come across a rather unheroic but still Zeus-hating Prometheus, who goes up to Cloudcuckooland to warn Pisthetairos for the anger of the gods; ever since Pisthetairos and his companion Euelpides founded their city-in-the-sky, the gods had not been receiving their customary sacrifices and now they are out for revenge. As he discusses matters with Pisthetairos, Prometheus is very restless as he is afraid that Zeus will see his betrayal from the Olympus. He therefore asks Pisthetairos to be quiet and take a parasol to shield him “so that the gods do not see me” (1508). Again, when Prometheus wants to leave, he asks Pisthetairos to “bring the parasol (φέρε τὸ σκιάδειον), so that if Zeus should see me from up there, he would think I was escorting one of the *kanephoroi*” (1550-1551). In

⁵⁹ Cf. Connelly, *Portrait* (2007) 33 n. 37 for the sources.

⁶⁰ Harris, *Treasures* (1995) 161-2, V 260 (= *IG II²* 1372. 7-10.)

⁶¹ For example in 382/1 we come across three silver *hydriai* of the Dioskouroi stored in the Hekatompedon (Harris, *Treasures* (1995) V254 = *IG II²* 1412.20) and in the archonship of Archippos (321/0) three silver *hydriai* are mentioned which the treasurers made from *phialai* dedicated by freedmen (V253 = *IG II²* 1469.3-12).

⁶² Pollux (7.174), probably following Demetrios as well, is in agreement.

both these instances the parasol may be understood as an incongruous, comical item that was not to be used or carried by either Pisthetairos or Prometheus as the use of parasols seems to be the preserve of women in classical Athens.⁶³ The mention of *kanephoroi* further points towards a ritual context, most likely that of the Panathenaic *pompe*, which was the only occasion where we know *kanephoroi* were shaded by *skiadephoroi*. Prometheus is therefore not only carrying a female attribute but also, by invoking the ritual context of the Panathenaia, a metic one. The comically unheroic and twitchy nature of the Titan in this play is thus given further emphasis by Aristophanes by presenting him so anxious to hide from Zeus that he is willing to carry anything as a shield even though this would mean he looks like one of the metic girls who carried a parasol for a *kanephoros* at the Panathenaia.⁶⁴

Although there are no parasols in the inventories of the Parthenon – they probably had to be replaced regularly – the close association with the *kanephoroi* indicates a possible number of one hundred metic girls carrying parasols to shade these Athenian girls, at least in Lykourgan times.

3.5 *Diphrophoroi*

Finally, there is a fourth group of metic carriers in the Panathenaic procession: *diphrophoroi*. Hesychius (*s.v.* διφροφόροι) tells us that *diphrophoroi* were “females who followed the *kanephoroi*, carrying stools with them”. Scholars generally believe these *diphrophoroi* to have been metics because of the close association with the other three metic groups. Because of that association and, as I suggest, because of the additional force it would give two rather similar puns on *diphroi* in Aristophanes and Kratinos, we can probably safely assume that *diphrophoroi* were indeed metic girls who carried low, four-legged stools with a cushion on top in procession.

In the same scene from the *Birds* in which Prometheus is associated with *skiadephoros*, we also come across a reference to a *diphrophoros*. When

⁶³ Cf. M.C. Miller, ‘The parasol: an oriental status-symbol in late archaic and classical Athens’, *JHS* 112 (1992) 91-105, and idem, *Athens and Persia in the fifth century BC: a study in cultural receptivity* (Cambridge 1997) 193-8. With the exception of the still puzzling Anakreon vases, all Athenian testimonia show women using parasols themselves or being shaded by female servants.

⁶⁴ Cf. N. Dunbar, *Aristophanes, Birds* (Oxford 1995) 693-4 on Aristophanes’ general presentation of Prometheus and his commentary on lines 1508, 1150-1551 *ad loc.*

Prometheus asks the parasol back from Pisthetairos and remarks that Zeus might think that he is shading a *kanephoros* Pisthetairos adds: “Wait, take this stool and act as *diphrophoros* too” (1552), thus suggesting that Prometheus should not only act as female metic *hydriaphoros* but as female metic *diphrophoros* as well. In a scholium to another scene in *Birds* (1294), it is further suggested that an association between resident foreigners and *diphrophia* was similarly exploited in Kratinos’ *Maids of Delos* (fr.30) where it was said that “Lykourgos shall follow them carrying a stool (δίφρον), clad in Egyptian dress (καλάσιριν)”. This Lykourgos can probably be identified with the statesman who was put to death by the Thirty and the homonymous grandfather of the famous politician of the 330s. He was often ridiculed in Old Comedy for being feminine and an Egypt-lover or even an Egyptian himself.⁶⁵ The carrying of a *diphros* thus seems to underscore a certain femininity *and* foreignness.

From Hesychius and scholia on the *Birds* scene with Prometheus, it is usually assumed that metic girls carried stools for the comfort of the *kanephoroi* but this is not at all clear. Hesychius only says that *diphrophoroi* followed (εἵποντο) the *kanephoroi* and this order seems to be confirmed by the mock procession in Aristophanes’ *Ekklesiazusai* (734-735) where the cooking pot, serving as *diphrophoros*, is placed directly behind the flour-sieve that acts as *kanephoros*. Also, in *Birds* only the parasol is associated with escorting (ἀκολουθεῖν) a *kanephoros*, while the carrying of the *diphros* is mentioned separately. In addition, I would like to refer to the small number of *diphroi* that are recorded in the inventory of the Hekatompedon, which seems to preclude a large group of *diphrophoroi* escorting perhaps as many as a hundred *kanephoroi* up the Akropolis with stools. We come across one group of five round-footed *diphroi* that was first entered in 397/6, four complete stools entered in 434/3, and another four stools and one broken one added in 371/0.⁶⁶ Although these data are too cursory to come to any conclusion about the exact number of *diphrophoroi* walking in procession for Athena, they do seem to point to a small number.

What then was the function of the stools in the Panathenaic procession? Several suggestions have been put forward. Complicating the matter are the two girls carrying stools depicted in the much discussed central east scene of the

⁶⁵ Cf. R.R. Simms, ‘Isis in classical Athens’, *CJ* 84 (1988/9) 216-21.

⁶⁶ Harris, *Treasures* (1995) V118 = *IG* II² 1394.13-14, IV 27 = *IG* I³ 343.14, V116-117 = *IG* II² 1424a. 297-8, 345.

Parthenon Frieze. In this so-called *peplos* scene we see five figures: two adults and three smaller attendants. From left to right we encounter two girls with stools on their head, while the girl most left is probably carrying a smaller footstool or an incense box as well.⁶⁷ The other girl is about to hand over her stool to a woman in a richly draped chiton, probably to be identified as a priestess. The position of the stool-carrying girls in this prominent part of the Frieze and away from the *kanephoroi* has led to numerous speculations.⁶⁸ The most common view is expressed by Neils, who emphasises the absence of the *kanephoroi* in this scene with whom the *diphrophoroi* are commonly, though, as I argue, falsely associated. She states that these girls cannot be “simply *diphrophoroi*” but “rather must be more important figures, who played a key role in the cult of Athena” and she concludes that they are probably to be identified as *arrephoroi*, young girls who served Athena for one year.⁶⁹ However, although these girls began weaving the new *peplos* at the festival of Athena called the Chalkeia nine months before, *arrephoroi* are nowhere attested as participating in the Panathenaia. The claim that *diphrophoroi* were only “minor characters” is furthermore misinformed as it is based on a preconceived notion of low metic status and not on the ritual role performed. Thus, as the girls on the Frieze carry *diphroi*, there is no compelling reason not to identify them as *diphrophoroi*.⁷⁰

But, again, what was the function of the stools they carried? A. Furtwängler was the first to argue that the stools were used in a ritual called *theoxenia*, the entertainment of the gods, which was not uncommon in ancient Greek cult.⁷¹ Dorothy Thompson alternatively suggested that the stools were actually part of Persian booty captured during the Persian Wars; in an inventory of the Parthenon

⁶⁷ Cf. J. Boardman, ‘The Parthenon Frieze: a closer look’, *RA* 99 (1999) 307-13, on these objects.

⁶⁸ C. Waldstein, ‘Τραπεζώ and Κοσμώ in the Frieze of the Parthenon’, *JHS* 11 (1890) 143-5, identifies the two girls in the peplos scene as Athena’s attendants Trapezo and Kosmo, though *trapezophoros* clearly means table-carrier and not stool-carrier. C. Kardara, ‘Glaukopsis – Ho archaios Naos kai to Thema tes Zophorou tou Parthenos’, *Arch. Eph.* (1964) 115-58, identifies them as two daughters of Kekrops but her mythical reading of the Frieze is now no longer accepted.

⁶⁹ Neils, *Frieze* (2001) 167-8. Similar: Simon, *Festivals* (1983) 67.

⁷⁰ Cf. O. Walter, *Ath. Mitt.* 38 (1913) 145-7 and K. DeVries, ‘The *diphrophoroi* on the Parthenon Frieze’, *AJA* 98 (1994) 323.

⁷¹ A. Furtwängler, *Meisterwerke der griechischen Plastik* (Leipzig and Berlin 1893) 186-90. On *theoxenia* see most importantly: M.H. Jameson, ‘Theoxenia’ in R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Copenhagen 1994) 35-57.

we come across “five round-footed stools; one with silver feet”, a description, Thompson argued, that hints at their Persian origin. According to Thompson, these “Persian” stools were captured from the Persians during the Wars and then incorporated in the Panathenaic procession as symbols of royal power.⁷² Both theories are attractive but both have their weaknesses as well. Against Furtwängler, for instance, it can be argued that on the Parthenon Frieze the gods are already seated, with the exception of Eros and Iris. Also, Thompson presents a depiction of a *diphrophoros* at the court of Sargon II on which we see a man carrying a footstool in front of his body while a terracotta figurine that was found in the Athenian Agora shows that an “Athenian” *diphrophoros* was a girl carrying a stool on her head.⁷³ There appears to be no way to decide which theory deserves our preference.

4 Honour or humiliation?

These then were the *hiera* of Athena Polias that metics shared in. Probably more than two hundred metics walked in procession during the Panathenaia, among them perhaps as many as one hundred *skaphephoroi* as indicated by the number of *skaphai* kept on the Akropolis and perhaps one hundred *skiadephoroi* matching the number of *kanephoroi* they shaded with parasols. Evaluations of these duties vary widely, though all seem to pivot around the theme of honour and dishonour. Since the early nineteenth century the pendulum has swung several times from describing the metic duties as “geringe und ehrenrührige Dienste”⁷⁴ to “un grand honneur”.⁷⁵ The current view is David Whitehead’s, who in 1977 wrote that “we should recognise both the concessions and their limits”, emphasising the subjective nature of our sources, preventing us from choosing between a “disgrace theory” and economically motivated concessions.⁷⁶ According to the “disgrace theory” metics were forced to participate in a demarcated manner that would clearly display their (presupposed) inferior

⁷² D. B. Thompson, ‘The Persian spoils in Athens’ in: S.S. Weinberg (ed.), *The Aegean and the Near East. Studies presented to Hetty Goldman* (New York 1956) 281-91.

⁷³ Waldstein (1890) 144.

⁷⁴ A. Böckh, *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener* I (3rd ed.) (Berlin 1886) 624. First published in 1817.

⁷⁵ Clerc, *Métèques athéniens* (1893) 159.

⁷⁶ Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 88.

position, while in the latter case the contributions that were made by metics, either to Athenian society at large or to meet the specific costs of the Panathenaia – remember that the *skaphephoria* was described as a liturgy in Bekker’s *Anecdota* (280, 1; 304, 7) – were compensated by a small share in the festival.⁷⁷

The debate about the Panathenaic metic duties is characterised by a rigid polarity. This is partly due to the nature of our sources and partly to pre-conceived, modern ideas about what metic status entailed. In what follows, it will become clear that our sources do not support the notion that the metic duties were part of a deliberate policy to humiliate metics, as some scholars have done. On the other hand, to describe metic participation as a great honour is too simplistic and passes over the connection between differentiated participation of demarcated groups in the *hiera* of the Athenian polis and the definition of the Athenian community and its members.

Scholars who label metic duties as humiliating usually focus on the obligatory nature of these duties as if they were designed to coerce metics into subordination. Their most important source is Aelian (*VH* 6.1), writing in the second century AD, who tries to illustrate his view that the growing prosperity of Athens after the Persian Wars led to increasing hubris among the Athenians. As one example of this hubris he states:

Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ὕβρισαν καὶ ἐκείνην τὴν ὕβριν· εὐτυχίας γὰρ λαβόμενοι τὴν εὐπραγίαν σωφρόνως οὐκ ἤνεγκαν. τὰς γοῦν παρθένους τῶν μετοίκων σκιαδηφορεῖν ἐν ταῖς πομπαῖς ἠνάγκαζον ταῖς ἑαυτῶν κόραις, τὰς δὲ γυναικὰς ταῖς γυναιξί, τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας σκαφηφορεῖν.

The Athenians committed another excess. For having had good fortune they did not use this prosperity sensibly. They forced the daughters of metics to carry parasols in the processions for their own girls, and their wives for their own wives, while the men had to carry trays.⁷⁸

Scholars also refer to an entry in Pollux’ lexicon to emphasise that metics were supposedly very reluctant to participate. When Pollux (3.57) tries to explain the

⁷⁷ See, for instance, P. Wilson, *The Athenian institution of the khoregia: the chorus, the city and the stage* (Cambridge 2000) 25-7, who states that all details of these duties reflect “the markedly inferior status-position” of metics and describes their participation as concessions for the financial contributions made by metics to meet festivals costs.

⁷⁸ The translation comes from A. F. Scholfield, *Aelian. On the characteristics of animals*, vol. 2 (Cambridge [MA] and London 1958) *ad loc.*

term ἀδιάτακτοι – literally “out of rank” but often misleadingly translated with the morally coloured “undisciplined” – he refers to metics “who are not enrolled among the metics, who have not paid the metic tax or carried the *skaphe*.”⁷⁹ In that sense, Agasikles was most definitely a metic who was out of rank. These scholars also find it significant that *skaphephorein* is sometimes described as a liturgy and Demetrios of Phaleron is often quoted as he tells us that there used to be a law ordering metics to carry trays, *hydriai* and parasols.⁸⁰ These scholars, in short, seem to picture metic participation as a deliberate policy of the Athenians that forced an unwilling and unruly metic population into dishonourable duties that would symbolise their subordinate position.

Another sign of the supposedly degrading nature of carrying trays in a ritual context is often seen in an Athenian proverb that is transmitted in several lexicons, containing snippets of Theophrastus’ *On Laws* and Menander’s *Eunuch*. According to Zenobius (5.95) the proverb that one was “as tight-lipped as a *skaphe*” (Συστομώτερον σκάπης) referred to the lack of speech (ἀπαρρησίαστον) of metics, “not being allowed even to open their lips”. The Suda (s.v. συστομώτερον σκάπης), following Theophrastus, in addition, records that

εἰρησθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ τοὺς μετοίκους Ἀθήνησιν ἐν ταῖς δημοτελέσι πομπαῖς σκάφας φέροντας πομπεύειν· καὶ ὁπότε δὲ ἐβούλοντο μέτοικον δηλώσαι, ἢ σκάφην ἔλεγον ἢ σκαφηφόρον. διὰ δὲ τὸ ἀπαρρησίαστον εἶναι, συστομώτερον ποιήσειν ἀπειλεῖν σκάπης.

It is derived from the fact that metics in Athens carried bowls in public processions, and, whenever [the Athenians] wanted to point out a metic, they said “*skaphe*” or “*skaphephoros*” and because of their lack of freedom of speech, they could threaten to make them as tight-lipped as a *skaphe*.

These references to metics as *skaphai* or *skaphephoroi* in New Comedy are usually understood as insulting to metics.⁸¹ Finally, the special dress code for the *skaphephoroi* and the items metics carried, i.e. “the humiliating trays” and the “oriental” parasols associated with Eastern luxury, are often described as

⁷⁹ E.g. Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 25-7, esp. n. 77: “The unruly metic is the one who resists the public duty that serves to symbolise his proper place in society”.

⁸⁰ Law of Demetrios: Harpokration and Suidas s.v. σκαφηφόροι. *Skaphephorein* as a liturgy: Bekker, *Anecd.*, 304, 27, 280,1.

⁸¹ Cf. Photius, Suda, and Hesychius s.v. συστομώτερον σκάπης.

demeaning, separating metics from the other (Athenian) participants as markedly inferior.⁸²

On the other hand, scholars have argued that the Panathenaic metic duties should be described in terms of inclusion and honour. They refer to Hesychius (*s.v.* σκαφηφόροι), who informs us that metics “carried trays at the Panathenaia, in order that they, through sharing in the offerings, were counted as well-disposed (εἶνοι).” This benevolent disposition towards metics participating in the Panathenaia seems to echo the exodus of Aeschylus’ *Eumenides*, performed in 458. In her final speech, Athena emphasises the goodwill of the Eumenides who are now incorporated in Athenian society as metics. When, at the end of the play, Athena decides on the acquittal of Orestes and the founding of a special court for homicide in Athens (i.e. the Areopagus), she thereby infringes on the ancient authority of the vengeance-seeking Furies. The Furies, feeling wrongfully harmed in their venerable status as the sole pursuers of vengeance, repeatedly refer to the injustice done to them in terms of *atimia*, thus asking for an appropriate position within the changed community.⁸³ To restore the social equilibrium Athena grants these divine powers a new position in Athenian society: they become Eumenides (Good Spirits), they receive cultic worship, and they become metics with a residence underneath the Areopagus. After the Eumenides have received their new status – they are now described as μετοίκοι (1011 and 1018) in contrast to their previous state of ξυνοικία (833 and 916) – both Athena and the Eumenides draw attention to the honours bestowed upon the new metics and the benefits and goodwill Athens will receive in return from them. Then, in the final lines of her speech, Athena orders her servants:

1028. φοινικοβάπτοις ἐνδυτοῖς ἐσθήμασι
τιμᾶτε καὶ τὸ φέγγος ὀρμάσθω πυρός,
ὅπως ἂν εὐφρων ἦδ’ ὀμιλία χθονὸς
1031. τὸ λοιπὸν εὐάνδροισι συμφοραῖς πρέπητι

honour them by dressing them in crimson cloaks

⁸² Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 26, writes that metics were “included in a way which marked out not just their difference from citizens but also their hierarchical inferiority” (i.e. by humiliating trays). Cf. Maurizio (1998) 305: these items “implicitly link metic with slave”.

⁸³ Cf. H.H. Bacon, ‘The Furies’ homecoming’, *CP* 96 (2001) 48-59 and P.E. van ‘t Wout, forthcoming, on the *atimia* of the Erinyes.

and escort them by the light of flaming torches,
so that this kindly company of visitors to our land may show itself
afterwards in goodwill that bring prosperity to men.⁸⁴

Most scholars see several references to the Panathenaia in this passage but perhaps this designation is too specific as the scene rather creates a (conflated) image of a generic *pompe*.⁸⁵ Crimson cloaks for metics, flaming torches, paeans and ὀλολύγματα are indeed referred to but these were part of other festivals as well and the explanation of ἐυνάδροισι (1032) as a specific reference to the Panathenaic *euandria* is not watertight.⁸⁶ The scene nevertheless presents us with a positive evaluation of metic participation in polis festivals.

The debate on metic participation in the Panathenaia as outlined above thus appears to be characterised by a rigid polarity, which primarily derives from the highly personal and often extreme views voiced in our sources.⁸⁷ Presented with these divergent opinions scholars, often with preconceived ideas about metic status, have tried to extract a normative program behind the organisation of the

⁸⁴ The translation is based on: Smyth, H.W., *Aeschylus II* (Cambridge [MA], London 1981) *ad loc.*

⁸⁵ Headlam (1906) 268-77, and Thomson (1938) 314-21, connect the scene with the Panathenaia because of the mention of 1) crimson cloaks for the metic Eumenides (1029), 2) *euandria* (1032), and 3) the procession with its flaming torches, paeon and ὀλολύγματα probably referring to a *pannychis* (1033-1035). This last similarity was already noted by August Mommsen, *Heortologie: antiquarische Untersuchungen über die städtischen Feste der Athener* (Leipzig 1864) 171. But see Parker's doubts, *Athenian religion* (1996) 298-9. B.H. Weaver, 'A further allusion in the Eumenides to the Panathenaia', *CQ* 46 (1996) 559-61 sees "a further allusion" in the coinciding dates for homicide trials in classical Athens and the Panathenaia, one of the few festivals known to have been celebrated on these days.

⁸⁶ Several other translations have been suggested, e.g. H.W. Smyth, *Aeschylus II* (Cambridge [MA], London 1981): "that the kindly disposition of this company may henceforth make its presence manifest in blessings that bring prosperity to men " or H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Eumenides* (Oxford 1970): "that this sojourn, kindly to this land, may in future time be made manifest in fortune that brings it noble men ".

⁸⁷ Only few attempts have been made to reconcile the two traditions. Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 26-7, argues that the more positive evaluation of metic participation is probably to be understood as an "official" attempt to sooth a potentially explosive situation while the more negative reports are "popular" reactions. Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 87-8, following Y. Katayama, 'The social significance of liturgies from the viewpoint of the participation of metics', *JCS* 18 (1970) 40-51, has suggested that the sources reflect a historical development in the evaluation of metic participation. What was initially, at the time of Aeschylus, understood as honourable turned into dishonour, if we take the jokes on metics in New Comedy as the first proof of such a switch in evaluation. It is, however, dangerous if not impossible to trace a development in mentality from tragedy via comedy to eventually Aelian's cynic reports.

Panathenaic metic duties. They thereby seem to feel forced to choose between two opposing values, leading to oversimplified statements that suggest a uniform view of metic participation.

For instance, discussing the legally enforced “subordination” of metics in the Panathenaia, scholars commonly ignore the fact that Athenians, both male and female, too were ordered by law to participate in polis festivals in a particular manner. The same applies to the negative interpretations of liturgies performed by wealthy metics, like the *skaphephoria*, while liturgies performed by wealthy Athenians are commonly judged positively. Peter Wilson, for instance, clearly elucidates the importance of liturgies for communal self-definition but he nonetheless denies metics any share in this communal and ideological practice.⁸⁸ It is true that enthusiasm had to be commanded by law but this applied to both metics and Athenian citizens. Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, similar honours and benefits were to be gained through the performance of liturgies by metics and Athenian citizens alike and claims to the expected goodwill of the community after performing liturgies as expressed in the Athenian courts are the same for citizens (*e.g.* Dem. 38.25) and metics (*e.g.* Lys. 12.20).⁸⁹ We may even wonder if contributing to public services did not make these rich metics feel more committed to Athenian concerns rather than feeling subordinated and humiliated.⁹⁰ There is, in other words, no good reason to describe the metic liturgy of *skaphephoria* as a duty designed to humiliate, it was rather an opportunity for a small group of wealthy metics to participate in the highest echelons of Athenian society, vying for honour with wealthy Athenians.

To continue, special dress regulations like the one requiring metic *skaphephoroi* to wear crimson cloaks were a common phenomenon in ancient Greek religion. They applied to widely diverse groups of participants. The

⁸⁸ Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) *passim*, esp. 108-143.

⁸⁹ J.K. Davies, *Athenian propertied families, 600-300 BC* (Oxford 1971) xviii n.4, provides a list of instances where ancient orators play on the expected goodwill of the audience after performing liturgies. Cf. J. Ober, *Mass and elite in democratic Athens: rhetoric, ideology, and the power of the people* (Princeton 1989) 231-3 and P. Millet, ‘The rhetoric of reciprocity in classical Athens’ in: C. Gill, N. Postlethwaite and R. Seaford (eds.), *Reciprocity in ancient Greece* (Oxford 1998) 227-53, on the expected return of *charis* after performing a liturgy.

⁹⁰ On the correlation between the amount paid and the involvement of taxpayers in communities, see the comparative study of J.L. van Zanden and M. Prak, ‘Toward an economic interpretation of citizenship: the Dutch republic between medieval communes and modern nation-states’, *European Review of Economic History* 10 (2006) 111-45.

arrephoroi, for instance, four Athenian girls who were to serve Athena for a year, were required to wear white garments and golden objects that became *hiera* when put on.⁹¹ In 1893 Michel Clerc already argued that since the carrying of sacrificial baskets was considered a great honour, the carrying of objects, like trays, parasols and *hydriai*, cannot be considered degrading *per se*.⁹² There are, moreover, several examples in which the carrying of parasols appears to have been a highly venerable task: at the festival for Athena, Demeter, Persephone and Poseidon called the Skira only members of the eminent *genos* of the Eteoboutadai were allowed to carry parasols to shade the priestess of Athena and the priests of Poseidon and Helios and on their way to Eleusis during the Mysteries, the *kanephoroi* probably carried parasols themselves.⁹³ One cannot therefore claim that the *skiadephoria* was a humiliating duty in itself.

In addition, the explanation by Zenobius of the Athenian proverb “to be as tight-lipped as a *skaphe*” appears to be highly programmatic. First, we should recognise the rhetoric behind his explanation as it was probably a highly effective rhetorical tool to refer to some sort of lack of speech of metics (perhaps referring to a ritual silence or the exclusion of metics from the political arena) to underline a privileged (Athenian) identity.⁹⁴ More still, Zenobius, writing in the second century AD, is explaining a proverb while the expression only occurred in comedy and is therefore probably best understood in its proper, comical, context. The discrepancy between tight-lippedness and the openness of *skaphai* is perhaps a good starting point to explain this joke.⁹⁵

⁹¹ Bekker, *Anecd.* 446,18; Harp. s.v. ἀρρηφορέϊν; Bekker, *Anecd.* 202, 3. Cf. Dillon, *Girls* (2002) 57-60 and Connelly, *Portrait* (2007) 31-3. On dress-codes in sacred laws: H. Mills, ‘Greek clothing regulations: sacred and profane’, *ZPE* 55 (1984) 255-65 and P. Culham, ‘Again, what meaning lies in colour!’, *ZPE* 64 (1986) 215-45.

⁹² Clerc, *Métèques athéniens* (1893) 156-9.

⁹³ Skira: Lysimachides *apud* Harpokration s.v. σκίρον. *Kanephoroi* to Eleusis: Σ Ar. *Birds* 1508.

⁹⁴ On ritual silence: Clerc, *Métèques athéniens* (1893) 158. Cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 1035 (“keep auspicious silence”) and Ar. *Ach.* 241. Note that Demosthenes (9.3) could claim that the Athenian polis was as great as it was because they even “allow free speech to foreigners and slaves” (καὶ τοῖς ξένοις καὶ τοῖς δούλοις), presenting an inclusive and egalitarian perspective on Athenian society, cf. Dem. 58.68. (ἀ)παρρησία was of course a popular *topos* in Attic literature. Cf. D.M. Carter, ‘Citizen attribute, negative right: a conceptual difference between ancient and modern ideas of freedom of speech’ in: I. Sluiter and R. Rosen (eds.), *Free speech in classical antiquity* (Leiden 2004) 197-220.

⁹⁵ A paradox that perhaps indicates the big mouths (“μεγαλόστομος” in Arist. *Pol.* 662a24) of metics in normal life while being forced to silence in *pompai*. Personal communication with P.E. van ‘t Wout.

All in all, it is clearly too extreme to describe metic duties in the Panathenaia as a policy to humiliate and symbolically oppress metics. However, to state that the Athenians allowed metics to share in the *hiera* of the Panathenaia simply to grant them honour is equally simplistic. It may therefore seem wise to concede with Parker that we will probably never reach a final answer to the question “whether it is more important that these non-citizen groups were let in, or that they were separated and subordinated.”⁹⁶ I think, however, that we should not try to choose between two extremes. Instead of trying to answer the question whether the Panathenaic metic duties were *either* honourable *or* humiliating we should rather investigate the layout of these duties to see what *both* the inclusion of metics in this festival *and* their differentiation from and/or association with the other participants can tell us about the incorporation of metics as a group of its own in the Athenian community at large.

5 What the future beholds - the metic promise

5.1 Groups in transition

Within the Panathenaic processional community various groups were demarcated along different lines and (re)presented in different ways. Several of these groups shared certain common characteristics. Besides the probably enormous and somewhat undifferentiated group of demesmen, an annual Panathenaic procession included a number of groups that all appear to have been demarcated along very specific lines of age and gender: from early on we come across groups of young, teenage Athenian girls participating as *kanephoroi* and old men as *thallophoroi*, while Athenian youths known as ephebes are attested to participate in the Panathenaic *pompe* in the second half of the fourth century. The four groups of metic youths and girls in the Panathenaic *pompe* seem to have been demarcated along similarly specific lines of age and gender. All these groups may seem to represent persons who on account of their age, sex or descent moved on the borders of what most of our literary sources and modern interpretations imply was the core of Athenian society: adult males who on account of their Athenian descent were active in political deliberation and military pursuits. It has even been argued by Maurizio that the inclusion of these

⁹⁶ Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 261.

groups created a contrast with the “full citizens” marching as demesmen, defining the latter *e negativo* as male, adult and Athenian-born.⁹⁷

However, since membership of the Athenian community did not solely depend on political participation but also on participation in polis religion, we should move beyond a strict division of the Athenian (or Panathenaic) community into citizens and non-citizens. Instead of simply discarding the *kanephoroi*, *thallophoroi*, ephebes, and metics as mirror groups of the “core” of adult, male, Athenian participants we should rather look at the positions these groups held within the community according to their specific roles in the *pompe*. So instead of representing all kinds of non-citizens, I think the groups that were divided along very specific lines of age and gender are better understood as groups in transition: *kanephoroi* represented girls on the verge of marriage, ephebes were youths about to participate in military life, and *thallophoroi* were old men who had just left the group of those Athenians who defended the polis on the battlefield. These were also the groups that were designated to carry the items for the worship of Athena Polias, which seems to have highlighted the position these groups held in society: they were the ones who were expected to bring great contributions to the Athenian community. They were all bearing gifts, both to Athena Polias and, in their own person, to society at large: the *kanephoroi* carried sacrificial baskets while being presented in their youthful glory on the verge of marriage and motherhood; the presence of ephebes, who carried an excellence award, a so-called *aristeion*, can be interpreted in the context of their military potential; finally, the older men who carried branches were expected to offer their good advice and experience to the younger Athenians.

The four groups of metics that were incorporated into the Panathenaic *pompe* in the early fifth century seem to have been demarcated along similar lines and represented in a similar way as these Athenian “groups in transition”. In what follows I will therefore argue that the representation of these metic groups is to be understood against the background of these Athenian groups. It is my opinion that the apparent links that were generated between the four groups of metics and these Athenian “groups in transition” point to similar ideas about the position of metics within the Athenian community, that is, as expected to contribute to the well-being of the community.

⁹⁷ Maurizio (1997). In her view the participation of *thallophoroi*, who are on no account to be considered non-citizens, is unexplained.

5.2 With whom I march

The four groups of metics marching in the Panathenaic *pompe* were associated with the Athenian “groups in transition” in several ways. The resulting correspondence suggests that on the occasion of the Panathenaia young metics were presented as holding a membership to the Athenian community comparable to the ones of the carefully demarcated groups of *kanephoroi* and *thallophoroi*. The later participation of ephebes conforms to this pattern, thus strengthening this view.

A correspondence between the young metics and the Athenian “transitional” groups in the *pompe* is first suggested by the similarity in the way in which the metic representatives were split up. For while the representatives of allies and colonies marched *en bloc* and consisted solely of men, the metics were divided more specifically along lines of age and gender. Once every four years, groups of representatives from the colonies and allies processed together, each bringing a cow and panoply, probably forming an undifferentiated body of people. Brulé has estimated that between the 450s and 420s the number of allies could amount to 200 and the number of *apoikoi* or clerouchies to around twenty.⁹⁸ This number of ca. 220 allies and colonists in the Panathenaic *pompe* approximates the number of marching metics. However, unlike the representatives of allies and colonies, metics did not march as a closed group and were not presented as an undifferentiated collective.

By regulating that metics participated in a more differentiated manner in the Panathenaic procession, the Athenians chose to emphasise a different and closer relationship with their metic population than with their allies and colonists. Significantly, the way in which the participation of metics was differentiated rather points to an association between metics on the one hand and the *kanephoroi*, *thallophoroi*, and, eventually, the ephebes on the other. The proximity between *kanephoroi*, *thallophoroi*, metic groups, and possibly ephebes in the front of the *pompe* obviously created an idea of unity. But there was more. These groups all consisted of participants who were of a particular age that heralded a new stage in their life: they were either young and about to get married or get involved in public life, or old and about to retire from the battlefield and become of value to the community as advisors. These were also

⁹⁸ Brulé (1996) 61-2.

the groups that carried the ritual items of the Panathenaia, like the sacrificial baskets, *hydriai*, *skaphai* filled with offerings, and, at least in Hellenistic times, the excellence award for Athena called the *aristeion* that was carried by ephebes.

Also in ritual the four groups of metics were linked to the other groups. The strongest evidence for an association between metic participants and the other “groups in transition” comes from the direct linking of the (metic) *skiadephoroi* with the (Athenian) *kanephoroi*. The metic girls were probably of approximately the same age as the Athenian girls whom they shaded with their parasols. As for this practical reason they had to march side by side, perhaps creating as much as a hundred pairs of Athenian and metic girls. Interestingly, this number was perhaps matched by an equal number of *skaphephoroi* as might be indicated by the accounts of the Treasurers of Athena (*IG I³ 342.24*) that mention one hundred bronze *skaphai* being stored on the Akropolis from at least 404 onwards.⁹⁹ In the front of the procession we would thus be confronted with three groups of equal size: one group of Athenian girls, accompanied by a group of metic girls, followed by yet another group of metic youths carrying large basins.

The male metics who participated in the *pompe* were young, as shown on the Parthenon Frieze (N13-19; S115-121): the *skaphephoroi* and the *hydriaphoroi* are depicted as no longer children and not yet adult men. They are not bearded, which signals them as “youthful”. The already discussed fragment from Deinarchos’ *Speech against Agasikles* further indicates that the metic *skaphephoroi* were not young in general but of a specific “ephebic” age, i.e. between puberty and adulthood. Deinarchos (16.3) implies that the unlawful enrolment of Agasikles and his sons in the deme Halimous was brought to light by the participation of Agasikles and his sons in the Panathenaic *pompe*, where his sons “ascend the Akropolis as ephebes instead of *skaphephoroi*.” From this we may conclude that *skaphephoroi* and ephebes were roughly of the same age.¹⁰⁰ The groups were in fact so similar that Agasikles’ sons thought it feasible to switch groups. This “ephebic” age of the *skaphephoroi* also corresponds well with the fact that all vases depicting *skaphephoroi* in a processional context show

⁹⁹ *Supra*, 47.

¹⁰⁰ In Bekker, *Anecd.* 280, 1 it is stated that the *skaphai* were carried “by the metics who are present (ἡκόντων)”. Schenkl has amended ἡβώντων “who are mature”. In light of Deinarchos’ *Speech against Agasikles*, Schenkl’s amendment makes more sense, although ἡκόντων must remain a possibility.

us beardless youths carrying basins.¹⁰¹ It seems, therefore, that ephebes and metic *skaphephoroi* were of the same “transitional” age, both about to engage fully in adult life.

We can conclude that in the context of the Panathenaia metics were associated with *kanephoroi*, *thallophoroi* and ephebes in several ways; on those hot days in Hekatombaion, metics were presented as belonging to these “groups in transition”. This is reflected not only in the proximity between the groups, the “transitional” age these participants had, and the fact that these were the groups carrying ritual equipment but also in the close link created between the metic *skiadephoroi* and the *kanephoroi*, the correspondence in the number of *kanephoroi*, *skiadephoroi* and *skaphephoroi* and the “ephebic” age of the *skaphephoroi*. This correspondence is pivotal for our understanding of the ways in which metics shared in the *hiera* of Athena Polias and our knowledge of the early conceptualisation of metic status. The next question to be considered, then, is how each of these groups was presented at the Panathenaia.

5.3 *Kanephoroi*

Kanephoroi were Athenian girls who headed processions carrying large baskets (*kanâ*) that contained a sacrificial knife and other sacrificial paraphernalia such as barley and fillets. These *kanephoroi* were selected from the young Athenian girls who had just reached the age of puberty but who were not yet married. As such they were probably between the age of eleven and fifteen.¹⁰² These girls, living in an intermediate state between the *oikos* of their fathers and that of their future husbands, were called *parthenoi*. Not all Athenian *parthenoi*, however, could be chosen to act as *kanephoroi*: Thucydides (6.56-7) informs us that when Harmodios’ sister was chosen to act as *kanephoros*, the tyrant Hippias claimed she could never perform this duty on account of her not being worthy (*μὴ ἀξίαν*).

¹⁰¹ For these vases see below, 78-83.

¹⁰² On the age of *kanephoroi* see: C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Studies in girls’ transitions: aspects of the arkteia and age representation in Attic iconography* (Athens 1988) 54-7, 94-7; P. Brulé, *La fille d’Athènes. La religion des filles à Athènes à l’époque classique. Mythes, cultes et société* (Paris 1987) 300-23; Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 224-5, referring to Σ Theocr. 2.66b and the appearances of *kanephoroi* on vases. Some vases show that boys could also act as *kanephoroi*, but this rarely occurred, e.g. Van Straten, *Hiera Kala* (1995) V175, V193. Unfortunately we only have pictorial evidence and the circumstances of boy *kanephoroi* are completely obscure to us.

What “not being worthy” denotes in this context is unclear. Perhaps the *kanephoria* was a prerogative of the Attic *gene* and perhaps the affiliation of Harmodios with the “immigrant” *genos* of the Gephyraioi was a reason to exclude his sister, as Stephen Lambert will argue in a forthcoming article.¹⁰³ But whatever the reason for the exclusion of the girl, Thucydides’ remark seems to indicate that *kanephoroi* were commonly only selected from the higher echelons of Athenian society.

Kanephoroi were present at many Athenian festivals. We know they carried their baskets at the Brauronia, the Diisoteria, the Eleusinia, the Epidauria, the festival for the Mother of the Gods, the Anthesteria, the Pythais, the City Dionysia, and, of course, the Panathenaia.¹⁰⁴ The many vase depictions of sacrifices and processions with *kanephoroi* in addition attest to the presence of these girls on many occasions. From a passage in Aristophanes’ *Acharnians* (253-258) we further know that even privately organised processions could include a *kanephoros*. Here, Dikaiopolis organises his own procession during the rural Dionysia and has his daughter act as *kanephoros*:

253. ἄγ’ ὦ θύγατερ ὅπως τὸ κανοῦν καλῆ καλῶς
οἴσεις βλέπουσα θυμβροφάγον. ὡς μακάριος
ὅστις σ’ ὀπύσει κάκποιήσεται γαλᾶς
σοῦ μηδὲν ἥπτους βδεῖν, ἐπειδὰν ὄρθρος ᾗ.
πρόβαινε, κὰν τῶχλω φυλάττεσθαι σφόδρα
258. μή τις λαθῶν σου περιτραχητῆ τὰ χρυσία

Come now, my fair daughter, make sure you carry the basket fairly, looking savoury-eating. What a happy man he will be who marries you and receives a set of ferrets as good as you at farting in the grey dawn! Set forward, and take great care in the crowd that no one snaffles your golden ornaments on the sly.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ Lambert, ‘Aristocracy’, forthcoming. Also see n. 28 above on the unfounded assumption that *kanephoroi* were aristocratic girls. The *kanephoria* rather seems to have been an ancient prerogative of the Attic *gene*. In much later sources (Diod. Sic. 9 F 37.1; Plut., *Mor.* 189c) we hear that Peisistratos’ daughter had acted as *kanephoros*. This, however, seems misinformed as Peisistratos did not belong to a *genos*. Perhaps his family had illegitimately appropriated the right to *kanephoria* or perhaps Diodorus and Plutarch misunderstood Thucydides’ account (6.56-57) on the exclusion of Harmodios’ sister by Hippias.

¹⁰⁴ Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 224 n. 28; Brulé, *Fille* (1987) 312 n.149.

¹⁰⁵ The translation comes from A.H. Sommerstein, *Acharnians* (Warminster 1980) *ad loc.*, with slight modifications

Although Aristophanes is sketching a privately organised procession, the passage nicely illustrates several elements of *kanephoria* that we also find in other sources. First there is the element of beauty and fairness.¹⁰⁶ In *Acharnians* the beauty of the *kanephoros* is expressed through the gold ornaments worn by the girl and the order to “act fairly, fair one” (καλῆ καλῶς).¹⁰⁷ The beauty of these girls is corroborated by the many vases showing *kanephoroi* in beautiful garments and covered with golden jewellery.¹⁰⁸

The marriageable status of these girls is also often emphasised. Aristophanes suggests that to act as a *kanephoros* was a perfect opportunity to present a girl to her future husband. Stories about girls being seduced and raped when acting as *kanephoroi* seem to confirm the idea that these girls presented themselves to the public, or more specifically, to their future husbands. Significantly, *kanephoroi* regularly performed their duty at large polis festivals where men could and would attend. This “publicity” stands in sharp contrast to ritual duties performed by girls which were surrounded by secrecy and often witnessed by girls and women only.¹⁰⁹ It seems to have been a crucial aspect of the *kanephoria* that the duty was performed in public in the presence of many potential husbands. This observation made Brulé famously describe the *kanephoria* as an “*étalage de beauté*”, a show of beauty where girls presented themselves as ready for marriage.¹¹⁰ Similarly, the virginity and fertility of these

¹⁰⁶ Most examples are discussed in detail by Brulé, *Fille* (1987) 289-302.

¹⁰⁷ This expression, which is also found in another comedy of Aristophanes (*Ekkl.* 730), is described by Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 225, as a ritual formula.

¹⁰⁸ L.J. Roccas, ‘The *kanephoros* and her festival mantle in Greek art’, *AJA* 99 (1995) 641-66; Connelly, *Portrait* (2007) 34-6; Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 224-5. Cf. *Ar. Lys.* 1188-1194, where the chorus offers its own dresses and gold ornaments to future *kanephoroi*.

¹⁰⁹ Girls had many opportunities to fulfil religious duties, like being an *arrephoros* carrying “secret things” as a servant of Athena, or, if they belonged to the *genos* of the Praxiergidai, a *loutrides* washing the statue of Athena at the Plynteria, on which see: Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 307. *Ar. Lys.* 641-647 mentions both duties. Cf. Dillon, *Girls* (2002) 37-72; Connelly, *Portrait* (2007) 27-56; Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 218-52. Several stages in a girl’s life were marked ritually, for instance the period just before menstruation when girls could act as bears in service and under the protection of Artemis at Brauron and in other sanctuaries of Artemis around Attica, on which see: Sourvinou-Inwood, *Girls’ transitions* (1988). Cf. L. Kahil, ‘Autour de l’Artémis attique’, *AntK* 8 (1965) 20-33; idem, ‘L’Artémis de Brauron: Rites et mystère’, *AntK* 20 (1977) 86-98; S.G. Cole, ‘The social function of rituals of maturation: the *Koureion* and the *Arkteia*’, *ZPE* 55 (1984) 233-44; Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 232-48.

¹¹⁰ Stories of seduction: Maurizio (1997) n. 101; Brulé, *Fille* (1987) 287-300. See, for example, the story of Orytheia who was “taken away” by Boreas when she was ascending the Akropolis as *kanephoros* (Acusilaus *FGrH* 2F30) and the daughter of Peisistratos who

girls is occasionally referred to, like in Menander's *Arbitrators* where the *hetaire* Habrotonon claims that after three days of sexual abstinence she is like a *kanephoros*.¹¹¹ Perhaps the chains of figs worn by the chorus in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* (646-647) "when they were *kanephoroi*" can best be seen as symbolising their fertility.¹¹²

These defining characteristics of *kanephoria* – beauty, publicity, marriageable status, fertility – appear to have been especially prominent in the context of the Panathenaia.¹¹³ For instance, the hundred *kanephoroi* Lykourgos provided gold ornaments for far exceeds the number of *kanephoroi* at any other festival – the Panathenaic ones aside, the highest attested number of *kanephoroi* are the eleven at the Pythais in the second century BC.¹¹⁴ Also, the ceremonial whiteness associated with *kanephoria* is only mentioned in connection with Panathenaic *kanephoroi* and was perhaps intended to bring out the beauty and status of these girls and emphasise their ritual purity on this greatest of all public occasions.¹¹⁵ The beauty and purity of these girls was perhaps even further enhanced by the shading of these girls by the metic girls carrying parasols.

Kanephoroi, in sum, represented girls in a transitional phase of their life. Living in between their parental *oikoi* and the *oikoi* of their future husbands, the air was thick with promises of marriages and children. Many festivals, but especially the Panathenaia, were thought excellent opportunities to present these girls to the public and celebrate the contributions they were about to bring to the well-being of the polis community.

was harassed by a man when she was *kanephoros* (Plut. *Mor.* 189c; Dio. Sic. 9 F37.1). *Kanephoria* as a "balle des debutantes": Brulé, *Fille* (1987) 300-8 on 302. Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 226, objects that too few girls acted as *kanephoroi* for the *kanephoria* to be a presentation of all marriageable girls but admits that the select group of *kanephoroi* must have stood as symbols for all.

¹¹¹ Menander F172.262-264.

¹¹² Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 226 is, I think, too quick to refute this "earthly symbolism" in the context of the Panathenaia.

¹¹³ The separate mention of the *kanephoroi* as recipients of honorary shares of meat in the decree regulating the meat distribution at the Little Panathenaia (*IG II²* 334.14-15) already points to special attention for these girls at this festival.

¹¹⁴ Pythais: Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 83 and 224.

¹¹⁵ Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 225 n. 35. The few sources on the whiteness of the *kanephoria* seem to be concerned exclusively with the Panathenaia: Ar. *Ekk.* 730-732 with Hermippus fr. 25, where Chremes is staging a mock procession modelled on the Panathenaic one, as *skiadephoroi* shading *kanephoroi* are only attested for the Panathenaia. Also see n. 28.

5.4 *Thallopophoroi*

The details of the participation of the so-called *thallopophoroi* in the Panathenaia are rather obscure to us. The term “*thallopophoroi*” implies that they carried olive branches in processions. Two short references in Aristophanes and Xenophon further indicate that they were old men. In his *Wasps*, performed in 422, Aristophanes makes *thallopophoroi* a laughing stock as he has the chorus, existing of old men, claim:

540. οὐκέτι πρεσβυτῶν ὄχλος
χρήσιμος ἔστ' οὐδ' ἀκαρῆ·
σκωπτόμενοι δ' ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς
θαλλοφόροι καλουμεθ', ἀντωμοσιῶν
545. κελύφη.

that old men are no longer good for anything;
we shall be perpetually laughed at in the streets,
shall be called *thallopophoroi*, mere brief-bags.

Xenophon (*Symp.* 4.17), on the contrary, argues that:

θαλλοφόρους γὰρ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ τοὺς καλοὺς γέροντας ἐκλέγονται, ὡς
συμπαρομαρτοῦντος πάση ἡλικία τοῦ κάλλους.

in selecting *thallopophoroi* for Athena [the Athenians] choose beautiful old men, thus intimating that beauty attends all stages in life.

Thallopophoroi might also be depicted on the Parthenon Frieze. It has been suggested that the old men on the Frieze with *himations* around their waists (N28-43 and S89-106) are in fact *thallopophoroi*. Four of them are depicted with clenched fists, suggesting they held something. Their hairdos, i.e. long braids encircling their heads, further indicate that they are old men. All this suggests that we are indeed dealing with *thallopophoroi*.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁶ Neils, *Frieze* (2001) 142. Their number on the Frieze is surprisingly large, i.e. thirty-four, but any conclusion to the actual number participating annually in the Panathenaia must remain conjectural.

On many occasions branches were carried by males and females, young and old, as many vase depictions show.¹¹⁷ The passage from Xenophon indicates, however, that at the Panathenaia *only* old men could act as *thallophoroi* for Athena. This requirement that only old men could carry branches seems to have been a distinctive feature of the Panathenaia. Apart from that, this festival also seems to have been the only religious occasion at which old men were displayed as a separate group; on no other occasion do we find a group of old men performing a clearly delineated cultic duty. This specific choice for old men to carry the branches for Athena becomes, I argue, comprehensible in the light of the transitional status of several of the other groups in the Panathenaic *pompe*.

In certain contexts the status of old men can be typified as transitional, as moving from one phase in life to another, comparable to the status of *kanephoroi* and, as we will shortly see, ephebic youths. For instance, when the Corinthians – knowing that the Athenian forces were away in Egypt and Aegina – marched into Megara in 459/8, the Athenians raised an emergency army of old and young men, which was sent to the help of the Megarians.¹¹⁸ In his funeral oration, Lysias (2.50) refers to this event and speaks of “the elderly and those below the age of service”. The way in which Lysias specifies the identity of the youths that were sent to Megara as “those below the age of service” suggests that the former are best understood as “those above the age of service”, as no longer thought fit or required to fight.¹¹⁹ A clear differentiation between old and young Athenians also seems to have been at work when the Athenian assembly had to decide in 415 whether to send military aid to the people of Egesta on Sicily. According to Thucydides (6.13.1), Nicias on this occasion specifically addressed the elderly (τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις) in the *ekklesia* in order to find support against the young Alkibiades who was stirring up the eager young men on the Pnyx to go to Sicily.

These few examples illustrate that old men could in some contexts be seen as a separate group. But although these *γεράτεροι* could be presented as having become marginal to the military affairs of the polis, they had a new role to fulfil within the community as advisors and political leaders. The specific contributions

¹¹⁷ See for examples: Van Straten, *Hiera Kala* (1995) V6, V9, V21, V22, V52, V55, V67.

¹¹⁸ Thuc. 1.105.4.

¹¹⁹ Another example is found in Thuc. 2. 13, where Athens’ financial and military strength is discussed. Besides 13.000 hoplites, Thucydides’ Perikles informs us, there were another 16.000 guarding the walls or located in garrisons around Attica who consisted of the oldest and the youngest citizens *and* metics.

they were expected to bring are often highlighted, mostly in terms of good advice and experience.¹²⁰ So, Lysias (2.50-51) tells us that the old men fighting the Corinthians in Megara were quite capable since they were the ones who “had acquired valour by experience (ἐμπειρία) [...] had proven their own worth (αὐτοὶ ἀγαθοὶ) many times [...] and as seniors knew how to command (ἄρχειν ἐπισταμένων)”. Thucydides’ Nicias (6.13.1) uses similar qualifications when he says that the Athenians should remember “how rarely success is achieved by wishing [i.e. as the young were doing] and how often by forethought (προνοία)”. This association between old age and experience and prudence ties in with the honoured, Athenian tradition that the oldest man on an embassy or in an assembly should speak first, to which Aeschines (2.22, 108) refers when he furiously responds to the attempts of the young Demosthenes to speak first when on audience at Philip of Macedon. In another speech Aeschines (3.2) explains that a “Solonian” law prescribed that the oldest citizen is permitted to speak first “with dignity and [...] out of his experience to advise for the good of the polis.”

To sum up: it was possible in ancient Athens to conceptualise old men as a separate group, who were no longer military active but who had new important civic duties to perform as political leaders. As such, I suggest that the group of old men carrying olive branches at the Panathenaia represented yet another transitional group in Athenian society, analogous to the groups of *kanephoroi* and ephebic youths. For the group represented by the *thallophoroi* in the Panathenaic *pompe* the transition seems to mainly lie in the end of a military career and the beginning of new position in the political arena as experienced wise men. These old men are therefore not to be discarded as marginal or insignificant. On the contrary, they have their own specific contributions to make to society. So, similar to the youthful groups, the participation of the *thallophoroi* is perhaps best understood as emphasising the specific gifts these πρεσβυτέροι were expected to bring to the community, in their case their experience and good advice.

¹²⁰ This idea that old men were no longer considered fit for military duty is made explicit by Xenophon. In his description of the four male age classes in Persia (*Cyrop.* 1.2.4) he refers to the fourth age class, the old, as those who are beyond the age for military service (τοῖς ὑπὲρ τὰ στρατεύσιμα ἔτη γεγονόσι).

5.5 Ephebes

In the course of the fourth century the participation of the *kanephoroi* and the *thallophoroi* in the Panathenaia was complemented by that of a group of ephebes. It seems that the status of an *ephebos* was comparable to the status of a *parthenos* in that it reflected a transitional stage between childhood and adulthood.¹²¹ In the Lykourgan form of the ephebate, as instituted by a law of Epikrates in 335/4, ephebes were youths between the age of eighteen and twenty who had just registered in their demes. Before assuming full citizenship, they had to spend two continuous years in military training provided for by the polis.¹²² Before this reorganisation, youths were most likely already trained as ephebes, though probably not as strictly regulated as after the 330s. Our main indication for this pre-Lykourgan ephebate is a reference in Aeschines, who in 348 could refer to his time as an ephebe ca. twenty-seven years earlier. In his *Speech against Timarchos* Aeschines (1.49) claims that Timarchos' allegedly much older boyfriend Misgolas "happens to be, indeed, of the same age as I am, and my συνέφηβος; we are now in our forty-fifth year". Although the details of this account, and especially the respective ages of Timarchos and Misgolas seem to have been manipulated by Aeschines to place Misgolas, and thus Timarchos, in as bad a light as possible, most scholars still accept that these remarks indicate that Aeschines (and Misgolas probably also) had been an ephebe in ca. 365.¹²³

But even long before Aeschines' time as an ephebe, youths who had just passed out of childhood could be treated as a separate group, especially in a military context. What this "proto-ephebate" entailed is extremely uncertain.

¹²¹ Most importantly: C. Pélèkidis, *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ* (Paris 1962) and O.W. Reinmuth, *The ephebic inscriptions of the fourth century BC* (Leiden 1971). But see David Lewis' critical review of Reinmuth in *CR* 23 (1973) 254-6.

¹²² Harpokration s.v. Ἐπικράτης (= Lyk. Fr. 5.3) informs us that Epikrates, an associate of Lykourgos, "was honoured with a bronze statue for his law concerning the *ephebeia*". Earlier sources seem to suggest that before this time the *ephebeia* was not a continuous service neither that the two years of service were strictly divided according to the tasks to be performed by the ephebes, i.e. as garrisons in Piraeus in the first year and patrolling the country in the second, e.g. Aeschin. 2.167; Xen. *Ways* 4.51-52; Ar. *Frogs* 1087-1088. Ephebic inscriptions only appear after 334/3 (*SEG* 23.78). Our most informative source on the Lykourgan ephebate is [Arist.] *Ath.Pol.* 42.2 (with P.J. Rhodes, *A commentary on the Aristotelian 'Athenaion Politeia'* (2nd ed.) (Oxford 1993) 494-5).

¹²³ On these "false" claims see N.R.E. Fisher, *Aeschines, Against Timarchos* (Oxford 2001) Cf. Aeschines 2.167, where the orator refers to his time as frontier guard "when he passed out of boyhood (παίδων)", for which he calls upon his συνέφήβους and officers to witness.

Some scholars wish to associate it with the famous ephebic oath, others with the phratry-festival called the Apatouria. However, even though the famous ephebic oath on a *stèle* from Acharnai (RO 88), dated to 335/4, seems to contain several fifth-century features, P. Siewert's attempt to show specific traces of it in Thucydides and Sophokles are too general to associate them specifically with the oath.¹²⁴ Pierre Vidal-Naquet has proposed an archaic ephebate as a *rite de passage*, full of reversal patterns, ending in the acceptance of these boys into the Attic phratries by the shaving of their heads at the Apatouria.¹²⁵ However, his claims are mainly based on circumstantial and very late evidence. Although the Apatouria were indeed concerned with the public acceptance of new members into phratry-communities, and a torch-race run by ephebic youths is perhaps to be associated with it, envisaging a quasi-ephebate period for adolescent boys before this acceptance seems unwarranted given the present state of our evidence.¹²⁶

Despite these many uncertainties, the term “*epheboi*” or other terms denoting a male age group on the verge of becoming adult Athenians were already in use in the fifth century. Especially in a military context youths could be singled out long before Aeschines was an ephebe. Thucydides (1.105.4; 2.13.7), for instance, mentions the special employment of *neotatoi* during the Peloponnesian War separate from the adult soldiers of Athens. And Lysias (2.50-51), as already mentioned, could commemorate the valour of “the elderly and those below the age of service” who were sent to help the Megarians in 459/8. But also outside a strictly military context youths seem to have constituted a separate category in the fifth century. So, in Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*, performed in 467, Eteokles underlines the “audacious acts” of his brother Polyneikos by saying that Justice has never acknowledged him or considered him worthy “neither when he escaped the darkness of his mother's womb, nor in childhood, nor at any point in his early manhood (ἐφῆβήσαντά), nor when the

¹²⁴ P. Siewert, ‘The ephebic oath in fifth-century Athens’, *JHS* 97 (1977) 102-11. In 348, Demosthenes (19.303) stated that Aeschines had referred to this oath.

¹²⁵ P. Vidal-Naquet, ‘The Black Hunter and the origin of the Athenian ephebeia’ in: idem, *The Black Hunter. Forms of thought and forms of society in the Greek world* (Baltimore 1986) 106-28.

¹²⁶ On the Apatouria festival see most importantly: S.D. Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica* (2nd ed.) (Ann Arbor 1998) 143-89, esp. 148-51 for a rebuttal of Vidal-Naquet's association of this festival with the *ephebeia*, and Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 458-61. Torch-race at the Apatouria: Istros *FGrH* 334 F 2 A *apud* Harpokration, s.v. λαμπάς, on which see Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 460-1.

beard first thickened on his cheek” (664-666).¹²⁷ These sources clearly demonstrate an Athenian sensitivity to a transitional phase between childhood and manhood in the fifth century, felt first and foremost in military contexts. It was only natural that the (further) definition and negotiation of the status of this group would also find expression through differentiated sharing in the *hiera* of the Athenian community.

Like almost all evidence on the participation of ephebes in polis *hiera*, most evidence for their participation ephebes in the Panathenaic procession is relatively late: Deinarchos’ (16.3) reproach of Agasikles’ sons who “will ascend the Akropolis as ephebes instead of *skaphephoroi*” shows that ephebes formed a demarcated group in the context of the Panathenaic procession in the second half of the fourth century. What their role entailed may be derived from an ephebic inscription (*Hesp.* 16 (1947) no. 67.27-28), dated to 116/5 BC, which records that ephebes are to dedicate the *aristeion*, an excellence award in the form of a crown, at the Panathenaia and the Eleusinia.

Despite the late date of these references, it is nevertheless certain that male youths were already presented as separate from both boys and adult men in the context of other Panathenaic events before this time.¹²⁸ Several Panathenaic *agones* were divided in three age classes. An inscribed list of Panathenaic contests and prizes from the early fourth-century (*IG* II² 2311) shows contests in which boys (*paidēs*), beardless youths (*ageneioi*) and adult men (*andres*) competed separately. After several musical *agones*, we come across athletic contests for boys, like the *stadion*, the pentathlon, boxing, wrestling and the *pankration* (23-37). The same contests are repeated for *ageneioi* (38-50). Although the column breaks off at this point, it is likely that the same competitions are listed once more, this time for the adult men. On the next column we come across several equestrian events apparently without age categories (52-71). Then, the Phyrriic dance is recorded, arranged in three categories, again with beardless youths constituting a category between boys and adults (72-74).

¹²⁷ Cf. H.Y. McCulloch and H.D. Cameron, ‘*Septem* 12-13 and the Athenian *ephebia*’, *ICS* 5 (1980) 1-14, on another allusion to ephebes in Aeschylus’ *Seven against Thebes*.

¹²⁸ Reinmuth, *inscriptions* (1971) 137 and O. Palagia, ‘The ephebes of Erechtheis 333/2 BC (with David Lewis)’, *BSA* 84 (1989) 338, n.17 have identified the equestrian figures clad in *petasos* and *chlamydes* on the Parthenon Frieze (W16-17, S50-55 restored) as early ephebes. The argument is, however, highly conjectural, as Reinmuth himself already admits.

A second indication that youths already participated in the Panathenaia before the late fourth century as a demarcated group comes from some early references to a Panathenaic torch-race, an event usually associated with youths, and later on with ephebes specifically. A Panathenaic torch-race is attested as early as Aristophanes' *Frogs* (1089-1098), performed in 405, and in inscriptions from the first half of the fourth century (*IG* II² 2311, 3019, 3022).¹²⁹ As torch-races were the prerogative of "ephebic" Athenian youths I suggest that the Panathenaic *lampadephoria* constituted a prime context in which male youths were presented as a coherent collective from at least the late fifth century.¹³⁰

Although our earliest evidence for the presence of ephebes in the Panathenaic *pompe* comes from Deinarchos' *Speech against Agasikles*, the early fourth-century prize list shows an earlier concern with the transitional group of "beardless youths" in the context of the Panathenaic *agones*. This Panathenaic concern with youths was in fact exceptional: the Isthmian and Nemean Games knew three age classes as well, including one for beardless youths, but in those cases evidence is postclassical.¹³¹ It thus seems that, in the fourth century at the latest, yet another "group in transition" was integrated into the Panathenaic ritual program, perhaps first in the *agones* and next in the *pompe*. This rather unique concern at the Panathenaia with the transitional phase between boyhood and manhood is comparable to the exceptional care taken to underline the transitional status of *kanephoroi* and *thallophoroi* at this festival. Next to the young girls and the old men in the Panathenaic *pompe*, a group of male youths was included in the procession at some time in the fourth century. They were presented in their promising glory, as about to enter Athenian military life and defend the polis to their best abilities, perhaps most vividly illustrated in conjunction with their participation in the torch-race, "that display of speed and dexterity and teamwork".¹³²

¹²⁹ Cf. Sekunda, N.V., 'IG II² 1250: a decree concerning the *lampadephoroi* of the tribe Aiantis', *ZPE* 83 (1990) 149-156, who also refers to Harpokration s.v. λαμπάς (quoting Polemon's work *On the Painting in the Propylaia*) and Xen. *Ways* 4.51-52.

¹³⁰ Torch-race as quintessentially ephebic: Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 254; Sekunda (1990). An exceptional case is the torch-race at the Bendideia, where Thracians competed on horseback, for which see 277-8 below.

¹³¹ Cf. M. Golden, *Children and childhood* (Baltimore 1990) 67-71.

¹³² Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 254.

5.6 Differentiation: the contributions of the metic population of Athens

In the Panathenaic *pompe* four groups of metics were associated with groups of *kanephoroi*, *thallophoroi* and ephebes in several ways. Through these associations the four groups of young metics, who were on the verge of becoming adult metics, were presented as holding a similar “transitional” status as those other groups. All were expected to soon bring great benefits to the polis community. Metics were, however, also differentiated from these groups; they carried different ritual objects and had different functions. Except for the *skiadephoroi*, they formed clearly separate contingents and, in the case of the *skaphephoroi*, they wore remarkably different clothes. It is my opinion that this differentiation was instrumental in underlining the specific contributions these metics were expected to make to the Athenian community in the near future.

In other words, we should view the details of metic participation in the Panathenaia against the background of the participation of the other “transitional” groups in the Panathenaic procession. That is, as all presenting and celebrating the contributions they were expected to bring to the community. This interpretation is more likely than the one which views the participation of metics as signalling their subordination or as positioning them in an inferior position. It is a common misconception to associate differentiation with subordination or even humiliation. I already argued that the parasols carried by the *skiadephoroi* for the Athenian *kanephoroi* need not necessarily signal subordination in general. To the contrary, when we understand the differentiated participation of the *skiadephoroi* as signalling the specific contributions these girls were about to make, it seems more likely that the parasols highlighted the supportive roles these immigrant girls would soon fulfil in Athens. Also, the crimson cloaks of the *skaphephoroi* made their separate status clearly visible but not necessarily in a negative sense. Crimson was the most expensive colour in antiquity and although it was associated with royalty at the Persian Court in Athens it seems to have been functional in setting someone apart as exceptional, not as royal *per se*.¹³³ It might even be argued that the expensive colour of the cloaks worn by the *skaphephoroi* was meant to evoke the benefits brought to the city by its metic

¹³³ Reinhold (1970) 22-28. For instance, Athenaeus (12.534) tells us the story of how Alkibiades entered the theatre during the City Dionysia dressed in purple and immediately “blinding” the audience with his extravagant behaviour.

population in terms of wealth.¹³⁴ The fact that *skaphephoria* is described as a metic liturgy by some lexicographers, suggesting the metic *skaphephoroi* had to meet the costs of their expensive cloaks themselves, ties in with this idea that at the Panathenaia young metics were symbolically presenting the wealth they had in store.

The idea that metics brought wealth to the city was a not uncommon *topos* in classical Athens.¹³⁵ In his *Ways and Means* (2.1) Xenophon famously argues that the Athenians should make it more attractive for foreigners to settle in Attica and he sketches the current situation as already beneficial for Athens:

αὕτη γὰρ ἡ πρόσοδος τῶν καλλίστων ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ εἶναι, ἐπεὶπερ αὐτοὺς
τρέφοντες καὶ πολλὰ ὠφελούντες τὰς πόλεις οὐ λαμβάνουσι μισθόν, ἀλλὰ
μετοίκιον προσθέρουσιν.

For in them (i.e. the metics) we have one of the very best sources of income, in my opinion, for they are self-supporting and, so far from receiving payment for the many services they render to *poleis*, they contribute by paying the *metoikion*.¹³⁶

Elsewhere, Xenophon (*Hell.* 2.3.21) explains the radical decision of the Thirty to each seize one of the metics and kill the men and confiscate their possessions, “in order to have money to pay the garrison”.¹³⁷ The great advocate of panhellenism, Isokrates (*On the Peace* 21) employs a similar theme when he argues that the Greeks should make peace to resist Philip of Macedon and, delivered from war, live in prosperity and security and “see our city enjoying twice the revenues which she now receives, and thronged with merchants and foreigners and metics, by whom she is now deserted”. We already came across this common notion that metics were expected to bring wealth to the Athenian community in Athena’s

¹³⁴ P.G. Maxwell-Stuart, ‘Remarks on the black cloaks of the ephebes’, *PCPS* 16 (1970) 114, suggested that purple/red was the usual colour in ancient Athens worn by those passing through an intermediate state and he mentions brides and ephebes specifically.

¹³⁵ Cf. G. Bakewell, ‘Lysias 12 and Lysias 31: Metics and Athenian citizenship in the aftermath of the Thirty’, *GRBS* 40 (1999) 5-22, esp. 10-13, discussing the idea that the supposed wealth of metics inflamed the greed of the Thirty, as exploited by Lysias in his speech against Eratosthenes (12) and Philon (31).

¹³⁶ The translation comes from: E.C. Marchant, *Xenophon VII Scripta Minora* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1984) *ad loc.* On the Thirty supposedly being motivated by greed see, P. Krentz, *The Thirty at Athens* (New York and London 1982) 80-3, who suggests that the support of metics of Thrasyboulos also might have played a role. Also see previous note.

¹³⁷ See also Xen., *Hell.* 2.3.41 for Theramenes’ objections against this decision.

speech to the metic Eumenides in Aeschylus' play performed in 458. There Athena advised her servants on how to treat the new metics of the Athenian community. They should be dressed in crimson cloaks, escorted by the light of flaming torches:

so that this kindly company of visitors to our land may show itself afterwards in goodwill that bring prosperity to men (1030-1031)

6 Defining the new metic members of the Athenian community

One of the main flaws of the debate on metic status in general and metic participation in the Panathenaia specifically is that scholars have often argued from preconceived ideas about metic status with a strong institutionalist inclination; legal and financial measures and political exclusion are seen as the pivotal means by which an inferior metic status was “created”, marking metics as outsiders in many arenas of Athenian public life. However, since sharing in the *hiera* of the Athenian polis constituted membership and differentiated sharing was a pivotal means to conceptualise different status groups, the differentiated participation of metics in the Panathenaia (and other festivals) should also be taken into account when looking at the development of metic status.

Significantly, the conceptualisation of a separate metic status through differentiated sharing in the *hiera* of the Athenian polis appears to have preceded any political, juridical and fiscal definition of metics by several decades. In what follows we will look at several vases that depict typical “Panathenaic” metic duties in a religious context. Importantly, most of these can be dated to the first decades of the fifth century, long before other metics defining measures. The duties depicted were probably, and in the case of the *skaphephoria* certainly, also performed at other polis festivals.¹³⁸ This makes that we cannot be certain whether these images refer to the Panathenaia, to another specific polis festival (i.e. the ones that will be discussed in the next chapter), or to festivals in general. The main point, however, is that polis religion was one of the first public arenas in which metics were presented as a separate and coherent group. And since the Panathenaia constituted one of the most prominent events on the religious calendar of Athens and since it is not entirely unlikely that metics were included in this festival first, it is only natural to treat these vases in this chapter.

¹³⁸ Supra, 43-4.

First, a word about the identification of metics on vases is necessary. The great difficulty of understanding generic depictions on ancient vases is commonly accepted nowadays. We are nevertheless justified to identify the youths who carry *skaphai* or *hydriai* and the girls who carry parasols for other girls in a religious context as metics (even though a connection with the Panathenaia is often too strained), for there are several indications for an exclusive association of metics with these duties. Nowhere in our sources do we come across Athenians performing these roles, while the idea that only metics performed these duties is further strengthened by the fact that: 1) metics were often designated as *skaphai* and *skaphephoroi* in New Comedy, that 2) Bekker's *Anecdota* (280, 1 and 304, 7) describes the *skaphephoria* as a typical metic liturgy, and that 3) all lexicons exclusively associate these functions with metics. These then were typical metic duties and we possess around a dozen of images of them: three groups of metics are depicted on the Parthenon Frieze and we have eight images on vases.¹³⁹

On a red-figure *kylix* by the Pan Painter in Oxford (*Ashmolean* 1911.617), dated to around 470, we have one of the earliest depictions of *skaphephoroi*.¹⁴⁰ On the inside of the cup we see a male clad in a *himation*. He is moving to the left while holding a long shallow vessel, which can be identified as a *skaphe* full of irregularly shaped objects.¹⁴¹ The *skaphephoros* looks back at a man carrying a writing-case. Although the context is probably not the Panathenaia it is almost certainly religious for a sacrificial scene is shown on the outside of the cup. There we see a sacerdotal figure accompanied by two youths and a man who is pouring a libation onto a flaming altar. On the other side there is another *skaphephoros* who approaches a low platform on which stands a vessel full of objects similar to the ones carried in the *skaphe*. A bearded man, with one foot on the low platform, holds a stylus and a writing-tablet and is looking at the youth. On the other side

¹³⁹ A small terracotta statue of a girl carrying a stool on her head can probably be identified as *diphrophoros*. This statue is dated to the first half of the fifth century and was found in a grave in the Kerameikos. Waldstein (1890) 144 tenuously suggested that the person buried there had probably served as *diphrophoros*. As *theoxenia* was a very common rite in Greek religion it seems likely that stools were carried on many occasions, making it impossible to identify stool-carrying girls in a context that is not clearly the Panathenaia as metic *diphrophoroi*.

¹⁴⁰ CVA, *Oxford* 1.6 pls. 2.9, 7.3-4, ARV² 559,152. Cf. Van Straten, *Hiera kala* (1995) V195 (fig.145) and J.D. Beazley, 'The master of the Boston Pan-Krater', *JHS* 32 (1912) 362 pl. 9.

¹⁴¹ Perhaps these objects are to be understood as cakes and honeycombs, as Photios (*s.v.* σκάφας) tells us were the contents of the *skaphai* carried by metics in the Panathenaia.

of the platform stands another youth holding something over the platform similar to the objects in the *skaphai*. Behind him stands a bearded man holding a staff and another writing-case. Folkert van Straten points out that this scene seems concerned with the collection and recording of things, but what and on what occasion remains unclear.¹⁴²

A red-figure amphora in the Metropolitan Museum in New York (no.20.244), dated to the same period (i.e. ca. 470) shows another *skaphephoros*. The body of the vase is decorated with a single figure on each side. On one side we see a youth carrying a *skaphe* on his shoulders and on the other a youth holding a branch with his hand in a gesture of greeting. Gisela Richter suggested that the scene refers to an athletic victory though this rests on the misinformed identification of the vessel on the youth's shoulder as a *lebes* a prize often awarded to victorious athletes.¹⁴³ It seems more likely that the scene is a reference to a religious rite: a youth holding a sprig is a common figure in sacrificial scenes.¹⁴⁴ The other side of the amphora, then, is likely to be a depiction of a metic *skaphephoros* bringing cakes and honeycombs as offerings.

Besides these two quite complete vases showing *skaphephoroi*, we also have two fragments. On a red-figure fragment found in the debris from a public dining place in the Athenian Agora, dated to 460-450, we see a youth carrying a *skaphe* on his shoulder following another youth who carries on his shoulder an only partly preserved large vessel (*lebes*, *hydria*, amphora?). We are probably looking at a procession scene with a *skaphephoros*.¹⁴⁵ On a fragment of a *kalyx* krater we see a head of a youth carrying a tray identified by Martin Robertson as a *skaphe*. Detecting an influence of the Parthenon Frieze, he dates the fragment to the late fifth century.¹⁴⁶

Besides these images of *skaphephoroi*, we also have two depictions of *hydriaphoroi*. They were already mentioned earlier when we looked at the sex of these metic water carriers. On the one, a red-figure pelike by the Pan Painter, dated to around 440, we saw a youth who was picking up his *hydria*, ready to

¹⁴² Van Straten, *Hiera kala* (1995) 139-40.

¹⁴³ G.M.A. Richter, 'Red-figured Athenian vases recently acquired by the Metropolitan Museum of Art', *AJA* 27 (1923) 269-71, figs. 6 and 7.

¹⁴⁴ See above n. 117.

¹⁴⁵ Rotroff and Oakley, *Debris* (1992) no.113, pl. 36.

¹⁴⁶ Robertson (1984) 206, pl. 15.2.

follow the *kanephoros* in front of him.¹⁴⁷ On the other, a red-figure fragment attributed to the Dinos Painter, dated to around 420, we saw a *hydriaphoros* in a similar pose.¹⁴⁸ This collection of depictions of metic duties is completed by a red-figure lekythos, dated to 480-470, by the Brygos Painter in the Archaeological Museum in Paestum on which we see a girl shading another girl with a parasol.¹⁴⁹ The sprig held by the smaller child has been identified as an olive branch and seems to indicate a rite in honour of Athena. That the vase depicts a *kanephoros* is corroborated by the fact that the smaller girl is wearing golden earrings and that gold is often associated with *kanephoroi*.¹⁵⁰ This scene therefore almost certainly refers to the Panathenaia, the only occasion where we know *kanephoroi* were shaded by other girls, that is, by metic girls.¹⁵¹

Several important conclusions can be drawn from this overview. First it should be noted that most of these images of ritual duties that were typically performed by metics are dated to the first half of the fifth century, the oldest, the depiction of a *skiadephoros* shading a *kanephoros* at the Panathenaia, dating to 480-470. Based on the first performance of Aeschylus' *Eumenides* in 458 the conventional view is that the initial organisation of metic participation in the Panathenaia should be dated to the 450s. In that play the new metic Eumenides are escorted to their new residence underneath the Areopagus in a procession recalling the Panathenaic one, thus constituting early proof of the incorporation of metics into the Panathenaic *pompe*. Based on the iconographical evidence just presented, however, it seems likely that we can date this initial incorporation even earlier, at least to the 470s.

¹⁴⁷ Paris, *Musée du Louvre* Cp 10793 (ARV² 555.92).

¹⁴⁸ Private collection Herbert Cahn Collection, Basel 23.

¹⁴⁹ Paestum, *Museo Archeologico*, ARV² 384.212.

¹⁵⁰ E.g. Ar. *Ach.* 253-258. Lykourgos provided gold ornaments for *kanephoroi*. Miller (1992) 103 suggests the girl is possibly an *arrephoros*. It is, however, nowhere attested that these girls participated in a festival for Athena while being shaded. The fact that the female figure with the parasol is depicted much larger than the *kanephoros* does not preclude the identification of this figure as metic girl acting as *skiadephoros* and may be explained by the difficulties of rendering an image of a parasol on a vase of this shape.

¹⁵¹ It is true that ritual *skiadephoria* is also attested for the Skira but in that case it was to shade the adult priestess of Athena and the priests of Helios and Poseidon. When we see girls shading other girls we can probably identify them as metic girls shading *kanephoroi* at the Panathenaia.

Secondly, since sharing in polis *hiera* constituted an important aspect of being a member of the Athenian community we should not understand the participation of metics in polis religion as a minor concession but rather as a pivotal and, as we have now established, very early step in the Athenian conceptualisation of immigrants as a separate group of metics. Traditionally it is believed that metic status developed from a rough indication of a separate immigrant status in Kleisthenes' time. The occurrence of the term *μετάοικον* in the already mentioned, late sixth-century epigram honouring the Naxian Anaxilas (*SEG* 22.79) seems in fact to reflect an early notion of people who could be distinguished from both native Athenians and *xenoi*. The notion of a separate "metic" status was in fact so novel at the time of this epigram that the cutter mistakenly engraved *μετέοικον* and changed it later into *μετάοικον*.¹⁵²

According to Whitehead, it was from this late sixth-century "blueprint" that later metic status (*metoikia*) developed into its fully evolved, fourth-century form with political exclusion, liability to certain taxes and a separate juridical status as its main characteristics. Despite obvious teleological weaknesses in this kind of reasoning and although we have references to metics in the first half of the fifth century – like in the Skambonidai decree (*IG* I³ 244.C2-4), dated to ca. 460, mentioning *metoikoi* sharing in a sacrifice to Leos together with the Skambonid demesmen, and references to metics and *metoikia* in several plays of Aeschylus (e.g. *Pers.* 319, *Seven* 548, *Suppl.* 609, *Eum.* 1011 and 1018) – most scholars still wish to date the "full" institutionalisation of metic status to the second half of the fifth century. In that period, important phases in the development of a metic status were marked by Perikles' Citizenship Law in 451/0, which practically excluded metics from marrying native Athenians, and the first occurrence of the "*oikein en...*" formulation in a decree of 413/2 (*IG* I³ 421 b.33) indicating some form of registration of metics in demes perhaps for military or fiscal purposes.¹⁵³

¹⁵² Epigram: Baba (1984). The famous Themistokles decree (*ML* 23) mentions the enrolment of τοὺς ξένοισι τοὺς οἰκοῦντας Ἀθηνησι (6-7) in the Athenian fleet and is often pressed as evidence for the existence of *metoikia* in the 480s. This reading rests on restorations and, more importantly, the decree as a whole is almost certainly a fourth-century fabrication. Cf. C. Habicht, 'Falsche Urkunden zur Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter der Perserkriege', *Hermes* 89 (1961) 1-35 and most recently J.K. Davies, 'Documents and 'documents' in fourth century historiography' in: P. Carlier (ed.), *Le IV e Siècle av. J-C: Approches historiographiques* (1996 Paris) 29-40. See, however, H. van Wees, *Greek warfare. Myths and realities* (London 2004) 208, 216, and esp. 248, who argues that although it is certainly a fourth-century fabrication, the decree in fact reflects a very real decision and records accurately the procedures used to mobilise the Athenian fleet in 480.

¹⁵³ Most importantly: Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 140-54. On *politai* see Blok (2005).

Recently, George Bakewell argued that Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women*, performed ca. 463, provides support for a date for the institutionalisation of *metoikia* in the 460s. Although the term "metic" does not occur in *Suppliant Women*, the centrality of foreign residents and their status in the polis in this play indeed seem to point to a heightened concern with this newly defined group.¹⁵⁴ However, from the evidence just presented we may now conclude that 1) metics were conceptualised and presented as a separate group even earlier than this, in the 470s at the latest, and that 2) the context in which this first happened was a religious one. It was only after this initial incorporation of foreign residents as metics into Athenian ritual that metic status was further carved out in other contexts.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have argued that the details of the participation of metics in the Panathenaia are indicative of the specific membership this newly conceptualised status group held in the Athenian community. When we looked at these details it became clear that metics 1) were associated with and presented as one of the transitional groups in the Panathenaic procession, 2) were similarly expected to soon make their own contributions to the community, and 3) that the specific contributions of metics are probably best understood in terms of the support and wealth the young metics marching in the procession were soon to bring. Significantly, polis religion, with the Panathenaia as one of the main ingredients, was one of the first contexts in which metics were presented as a clearly recognisable and coherent collective of people and acknowledged as such by the Athenians. Vase depictions of typical metic duties support a date as early as the 470s for the incorporation of these resident foreigners as metics in Athenian ritual. That they were expected to bring wealth to the city and offer support to the Athenians was thus one of the first labels attached to this newly conceptualised group, one moreover that stuck with metic status throughout the whole classical period, as we can tell from remarks in Xenophon and Isokrates.

In her discussion of the presentation of the Panathenaic procession on the Parthenon Frieze Jennifer Neils states that

¹⁵⁴ G.W. Bakewell, 'Μετοίκια in the *Supplikes* of Aeschylus', *CA* 16 (1997) 209-28.

[...] just as civic parades today feature young men in their prime (football players or astronauts), beautiful girls (cheerleaders or pom-pom girls), and distinguished older leaders (statesmen and politicians), so in ancient art religious processions always present something of an ideal in their accentuation of youth, beauty and wisdom.¹⁵⁵

It should be clear that the Athenians also expressed a great amount of pride in their youthful metic population on the occasion of the greatest of their parades. They were excited in anticipation of the contributions of wealth and support these immigrants were expected to make, something unfortunately still largely absent in most modern, western societies.

¹⁵⁵ Neils, *Frieze* (2001) 186.

Chapter 2

Metics at other polis festivals

The negotiation of metic status in the second half of the fifth century

After their incorporation into the Panathenaic *pompe* in the early fifth century, metics became included in several more *hiera* of the Athenian polis. This chapter deals with the various instances of metic participation in the Lenaia, the City Dionysia, the Hephaisteia, and the Mysteries – four polis festivals in which resident foreigners were allowed or required to participate from the second half of the fifth century onwards. In that way, metics were both integrated in the Athenian community more firmly and, through demarcated participation, differentiated from other members of the community as a separate group on more occasions. Significantly, this inclusion of metics in more polis *hiera* coincides with several Athenian measures in second half of the fifth century that made it easier to distinguish different status groups more precisely, most importantly Perikles' Citizenship Law of 451/0, restricting citizenship to those born of an Athenian mother and an Athenian father, and, in the case of metics, the institution of a special metic tax and the use of the “metic *demotikon*”, the “οἰκεῖν ἐν”-formula, from the late fifth century onwards.¹ Concerning metic status scholars usually focus on these institutional demarcations. However, in order to arrive at a more comprehensive understanding of the position of metics in Athenian society in this tumultuous period we also need to examine the ways in which metics were incorporated in more polis *hiera* in the second half of the fifth century.

¹ On the development of metic status in the fifth century from an institutional perspective: D. Whitehead, *The ideology of the Athenian metic* (Cambridge 1977) 140-59.

Despite the importance of differentiated participation in Athenian polis religion for the conceptualisation of different social statuses, the differentiated participation of metics in polis festivals has not received the attention it deserves when dealing with metic status. As said before, the focus in most studies lies instead on the legal and fiscal measures excluding metics from several aspects of Athenian public life and marking them as a special group.² Josine Blok has recently taken a first important step to fill this lacuna in our understanding when she stated that in a time when Athenians and metics were increasingly separated from each other through several political, juridical and fiscal measures, the inclusion of metics into more *hiera* was crucial in preventing the disintegration of the Athenian community. She argues that, since sharing in the *hiera* of the Athenian polis was a qualifying mark of the members of the community, the incorporation of metics in more polis festivals could secure the cohesion of the group at large.³

There were good reasons to prevent too much of a gap between metics and Athenians. Metics were important to the Athenians and considered indispensable. They were to be treasured because they brought wealth and prosperity to the city. One way to maintain and strengthen the ties between metics and Athenians and safeguard the precious cohesion of the community was to include metics in more polis festivals. Cohesion was, however, not all that was established, for, in conjunction with the tendency to distinguish status groups more precisely, the separate membership of metics was also displayed and negotiated on more occasions by means of differentiated participation. By regulating the differentiated participation of metics in these festivals, the Athenians could thus both stress the polis membership of metics and negotiate a separate metic status.

Although we do not have as much information on the participation of metics in these festivals as we have for the Panathenaia, the evidence we do have clearly illustrates the attempts of the Athenians to come to terms with this large group of

² The main exception is from over a century ago when M. Clerc, *Les métèques athéniens: étude sur la condition légale, la situation morale et le rôle social et économique des étrangers domiciliés à Athènes* (Paris 1893) 176, stated: “C’est donc qu’ils avaient dans la cité leur place nettement déterminée, et rien ne les distingue plus nettement des étrangers que leur admission à la religion de la cité. [...] C’est donc la religion qui, mieux que tout, nous révèle la véritable condition des métèques athéniens [...].” He nevertheless discussed the role of metics in religion in isolation.

³ J.H. Blok, ‘Fremde, Bürger und Baupolitik im klassischen Athen’, *Historische Anthropologie* 15 (2007) 309-26.

resident foreigners in the second half of the fifth century. The sources show a balancing act on the part of the Athenians as they incorporated metics into more polis festivals, thus reinforcing their membership to the community, while also differentiating them from the other members by having metics participate in a specific manner. We will see that at the Lenaia metics sat in the audience, sang in the choruses and acted as *choregos*, participating in this ancient festival undifferentiated from the Athenian participants. At the City Dionysia metic *skaphephoroi* walked in procession but in the theatre they were largely grouped among the *xenoi* and excluded from performing the *choregia*. The balancing act is perhaps most clearly illustrated in the case of the Hephaisteia, where metics shared in the sacrifices to Hephaistos and Athena but where their share was a limited one compared to that of the Athenians. Finally, at the Mysteries, that great showcase of Panhellenism, metics could perform the act of mediator between foreigners wishing to be initiated and the authorities at Eleusis.

In this chapter the metic participation in each of these four polis festivals will be examined. It will become clear in what ways the Athenians could incorporate resident foreigners into their community and how the same group was displayed as essentially different from the other participating members of the community. By dealing with both movements of incorporation and differentiation at each festival I shall illustrate the balancing act the Athenians performed in dealing with metics in the context of polis religion; on the one hand solidifying the ties between metics and the Athenian community, on the other hand highlighting a separate status for resident foreigners.

1 Metics at the Lenaia – a showcase of unity

The first festival we will look at is the Lenaia, a very ancient festival in honour of Dionysos in which metics participated in several ways: they sat in the audience to watch the tragic and comic performances, they sang in the choruses and perhaps most significantly, they could act as *choregos*, paying all expenses for a Lenaian chorus. Aristophanes (*Ach.* 504-508) famously remarks that at the Lenaia metics and Athenians were “amongst themselves” and other sources indicate that this view is not to be solely ascribed to Aristophanes’ personal view: at the Lenaia the free, male population of Attica collectively worshipped Dionysos Lenaios, with metics and Athenians participating undifferentiated from each other.

1.1 The Lenaia – ancient, Athenian and intimate

The Lenaia were an ancient festival in honour of Dionysos Lenaios, celebrated mid-winter, around the twelfth of Gamelion.⁴ The name of the festival and Dionysos' epithet most probably go back to a Greek term for Maenads (λήναι), which suggests that the festival focussed on the rather orgiastic side of the civilising wine-god.⁵ Only few and often late sources mention the festival. The Aristotelean *Ath. Pol.* (57.1) contains the statement that the Archon Basileus was in charge. It is stated that

ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς πρῶτον μὲν μυστηρίων ἐπιμελεῖται μετὰ τῶν ἐπιμελητῶν
ᾧν ὁ δῆμος χειροτονεῖ, δύο μὲν ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων, ἓνα δὲ ἐξ
Εὐμολπιδῶν, ἓνα δὲ ἐκ Κηρύκων. ἔπειτα Διονυσίων τῶν ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ· ταῦτα
δέ ἐστι πομπή τε καὶ ἀγών. τὴν μὲν οὖν πομπὴν κοινῇ πέμπουσιν ὁ τε
βασιλεὺς καὶ οἱ ἐπιμεληταί, τὸν δὲ ἀγῶνα διατίθουσιν ὁ βασιλεὺς.

And the Basileus supervises, first, the Mysteries, in co-operation with the *epimeletai* who the *demos* elect by show of hands, two from all the Athenians, one from the Eumolpidae and one from the Kerykes. Next, the Dionysia in the Lenaion; this festival consists of a procession and a competition, the former conducted by the Basileus and the *epimeletai* jointly, the latter organised by the Basileus.

The fact that the Basileus, the alleged successor of the old kings of Attica, was in charge of the Lenaia signals the festival's antiquity, for it is also stated in the *Ath. Pol.* (3.3) that the Basileus was in charge of "the ancestral rites" (τῶν πατρίων) together with the Polemarchos, while the more recently instituted Eponymous Archon administered "merely the duties added later on". The first Eponymous Archon is often, based on the "chronology" of Eratosthenes of Alexandria, dated to 683/2 and some have accordingly suggested that all rites in charge of the Basileus, including the Lenaia, should be dated to before this year.⁶ Although I

⁴ The sources were collected by A. Pickard-Cambridge, revised by J.P.A. Gould and D.M. Lewis, *The dramatic festivals of Athens*² (Oxford 1991) 25-42 and E. Csapo and W.J. Slater, *The context of ancient drama* (Ann Arbor 1995) 132-7. On the date: J.D. Mikalson, *The sacred and civil calendar of the Athenian year* (Princeton 1975) 109-10, who suggests a date between 12 and 21 Gamelion.

⁵ *DFA*² 29-30.

⁶ E.g. K. Clinton, 'The sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis' in: N. Marinatos and R. Hägg (eds.), *Greek sanctuaries: new approaches* (London 1993) 112. Cf. P.J. Rhodes, *A commentary on the Aristotelian 'Athenaion Politeia'* (2nd ed.) (Oxford 1993) *ad loc.* 3.3 and

am reluctant to apply such a rigid divide, at least in classical times the Lenaia were perceived as very ancient.⁷

The Lenaia consisted of a *pompe* and an *agon*, as the author of the *Ath. Pol.* (57.1) states. The procession appears to have been quite a disorderly affair. We do not know much about who participated and in what way but if the name Lenaia and the epithet Lenaios indeed came from a Greek term for Maenads (ληναι), we should probably include these female worshippers of Dionysos in the *pompe* and/or similar orgiastic groups. This corresponds well with what we read in Photios (*s.v.* τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀμαξῶν) that the procession of the Lenaia, like the one of the Anthesteria, included “revellers on wagons who mocked and abused everyone they met”, a custom commonly known as ritual *aischrologia*.⁸ These Maenadic and abusive aspects may suggest we have to imagine a *komos*, a wild and festive procession common for Dionysos, rather than a *pompe*, which was a more sober escorting of sacrifices and/or sacred items, but our sources are univocally clear that the Lenaia only included the latter.⁹

After the arrival of this festive *pompe*, sacrifices were offered to Dionysos, probably in his sanctuary called the Lenaion, which was most likely located in the Agora.¹⁰ The so-called Lykourgan skin-sale records of the 330s (*IG II² 1496*)

57.1, who is more sceptical concerning Eratosthenes’ dating of the first archon basileus and T.J. Cadoux, ‘The Athenian archons from Kreon to Hypsichides’, *JHS* 68 (1948) 70-123 on the archon lists. That the Lenaia were celebrated in several Ionian poleis can also be understood as a sign of the antiquity of this festival. Cf. Hesiod, *Works* 504 with scholia.

⁷ In Roman times the Basileus was still in charge. In *IG II² 2130*, dated to 192/3 AD, we come across the statement that the Basileus “has carried out the *agones* of the Lenaia” (59-63).

⁸ The expression “from the wagon” was used by Demosthenes (18.122) to characterise Aeschines’ attack on him as abusive and “carnavalesque”. See also the slightly confused glosses in Σ *Ar. Knights* 546 and Suda *s.v.* ἐξ ἀμάξης who both state that “from the wagon” referred to the poets who used to sing comical poems while sitting on wagons. It is however, abundantly clear that the poets performed their plays in a theatrical setting. On *aischrologia* in the context of the (rural) Dionysia: S.G. Cole, ‘Procession and celebration at the Dionysia’ in: R. Scodel (ed.), *Theater and society in the classical world* (Ann Arbor 1993) 33-4, who refers to H. Fluck, *Skurrile Riten in griechischen Kulte* (Endingen 1931) for the evidence on *aischrologia* in Greek cult.

⁹ Classical sources mentioning the *pompe*: Dem. 21.10; [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 57.1.

¹⁰ The Lenaion has not been located. What most of our (late) sources agree on is that before the Dionysian theatre was built on the south slope of the Akropolis the Lenaian *agones* took place in the Athenian Agora and this is where we should expect to find the Lenaion. Cf. Hesychius *s.v.* ἐπι Ληναίῳ ἀγῶν; Σ Dem.18.129; Photios *s.v.* Λήναιον, ἴκρια and ὀρχήστρα. A reference in Xenophon (*Hipp.* 3.2) to “choruses giving additional pleasure by performing dances in honour of the Twelve Gods and others” during the Dionysia might point to a more exact location of the Lenaion near the Altar of the Twelve Gods. F. Kolb,

show that in 332/1 an amount of 106 drachma was handed over by the *strategoí* from the sale of the skins of the animals sacrificed on the occasion of the Lenaia (105-106), suggesting that between 15 and 24 (bovine) animals were sacrificed that year.¹¹ Even when “only” 15 oxen were sacrificed, this would yield as much as 1400 to 1680kg of meat.¹² At least in the Lykourgan period a large crowd of people could thus share in the sacrifices offered to Dionysos Lenaios. It was probably after these sacrifices that an Eleusinian official, the *dadouchos*, “summoned the god” to which the audience would answer “Son of Semele, Iacchos, bringer of Wealth”.¹³ Besides this role of the *dadouchos* and the involvement in the *pompe* of the *epimeletai*, two of whom chosen from Eleusinian *gene*, there are also other Eleusinian connections: in 339, for instance, Eleusinian *epistatai* sacrificed on the occasion of the Lenaia (*IG II²* 1672.182) and in 333/2 the sale of the skins from the Lenaia was handled by the *epimeletai* of the Mysteries (*IG II²* 1496.74-5). This Eleusinian presence at the Lenaia preliminary to the theatrical *agones* should probably, as Deubner suggested, be seen against the general background of the similarities between the Mysteries and the orgiastic aspects of this part of the Lenaia.¹⁴

After the “summoning of the god”, the festival continued with competitions in both tragedy and comedy. These *agones* were probably already part of the Lenaia in the sixth century. Several lexicographic sources inform us that after the collapse of wooden bleachers (*ikria*) in the Agora, commonly dated to around

Agora und Theater, Volks- und Festversammlung (Berlin 1981) 20-58, argues for a widespread association in antiquity between agora and theatre. More recently, Ch. Schnurr, ‘Zur Topographie der Theaterstätten und der Tripodenstrasse in Athen’, *ZPE* 105 (1995) 139-45, argued that the Lenaion should probably be located in the Old Agora, east of the Akropolis. Cf. N.W. Slater, ‘The Lenaean theatre’, *ZPE* 66 (1986) 255-64, who tenuously identified the sanctuary of Dionysos in the Marshes near the Ilissos river as the Lenaion.

¹¹ W.S. Ferguson, ‘Orgeonika’, *Hesp. Suppl.* 8 (1949) 144-5 argued that a single hide was sold for 4.5 drachma, as he believed a hecatomb was sacrificed on the occasion of the Bendideia in 334/3 raising 457 drachma from the sale of hides (*IG II²* 1496.86). M.H. Jameson, ‘Sacrifice and animal husbandry in classical Greece’, *PCPhS Suppl.* 14 (1988) 107-12, suggested 6-7 drachma per hide instead based on a relation between the price of cattle and that of wheat throughout antiquity.

¹² V.J. Rosivach, *The system of public sacrifice in fourth-century Athens* (Atlanta 1994) 157-8, suggests on the basis of African cattle that an Athenian ox might yield as much as 100-120kg of meat.

¹³ Ar. *Frogs* 479 with scholion. Another similarity could be the ritual *aischrologia*, which is otherwise only attested for the Anthesteria (Photius *s.v.* τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀμαξῶν) and the Eleusinian festivals of the Eleusinia and the Mysteries (Suda *s.v.* τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀμαξῶν σκῶμματα).

¹⁴ L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1966) 125-6.

500, the theatre of Dionysos was built and the dramatic *agones* previously held in the market-place were moved to the south slope of the Akropolis.¹⁵ Photios (*s.v.* ἰκρία), for instance, tells us that *ikria* stood “in the Agora from which they used to watch the Dionysian *agones* before the theatre in the sanctuary of Dionysos was built”. Hesychius (*s.v.* ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ ἀγών) informs us that “the Athenian *agones* were held in the sanctuary of Dionysos Lenaios before the theatre was constructed”. Hesychius’ explicit mention of the Lenaion indicates that the Dionysian *agones* being performed in the Agora before the collapse of *ikria* around 500 included the Lenaian *agones*. After this event the dramatic *agones* of the Lenaia were then most likely performed in the theatre on the south slope.

The Lenaian dramatic *agones* seem to have become an even more pronounced aspect of the festival in the 440s-430s. It was probably in this period that polis authorities began recording the names of victorious poets and actors and perhaps awarding prizes for the first time. We possess several fragments of fourth- and early third-century victor lists, once part of small buildings inside the theatre-district. They record victories won at the Lenaia and the City Dionysia going back, it seems, to the period when victories were first recorded. The list of Lenaian victors in comedy goes back to the poet Xenophilos (*IG II² 2325.118*), whose first Lenaian victory can probably be dated to ca. 442, while the list of tragic victors starts in ca. 432 with the poet Chairestratos (*IG II² 2325. 248*).¹⁶

Each comic poet competed with one play and each tragic poet with two. Exactly how many poets could enter the Lenaian competitions is uncertain; in the classical period between three and five comic poets competed where two or three poets could enter the tragic competition.¹⁷ These performances were financed

¹⁵ On the collapse of the *ikria* in the Agora, dated to ca. 500: H.A. Thompson and R.E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens: the history, shape, and uses of an ancient city center* (*The Athenian Agora* 14) (Princeton 1972) 126-9. Besides the archaeological finds of potholes in the Agora often associated with these wooden stands, the date is mainly based on an entry in the *Suda* (*s.v.* Πρατίννας) on Pratinas, allegedly the first poet to write a satyr play, in which it is stated that during a contest between Pratinas, Aeschylus and Choirilos in the 70th Olympiad (i.e. 500-497): “the *ikria* on which the spectators stood collapsed and as a result of this a theatre was built for the Athenians”.

¹⁶ *DFA² 116-25*; Csapo and Slater, *Context* (1995) 133-4. J. Rusten, ‘The four “new Lenaeon victors” of 428-5 B.C. (and the date of the first Lenaeon comedy reconsidered)’, *ZPE* 157 (2006) 22-6, suggests a date between 444-441 for the beginning of comic competitions, while W. Luppe, ‘Nochmals zum Einführungstermin der Komödien-Agone an den Lenäen’, *ZPE* 159 (2007) 25-7, argues for 443-439.

¹⁷ In the Hellenistic *Didaskaliai*-lists, naming victorious poets and actors of the Lenaia and the City Dionysia, it is recorded that two tragic poets competed annually in 420-418 (*IG II² 2319.70-84*), while three tragic victors are given for 364/3 (*Hesp.* 40 (1971) 302-07).

through the institution of *choregia*, the financing of choruses by the wealthiest inhabitants of Attica.¹⁸ Between five and eight *choregoi* were thus needed to finance the Lenaian choruses. The earliest reference to a Lenaian *choregos* is found in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (1150), performed in 425. I find it likely, however, that it was already in the 440s-430s, i.e. in a period of increasing regulation of the Lenaia by polis authorities, that the Athenians had made the wealthy inhabitants of Attica liable to finance the Lenaian choruses. *Choregia* is first attested around this time, in 440-431, in relation to the Dionysia held in the deme Ikarion (*IG I³ 254*) and it is certainly a possibility that the Athenians decided to institute this mechanism to finance the ca. thirty annual dramatic and dithyrambic choruses at the City Dionysia, the Lenaia and the Thargelia at roughly the same time.¹⁹

1.2 Metics at the Lenaia – spectators, chorus-members, choregoi

The Lenaia were a strictly Athenian affair. Aristophanes (*Ach.* 505-506) referred to the absence of visiting *xenoi* and allies in the theatre on the occasion of the Lenaia to contrast the festival's intimate nature to that of the cosmopolitan City Dionysia. It was probably due to rough weather conditions that the Athenians were by themselves at the time of the Lenaia, with visiting *xenoi*, foreign traders, and troops coming to Athens only months later. It is interesting to observe, then, that it was at this ancient, orgiastic, agonistic, and quite intimate festival that the Athenians decided to include metics and have them share in the *hiera* of Dionysos Lenaios.

So what was the role of metics at the Lenaia? In a famous passage in his *Acharnians* (497-508), performed at the Lenaia of 425, Aristophanes refers to the presence of metics in the audience. The poet emphasises the intimate setting of

Similarly, several hypotheses to Aristophanes' Lenaian plays (i.e. *Acharnians* (425), *Knights* (424), *Wasps* (422), and *Frogs* (405)), mention three comic poets at the Lenaia while four are referred to in the *Didaskaliai*-lists concerning the fourth-century (*IG II² 2322.92-96*) and even five concerning the early third (*IG II² 2319.59-66*). There is no way of telling whether the lower number attested in the late fifth-century was due to a temporary war-time reduction. Cf. J.K. Davies, 'Demosthenes on liturgies: a note', *JHS* 87 (1967) 34 and W. Luppe, 'Ein weiteres Zeugnis für fünf Konkurrenten und den Komödien-Agonen während des Peloponnesischen Krieges', *ZPE* 129 (2000) 19-20.

¹⁸ On *choregia* in general: P. Wilson, *The Athenian institution of the khoregia: the chorus, the city and the stage* (Cambridge 2000).

¹⁹ For the number of liturgies in Athens: Davies (1967) 33-40.

the festival by pointing out that *xenoi* and allies are absent in the audience and he implies that on the occasion of the Lenaia resident foreigners were conceptualised as a vital part of the Athenian community. In this passage Dikaiopolis explains why Kleon, Aristophanes' favourite victim, will have to admit that slandering the city is less harmful in front of a Lenaian audience than in front of the audience at the City Dionysia:

497 μὴ μοι φρονήσητ' ἄνδρες οἱ θεώμενοι,
εἰ πτωχὸς ὢν ἔπειτ' ἐν Ἀθηναίοις λέγειν
μέλλω περὶ τῆς πόλεως. τρυγωδιαν ποιῶν
500 τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον ᾔδει καὶ τρυγωδία.
ἐγὼ δὲ λέξω δεινὰ μὲν δίκαια δέ.
οὐ γὰρ με νῦν γε διαβαλεῖ Κλέων ὅτι
ξένων παρόντων τὴν πόλιν κακῶς λέγω.
αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἐσμεν οὐπὶ Ληναίῳ τ' ἀγών,
505 κοῦπω ξένοι πάρεισιν· οὔτε γὰρ φόροι
ἤκουσιν οὔτ' ἐκ τῶν πόλεων οἱ ξύμμαχοι·
ἀλλ' ἐσμεν αὐτοὶ νῦν γε περοεπτισμένοι·
508 τοὺς γὰρ μετοίκους ἄχυρα τῶν ἀστῶν λέγω.

Be not indignant with me, members of the audience, if, though a beggar, I speak before the Athenians about the polis in comedy. For even comedy is acquainted with justice, and what I have to say will be shocking but just. This time Kleon will not allege that I am slandering the city in the presence of strangers; for we are by ourselves now, it is the Lenaian competition and there are no strangers yet; neither tribute nor troops have arrived from the allies. This time we are by ourselves ready hulled, for I consider the metics as the bran of the citizens.²⁰

In this metaphor the metics are likened to the part of grain that remained after a first hull. The metics the bran (ἄχυρα), which, together with the groats, remained after the grain had been pounded in a mortar and the useless husk, the coverings, i.e. the *xenoi*, had been hulled out (περοεπτισμένοι) in the first stage in the preparation of meal or flour. What was left was a mixture of groats (Athenians) and bran (metics). After this stage, the bran could either be sifted out or ground into flour together with the groats, which was commonly used to make Athenian

²⁰ The translation comes from A.H. Sommerstein, *Acharnians* (Warminster 1980) *ad loc.* with small modifications.

bread.²¹ In other words: while *xenoi* were absent, metics were sitting among the spectators watching the Lenaian *agones*.

Metics could also participate in the Lenaia in a more active way. Scholia to Aristophanes' *Wealth* (953c+d) inform us that

οὐκ ἔξιῆν ξένον χορεύειν ἐν τῷ ἀστικῷ χορῷ [...] ἐν δὲ τῷ Ληναίῳ ἔξιῆν·
ἐπεὶ καὶ μέτοικοι ἐχορήγουν.

It was not allowed for a stranger to dance in the city choruses [...] but in the Lenaian ones it was, since metics were *choregoi* [there].²²

Peter Wilson sees this passage as a clear example of the close ideological association between a *choregos* and his chorus. Just as a chorus at the City Dionysia was organised by a wealthy Athenian and had to consist wholly of Athenian citizens, a chorus at the Lenaia, as the scholia indicates, could be led by a metic *choregos* and could *therefore* include foreigners. Wilson rightly adds that, despite this close link between *choregos* and chorus, “it would surely be wrong to imagine that only metic *khoregoi* could employ foreigners; such a potential benefit will not have been granted the metic and denied the citizen”, and there is in fact an example of an Athenian and a metic cooperating with a comic chorus at the Lenaia around 400.²³ Apparently, at the Lenaia the ideological conformity between *choregos* and chorus lay in the fact that the Lenaian choral *agon* was open to *all free men living in Attica*, whereas the *choregoi* and chorus-members at the City Dionysia were all Athenian citizens.²⁴

The Lenaia were the only polis festival at which metics could act as *choregos*.²⁵ It is interesting to observe that of the seven known Lenaian *choregoi*

²¹ Sommerstein, *Acharnians* (1980) 180, and Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 39.

²² Since the Lenaia are mentioned, the city choruses should be understood as the ones of the City Dionysia for which a law is attested excluding *xenoi* from certain choruses, which I will discuss in the next section.

²³ Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 29. On the so-called Onesippos' Herm (*SEG* 32.239), dated to around 400, we find the Lenaian *choregos* Sosikrates, most likely a metic, together with the Athenian poet Nikochares.

²⁴ On the “civic purity” of the choruses of the City Dionysia: Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 80-1.

²⁵ In the next chapter we will look at the possibility of metic *choregoi* at the rural Dionysia in Ikarion.

five are securely identified as metics.²⁶ Most famous among these are Lysias and his brother Polemarchos, who, as Lysias claims (12.20), had deserved a better treatment at the hands of the Thirty Tyrants after performing *choregia* for the city. In addition, two metics are recorded as *choregoi* in an inscription of 331/0 listing liturgists who had dedicated a *phiale* after performing their duty (ed. *Hesp.* 37 (1968) no. 51): we find Timon, who, it is stated, was a metic living in Melite and who had been *choregos* of a tragic chorus, and (probably) another metic *choregos*, living in Lakiadai (46-50).²⁷ As metics were only allowed to perform the *choregia* at the Lenaia, we should understand these two men as metic Lenaian *choregoi*. Finally, on the so-called Onesippos' Herm (*SEG* 32.239.3), dated to ca. 400, a certain Sosikrates is recorded as the victorious *choregos* in comedy of that year. He is mentioned with his occupation, probably suggesting he was of metic status. Clearly then, the possibility to act as *choregos* at the Lenaia was actively taken up by the rich metics of Athens. From what time they could actually do so is not exactly known. Most likely is that the Athenians decided that metics could finance Lenaian choruses around the same time that witnessed an increasing formalisation of the Lenaian *agones* and *choregia*, i.e. in the 440s-430s.²⁸

Besides the role of spectator, *choregos* and chorus-member, there is a slight, though I think unlikely chance that metics participated in the Lenaian procession as *skaphephoroi*. The Suda (s.v. 'Ασκὸς ἐν πάχυνῃ) mentions that

ἐν ταῖς Διονυσιακαῖς πομπαῖς, τὰ μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀστῶν ἐπράττετο, τὰ δὲ τοῖς μετοίκοις ποιεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν νομοθετησάντων προσετέτακτο. οἱ μὲν οὖν μέτοικοι χιτῶνας ἐνεδύοντο χρώμα ἔχοντας φοινικῶν καὶ σκάφας ἔφερον· ὄθεν σκαφηφόροι προσηγορεύοντο.

In the Dionysiac processions, some things were done by the *astoi*, while others had been assigned to the metics to do by the lawgivers; accordingly

²⁶ Unclear is the status of 1) Antimachos (*PA* 1106) who is mocked by the chorus in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (1150-1173) after sending them home on the occasion of the Lenaia without providing dinner for them and of 2) Stratonikos who is listed only with his patronymic on the so-called Onesippos Herm (*SEG* 32.239.3) as *choregos* for a Lenaian tragedy in ca. 400.

²⁷ D.M. Lewis, 'Dedications of *phialai* at Athens', *Hesp.* 37 (1968) 368-80.

²⁸ Csapo and Slater, *Context* (1995) 133. Cf. Wilson, *Choregia* (2000) 28, who interprets this "concession" as a compensation "at a time when their inferior status had recently been given sharper focus by Perikles' citizenship laws".

the metics wore crimson-coloured cloaks and carried basins, for which they were called *skaphephoroi*.²⁹

These “Dionysiac processions” would at least have included the procession of the City Dionysia, a polis-wide *pompe* including several differentiated groups associated with Athens, to which we will turn in the next section. Although there remains a small possibility that the Lenaian procession also included *skaphephoroi*, I think that this sharply demarcated participation of metics and Athenian *astoi* fits the context of the City Dionysia better than the Lenaia, where metics and Athenians participated quite undifferentiated from each other. It is more likely that metics walked in the Lenaian *pompe* undifferentiated from the other marchers, just as they sat in the audience and competed in the dramatic *agones* in an undifferentiated manner.

1.3 The truth in Aristophanes: being amongst themselves

Some time in the 440s-430s metics were incorporated in the Lenaian festival in many ways, thus sharing in many of the *hiera* of Dionysos Lenaios.³⁰ But how far did this incorporation go? Let us take another look at Aristophanes’ *Acharnians* (497-508). Dikaiopolis’ comments on the composition of the Lenaian audience are not straightforward observations. The passage is clearly coloured by Dikaiopolis’, or rather Aristophanes’ wish to attack Kleon, who had formally accused Aristophanes in the *Boule* of “slandering the city in front of strangers” after Kleon had been attacked by Aristophanes in his *Babylonians* in 426.³¹ In wishing to argue that although speaking critically about Athenian attitudes towards the Spartans he is not slandering the city “in front of strangers” this time, Dikaiopolis contrasts the audience of the City Dionysia, where visiting foreigners and allies *were* to be present and where critique would thus have a wider reach,

²⁹ Repeated almost *verbatim* in Bekker, *Anecd.* 214,3.

³⁰ That choruses were considered gifts to the gods and thus as *hieros* can be inferred from two oracular responses cited by Demosthenes in his *Speech against Meidias*, which order the Athenians to “not forget Bacchus, and joining all in these dances, down your broad-spaced streets in thanks for the gifts of the season” (Delphi) and “to pay public sacrifices, mix a bowl of wine and set up dances to Dionysos” (Dodona) (21.52-53). Demosthenes also stresses the impiety (*ἀσέβειαν*) of Meidias’ act of tampering with a (i.e. Demosthenes’) chorus (21.51) though here especially the orator is over-qualifying the acts of his enemy, aiming for the enraged reactions of the jurors.

³¹ On which see the ‘Introduction’ in Sommerstein, *Acharnians* (1980).

with the Lenaian audience, where *xenoi*, as Dikaiopolis emphasises, were in fact absent. Faced by the presence of metics, however, who could of course be thought of as *xenoi* in certain contexts, Dikaiopolis repeatedly tries to underscore the intimacy of the festival and the unity between Athenians and metics by addressing the audience commonly as Ἀθηναῖοι (498) and stating twice that they are by themselves at the Lenaia (ἐσμὲν αὐτοὶ νῦν – 504, 507) since *xenoi* and allies are not (yet) present in Athens. Closing his case, Dikaiopolis ends his defence by explaining that the metics in the audience are not to be thought of as *xenoi* but rather as one with the Athenians, the *astoi*, as “metics are the bran of the *astoi*” (ἄχυρα τῶν ἀστῶν – 508), that is, the bran that is left with the groats (the *astoi*) to make flour after the useless chaff had been hulled out.³²

Aristophanes thus presents us with a very positive, slightly over-the-top view on the inclusion of metics in the Lenaia: at this festival metics and Athenians are conceptualised as one. But what can this single passage in Aristophanes tell us about the position of metics in the Athenian community as conceptualised in the context of the Lenaia? From a minimalistic perspective one could argue that Aristophanes is clearly overstating his argument as he wants to cover all his bases before attacking Kleon; he wants to highlight that the Athenians are by themselves at the Lenaia and tries to work around the presence of metics in the audience, forcefully including them in the same group as the Ἀθηναῖοι. Also, all passages in Aristophanes explicitly mentioning metics (*Knights* 347; *Peace* 297; *Lys.* 580) point to a generally benevolent attitude of the poet towards resident foreigners.³³ One may therefore be inclined to ascribe the description of the Lenaian audience to Aristophanes’ enmity with Kleon and his personal opinion of metics.

I argue, however, that Aristophanes’ statement on the homogeneous worshipping community at the Lenaia appears to reflect a more widely shared notion. This can be seen, for instance, in the manner in which the names of victorious Lenaian *choregoi* are recorded on a Herm erected around 400 by the Basileus Onesippos on the steps of the Stoa Basileos, still visible today.³⁴ The inscription on Onesippos’ Herm (*SEG* 32.239.3) gives us the names of the

³² *Supra* n. 21.

³³ Cf. Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 41.

³⁴ Cf. T.L. Shear jr., ‘The Athenian Agora: excavations of 1970’, *Hesp.* 40 (1971) no. 4, 256-7 and C.N. Edmonson, ‘Onesippos’ Herm’, *Hesp. Suppl.* 19 (1982) 48-50.

victorious *choregoi* of a single year together with the poetic directors of their choruses, the so-called *didaskaloi*. Significantly, clear status markers like the *demotikon* for citizens, the *ethnikon* for foreigners (including metics), or the “οἰκεῖν ἐν”-formula giving a metic’s deme of residence are lacking.³⁵ We come across a certain Sosikrates, the victorious comic *choregos*. He is mentioned with his occupation as a bronze merchant (χαλκοπώλης). As Athenians were quite reluctant to be associated with manual labour, Sosikrates should probably be identified as a metic but he is not explicitly referred to as such: although ethnics and the “οἰκεῖν ἐν”-formula were both being increasingly used in the late fifth and fourth century as markers of metic status, we are not informed where Sosikrates came from nor in which deme he lived. Beside Sosikrates, Stratonikos is listed, who was the victorious *choregos* in tragedy. Stratonikos’ social status is referred to in a similar opaque manner: he is only named with his father’s name, Stratonos, and patronymics were used by both citizens and metics. What can be the reason for this lack of social markers on Onesippos’ Herm?

When we look at names and social markers we have to consider the type of inscription and the context in which they occur. Obviously, a name on a potsherd does not have the same function as a name among the many dead on an official casualty list.³⁶ Onesippos’ Herm, however, is a curious and unique type of monument: erected by the Basileus in front of the Stoa Basileos it can be seen as a monument issued by the polis, but since it commemorates only a single year and was (illegally) erected by the Basileus when he was still in office it can also be understood as the result of a private initiative, celebrating the personal achievements of the Basileus in successfully organising the Lenaia.³⁷ Both types of choral monument (polis and private), however, had their own onomastic traditions with differing uses of social markers. On the official victor lists of the polis the use of demotics is extensive while patronymics are largely absent. On

³⁵ On the metic *demotikon*, though overoptimistic and obviously outdated: U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, ‘Demotika der attischen Metoeken’, *Hermes* 22 (1887) 107-28 and 211-59. Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 152-3 dates the introduction of the “οἰκεῖν ἐν” designation, and with it the formal introduction of *metoikia*, to 414/13 based on its first appearance in M&L no.79.33. But see Nick Fisher’s doubts in his review of Whitehead, *CR* 29 (1979) 266-8, and his suggestion that a stricter definition of metic status is likely to have occurred closer to Perikles’ Citizenship Law of 451/0.

³⁶ See the forthcoming work of Diana Kretschmann on the use of *demotika* in various contexts.

³⁷ Cf. Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 30-31. At least in Aeschines’ time “the man who is subject to audit is not allowed to [...] make a votive offering [...]” (Aesch. 3.21).

individual monuments, on the other hand, patronymics dominate while demotics tentatively appear only from the last quarter of the fifth century onwards.³⁸ However, on Onesippos' Herm, the only known monument commemorating Lenaian victories, the statuses of the two *choregoi* are rendered in an exceptionally vague manner for both types of monuments. Perhaps the lack of demotics, ethnics and “οἰκεῖν ἐν”-formulas on the Herm can best be seen as signalling a lack of interest in the different “civic” statuses of Lenaian *choregoi*.

That metics and Athenians were not only commemorated undifferentiated from each other but also participated indiscriminately in the dramatic *agones* of the Lenaia is also illustrated on the same Herm on which Sosikrates' *didaskalos* is the famous Athenian poet Nikochares, who is referred to only with his personal name; an illuminating example of undifferentiated metic-Athenian cooperation at the Lenaia.

Metics furthermore also expressed the same sentiments and expectations as Athenians did after performing *choregia* and this too points to the conclusion that at the Lenaia metic and Athenian *choregoi* did not participate in different ways. Most scholars try to minimise the importance of metic *choregoi* at the Lenaia by labelling this festival as “inferior” (i.e. to the City Dionysia). They also explain metic liturgies out of a need to keep metics satisfied and metic wealth and skills secured in Attika granting them this “small concession”, especially after Perikles' Citizenship Law had drawn the lines between metics and *astoi* more sharply. Peter Wilson, for instance, wrote that “the ‘honour’ was clearly a carefully delimited one, given the evident second-ranking of the festival.”³⁹ However, although the poet's voice and *choregos*' prestige would admittedly reach a more cosmopolitan crowd at the City Dionysia, a hierarchical arrangement of festivals and rites, with the City Dionysia superior to the Lenaia, is mainly based on a modern and misconceived correlation between the scale of a festival and its

³⁸ The first epigraphically attested use of a *demotikon* on a private choral monument dates to the 430s-420s (*IG I³ 959*). Themistokles' choregic inscription of 476 is preserved in Plutarch (*Them.* 5.4): “he won a victory with tragedies [...] and set up a *pinax* commemorating his victory with the following inscription: “Themistokles the Phrearrhian was *choregos*; Phrynichus was *didaskalos*, Adeimantus was archon”. It is unlikely that a wooden *pinax* would survive in Plutarch's time and the occurrence of Themistokles' demotic is probably the result of later contamination. Cf. Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 214-16.

³⁹ Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 30. Also see 28: “a general inferior festival in terms of the prestige to be won by poet, performer and *choregos*” and Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 80-1: “it is important to emphasise the probable restriction of metic *choregia* to one small winter festival”.

importance; all gods, in every capacity, had to receive due worship to safeguard the well-being of the polis.⁴⁰ The Lenaia should therefore not be understood as inferior to the City Dionysia, with a Lenaian *choregia* lower in regard than a City one.⁴¹

Corroborating evidence for this is found in the Athenian courts where metics and Athenians referred to the performance of liturgies at these festivals in the same way; benefits and respect were to be gained by both metics and Athenians alike. Demosthenes (38.25) could thus state that he deemed “it right that some gratitude (χάρις) should be accorded by you to all who perform liturgies”, while Lysias (12.20), discussing the Thirty’s monstrous treatment of him and his brother, claimed that “this was not the treatment that we deserved (ἀξίους γε ὄντας) at the city’s hands, when we had produced all *choregias* and contributed to many *eisphorai* when we showed ourselves men of orderly life, and performed every duty laid upon us.” Both the Athenian-born Demosthenes and the metic Lysias expected gratitude from the Athenians in return for the liturgies they had performed, including the *choregia* at the Lenaia.

The other side of the coin, the burden of actual paying for the liturgy, was also shared by rich Athenians and rich metics alike. And similar to Athenian citizens, metics could also be excused from performing this duty at the Lenaia, an exemption conceptualised as an honour for both. So, in an Athenian decree of ca. 378 (*IG* II² 141 = RO21) that honours Strato, king of Sidon, it is stated that in case his fellow Sidonians “visit Athens for the purpose of trade, it shall not be permitted to exact the metic tax from them or to appoint any of them as *choregos* or to register them for any *eisphora*” (32-36).⁴² It seems, then, that metics were

⁴⁰ Of the many studies stressing this aspect of Greek religion, perhaps most important are S.G. Cole, ‘Civic cult and civic identity’ in: M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium August, 24-27 1994. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre vol. 2* (Copenhagen 1995) 292-325 and M. Jameson, ‘The spectacular and the obscure in Athenian religion’ in: S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance culture and Athenian democracy* (Cambridge 1999) 321-40.

⁴¹ A commentary on a comic text (*P.Oxy.* 2737.44-51) states that, after coming fourth at the City Dionysia with his *Rhabdouchoi* (Theatre-police), the comic Plato was “pushed back” to the Lenaia. An official demotion rule has often been assumed from this but R.M. Rosen, ‘Trouble in the early career of Plato Comicus: another look at *P.Oxy.* 2737.44-51’, *ZPE* 76 (1989) 223-28, has convincingly argued that the selection and rejection of poets is probably to be ascribed to the whims of the archon in charge, i.e. the Eponymous Archon at the Dionysia and the Basileus at the Lenaia.

⁴² See also Demosthenes’ attack on Leptines’ proposal to cancel exemptions to perform liturgies granted to several benefactors, stating that there are five or perhaps ten metics and possibly six citizens exempted from performing annual liturgies in 355 (20.19-21).

not allowed to perform these important liturgies because the Lenaia were “only an inferior festival” or merely to exploit the wealth of some resident foreigners or to silence metic voices by granting them this “carefully delimited honour”. Rich metics rather performed these public duties expecting the same benefits, participating in the same discourse of communal self-definition, thereby actively participating in this important aspect of Athenian public life similar to rich Athenians.

It is evident, then, that metics not only participated in all aspects of the Lenaia but that they moreover participated undifferentiated from the Athenian participants. Aristophanes’ remarks about Athenians and metics being “amongst themselves” turn out to be very appropriate; the Lenaia should be understood as a context in which the associations between Athenians and metics were emphasised and strengthened as differences were largely ignored.

1.4 Aristophanes revisited: the lesser part of grain

So, at the Lenaia differences between participants were not expressed through differentiated participation as the Athenians chose instead to conceptualise and present a coherent group of worshippers consisting of all free men living in Attica. However, just the simple fact that we know metics participated in the Lenaia implies that it could occasionally become desirable to distinguish the metic from the Athenian participants. Even in Aristophanes metics are in the end referred to separately. Wishing to emphasise the intimate setting of the Lenaia in contrast to that of the City Dionysia, Aristophanes is faced with the presence of metics in the audience whom he consequently describes as the bran (*ἄχυρα*) of the *astoi*, i.e. the bran incorporated into Athenian bread after the useless husks had been hulled out. Positive as this interpretation is – without bran no (Athenian) bread – the poet nevertheless singles out the metic participants at the Lenaia. It appears that while in the intimate context of the festival unity between Athenians and metics prevailed, when the Lenaia and its participatory community were seen from a wider perspective and were compared to more widely attended festivals, like the City Dionysia, differences between Athenians and metics became articulated again. It thus appears that the same two groups could be described and perceived as a unity when by themselves, but were seen as distinct when there was a wider perspective. Especially the presence of non-metic *xenoi* at other festival like the City Dionysia seems relevant here, as their presence

seems to draw attention, as it were, to the foreign side of metics over their closeness to the Athenians as free inhabitants of the Athenian polis.

Another instance in which Athenian and metic participants were differentiated can be found on the lists, dated to 331/0, recording the (mandatory) dedications of *phialai* by the liturgists of a single year.⁴³ On the columns we come across two metics who had acted as *choregoi*, which must refer to the Lenaia, the only polis festival at which metics could act as *choregoi*. We find a metic living in the deme Lakiadai ([---ἐν Λα]κιαδῶ[ν οἰκῶν---] – *Hesp.* 37 (1968) no. 51.48-50) and a certain Timon, a metic living in Melite (Τίμων[---ἐμ Με]λίτη οἰκῶν---] – 46-48). In contrast to Onesippos' Herm, on which the status of the Lenaian *choregos* Sosikrates is only vaguely alluded to by reference to his occupation, the two metic *choregoi* on the *phialai*-lists are named with their place of residence with the “οἰκεῖν ἐν”-formula, thus clearly marking them as metics. This concern with a more precise labelling of status is also apparent in the names of the Athenians on the list: they are, without exception, recorded with patronymics and demotics.

In contrast to Onesippos' Herm, the status of the Lenaian *choregoi* on the *phialai*-lists is thus unmistakable. But this need not be seen as undercutting the unity between metics and Athenians at the Lenaia. The nature and purpose of Onesippos' Herm and the *phialai*-lists differ significantly, which explains the different uses of social markers.⁴⁴ In the context of the lists, set up in a public place for the general public to formally check who had acted as liturgist in a particular year, it was deemed necessary to duly register the wealthy individuals who had contributed to the festival programme of the polis in the most detailed way possible. In that context, status markers were in fact necessary to make it possible to identify as accurately as possible the wealthy individuals who had performed their liturgies as required, who had been munificent to the Athenians and who could thus claim *charis* or leniency from them. It was, in sum, the nature

⁴³ On the *phialai* lists: D.M. Lewis, ‘Attic manumissions’, *Hesp.* 28 (1959) 208-38; idem, (1968).

⁴⁴ Similar, C.M. Keesling, *The votive statues of the Athenian Acropolis* (Cambridge 2003) 22-6, argues how dedications should be considered to have had a dual perspective: one looking at and communicating with the deity and one communicating with the human audience passing by these publicly erected dedications. According to the intentions of the dedicator, formal markers of social status were more or less expressed. Whereas the more private communication with a deity did not call for formal distinctions of the dedicator, it could be considered of utmost importance that the human public would know who had dedicated a colossal *kore* to Athena.

of the *phialai* lists as a formal, public register that made the Athenians record the social background of the Lenaian *choregoi* in the clearest way possible.

A similar distinction between metic (i.e. Lenaian) and Athenian festival liturgies was also employed by Demosthenes in his *Speech against Leptines*. In 355, Leptines proposed a law to cancel the exemptions that had been granted to several wealthy men for performing liturgies. Demosthenes opposed Leptines by claiming that the financial gain would not outweigh the damage his law could cause to the image of the polis cancelling honours bestowed on the benefactors of Athens by the *demos*. “Estimating” the financial benefits, Demosthenes (20.18) states that “there are, as you know, among us liturgies belonging to metics and citizen ones” (εἰσὶ γὰρ δήπου παρ’ ἡμῖν αἱ τε τῶν μετοίκων λητουργίαι καὶ αἱ πολιτικαί). Crudely rounding off downwards, he then posits that if Leptines’ proposal is accepted five, or possibly ten (20.21), metics and perhaps six citizens would again be available to perform liturgies. According to Demosthenes, this is a negligible number considering a total of sixty annually returning liturgies.⁴⁵ The orator here employs an apparently familiar distinction (εἰσὶ γὰρ δήπου) between metic and Athenians liturgists who together financed Athens’ extensive festival programme. It seems that in his attempt to give the jury the impression that he is presenting a complete and, as he emphasises, negligible list of exempted liturgists, Demosthenes differentiates the constituent parts of the free male population of Attica. No one can accuse him being inaccurate or incomplete.

These testimonia suggest that differences between Athenian and metic participants at the Lenaia could be made explicit again. It is significant, however, that differences between the Lenaian participants were never expressed in terms of differentiated participation. We should conclude therefore that from ca. 440 onwards metics and Athenians shared in the *hiera* of Dionysos Lenaios as a coherent group, consisting of the free male population of Attica.

1.5 Conclusion

From its early beginnings the Lenaia had been an intimate and purely Athenian affair. By including metics undifferentiated from the Athenian worshippers in this festival the Athenians were able to give expression to some kind of unity between *all* free inhabitants of Attika in a time, especially after the introduction

⁴⁵ Davies (1967) has convincingly shown that these numbers are not anywhere near the total amount of Athenian liturgies to be performed annually.

of Perikles' Citizenship Law in 451/0, when this unity could have potentially crumbled. Although the two could practically no longer marry after 451/0 and produce legitimate Athenian children, the Athenians did not wish to deny all unity between Athenians and metics as this was essential to the continuing wellbeing of the Athenian community. The intimate setting of the Lenaia, without foreign onlookers, was probably considered an excellent opportunity to express this wish.

The Lenaia, in addition, probably not only gave expression to and thus maintained unity between Athenians and metics but also strengthened it as the abusiveness and solidarity of the Lenaia not only expressed cohesion but also generated familiarity, for only when one is "amongst one selves" can orgiastic and abusive behaviour, in the form of ritual *aischrologia*, be contained and produce a firmer foundation for associations between those involved. This, it seems, was the foundation on which Dikaiopolis could stage his attack on the rigid stance of the Athenians against the Spartans in 425. Only when "amongst themselves" can the polis be discussed without potentially dangerous repercussions.

2 Metics at the City Dionysia – the Athenians and other Greeks

Investigating participation in the Panathenaic *pompe*, Lisa Maurizio writes that "participating [i.e. in processions] was a serious matter not only because it was part of cult and worship but also because it played an important role in defining community members."⁴⁶ Looking at the passages she presents showing the negotiation of status in a processional context it is striking that most stories are set at the City Dionysia, the other major agonistic polis festival in honour of Dionysos. It seems that contrary to the Lenaia, where differences between participants were largely ignored, status differences were regularly expressed and felt in the context of the City Dionysia. For instance, Aeschines (1.43) tells a story about Timarchos, who failed to join Misgolas in the *pompe* of the City Dionysia even though the latter had hired Timarchos' services. Angered about this, Misgolas and a friend started looking for him and found him at lunch with some foreigners. According to Aeschines (1.43), Misgolas then "threatened the

⁴⁶ L. Maurizio, 'The Panathenaic procession: Athens participatory democracy on display?' in: D. Boedeker and K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Democracy, Empire and the Arts in fifth-century Athens* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1998) 312.

foreigners and ordered them to follow straight to prison for corrupting a free youth”.⁴⁷ Perhaps Alkibiades showing off in the procession and entering the theatre wearing an expensive crimson cloak, should also be understood as negotiating status as he challenged the boundary between Athenians and metics, who were supposed to wear crimson cloaks, as we will soon see.⁴⁸

It seems then that, in addition to some anticipated disorder common to most Dionysian festivals, during the City Dionysia the Athenians were especially sensitive for specific behaviour and circumstances that could lead to the blurring of distinctions between the different participants.⁴⁹ At this festival, which from the start was intimately tied up with the world of Athenian men but soon attracted an international crowd, differences between participants, and primarily those between native Athenian and foreign participants, were regularly expressed. We will see that as a consequence of this emphasis on the male Athenian participants foreign participants, this time *including* metics, were collectively set apart from the Athenian citizens as *xenoi*. At the City Dionysia, the foreign aspect of metics thus seems to have prevailed over their close associations with the Athenians in daily life.

⁴⁷ On this passage and a discussion of the roles of the persons involved in the *pompe* see: N.R.E. Fisher, *Aeschines, Against Timarchos* (Oxford 2001) *ad loc.* Other incidents referred to by Maurizio concern 1) Agoratos who is attacked by Aisimos: “a murderer like you must not join in the procession to Athena” (Lys. 13.80-81), 2) Epikrates’ alleged indecent behaviour in the City Dionysia’s *pompe*, where, according to Demosthenes (19.287), he marched in a revel (κωμῳδεῖν) without a mask, 3) the costumes of Demosthenes and his chorus (Dem. 21.20, 25), and 4) Isokr. 7.53-54 on the trend to measure the well-being of the polis and its people “by processions or by the efforts to outdo each other in fitting out the choruses”. Cf. Demosthenes (21.180), who tells the jury about a certain Ktesikles, who was sentenced to death for bringing a whip to the *pompe* and “maltreating freemen like slaves”

⁴⁸ Our main source for this story is Athenaeus (12.534c), who is quoting the third-century peripatetic philosopher and historian Satyrus (*FGrH* 3.160).

⁴⁹ In general, the presence of large crowds at festivals required additional measures to guarantee that order was maintained. This seems especially the case at festivals in honour of Dionysos. For instance, in a decree dated to 320/19 (*IG* II² 380) we hear that special officials, so-called *agoranomoi*, were in charge of maintaining order in the streets of Piraeus during the Dionysia held in the port. Dem. 21.10 refers to a law of Euegoros forbidding anybody to seize a debtor’s property on the occasion of the processions during the Dionysia in Piraeus, the Thargelia, the City Dionysia and the Lenaia and R. Garland, *The Piraeus*² (London 2001) 125, interprets this law as preventing disruptive behaviour at these well-attended festivals. Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 159, discusses the fact that in addition to the *epimeletai* the *Boule* had also been given a role in maintaining order at the City Dionysia; in 343/2 the *Boule* is honoured for maintaining *eukosmia* in connection with the theatre (*IG* II² 223). Wilson also sees the law which orders that the festival was to be reviewed at an assembly held in the theatre days after the festival (Dem. 21.8) as implying “a degree of anticipated social disorder”.

2.1 The City Dionysia – Athenian competitors, Panhellenic crowd

The City Dionysia, or Great Dionysia, were a festival in honour of Dionysos Eleuthereus celebrated in early spring, in the Attic month Elaphebolion.⁵⁰ Pausanias (1.38.8; 1.2.5) and a scholion to Aristophanes (*Ach.*243a) suggest that the festival became instituted in Athens in mythological times as part of the Athenian incorporation of Eleutherai, a small community located on the border between Boiotia and Attica and one of the acclaimed birth-places of Dionysos.⁵¹ One version (Pausanias 1.38.8) states that the statue of Dionysos came over to Athens together with the people of Eleutherai, while another tradition (Pausanias 1.2.5, Σ *Ar. Ach.* 243a) specifically name Pegasos of Eleutherai as bringer of the statue (*agalma*). The Athenians were, however, reluctant to welcome the god upon which they were struck with a terrible disease of the male genitalia. The Delphic oracle was then consulted and it advised the Athenians to honour Dionysos with a festival. In order to avert future disasters the Athenians then also decided to bring the god *phalloi* every year as a reminder of their sufferings. Thus the City Dionysia came into existence.⁵²

Other, more secure evidence suggests that the cult of Dionysos Eleuthereus was introduced in Athens in the late sixth century, most likely as part of an attempted incorporation by Athens of Eleutherai, just as the myths imply.⁵³ The earliest archaeological remains of an Athenian sanctuary for Dionysos

⁵⁰ The sources are collected and discussed in *DFA*² 57-125; C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Something to do with Athens: tragedy and ritual' in: R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (eds.), *Ritual, finance, and politics. Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis* (Oxford 1994) 269-90; Csapo and Slater, *Context* (1995) 103-21. On the date: Mikalson, *Calendar* (1975) 123-9, who suggests ten to fourteen Elaphebolion but the issue is not straightforward, cf. S.D. Lambert, 'Polis and theatre in Lykourgan Athens: the honorific decrees', in: A.P. Matthaiou and I. Polinskaya (eds.), *Mikros Hieromnemon. Meletes eis mnemen Michael H. Jameson* (Athens 2008) 53-4, n.2.

⁵¹ A sanctuary for Dionysos at Eleutherai is mentioned by Pausanias (1.38.9). A small fourth-century Doric temple at the site has been identified as the one for Dionysos, though earlier traces are lacking, on which see: J. Travlos, *Bildlexicon zur Topographie des antiken Attika* (Tübingen 1988) 170-1.

⁵² R. Parker, *Athenian religion. A history* (Oxford 1996) 92-5, suggests that the myths relate to the ancient introduction of this cult as motivated by the fact that Dionysos was born in Eleutherai and not to the incorporation of the border community.

⁵³ Cf. F. van den Eijnde's forthcoming dissertation on the cultic incorporation of (semi-) autonomous communities into Attica in the pre-classical period. He sees the location of the sanctuary for Dionysos on the slope of the Akropolis in analogy with the locations of the city branches of the cults of Artemis of Brauron, Demeter of Eleusis, and perhaps Asklepios of Epidauros as a sign of incorporation/annexation.

Eleuthereus are found on the south slope of the Akropolis and date to ca. 530.⁵⁴ Corroborating evidence for this date for the introduction of Dionysos Eleuthereus in Athens perhaps comes from some towers along the border between Attika and Eleutherai. For although W.R. Connor has tried to link the introduction of the City Dionysia specifically with Athens' newly instituted democracy and its victory over Chalkis and Boiotia in 506, John Camp has convincingly argued that an (attempted) incorporation of Eleutherai (with its cult of Dionysos) must have occurred before this time, i.e. in the late archaic period, as several border-towers indicate that for most of the classical period Eleutherai was Boiotian and not Attic.⁵⁵ In sum: Dionysos Eleuthereus seems to have arrived in Athens shortly before ca. 530, when the god received a sanctuary, and therefore cult, near the Akropolis. As such it was a recent addition to the religious obligations of the Athenians, which is also reflected in the fact that the archon in charge of the City Dionysia was the Eponymous Archon, who was in charge of the “duties added later” ([Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 3.3; 56.2-4).

What this early cult entailed is unclear. As just mentioned, the Eponymous Archon was in charge of the festival for Dionysos Eleuthereus. In addition, there is a chance that the *genos* of the Bakchiadai also performed a role at this festival, perhaps in organising the *pompe* and supplying people for the priesthood of Dionysos, as Stephen Lambert has suggested.⁵⁶ It is uncertain whether the famous dramatic *agones* were already performed for Dionysos Eleuthereus in this early phase – even though, as we saw earlier, Dionysos Lenaios probably already received such honours in the sixth century. The first tragic performance is traditionally attributed to Thespis in 534 and associated with the City Dionysia

⁵⁴ J.M. Camp, *The Archaeology of Athens* (New Haven and London 2001) 121; J.-C. Moretti, ‘The theatre of the sanctuary of Dionysos Eleuthereus in late fifth-century Athens’, *ICS* 24-25 (1999-2000) 380-1; J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (London 1971) 537-52.

⁵⁵ W.R. Connor, ‘City Dionysia and Athenian democracy’ in: W.R. Connor et al. (eds.), *Aspects of Athenian democracy* (Copenhagen 1990) 7-32. J.M. Camp, ‘Notes on two towers and borders of classical Boiotia’, *AJA* 95 (1991) 193-202. For a rebuttal of Connor: H.S. Versnel, ‘Religion and democracy’ in: W. Eder (ed.), *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?* (Stuttgart 1995) 367-87. The traditional association of the City Dionysia with Peisistratos has been refuted by Connor (1990) 14 n. 24 and J.H. Blok, ‘Phye’s procession: culture, politics and Peisistratid rule’ in: H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), *Peisistratos and the tyranny: a reappraisal of the evidence* (Amsterdam 2000) 17-48.

⁵⁶ S.D. Lambert, ‘The Attic *genos* Bakchiadai and the City Dionysia’, *Historia* 42 (1998) 394-403.

based on a fragment on the Hellenistic *Parian Marbles* (43). However, the great level of detail in this fragment is probably the result of the Hellenistic obsession with precision and the restoration of ἐν ἄ]στ[ει is rightly doubted by Connor, who thinks it more likely that the performances of Thespis rather took place at a celebration of the rural Dionysia in his home deme Ikarion.⁵⁷ It is of course still possible that choral performances were offered to Dionysos Eleuthereus in this early period of the cult but evidence is unfortunately lacking.

From ca. 510-494 we get a better idea of what happened at the City Dionysia; in that period dithyrambic and tragic *agones* in honour of Dionysos Eleuthereus are first attested, while contests in comedy were probably added only slightly later around 486.⁵⁸ So what else happened at the City Dionysia in the classical period?

On the days preceding the festival several preliminary activities took place. On the 8th of Elaphebolion poets presented the plots of their plays and their choruses to the public during a pre-competition called the *proagon*, which took place in the Periklean Odeion.⁵⁹ On the next day, the cult statue of Dionysos Eleuthereus was brought from his sanctuary on the south slope of the Akropolis to the Academy, which was located along the road to Eleutherai. Probably on the same day it was escorted back again. This ritual escorting of Dionysos' cult image to his sanctuary is commonly referred to as an introduction, an *eisagoge*

⁵⁷ Connor (1990) 26-32. Cf. M.L. West, 'The early chronology of Attic tragedy', *CQ* 39 (1989) 251-4, and S. Scullion, 'Tragic dates', *CQ* 52 (2002) 81-4. The Lenaia are also possible context for Thespis' performance.

⁵⁸ The *Parian marbles* (46) assign the first contest of χοροὶ ἀνδρῶν to the archonship of Lysagoras, dated to ca. 510-508. The first secure dates for dithyrambic and dramatic *agones* are preserved in a fragmentary fourth-century inscription (*IG* II² 2318, the so-called *Fasti*) recording victorious tribes, poets and *choregoi*. The preserved list starts in 473/2. On the basis of the likely reconstruction of two more columns, scholars have argued that the list goes back to ca. 501/0. Another victor list (*IG* II² 2325) contains the name Aeschylus (1.1f) whose first victory was in 484. Before this entry around ten lines are missing, suggesting a date around 494 for the first tragic performance at the City Dionysia. Cf. *DFA*² 101-25. (See, however, Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 12-21 on the ideological force of having the beginning of such a list coincide with the beginning of democracy and on arguments for dating the beginning of the *agones* to the period of the tyrants.) Finally, based on a reference in the *Suda* (s.v. Χιωνίδης), Chionides is commonly considered the first victor in comedy at the City Dionysia around 486, which seems to fit the victor list of comic victors at the Dionysia (*IG* II² 2325.39ff).

⁵⁹ Aesch. 3.67 with scholion. The Odeion was constructed east of the theatre of Dionysos around 444. Where and if the *proagon* took place before this time is not known. A moving, though late story (*Vit. Eurip.* 3.11) concerns the *proagon* of 406 at which Sophokles and his chorus appeared in mourning without the customary garlands or festive clothes because they had just heard the news of Euripides' death.

(e.g. Aesch. 3.66), which highlights that the City Dionysia centred on the re-enactment of the introduction and reception of Dionysos at Athens.⁶⁰

Next, in the early morning of 10 Elaphebolion, the festival officially began with a procession supervised by the Eponymous Archon and ten *epimeletai* ([Aristot.] *Ath.Pol.*56.2-4).⁶¹ The exact route of the *pompe* is unclear. At least in Xenophon's time the marchers crossed the Agora and stopped at the Altar of the Twelve Gods before continuing their way to the sanctuary of Dionysos on the south slope of the Akropolis.⁶² Many people participated: Athenian girls who acted as *kanephoroi* carrying a basket with first-fruits (grapes?), Athenian *astoi* who carried wineskins on their shoulders (*askophoroi*), people carrying loaves of bread (*obeliaphoroi*), metic youths carrying basins (*skaphephoroi*), *choregoi* with their choruses, many Athenians without circumscribed roles, like Misgolas and Timarchos, who we met at the beginning of this chapter, and even prisoners temporarily set free, as Demosthenes (22.68) sneers at his opponent Androtion stating that the prison was apparently built without a purpose as "your father danced his way out of it, fetters and all, at the procession of the Dionysia".⁶³

In the fifth century colonists and probably representatives of the Athenian allies were also asked to participate, each delegation bringing a *phallos* as we can read in the famous Brea decree (*IG I³* 46.11-13), dated to the 440s. Even in 372, long after the dissolution of the Athenian Empire in 404, we hear of the Athenians requesting the Parians, one of Athens' allies in the Second League, to "bring to the Dionysia an ox, a *phallus*, and an excellence award as being colonists of the Athenian *demos*" (καὶ εἰς Διονύσια βῶν καὶ φαλλὸν ἀπάγειν ἀριστεῖον ἐπειδὴ τυγχάνοσι ἄποικοι ὄντες τοῦ δήμου τὸ Ἀθηναίων – *SEG*

⁶⁰ Cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (1994), who tenuously suggested the *eisagoge* originally started in an unattested area in the Agora called the *eschara*. At least in Hellenistic times Athenian ephebes played an important role in this *eisagoge* of the god (e.g. *IG II²* 1006.12-13).

⁶¹ Demosthenes (21.74) claims to have been assaulted by Meidias early in the morning (ἔωθεν).

⁶² Xen. *Hipp.*3.2. Sourvinou-Inwood (1994) 278-88, argued the *pompe* started from the Prytaneion, the prime *locus* for the entertainment of guest friends and thus also for newly introduced gods.

⁶³ *Kanephoroi*: Σ Ar. *Ach.* 241. *Askophoroi* and *skaphephoroi*: Suda s.v. Ἀσκὸς ἐν πᾶχνῃ and s.v. Σκαφηφόροι quoting Demetrios of Phaleron and Theophrastos. *Obeliaphoroi*: Poll. 6.75; Ath. 3.111b. *Choregoi*: Dem.21.22; Ath. 12.534c. On prisoners also see: Σ Plat. *Leg.* 637b.

31.67.4-5), implying that both allies and colonists still participated in the Dionysia's *pompe* at this time.⁶⁴

When the procession arrived at the sanctuary of Dionysos Eleuthereus, sacrifices were offered to the god. The Lykourgan skin-sale records record a staggering amount of over 808 drachma raised in 333 from the “Dionysia in the city” (*IG II² 1496.80-81*) indicating that somewhere between 115 and 180 (bovine) animals were sacrificed, probably yielding as much as 10,000-20,000kg of meat! In the next year “only” 306 drachma was raised (*IG II² 1496.111-12*), indicating that between 44 and 68 animals were sacrificed that year.⁶⁵ In the 330s an enormous crowd could thus enjoy the meat of the animals offered to Dionysos Eleuthereus. We should, however, guard against drawing any too firm a conclusion from these figures for the period before 333, as the enormous scale of the sacrifices should probably be assigned to the Lykourgan policy concerning the revival of Athens' glory days with a special interest in the Athenian drama and the City Dionysia, so clearly illustrated in the canonization of the three Athenian tragedians and the construction of the Lykourgan theatre still visible today.⁶⁶ Undoubtedly, sacrifices were offered to Dionysos Eleuthereus before this time, though probably not of the size as in the 330s. The presence of *skaphephoroi*, *askophoroi* and *obeliaphoroi* further suggests that many bloodless offerings like cakes, wine, and bread were also presented on this occasion.

Probably on the same day as the *pompe* and the sacrifices, an enormous crowd filled the theatre to watch the performances. We do not know how many people were able to watch the fifth-century performances of Aeschylus, Euripides, Sophokles, and Aristophanes, but the late fourth-century theatre of Lykourgos could at least contain 14,000 people. We hear of a large and heterogeneous crowd of Athenian officials, priests and foreign guests seated in the front rows of the theatre, of members of the *Boule* and *prytaneis* in the middle of the theatre, and of Athenians, foreigners, slaves accompanying their masters, and probably women seated around them.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Cf. P. Krentz, ‘Athens’ allies and the *phallophoria*’, *AHB* 7 (1993) 12-6.

⁶⁵ For these calculations see *supra* n. 11.

⁶⁶ Canonization: Paus. 1.21.1-3 and [Plut.] *Lyk.* 841f. Cf. S.C. Humphreys, *The Strangeness of gods. Historical perspectives on the interpretation of Athenian religion* (Oxford 2004) 77-129 and Lambert (2008) 53-85. On the cultural policy of Lykourgos in general: B. Hintzen-Bohlen, *Die Kulturpolitik des Euboulos und des Lykurgs* (Berlin 1997).

⁶⁷ Inscribed seats dated from *c.*500 to *c.*400: *IG I³ 1389-1392*. Cf. Moretti (2000) 382-9 and the standard work of Maaß, M., *Die Prohedrie des Dionysostheaters in Athen* (München

Before the *agones* several ceremonies were performed in the theatre as the Athenians took advantage of the presence of such a large crowd to announce awards and praise Athens' power and democratic ideology.⁶⁸ Perhaps a libation was offered by the ten *strategoï*, a ceremony unfortunately only referred to by Plutarch (*Kim.* 8). In the mid-fifth century, a time when Athenian *hubris* reached its peak according to Isokrates (8.82), the tribute money brought to Athens by her allies at the time of the Dionysia was divided into talents and displayed in the orchestra.⁶⁹ Aeschines (3.154) recalls fonder memories to that period:

ταύτη ποτὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μελλόντων ὥσπερ νυνὶ τῶν τραγωδῶν γίνεσθαι ὅτ' εὐνομεῖτο μᾶλλον ἢ πόλις καὶ βελτίοσι προστάταις ἐχρήτο, προελθὼν ὁ κῆρυξ καὶ παρασησάμενος τοὺς ὀρφανοὺς ὧν οἱ πατέρες ἦσαν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τετελευτηκότες, νεανίσκους πανοπλία κεκοσμημένους, ἐκήρυττε τὸ κάλλιστον κήρυγμα καὶ προτρεπτικώτατον πρὸς ἀρετήν, ὅτι τούσδε τοὺς νεανίσκους, ὧν οἱ πατέρες ἐτελεύτησαν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ γενόμενοι, μέχρι μὲν ἦβης ὁ δῆμος ἔτρεφε, νυνὶ δὲ καθοπλίσας τῆδε τῇ πανοπλίᾳ, ἀφίησιν ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ τρέπεσθαι ἐπὶ τὰ ἑαυτῶν, καὶ καλεῖ εἰς προεδρίαν. τότε μὲν ταῦτ' ἐκήρυττεν, ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν.

once on this day, when as now the tragedies were about to be performed, in a time when the city had better customs and followed better leaders, the herald would come forward and place before you the orphans whose fathers had died in battle, young men clad in panoply of war; and he would utter the proclamation so honourable and so incentive to valour: "These young men, whose fathers showed themselves brave men and died in war, have been supported by the *demos* until they have come of age; and now, clad thus in

1972). Section for *Boule* and *prytaneis*: Ar. *Birds* 793-4, *Peace* 887-9. Slaves: Pl. *Gorg.* 502b-d and Theophr. *Char.* 9.5. On the presence of women in the audience see most importantly the polemic between J. Henderson, 'Women and the Athenian dramatic festivals', *TAPA* 121 (1991) 133-47 (pro) and S. Goldhill, 'Representing Democracy: Women at the Great Dionysia' in: R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (eds.), *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis* (Oxford 1994) 347-69 and (less extreme) 'The Audience of Athenian Tragedy' in: P.E. Easterling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge 1997) 54-68 (contra).

⁶⁸ S. Goldhill, 'The Great Dionysia and civic ideology', *JHS* 107 (1987) 58-76, and 'Civic ideology and the problem of difference. The politics of Aeschylean tragedy, once again', *JHS* 120 (2000) 34-56. Forthcoming is P. Wilson's, 'Tragic honours and democracy: neglected evidence for the politics of the Athenian Dionysia', who presents *IG I³ 102* as evidence that the announcement of honours at the tragic *agon* of the Dionysia already took place in the late fifth century, ca. 409, and derived from an earlier tradition by which awards were proclaimed for tyrant-slayers in the theatre, which, according to Wilson, can be considered yet another pre-play ceremony (J.H. Blok *per epistulam*).

⁶⁹ On tribute in theatre also see: *IG I³ 34.18-20* (=M&L 46) and Σ Ar. *Ach.* 504.

full armour by their fellow citizens, they are sent out with the prayers of the city, to each go their way; and they are invited to seats of honour in the theatre” and this was the proclamation then but not today.⁷⁰

These ceremonials were no longer performed in the fourth century. Instead, as both Aeschines (3.41) and Demosthenes (18.120) tell us, honours granted by the *demos* to benefactors of the polis were publicly announced in the theatre before the tragic *agones*. According to Aeschines, this custom was instituted after a tumultuous period in which honours were often announced in the theatre that had not been authorised by the *demos*.

After these pre-play ceremonial several dramatic and dithyrambic *agones* took place spread out over the following three to four days. From ca. 508 onwards ten choruses of fifty Athenian boys and ten of fifty Athenian men competed in dithyrambic *agones*. From fourth-century victor lists (*IG* II² 2318, 2325) we can infer that probably from ca. 500 onwards three tragic poets competed each with a trilogy and a satyr play and that from ca. 486 onwards five comic poets competed with one comedy each.⁷¹ The choruses in all these contests were financed by *choregoi*, twenty-eight men in total chosen from the wealthiest Athenians, who had to pay and supervise the training of a chorus. Contrary to the Lenaia, only Athenian citizens could perform this duty at the Dionysia.⁷² The tragic *choregoi* were appointed by the Eponymous Archon, the dithyrambic ones by the *phylai*, while the Aristotelean *Ath. Pol.* (56.3) informs us that “formerly [the Eponymous Archon] also used to appoint five [*choregoi*] for the comedies, but now the *phylai* nominate these”.⁷³

When the plays had been performed, ten previously allotted jury members, one from each *phyle*, announced the victorious choruses in each category.⁷⁴ The

⁷⁰ The translation comes from: C. Darwin Adams, *The speeches of Aeschines* (Cambridge (MA) and London 1988) *ad loc.*

⁷¹ *Supra* n. 58.

⁷² Σ *Ar. Plut.* 953c+d. Cf. Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 80-1. The most detailed ancient accounts of the *choregia* are found in Andok. 6.11-13 and Demosthenes’ *Speech against Meidias* (21). On festival liturgies see Davies (1967) and for liturgies in general see the introduction of J.K. Davies’ *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford 1971) xvii-xxxi.

⁷³ We do not know when the procedure for appointing comic *choregoi* changed but it appears to be at least earlier than 348/7 (Dem. 39.7). Cf. Rhodes, *Commentary*² *ad loc.* and Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 266.

⁷⁴ The most important sources for jury-selection at the City Dionysia: Isokr. 17.33-4; Lys. 4.3; Dem. 21.17, discussed by *DFA*² 95-7. Cf. E. Hartmann and C. Scheffer, ‘Preisrichter

victorious *choregoi* were then crowned in the theatre, while the victorious tragic *choregos* in addition received a tripod.

Only a few days after the festival a special assembly was held “in the sanctuary of Dionysos” solely devoted to matters concerning the City Dionysia.⁷⁵ An argument to Demosthenes’ *Speech against Meidias* (II) further includes the statement that it was only one month after the City Dionysia that new *choregoi* were already being appointed for the next dithyrambic *agones*, while the Aristotelean *Ath. Pol.* (56.3) states that already in Hekatombaion, four months after the festival, one of the first tasks of the newly installed Eponymous Archon was to appoint the *choregoi* for the tragic and comic *agones* for the Dionysia.

2.2 Metics in the procession: *skaphephoroi*

The City Dionysia were open to all Greeks and next to the Athenians many Greek *xenoi* indeed attended. The festival took place at a time when foreign visitors, *proxenoi* and allies came to Athens. It was around the time of the Dionysia that tribute owed by Athens’ allies had to be brought to the city.⁷⁶ Theophrastos’ Chatty Man (*Char.* 3), who is known for stating the obvious, even indicates that the City Dionysia could be considered the opening of the sailing season. Thucydides (5.23.4) informs us that the Peace of Nikias of 421 between Athens and Sparta “shall be renewed annually by the Lacedaemonians going to Athens for the Dionysia and by the Athenians to Lacedaemon for the Hyacinthia” and other sources indicate that many Greeks indeed attended the festival.⁷⁷ But how was this large throng of participants organised and what was the role of metics in all this? Let us first look at the *pompe* of the City Dionysia.

oder Publikum? Zur Urteilsfindung in den dramatischen Wettkämpfen des klassischen Athen’, *Klio* 88 (2006) 96-116, who seem painfully unaware of the earlier comprehensive contribution by C.W. Marshal and S. van Willigenburg, ‘Judging Athenian dramatic competitions’, *JHS* 124 (2004) 90-107.

⁷⁵ Demosthenes (21.8) cites the law: “The *prytaneis* shall call a meeting of the *ekklesia* in the *hieron* of Dionysos on the day after the Pandia. At this meeting they shall first deal with *hiera* matters; next they shall lie before it the complaints lodged concerning the *pompe* or the *agones* at the Dionysia, namely such as have not been satisfied”. It was at one of these meetings that Demosthenes filed a complaint against Meidias.

⁷⁶ *IG I³* 34.22-31; Isokr. 8.82.

⁷⁷ E.g. [Andok.] 4.20; Aesch..3.41-43; Dem.21.74; Isokr. 8.82.

The only source informing us on the participation of metics in the City Dionysia is found in the Byzantine lexicon the Suda (*s.v.* Ἴσκόδος ἐν πάχνῃ), already referred to in the previous section. It states:

In the Dionysiac processions, some things were done by the *astoi*, but others had been assigned to the metics to do by the lawgivers; accordingly the metics wore crimson-coloured cloaks and carried basins (σκάφας), for which they were called *skaphephoroi*, while the *astoi* wore the clothes they wanted and carried wineskins (ἄσκούς) on their shoulders, for which they were called *askophoroi*.

A classical origin of these regulations is guaranteed by Harpokration's gloss on *skaphephoroi* (*s.v.* Σκαφηφόροι = Suda *s.v.* Σκαφηφόροι) where he says that both Demetrios (of Phaleron) and Theophrastus referred to laws, i.e. classical laws, that used to instruct metics to participate in *pompai* as *skaphephoroi*.⁷⁸ From this we can conclude that at least in the fourth century metics carried *skaphai* in honour of Dionysos Eleuthereus next to wine-skin carrying *astoi*. In addition, it is highly likely, as I argued in the previous chapter, that metics no longer performed the *skaphephoria* at the Panathenaia and the City Dionysia and at any other festival where they might be required to do so, after Demetrios abolished all liturgies in the late fourth century.⁷⁹

Metics were thus incorporated into the procession of the City Dionysia and shared in the *hiera* of Dionysos of Eleuthereus. They were displayed as members of the Athenian community on yet another occasion. At the same time their specific membership was expressed by the way in which they participated, visibly differentiated from the other participants by the crimson cloaks they wore and the basins they carried. Analogous to the conventional interpretations of the participation of metics in the Panathenaia, scholars often explain the fact that there was a law stating metics had to wear crimson cloaks and carry basins, while Athenian *astoi* carried wineskins and could wear whatever they wanted, as

⁷⁸ Harpokration says that Demetrios also discussed metic *hydriaphoroi* and *skiadephoroi*. Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 270-1 n.9, argued on the basis of this entry that these groups of metics were probably also included in the procession for Dionysos Eleuthereus. However, Demetrios spoke of metics “ἐν ταῖς πομπαῖς” in general. Only in the Suda-entry is the participation “ἐν ταῖς Διονυσιακαῖς πομπαῖς” specified and there only *skaphephoroi* are mentioned.

⁷⁹ See p. 45-6 above.

reflecting the (alleged) subordination of metics to Athenian *astoi*. Peter Wilson, for instance, recently wrote:

A clear asymmetry is at work here: while the *obligations* fell on the metic community for the symbolically charged moments of the festival procession, the Athenian citizen by contrast was *invited* to participate in the Dionysiac procession wearing what he liked [...]. There is, of course, *no question of legally-enforced participation* here (my italics).⁸⁰

However, as I emphasised earlier, religious activities were generally regulated by law in classical Athens and differentiation from other participants by means of clothing was not negative in itself; in the context of the City Dionysia one only needs to call to mind the gold-embroidered robe of Demosthenes and the golden crowns he provided for his chorus (Dem. 21.16 and 22) or the crimson cloak worn by Alkibiades when he entered the theatre as *choregos* (Athen. 12.534c). Dress was a common means to differentiate a person or a group from other participants. It is, however, a common misconception to think differentiation constitutes subordination. The crimson cloaks of the *skaphephoroi* at the City Dionysia differentiated them from the other participants, including the *astoi*, who were themselves differentiated by the wine-skins on their shoulders, but not necessarily in a negative way. On the contrary, as I already argued, the expensive cloaks can perfectly well be understood as positively referring to the wealth and skills metics were expected to bring to the polis.

So, a group of metics participated in the *pompe* of the City Dionysia differentiated from the other participants, thereby carrying out both their membership to the community, paying due worship to a god of the Athenian polis, *and* their specific metic status, carrying *skaphai* in crimson cloaks. They did so with many of the other members of the Athenian community: in addition to metic *skaphephoroi* and wine-skin carrying *astoi*, we hear of *kanephoroi*, people carrying loaves of bread (*obeliaphoroi*), *choregoi* with their choruses, prisoners set free, representatives of the Athenian allies and colonists.⁸¹ Comparable to the Panathenaic *pompe*, many people associated with Athens thus

⁸⁰ Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 27.

⁸¹ Sources are cited above, 109.

took part and the City Dionysia can therefore be similarly understood as a polis-wide festival, as “a locus for the articulation of the whole polis”.⁸²

Festivals in honour of Dionysos were commonly perceived as very open events in which everybody could and should participate to pay the wine god respect. For instance, in Euripides’ *Bacchae*, performed in 406, the seer Teiresias explains that the wine god “desires to have collective honours from all and to be magnified without distinctions” (208-209). Later on in the play the chorus claims that “To the blessed and to the less fortunate, he gives an equal pleasure from wine that banishes grief” (421-424).⁸³ As wine could cure the pains of all people, everybody should honour the god who gave mankind the vine. And in Demosthenes’ *Speech against Meidias* (53) an oracle from Dodona is cited, which orders the people of Athens “to perform rites for Dionysos at public expense, and to mix bowls of wine, and to establish choruses, and to wear crowns, free men and slaves alike, and to take one day’s holiday”. Although Euripides’ comments and Zeus’ advice do not concern the City Dionysia specifically, they do show that everybody, whether poor or rich, young or old, free or enslaved, is expected to honour Dionysos collectively and this is exactly what happened in the *pompe* of the City Dionysia. In that sense the *pompe* was indeed polis-wide, similar to that of the Panathenaia.

However, the specific articulation of the City Dionysia’s *pompe* differed significantly from the Panathenaic one. Concerning the participation of metics it should be noted that compared to the Panathenaia the role of metics in the Dionysia’s *pompe* was noticeably smaller: where four groups of metic youths and girls participated in the Panathenaic *pompe*, we only hear of one group of metic youths walking in procession for Dionysos, while metic girls and women were even wholly absent. It seems that only a token representation of metics was required to walk in the *pompe*.

There is, moreover, no indication of any further involvement of metics as a demarcated group in the City Dionysia. During the following events in the theatre metics were instead largely included among the Greek *xenoi*. We can conclude that it seems that the Athenians honoured the tradition that Dionysos should be worshipped by all, that is, by *astoi*, metics, girls, representatives of allies,

⁸² Sourvinou-Inwood (1994) 272.

⁸³ Several other examples are cited by: R. Seaford (eds.), *Reciprocity in ancient Greece* (Oxford 1998) 246. n. 49.

colonists, and even prisoners, as they all benefitted from the healing qualities of Dionysos' wine. However, in the following competitions, the spectators' gaze was mostly drawn to the participation of Athenians citizens and it was probably this dominant focus on Athenian participants that resulted in a merely token representation of metics (and perhaps of other groups as well, although this is impossible to tell from our sources) in the preceding procession. Although no one could deny that everybody participated in the *pompe* for Dionysos Eleuthereus, one could equally well claim that it was a rather meagre representation of all people associated with Athens.

2.3 Resident foreigners in the audience: the other Greeks

Although many foreigners attended and participated in the festival, in the theatre the City Dionysia's main focus lay on the participation of Athenian citizen men. Following Simon Goldhill, scholars often emphasise the democratic and civic elements of the City Dionysia and as such they label it Athens' civic festival *per excellence*.⁸⁴ From a participatory perspective, however, I think the focus of the City Dionysia probably lay first and foremost on native Athenian men, with particularly democratic and civic associations later added to the overall layout of the festival. This focus probably originated with the dithyrambic *agones* in which members of the ten Attic *phylai* competed against each other. The dithyrambic *agones* were in this way intimately tied up with the new, Kleisthenic organisation of Attica and the new group of citizens that had derived from his reforms.⁸⁵ This *phyletic* basis of the dithyrambic *agones* – but also of the selection of jurors, and, later on, the selection of comic *choregoi* – seems to lay at the basis of the City Dionysia's focus on the male Athenian-born members of the community: these were performances offered to Dionysos Eleuthereus by the members of the Attic

⁸⁴ Goldhill (1987) and (2000). Several scholars have emphasised a link between the participation of large *phyletic* groups of Athenian boys and men in dithyrambic *agones* and Athenian democracy, e.g. A. Aloni, 'Anacreonte a Atene. Datazione e significato di alcune', *QS* 19 (1984) 114-16 and J.J. Winkler, 'The ephebes' song; tragōidia and polis', *Representations* 11 (1985) 26-62, especially 40-6, though Winkler is stretching the evidence too far to connect the Dionysia exclusively with the Athenian ephebate.

⁸⁵ Cf. N.R.E. Fisher, 'The bad boyfriend, the flatterer and the sykophant: related forms of the "kakos" in democratic Athens' in: I. Sluiter and R. Rosen (eds.), *KAKOS. Badness and anti value in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden 2008) 208-12, on Kleisthenes and the Dionysia's civic choruses as articulations of the new system of community. Cf. D. Pritchard, 'Kleisthenes, participation, and the dithyrambic contests of late archaic and classical Athens', *Phoenix* 58 (2004) 208-28, on who exactly participated in these *agones*.

phylai. As such the City Dionysia, and especially the *agones*, should be understood as one of the few festivals that focussed on the (future) male citizens of Attica.⁸⁶

In the course of the fifth and fourth centuries this focus on the male citizens of Athens was elaborated, especially, as Goldhill has so often expressed, with the pre-play ceremonials – the display of tribute in the theatre, the parade of adolescent sons of the Athenians who had died in battle, the libations made in the theatre by the *strategoï*, and the declaration of honours granted by the *demos* to benefactors in the preceding year – but throughout the focus on the male Athenian born members of the Athenian community remained unchanged.⁸⁷ What, then, was the role of metics at this festival after the procession had arrived at Dionysos' sanctuary?

From their participation in the procession it can plausibly be inferred that metic *skaphephoroi* also sat in the theatre to watch the performances, perhaps forming a recognisable group if they were still wearing their crimson cloaks. In addition, it is well attested and can reasonably be assumed that many foreigners, probably including many metics, were present in the theatre; the City Dionysia were held in early spring when the city became crowded with visitors, foreign workers and ambassadors and it seems many foreigners, both resident and visiting, took the opportunity to watch the dramatic *agones*. Aristophanes' contrast between the City Dionysia and the Lenaia (*Ach.* 504-508), where only Athenians and metics sat in the audience with *xenoi* and allies absent, already underscores the more cosmopolitan nature of the City Dionysia's audience. It is

⁸⁶ Cf. J.H., Blok, 'Virtual voices. Toward a choreography of women's speech in classical Athens' in: A. Lardinois and L. McClure (eds.), *Making silence speak, Women's voices in Greek literature and society* (Princeton and Oxford 2001) 112-5 and n. 81, who emphasises that although many Athenian festivals were attended by females only, like the Thesmophoria and the Brauronia, only few were for "men only". It seems an even smaller number of festivals was focused on the male citizens of Attica specifically. Besides the City Dionysia, the Apatouria come to mind. But women also participated in the latter, on which: P. Schmitt-Pantel, 'Athéna Apatouria et la ceinture: les aspects féminins de Apatouries à Athènes', *Annales (ESC)* 32.6 (1977) 1059-73; O. Palagia, 'Akropolis Museum 581. A family at the Apatouria?', *Hesp.* 64 (1995) 493-505; S.D. Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica* (2nd ed.) (Ann Arbor (1998) 178-88.

⁸⁷ Goldhill (1987) and (2000). Cf. Wilson, forthcoming. See, however, P.J. Rhodes, 'Nothing to do with democracy: Athenian drama and the polis', *JHS* 123 (2003) 104-19, who correctly emphasises that many of the Dionysia's rituals, plays and regulations also appeared in other poleis and should therefore not be labelled as "democratic" or "Athenian" *per se*. However, the democratic articulation of these institutions is in my view of more importance than Rhodes is willing to admit.

furthermore attested that, at least in the Demosthenes' time, foreigners could obtain tickets for the performances and pay the same price Athenians did: in his speech *On the Crown* (18.28), the orator tells the jury he made arrangements for Philip's ambassadors to sit in the honorary seats in the front row of the theatre, because otherwise the Macedonian ambassadors would have had to buy their own tickets and sit in the regular "two-obol seats".⁸⁸ We can assume, then, that many foreigners of a Greek background, i.e. able to understand the dramatic performances, bought a ticket and were present in the theatre.⁸⁹ But how were they seated in the theatre?

We know that already in the fifth century honorary seats were reserved in the front row for priests, priestesses, other Athenian officials and foreign guests.⁹⁰ Two passages in Aristophanes (*Birds* 793-794; *Peace* 887-889) further indicate that the *prytaneis* and members of the *Boule* had seats in the middle of the theatre. There is unfortunately hardly any evidence for seating arrangements for the rest of the audience. We do not know in what way the crowd of Athenians, metics, slaves and visiting foreigners was organised. Perhaps with the exception of the group of *skaphephoroi*, metics were not visibly demarcated as a separate group in the theatre. A separate section for metics is not attested and unlikely since in the context of the City Dionysia the main division of the participatory community was between Athenians and non-Athenians, i.e. *xenoi*, the latter including many metics. But even a separate section for *xenoi* is not securely attested.⁹¹

⁸⁸ On the audience: *DFA*² 262-78 (with 265-66 on the regular two-obol seats) and Goldhill (1997).

⁸⁹ Cf. Henderson (1991) 145, who argues that the dramatic festivals must have been particularly informative on polis matters for people "whose only connection with the official polis was at festivals: working farmers, children, slaves, foreigners and (surely) women". He suggests that these "others" perhaps outnumbered the citizen males. A.H. Sommerstein, 'The theatre audience, the *demos*, and the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus' in: C. Pelling (ed.), *Greek tragedy and the historian* (Oxford 1997) 67, furthermore suggests that the cash-oriented metics were perhaps more inclined to buy theatre tickets than peasants, who participated only marginally in the money economy.

⁹⁰ See supra n. 67.

⁹¹ A fragment of the fourth-century comic poet Alexis (*Gynaik.* 41) in which women complain that they "have to sit in the very last wedge of seats to watch just like foreign women" might suggest foreign women, or foreigners in general, sat in the back of the theatre. However, although it is not implausible foreigners were asked to take a seat in the back of the theatre, without context this passage cannot be used as evidence for such an arrangement.

Whatever the physical realities in the theatre, ancient sources demonstrate that foreign spectators could be perceived as a separate group, often referred to as “the other Hellenes”.⁹² Depending on context, specific elements in the City Dionysia’s audience could be highlighted. For instance, from Attic comedy it would seem that during the comic *agones* the entire audience was made up of men and especially of Athenian men; in Aristophanes the audience is regularly spoken to and when the spectators are addressed they are most often called either *Athenaioi* or men (ἄνδρες).⁹³ In tragedy spectators are far less often openly acknowledged and never directly addressed but even in those texts an emphasis lies on citizens (*astoi* and *politai*) and Athenians (*Athenaioi*).⁹⁴ Notwithstanding the facts that Attic drama appealed, and still appeals, to a much wider audience than ancient Athenians and that the plays themselves deal with more members of a community than only its male citizens – women and foreign outsiders in fact starred prominently on stage – it thus seems that poets chiefly focussed their attention on those spectators who were to be the judges of their plays: the Athenian male citizens.

However, despite the Athenian and principally male orientation of these texts, we know for a fact that the audience encompassed a much larger group; although hardly ever directly and never unambiguously addressed by the poets, many foreigners were present in the audience and most likely women too.⁹⁵ Discussing the (ignored) presence of women in the audience Jeffrey Henderson refers to this blatant discrepancy between the audience that was addressed by the

⁹² E.g. [Andok.] 4.20.

⁹³ In the extant plays of Aristophanes *Athenaioi* are referred to around forty times. In the case of at least six references (*Ach.* 643, 497; *Clouds* 608; *Peace* 503; *Lys.* 1149; *Frogs* 808) the term seems to refer to the audience in the theatre. ἄνδρες: *Ach.* 497; *Peace* 13, 244, 276; *Birds* 30, 685; *Lys.* 1044; *Wealth* 804. Cf. D.M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes and Athens; an introduction to his plays* (Oxford 1995) 7-16; Sommerstein, *Acharnians* (1997) 63-74.

⁹⁴ Tracing a gradual change in the fifth century from using *astoi* to *politai* as the normal word for “inhabitants of the city”, J.H. Blok, ‘Becoming citizens. Some notes on the semantics of “citizen” in archaic and classical Athens’, *Klio* 87 (2005) 15-7, notices that where Sophokles refers to *astoi* more frequently than to *politai* (2:1), both Aeschylus and Euripides refer to *politai* more often (1:1.5).

⁹⁵ Although *Athenaioi* could include women, the fact that the debate on the presence of women in the theatre will probably never be solved illustrates the (intentional?) ambiguity of these passages. On *Athenaioi* including female Athenians: Blok (2005) 22-8. Two passages in Aristophanes might suggest he is addressing women in the crowd: *Lys.* 1043-53 and *Peace* 962-67. In *Ach.* 504-08 Dikaiopolis contrasts the audience of the Lenaia, addressed as *Athenaioi*, with that of the City Dionysia where *xenoi* and allies were present; he is however not directly addressing the *xenoi* at the Dionysia.

poets and the audience in the theatre as a difference between the more political *notional* audience (i.e. Athenian men) and the more inclusive *actual* audience (including slaves, foreigners, metics, and women) and this is a very useful way to approach the predominant focus on Athenian men in the theatre.⁹⁶

Other sources demonstrate, however, that in other contexts it was quite possible to refer to a larger crowd that encompassed more people than just Athenian men. Plato even specifically seems to tackle the dichotomy between notional and actual audience: in his *Gorgias* (502 B-D), Sokrates, stating that a tragedy stripped of melody, meter, and rhythm is a mere speech, claims that tragedy is “a kind of rhetoric addressed to such a public as is compounded of children and women and men, and slaves as well as free” and then compares it to the speeches of the orators held in front of the Athenian *demos*. It seems that Sokrates is highlighting the presence of children, women and slaves in the theatre to challenge the set of imperatives defining the notional audience of tragedy, which, similar to the speeches of the orators, consisted of the Athenian *demos*.

Another context in which a more inclusive picture of the Dionysia’s theatre crowd could be considered was in the Athenian courts, where the presence of Greek foreigners in the theatre was regularly acknowledged. In this case, similar to Aristophanes’ sneer at Kleon in the *Acharnians* (497-508), the wider perspective on the audience should probably be explained by a need to emphasise the far-reaching consequences of the defendant’s behaviour in the theatre as it had taken place in the presence of not only one’s fellow citizens but also of many foreign visitors, thus endangering nothing less than the reputation of the Athenian *demos* among the other Greeks. So, when Aeschines (3.41) opposed the award of a golden crown to Demosthenes in the theatre, he explained that laws on the proclamations of honours in the theatre were enacted since

γιγνομένων γὰρ τῶν ἐν ἄστει τραγωδῶν ἀνεκήρυκτόν τινας, οὐ πείσαντες τὸν δῆμον, οἱ μὲν ὅτι στεφανοῦνται ὑπὸ τῶν φυλετῶν, ἕτεροι δὲ ὅτι ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν· ἄλλοι δὲ τινας ὑποκηρυξάμενοι τοὺς αὐτῶν οἰκέτας ἀφίεσαν ἐλευθέρους, μάρτυρας τοὺς Ἕλληνας ποιούμενοι.

it frequently happened that at the performance of the tragedies in the city [i.e. at the City Dionysia] proclamations were made without authorization of the *demos*, now that this or that man was crowned by his *phyle*, now that

⁹⁶ Henderson (1991) 133-47. Cf. Blok (2001) 95-116.

others were crowned by the their deme, while other men by the voice of the herald manumitted their household slaves and made Greeks their witness.⁹⁷

According to Aeschines, the pre-play time in the theatre, with all those Greeks (τοὺς Ἑλληνας) present, was not to be used for matters pertaining to a lower level than the polis itself, like the *phylai*, the demes, or the *oikos*. Nothing less than the Athenian *demos* was on display during the City Dionysia to “the whole of Hellas” (ἐναντίον ἀπάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων – 3.43).

In addition to this all-embracing conceptualisation of the City Dionysia’s audience, there are also instances in the orators where we come across a conceptualised division between Athenian and other Greek spectators. For instance, in the early fourth century, the author of the *Speech against Alkibiades* (4.20) referred to Alkibiades’ behaviour in the theatre “in your [i.e. Athenian] presence, in the presence of the other Greeks (τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων) who were looking on, and before all the archons in the polis”. The author here employs a common way of splitting up the City Dionysia’s audience between Athenians and other Greeks. Similarly, Isokrates could warn the Athenians for the dangers of overplaying their cards with “our allies [...] and the other Greeks” (τοῖς δ’ ἄλλοις Ἑλλησι– 8.82), when he argues that Athens had caused the envy of the entire Greek world when, in the fifth century, they had displayed in the theatre the tribute brought by the allies and paraded the sons of Athenian war-dead. Demosthenes further specifies these different groups of spectators when he claims that Meidias insulted him “in front of many foreigners and citizens” (ἐναντίον πολλῶν καὶ ξένων καὶ πολιτῶν – 21.74).

All these sources demonstrate that in the context of an Athenian court it was not unusual to present the audience of the City Dionysia as split up between Athenians and other Greeks or, as the passage in Demosthenes illustrates, between Athenian citizens (*politai*) and foreigners (*xenoi*). Significantly, metics are never mentioned separately and Demosthenes’ distinction between *xenoi* and *politai* suggests that resident foreigners were, contrary to the Lenaia, probably included among “the other Greeks”, the *xenoi*. This also suggests that the resident foreigners present in the theatre were of a Greek background, which could, of course, already be implied from the fact that the performances were in Greek. We

⁹⁷ The translation comes from: Darwin Adams, *Aeschines* (1988) *ad loc.*

can conclude, then, that although Greek metics were in fact present in the theatre their presence was not demarcated along metic lines.

2.4 The *agones*: the exclusion of *xenoi* from the choral competitions

Similar to the notional inclusion of metics among the foreign spectators in the theatre, the resident foreigners of Attica also appear to have been perceived as *xenoi* in the context of the dramatic competitions from which *xenoi* were explicitly excluded. *Xenoi* were not allowed to act as *choregoi* and perform in the choruses as only (future) Athenian citizens could perform these roles. The first time we hear of an explicit regulation excluding *xenoi* from the choruses is in the *Speech against Alkibiades*, probably written as a political pamphlet in first decade of the fourth century. Discussing Alkibiades' disorderly behaviour as *choregos* at the City Dionysia, where he drove off his *antichoregos* Taureas with his fists, the author ([Andok.] 4.20) states:

κελεύοντος δὲ τοῦ νόμου τῶν χορευτῶν ἐξάγειν ὃν ἂν τις βούληται ξένον ἀγωνιζόμενον, οὐκ ἔξόν ἐπιχειρήσαντα κωλύειν.

The law allows anyone who wishes [the right] to lead out a *xenos* from among the members of a competing chorus and it is not allowed to resist such ejection.

That *xenoi* were also excluded from the City Dionysia's *choregia* is inferred from the scholion to Aristophanes' *Wealth* (953c+d) which informs us that "it was not allowed for a *xenos* to dance in the city choruses [...] but in the Lenaian ones it was, since metics were *choregoi* [there]".⁹⁸ Wilson concluded from this passage that metics/*xenoi* were not allowed to act as *choregos* at the City Dionysia either.⁹⁹ It thus seems that *xenoi*, again including metics, were excluded both from the choruses of the City Dionysia and its *choregia*. Again this inclusion of metics among the *xenoi* and their collective exclusion from the core business of the City Dionysia can be explained as a consequence from the festival's main focus on Athenian men and boys, this time in the context of the *agones*. This exclusion of *xenoi* and focus on Athenian men probably goes back to the early beginnings of the City Dionysia in the late sixth century. It probably resulted

⁹⁸ See above, 94.

⁹⁹ Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 27.

from the *phyletic* organisation of the dithyrambic *agones*, in which ten tribal choruses of fifty Athenian boys and ten of fifty Athenian men competed from ca. 508 onwards. This close link between the dithyrambic competitions and the Attic tribes *de facto* precluded the participation of foreigners, both visiting and resident, in these choruses.

A passage in Demosthenes' *Speech against Meidias* (21.56-57), delivered in 348, allows us a further insight into the rules concerning the exclusion of *xenoi* from the choruses that applied in his time. Admitting that the City Dionysia were an occasion for fierce competition between the members of the elite who acted as *choregoi*, Demosthenes claims that Meidias' behaviour toward him was too extreme and too violent. The orator argues repeatedly that even in the agonistic setting of the City Dionysia certain rules applied to guarantee proper conduct. As one example he presents the rules surrounding the removal of an alleged *xenos* from the choruses:

Καὶ μὴν ἴστε γε τοῦθ', ὅτι βουλόμενοι μηδέν' ἀγωνίζεσθαι ξένον οὐκ ἔδωκατε ἀπλῶς τῶν χορηγῶν οὐδενὶ προσκαλέσαντι τοὺς χορευτὰς σκοπεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐὰν μὲν καλέσῃ, πεντήκοντα δραχμάς, ἐὰν δὲ καθίζεσθαι κελεύσῃ, χιλίας ἀποτίνειν ἐτάξατε. τίνος ἔνεκα; ὅπως μὴ τὸν ἔστε φανωμένον καὶ λειτουργοῦντα τῷ θεῷ ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν καλῆ μηδ' ἐπηρεάζῃ μηδ' ὑβρίζῃ μηδεὶς ἐξεπίτηδες.

And, as you know, although you are anxious to exclude *xenoi* from the competition you do not grant the *choregoi* to simply summon for scrutiny any member of a chorus; if he summons him he is to pay fifty drachmas and a thousand if he orders him to sit in the audience. What is the object? It is to protect the man who is crowned and who serves the god on that day from being maliciously summoned or annoyed or insulted by anyone for his own reasons.¹⁰⁰

Apparently by Demosthenes' time only *choregoi* could expel a *xenos* from a chorus, while in the time of the *Speech against Alkibiades* any volunteer (τῆς βούληται) could do so. In Demosthenes (21.60) we further read that upon payment of the considerable sum of a thousand drachmas a *choregos* could bring an alleged *xenos*, or rather the *choregos* who hired him, before the Eponymous

¹⁰⁰ The translation is derived from: J.H. Vince, *Demosthenes III* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1935) *ad loc.*, with slight modifications.

Archon who would review the case. When the chorus-member turned out to be indeed a *xenos* the *choregos* would recover his money, while the *choregos* who had hired the *xenos* probably had to pay a similar amount to the Archon. According to Demosthenes this elaboration of the rules had become necessary to minimize the possibilities for members of the elite for disruptive behaviour in public, demanding attention and humiliating opponents in that way. An ulterior motive might have been to avoid unfair competition by preventing *choregoi* from expelling talented chorus-members from an opponent's chorus by claiming they were *xenoi*, which, according to Douglas MacDowell, is reflected in the verb ἐξεπίτηδες as "to obtain some advantage for himself".¹⁰¹

The possible reasons for elaborating the rules aside, the regulation's main aim seems to be to guarantee that only (future) Athenian citizens would sing in the choruses and act as *choregos* while it also prevented *choregoi* from hiring talented foreign superstars. Even so, many foreigners nevertheless found their way to the theatrical arena. The law excluding *xenoi* is commonly interpreted as excluding *xenoi* from *all* performances in the theatre and much has been made of this. Wilson, for instance, has stated that "the ideological force of such a demand for 'civic purity' at the city's leading festival is clear."¹⁰² Although I agree with Wilson that the participation of Athenian citizens was central to the City Dionysia, it is of great importance to recognize that *xenoi* were only explicitly excluded from the choruses and the *choregia*; in other events foreigners were more than present. In the "pre-play ceremony" of announcing honours in the theatre to those who had benefitted the Athenian *demos*, for instance, many of those honoured, the majority actually, were in fact foreigners. Probably the earliest example, as Wilson will treat in more detail in a forthcoming article, was Thrasyboulos of Kalydon, who had assassinated Phrynichos, the leader in the oligarchic revolution of 411. He was honoured for this in 409 with a gold crown, worth a thousand drachmas, and the announcement of the reasons for which the

¹⁰¹ D.M. MacDowell, *Demosthenes against Meidias* (Bristol 1990) 278. That despite this regulation members of the elite still found ways to demand attention in public even using this rule to their own advantage is perhaps reflected in Plutarch (*Phok.* 30.3) where he tells us that when the late fourth-century politician Demades was *choregos* he brought into the theatre a chorus consisting of a hundred *xenoi* and with them a thousand drachmas each to pay the fine. Cf. Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 80-1.

¹⁰² Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 80.

demos had awarded the crown to him at a festival *agon*, most likely the Dionysia (*IG I³ 102*).¹⁰³

In the fourth century we find several more examples of foreigners who were honoured by the Athenians for providing services relating to Athenian drama at the special Assembly held after the Dionysia to discuss the festival.¹⁰⁴ For instance, the foreign comic poet Amphis of Andros was honoured in 332/1 with an ivy crown and proxeny (*IG II² 347*) and one Nikostratos was honoured in 318/17 (?) with a crown, equality of taxation with Athenians and *enktesis* since he “continues to be *philotimos* as regards the Dionysia and his responsibilities for (or at) it, and to serve enthusiastically a succession of *choregoi* [...]” (*IG II² 551*).¹⁰⁵ In the honorary decree *IG II² 713*, dating to the third century but perhaps copying a fourth-century decree, we find the Theban Ariston, son of Echthatios being honoured, if Wilhelm’s restoration is accepted, who was a flute-player at the Dionysia.¹⁰⁶

We also know that many foreigners took part in the dithyrambic and dramatic performances at the City Dionysia, though not as *choregoi* or as members of a chorus. For instance, among the early dithyrambic poets presenting their work at the City Dionysia we find Simonides and Bacchylides from Keos and Pindar from Boiotia. Non-Athenian tragedians from the fifth century onwards include Pratinas of Phlius, Neophron of Sicyon, Ion of Chios and Theodektes of Phaselis.¹⁰⁷ And in comedy, too, foreign poets could present their work: father and son Anaxandrides (*FRA6213*) and Anaxandros (*FRA6214*) of

¹⁰³ Wilson, forthcoming.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Lambert (2008), who presents ten decrees of the late fourth century honouring foreigners that were issued at the special assembly held after the City Dionysia to discuss the affairs of the festival. Cf. S.D. Lambert, ‘Athenian state laws and decrees, 352/1-322/1: III Decrees honouring foreigners A. Citizenship, proxeny and euergesy’, *ZPE* 158 (2006) 115-58, nos. 39, 40 and 42 and idem., ‘Athenian state laws and decrees, 352/1-322/1: III Decrees honouring foreigners B. Other awards’, *ZPE* 159 (2007) 101-54 nos. 75, 78, 95, 96, 98, 101 and 150, for full bibliographies.

¹⁰⁵ = Lambert (2008) no. 2 and 10. I have used the translation of Lambert (2008) no. 10.

¹⁰⁶ Stephen Lambert informs me that S. G. Byrne, ‘Some people in third-century Athenian decrees’ in: *Festschrift Elaine Matthews*, forthcoming, will argue that the proposer was in fact the fourth-century politician and that the decree was probably re-inscribed in the third century. The decree can be dated to the third century on the basis of its letterforms and the proposer, Demades son of Demeas, of Paiania who is usually associated with the homonymous grandson of the famous fourth-century politician.

¹⁰⁷ Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 99 n. 6.

Rhodos (or Kolophon) both presented comedies at the City Dionysia in the fourth century.

Besides foreign poets, foreign musicians also regularly came to perform at the City Dionysia's *agones*: besides the Theban flute-player Ariston, we also find, for instance, an *auletes* from Sicyon (*IG* II² 3068 – 344/3) and the Megarian flute-player Telephanes, who was chosen by Demosthenes (21.17) to join his dithyrambic chorus.¹⁰⁸

There is even a possibility that *xenoi* were only excluded from the dithyrambic choruses as these were the only *agones* organised on a *phyletic* basis and thus tightly connected with Athenian citizens. Corroborating this idea is the fact that the exclusion of *xenoi* is only mentioned in connection with the dithyrambic competition. The author of the *Speech against Alkibiades* ([Andok.] 4.20) tells the jury to “remember Taureas who competed against Alkibiades as *choregos* of a chorus of boys”, i.e. in the dithyrambic *agon*. Also, Plutarch (*Phok.* 30.3) tells us that the late fourth-century politician Demades broke all the rules when he entered the theatre with a chorus consisting of a hundred *xenoi* and with them a thousand drachmas each to pay the fine. Although the account is exaggerated and the result of centuries of vilification of Demades' character, the number of one hundred *choreutes* might imply that Demades had been *choregos* for the dithyrambic choruses of both fifty boys and fifty men.¹⁰⁹ Demosthenes, moreover, was *choregos* of a dithyrambic chorus for the *phyle* Pandionis when he was attacked by Meidias, who, as the orator stresses, deserves punishment since even the removal of a *xenos* from a chorus is regulated to prevent violence against a *choregos* (21.56-60).

Although the exclusion of *xenoi* from the choruses and the *choregia* of the City Dionysia can and should thus be put in perspective, the explicit exclusion of *xenoi* from the choruses was still a powerful means to divide the participatory community at the City Dionysia between the Athenian competitors and the other

¹⁰⁸ Cf. *DFA*² 76-7 and 279. Thebans seem to have been especially prominent among the foreign *auletai* and *didaskaloi* of the City Dionysia, for which see, e.g., *SEG* 26.220; *SEG* 27.12; *SEG* 27.18; *IG* II² 3106; *IG* II² 3083; *IG* II² 3046; *IG* II² 713. Also see the Theban flute-player Ismenias in Plut. *Mor.* 632D.

¹⁰⁹ On this passage see: P. Brun, *L'orateur Démade. Essai d'histoire et d'historiographie* (Bordeaux 2000) 151-53. As Lambert (2008) 58, points out: Demades was also the proposer of at least two decrees honouring foreigners for services they had rendered in relation to the theatre (his nos. 3 and 7). Perhaps the honorary decree for the Theban Ariston (*IG* II² 713) was also proposed by Demades, on which see n. 106. Cf. Humphreys, *Strangeness* (2004) 255, on another anecdote about Demades in connection with the theatre.

Greek participants who mainly participated in the margins. In the context of the City Dionysia the demarcated participation of metics was therefore restricted to the marching contingent of metic *skaphephoroi* in the *pompe*, while for the main part metics participated generally as Greek *xenoi*.

Many Greek *xenoi* were nevertheless present in the theatre and participated in the *pompe* and the dramatic *agones*. It is indeed not implausible that *xenoi* attended the special assembly that took place in the theatre after the City Dionysia to discuss festival matters: Demosthenes (21.193) states that Meidias had insulted this special meeting of the *ekklesia* by saying that it was composed of “those who should have gone out on campaign [i.e. to Euboia] and those who had left their posts unguarded” and that he was voted down “by chorus-members, foreigners, and all that sort.” Rhetoric aside, it is quite possible that *xenoi* were present at these special assemblies since it was at these meetings that in the late fourth century many foreigners were honoured by the *demos* for their services relating to the City Dionysia.¹¹⁰

Many Greeks thus attended the City Dionysia and comparable to the Panathenaia the City Dionysia are therefore best understood as a polis-wide festival. The City Dionysia nevertheless presented quite a different articulation: the festival’s main focus lay on the participation of Athenian citizen men while the position of non-Athenians, including many resident foreigners, was limited. The City Dionysia were a festival at which Athenian men were the focus of attention; they were the ones who chiefly shared in the *hiera* of Dionysos Eleuthereus. It was this focus on the male citizen of Athens that resulted in a conceptual differentiation between Athenian citizens and *xenoi* and the inclusion of metics among the latter.

3 Metics at the Hephaisteia – the young, strong men of Athens

In 421/0 the Athenians issued a decree (*IG I³ 82*) regulating the celebration of a festival in honour of Hephaistos and Athena Hephaistia. Many features of the festival were set out in detail, from the selection of two groups of sacrificial officials to the inscribing of the prizes won in the *agones*, among which most famously the torch-race that led from the altar of Prometheus near the Academy to the altar of Hephaistos in his sanctuary on the Kolonos Agoraios overlooking

¹¹⁰ Cf. Lambert (2008) 59; Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 167 n.55.

the Athenian Agora.¹¹¹ Most interesting to our present concern are lines 23-24 where it is stated that the *hieropoioi* “give the metics three cows and of these three the *hieropoioi* are to give them the meat raw”. Scholars have commonly explained this instance of metic participation as an exception to a general rule of exclusion, and an understandable one for that matter because of the obvious link between metics and Hephaistos, the god of fire and crafts.

However, besides the fact that metics participated in several other polis festivals, this explanation generally passes over way in which metics were included and differentiated from the other participants in the Hephaisteia. In order to better understand this instance of metic participation we should, beside Hephaistos’ field of expertise, also take into consideration the growing role of metics in the Athenian army and in the restoration of Athens in the second half of the fifth century. Their growing involvement in the community called for a further acknowledgement of the position of metics in Athenian society *and* for a further demarcation of a separate status for this group. The Hephaisteia offered an appropriate context to achieve just that.

3.1 The Hephaisteia of 421: new, reorganised, or single celebration?

Our single most important source on the Hephaisteia is the decree of the *Boule* and the *demos* of 421/0 (*IG I³ 82*).¹¹² Although the inscription is very fragmentary, a lot of information can still be obtained. The first fifteen lines are most damaged and we can only make out references to a four-yearly festival (a *penteteris*) (6), the agora (11), the participation of *demotai* (12), a curious reference to music (τ]ἔς μουσικῆς – 14), and the mention of Hephaistos and Athena (15). After this, the inscription becomes easier to read and restore. Ten sacrificial officials (*hieropoioi*) are to be appointed by lot from the *dikasts*, the pool of potential jury members, one from each *phyle*, and ten more from the *Boule*, also one from each *phyle* (17-23). These *hieropoioi*, twenty in total, are to provide metics with three oxen and give them the meat of these raw (23-24). They are also to take care of the procession and if someone does something

¹¹¹ Hephaisteion: J.M. Camp, *The Athenian Agora: Excavations in the heart of classical Athens* (2nd ed.) (London 1992) 82-7 and R.E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora III: The literary and epigraphical testimonia* (Princeton 1973) 98-102.

¹¹² Hephaisteia: Deubner, *Attische Feste* (1966) 212-3; Parke, *Festivals* (1977) 171-2; R. Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 471-2.

disruptive they can fine that person up to fifty drachma (24-28). Next, it is stated that at the sound of a trumpet a now lost number of oxen will be escorted to the altar of Hephaistos and 200 men will be chosen from all Athenians who are to lift up the animals – a truly amazing demonstration of strength (28-30).¹¹³

At this point the text becomes more difficult to read again. A torch-race at a four-yearly festival, a *penteteris*, is referred to in relation to the torch-race at the Hephaisteia (30-31). The *penteteris* probably refers to the Greater Panathenaia as it seems unlikely that it refers to the Prometheia, the other festival with a famous torch-race, which are both mentioned in relation to this *penteteris*.¹¹⁴ Robert Parker moreover noted that the *penteteris* in our decree cannot be the Hephaisteia as it is not included in the list of classical *penteterides* given in the Aristotelean *Ath. Pol.* (54.7), which appears to be complete, mentioning the Herakleia, the mission to Delos, the Brauronia, the Eleusinia and the Greater Panathenaia.

In *Ath. Pol.* 54.7 the Hephaisteia are in fact labelled a *penteteris* but as instituted in 329. Several scholars have, however, convincingly argued that the Amphiareia are a better candidate for a reorganisation in 329, with a special celebration every four years: it was in the late 330s that Oropos, the site of the famous sanctuary of Amphiaraos, had been given to Athens by Alexander the Great.¹¹⁵ From this we can conclude that the Hephaisteia were probably never celebrated as a *penteteris*, neither in 421 nor after 329. Lines 30-33 of our decree therefore most likely compare the torch-race of the Panathenaia (i.e. the *penteteris* in line 30-31) with the one of the Hephaisteia in some irretrievable manner and order the torch-race of the Hephaisteia “and the other *agones*” to be organised in the same manner as the spectacle of the Prometheia.

¹¹³ On this ritual bull-lifting: Van Straten, *Hiera Kala* (1994) 109-13; C. Kritzas, Πρακτικὰ τοῦ Ἐ' Διεθνoῦς Συνεδρίου Πελοποννησιακῶν Σπουδῶν, "Ἀργος-Ναύπλιον, 6-10 Σεπτεμβρίου vol. 2 (Athens 1996/1997) 33-42; Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 180-1.

¹¹⁴ Two other Athenian torch-races are attested in classical times: Herodotus (6.105) informs us that after the victory at Marathon in 490 the Athenians honoured Pan with a shrine below the Akropolis, annual sacrifices and a torch-race. The Bendideia hosted a *lampadedromia* on horseback, see below, 277-8.

¹¹⁵ E.g. Rhodes, *Commentary*² *ad. loc.*; Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 149 n.109, 246 n. 100; M. Faraguna, *Atene nell'età di Alessandro: problemi politici, economici, finanziari* (Rome 1992) 345. That Oropos was given to Athens by Alexander and not Philip of Macedon, as has been often assumed, was persuasively argued by D. Knoepfler, *Érétria. Fouilles et recherches XI. Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté* (Lausanne 2001) 370-80. Denis Knoepfler, 'Adolf Wilhelm et la *pentétèris* des Amphiaraia d'Oropos' in: M. Piérart (ed.), *Aristote e Athènes* (Paris 1993) 279-302, has even argued that the first penteteric celebration of the Amphiareia took place in 329.

In the final section of the decree the organisation of *agones* is laid down in more detail. After an isolated reference to Poseidon and Apollo (34), gymnasiarchs are mentioned (35) who, as we know from a polis decree of 346/5 (*IG* II² 3201), funded tribal teams of youths who competed in the torch-race.¹¹⁶ Next, we read that the altar of Hephaistos is to be seized (36), probably by the torch-runners, and at the end of the day something has to be announced (38-9), presumably who were the winners in the *agones* since in the next lines *hieropoioi* and competitors are required to be present and referees and *hieropoioi* are ordered to take care that prizes are inscribed (40-41). The decree ends with the formula for the inscribing and the erecting of the stone in the sanctuary of Hephaistos (42-44).

The most debated question concerning this decree is whether it sets out to regulate a new festival, reorganise an existing one, or order a special one-time celebration as has been suggested most recently by Vincent Rosivach.¹¹⁷ Although some aspects of the festival seem to be organised afresh by the decree, some even explicitly based on already existing festivals, like the torch-race of the Prometheia, there is much evidence suggesting the festival was not a completely new innovation in 421, as has been argued by previous scholars.¹¹⁸ The decree of 421/0 should probably be understood as specifying a reorganisation of the already existing Hephaisteia.

Hephaistos had not been lacking attention from the Athenians before 421: the construction of the temple for Hephaistos that is still visible today on the hill west of the Agora started in the 450s and a treasury of Hephaistos is referred to in the accounts of the Other Gods of 429/8 (*IG* I³ 383 A57) and 426/5 (*IG* I³ 369.85).¹¹⁹ Hephaistos was also regularly depicted on Attic pottery from the sixth

¹¹⁶ Other gymnasiarchs at Hephaisteia are mentioned in Andokides (1.132), *SEG* 25.177.29 (330s), and *IG* II² 3006 (1st century AD). Cf. Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 427 and Sekunda, N.V., 'IG II² 1250: a decree concerning the *lampadephoroi* of the tribe Aiantis', *ZPE* 83 (1990) 149-56.

¹¹⁷ Rosivach, *Public sacrifice* (1994) Appendix B.

¹¹⁸ A pre-421 Hephaisteia has been suggested by Deubner, *Attische Feste* (1966) 212-3 and Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 471-2.

¹¹⁹ In the famous law of Nikophon on coinage, ordering the allies of Athens to use one type of (Athenian) currency and weights, Hephaistos is mentioned as the recipient of something (*IG* I³ 1453 C17). Although the decree is conventionally dated to the 440s (*e.g.* M&L 45), a date in the 420s was first suggested by H.B. Mattingly, 'The Athenian coinage decree',

century onwards.¹²⁰ There was in fact a very ancient festival called the Chalkeia in honour of Athena and Hephaistos, in this case allegedly celebrated only by craftsmen.¹²¹ Evidently, although outside Athens Hephaistos was surprisingly neglected, the limping god received much worship in Athens from an early date onwards. This special relationship between Hephaistos and the diligent Athenians is clearly expressed in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* (13-14), performed in 458, where the Pythia calls the Athenians "the high-way building sons of Hephaistos".

There is, in addition, strong evidence indicating that specific elements of the Hephaisteia were already familiar before 421. For instance, when Herodotus, who died in 425, discusses the Persian messenger system (8.98.2) he compares it to the "torch-race held by the Greeks in honour of Hephaistos". The historian refers to Greeks in general but since Athens seems to have been the only place where Hephaistos was honoured with a torch-race in classical times, he was probably talking of the Athenians specifically.¹²² In Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (279-314), performed in 458, Klytaimnestra similarly seems to refer to the (Athenian) custom of honouring Hephaistos with torch-races when she describes how a message from her husband in Troy reached her in Mycene, going from beacon to beacon, Hephaistos sending his fire in a sort of relay race in which "the first and last are both victorious."¹²³

The torch-race of the Hephaisteia is perhaps also depicted on a black-figure volute-krater by Polion dated to the 420s and now in Ferrara.¹²⁴ On the krater's neck we see youths with torches approaching an altar at which stands a bearded man (a priest? Hephaistos?). On the main body we see typical dithyrambic themes: Thamyras is playing his lyre before the Muses and Hephaistos returns to the Olympos. H. Froning has connected this vase with the torch-race for

Historia 10 (1961) 148-69 and idem, 'New light on the Athenian standards decree', *Klio* 75 (1993) 98-102.

¹²⁰ *LIMC* s.v. Hephaistos, 627-54. Of the 150 Attic vases listed only 18 postdate the 430s.

¹²¹ *Suda* s.v. Χαλκεῖα referring to Hypereides and Phanodemos. Cf. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (1966) 35-6 and Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 464-5, who lists the most important sources.

¹²² First observed by Deubner, *Attische Feste* (1966) 212-3. In later times torch-races for Hephaistos are attested elsewhere, like on a third-century coin from Methone, Messenia (B. Head, *Historia Numorum*² (Oxford 1911) 433). G. Dunst, 'Die Siegerliste der samische Heraia', *ZPE* (1967) 225-39, discusses a second-century torch-race for Hephaistos on Samos.

¹²³ Deubner, *Attische Feste* (1966) 212-3, further suggested that the use of the definite article in the decree in referring to the torch-race (l.32) implies it was already in existence.

¹²⁴ Ferrara, Museo Nazionale di Spina, T 17 = Simon, *Festivals* (1983) pl. 15.2.

Hephaistos and suggested that the Hephaisteia also hosted a dithyrambic *agon*.¹²⁵ Besides this vase, there is the occurrence of μουσικῆς in the decree of 421 (*IG I³* 82.14), a mention of *choregoi* at the Hephaisteia in the Old Oligarch (*Ath. Pol.* 3.4) and a reference to the Hephaisteia in a fourth-century decree of the *phyle* Pandionis honouring victorious *choregoi* (*IG II²* 1138.11), all strongly suggesting that the Hephaisteia indeed also hosted a dithyrambic contest, perhaps already part of the festival before 421 as the krater of Polion might indicate.¹²⁶

It further appears that the lifting of bulls, alluded to in the decree, was also familiar before 421: the ritual is depicted on two Attic vases, one of which specifically associated with Hephaistos.¹²⁷ On a black-figure amphora in Viterbo, dated to ca. 550, we see seven bearded men who have lifted a bull on their shoulders while another man holds a sacrificial bowl beneath the animal's neck (probably to collect the blood), while another kills the bull with a knife, a moment rarely depicted on Attic vases.¹²⁸ On a red-figure *kylix* in Florence, dated to ca. 500, we see a similar scene: five youths are wrestling with a bull in an attempt to lift the animal, which will be killed by the youth on the left who is sharpening his knife. On the other side we see a trumpeter and more youths, this time with horses. On the inside of the cup Hephaistos is depicted in a wheeled chair reminiscent of the chair in which Triptolemos is so often depicted on Attic vases. Folkert van Straten has suggested that perhaps "the vase painter has intended the decoration of this *kylix* as a coherent whole, the pictures on the outside illustrating a festival in honour of Hephaistos."¹²⁹ Apparently, Athenians were already lifting bulls in honour of Hephaistos in the late sixth, early fifth century.

¹²⁵ H. Fröning, *Dithyrambos und Vasenmalerei in Athen* (Würzburg 1971) 78-81.

¹²⁶ Cf. Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 35-6. On *IG II²* 1138 see: P. Amandry, 'Trépièds d' Athènes', *BCH* 101 (1977) 171-7. Some sceptics have (unnecessarily) argued that the reference to *choregoi* at the Hephaisteia should be understood as referring to tribal competitions in general, e.g. Davies (1967) 35.

¹²⁷ In Euripides' *Helena* (1560-1564), performed in 412, we find bulls being lifted on youthful shoulders as a typically Greek custom. Cf. Van Straten, *Hiera kala* (1995) 110. The lifting of bulls is also attested for the Proerosia and the Mysteries at Eleusis in several ephebic inscriptions of the second and first centuries (*IG II²* 1006.9-10, 78-79; 1008, 8-9; 1011.8) and at a Herakleion (Theophrastus (*Char.* 27.5). Also see n. 113 above.

¹²⁸ Museo Nazionale Archeologico, Rocca Alborno, Viterbo = Van Straten, *Hiera Kala* (1994) V141 (fig.115).

¹²⁹ Florence 81600 = Van Straten, *Hiera Kala* (1994) V145 (fig.116), 112.

Finally, a *lex sacra* of the deme Paiania (*IG I³ 250*) dated to ca. 450-430 needs to be mentioned as it might include a reference to the participation of the Paianian demesmen in the Hephaisteia before 421. Lines 4-7 of that decree possibly contain an allusion to the participation of the demesmen in the Skira and the Hephaisteia: τῶι δέμο[ι--c.7-8---] ἠέρειαν πα[ρέχεν νν Σκ]ίροισι καὶ Ἡεφ[αιστίοισι ὀ]πτανα.¹³⁰

We can conclude, then, that the Hephaisteia were already in existence in 421 and that it already include at least a torch-race, a bull-lifting ritual, probably a dithyrambic *agon* and perhaps some form of participation by demes. The torch-race, bull lifting and other *agones* point to an agonistic festival in which young and strong men in general and in later times ephebes specifically predominantly took part. Although on the Viterbo amphora the bull-lifters are bearded and in the Hephaisteia-decree they are chosen “from all Athenians” (ἐχς ἸΑθ[ν]αίου – 30) and not from Athenian youths specifically, Van Straten rightly emphasises that we should understand these as typical ritual activities of strong, young and active men. Hellenistic inscriptions in fact only mention ephebes as the ones lifting bulls and competing with torches and when in the fourth century Theophrastus (*Char.* 27.5) portrays the Late Learner as doing things not fit for his age he explicitly refers to competing in torch-races and lifting bulls.¹³¹ The participation of these strong and young Athenians in the Hephaisteia was furthermore mainly organised through Attica’s tribal and deme system, thus articulating the Kleisthenic reorganisation of the Athenian polis: dithyrambic contests were commonly organised on a tribal basis, the *lex sacra* of Paiania mentions participation by a deme, and from the polis decree honouring the gymnasiarchs of the Hephaisteia (*IG II² 3201*) we can conclude that at least by 346/5 the torch-race was run by *phyletic* teams of ephebes. The Hephaisteia, in sum, were an agonistic festival in which strong, young, male Athenians participated predominantly on a tribal basis, already before 421.

What then was the purpose of the decree of 421/0? Rosivach has suggested it regulated a special, one-time celebration on a grand scale in association with the dedication of the new cult statues of Alkamenes for Hephaistos and Athena

¹³⁰ The restoration was first suggested by Peek in 1941. Michael Jameson in *IG I³* suggested restoring ἠεφ[σάνα καὶ ὀ]πτανα instead.

¹³¹ Van Straten, *Hiera kala* (1995) 112. See supra, ns.110, 125.

Hephaistia, as recorded in another inscription (*IG I³ 472*).¹³² However, this inscription records that the work on these statues commenced in 421, only to be finished five years later in 416/5 and I consider it very unlikely that the dedication of new cult statues should be celebrated five years before they would actually be in place. I am therefore inclined to discard Rosivach's theory on the close association between our decree and the building accounts of the Hephaisteion. What the two inscriptions do have in common is that they signal an increased interest in the cult of Hephaistos in the final two decades of the fifth century, with the Hephaisteia being reorganised in 421/0 and new cult statues being dedicated in 416/5. The purpose of the decree of 421/0 was most likely then to *reorganise* the Hephaisteia and one of the things the Athenians deemed necessary to stipulate was that from then onwards metics would share in the sacrifices to Hephaistos and Athena Hephaistia.

3.2 Metic participation in the Hephaisteia

The decree of 421/0 (*IG I³ 82*) is not only our most important source for the Hephaisteia, it also contains the only information we have for the participation of metics in this festival. In lines 23-24 we read:

δῶναι δὲ [κ]αὶ τοῖς μετοίκοις τρεῖς βοῦς, τούτων [τῶν τριῶν δὲ ἑ] ἱεροποιοὶ [νε]μόντων [α]ὐτοῖς ὁμὰ τὰ κρέα.

And to give the metics three oxen from [which three] the *hieropoioi* are to give them the meat raw

What can we say about this instance of metic participation which led to the further incorporation of metics into the community and a further carving out of their status? First of all, it is important to emphasise that the Hephaisteia were the

¹³² Rosivach, *Public sacrifice* (1994) appendix B. For a discussion of several reconstructions of the cult statues of Alkamenēs: F. Brommer, *Hephaistos. Der Schmiedegott in der antiken Kunst* (Mainz am Rhein 1978) 75-90 and A. Kosmopoulou, *The iconography of sculptured statue bases in the archaic and classical periods* (Wisconsin 2002) 126-30. A. Jacquemin, *LIMC s.v. Hephaistos*, notes that after the late fifth-century most depictions of Hephaistos seem derived from a prototype, probably the statues of Alkamenēs; Hephaistos is consistently depicted with a beard, wearing a *pilos* and the typical worker's tunic called an *exomis*, often holding hammer or double axe. For a "democratic" reading of the metopes and frieze which were sculpted around the same time: K. Reber, 'Das Hephaisteion in Athen – ein Monument für die Demokratie', *JdI* 113 (1998) 31-48.

only festival where metics were explicitly included in sacrifices as metics on polis level. Perhaps, as we saw earlier, metics shared in the sacrifices to Athena at the Panathenaia but, if so, they did so as the people carrying ritual items in the front part of the *pompe*. In the next chapter I will treat the inclusion of *metoikoi* in the sacrifices to the hero Leos in the deme Skambonidai but this instance says more about the incorporation of *metoikoi*, perhaps including Athenian “immigrants” from other demes, into a deme community than into the polis community at large. The Hephaisteia thus present us with an exceptional inclusion of metics on polis level in a religious act that was of key importance for identifying the core of a cult community. In a moment we will look at some possible reasons for this but for now we should not solely focus on the extraordinary inclusivity of the Hephaisteia for the participation of metics was also differentiated and limited compared to the participation of Athenians.

The differentiation between metic and Athenian participants at the Hephaisteia is already clear in the wording of the decree reorganising the festival; the several groups of participants are demarcated and referred to separately, with Athenians participating by themselves in most activities. The decree specifies Athenians (ἸΑθηναίων – 30) as the sole participants in the bull-lifting ritual and in the fragmentary beginning we come across a reference to *demotai* (τῶν δαιμόνων – 12). Let us dwell a little longer on this occurrence of the term *demotai* as it illustrates well how group identities could be conceptualised in terms of religious obligations and responsibilities. David Whitehead observed that the Hephaisteia decree contains one of the earliest epigraphic attestations of the use of the term *demotai* as “demesmen”. The other decrees are the *lex sacra* from the deme Paiania already referred to (*IG I³ 250.14* – ca. 450-430), a decree from the deme Ikarion regulating the *choregia* for the local Dionysia (*IG I³ 254.3* – ca. 440-431), and a decree from the deme Plotheia dealing with religious funds (*IG I³ 258.33* – ca. 420).¹³³ Significantly, all these early occurrences are concerned with differentiating a collective of deme-members from other groups in terms of religious responsibilities. So, in the Ikarion decree (*IG I³ 254*) it is stated that two *choregoi* are to be selected from the demesmen and two “from those living in Ikarion” (τῶν δαιμόνων καὶ τῶν Ἰκαρίοι οἰκόντων – 3-4) thus neatly dividing the religious obligations between the Ikarian demesmen and non-

¹³³ D. Whitehead, *The demes of Attica, 508/7 - ca. 250 BC. A political and social study* (Princeton 1986) 68 n. 4.

demesmen living in the deme.¹³⁴ The decree from Plotheia (*IG I³ 258*) is concerned with the financing of the deme’s religious obligations on various levels, i.e. on deme level, on polis level and on a sub-level within a (pre-Kleisthenic?) group referred to as the Epakrians. We read that

28 καὶ ἐς τᾶλλα ἱερά, ὅποιοι ἂν δέ[ηι Π]-
 λωθέας ἅπαντας τελεῖν ἀργύριο[ν ἐς]
 [ἰ]ερά, ἢ ἐς Πλωθέας ἢ ἐς Ἐπακρέα[ς ἢ ἐς]
 [Α]θηναίους, ἐκ τῶ κοινῶ τὸς ἄρχο[ντας],
 [οἱ] ἂν ἄρχωσι τὸ ἀργυρίο τῶ ἐς τῆ[ν ἀτ]-
 33 [έ]λειαν, τελεῖν ὑπὲρ τῶν δημοτῶν·

And concerning the other *hiera*, whenever all Plotheians are required to pay money for *hiera*, either due to the Plotheians or to the Epakrians or to the Athenians, the archons who are in charge of the *ateleia* (a fund for (tax) exemption) are to pay on behalf of the demesmen from the common (fund).

In this way the Plotheians set out that the deme from now onwards was going to pay for the common religious obligations of the Plotheian demesmen for which these demesmen had hitherto paid individually.¹³⁵ Thus, the collective responsibility for the *hiera* of the Plotheian demesmen as *a group* is recorded, secured and displayed, whether it was for the *hiera* within the context of the deme or within a larger worshipping community of Epakrians or Athenians.

Although the individual use of demotics had slowly and haphazardly come in vogue from 508 onwards, and although Athenians had long been referring to themselves by using the name of the villages they came from, (*e.g.*, the Sounians in *IG I³ 1024a*, dated to ca. 550), it apparently took until the second half of the fifth century before the Athenians felt a need to express their collective, shared membership of the Kleisthenic demes as *demotai*. Significantly, just as individual demotics first appear on dedications of the Akropolis, the collective “*demotai*” first occurs in inscriptions concerned with the mutual sharing in *hiera* by enrolled members *and* other worshippers, like those merely resident in Ikarion, the non-

¹³⁴ On this deme decree see the next chapter, 200-16.

¹³⁵ Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 165-9; Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 62, 73; J.H. Blok, ‘Deme accounts and the meaning of *hosios* money in fifth-century Athens’, forthcoming.

Plotheian Epakrians and Athenians.¹³⁶ In the same line of reasoning, the use of the term *demotai* in the Hephaisteia decree can be seen as significant in setting the parameters of the identity of the Athenian participants in relation to the other participants; it was not simply the Athenians who worshipped Hephaistos but rather the collective of Athenians whose identity was anchored in their hereditary deme communities in which they were enrolled by descent and on account of which they were collectively entitled to specific shares in the *hiera* of the Hephaisteia while other shares went to the metics.

Although the Athenian demesmen were thus entitled to particular shares in the *hiera* of Hephaistos on account of their deme membership I want to emphasise that the stress on deme-membership should not be understood as marking metics as inferior members of the community; it merely highlighted different memberships and entitlements for demesmen and metics. Just as the different participating groups in the Panathenaic *pompe* should not be perceived as reflecting a hierarchy but rather as negotiating different memberships of the community through differentiated sharing in the *hiera* of Athena, the various labels used in the Hephaisteia decree for the various participants should similarly not be understood as creating or reflecting any hierarchy; they are neutral demarcations.

That being said, several aspects of their participation reveal that metics nevertheless participated in a somewhat limited way in the Hephaisteia. For instance, the “only” *hiera* metics shared in were the sacrifices; the dithyrambic *agones* were tribally organised and thus open only to members of the ten Attic *phylai*, only Athenians could participate in the bull-lifting ritual, as we could read in the decree, and the torch-race was intimately tied up with the education of Athens’ youth.¹³⁷ And even in the context of the sacrifices it seems the role of metics was relatively small. Metics received three oxen from the *hieropoioi* while the Athenians probably received more. Even Michel Clerc, otherwise very willing to stretch the evidence to its limits to highlight the inclusion of metics in polis religion, described the participation of metics in the Hephaisteia as a token representation in light of the number of animals sacrificed by Athenians. He

¹³⁶ On *demotika*: Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 69-72. For a fresh look at the development and the implications of *demotika* see the forthcoming work of Diana Kretschmann.

¹³⁷ Cf. Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 253-4; Van Straten, *Hiera Kala* (1994) 112.

suggested that the references in the Hephaisteia decree in lines 11-13 to an agora, *demotai* and several hundreds (---]κοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν) might refer to the distribution of hundreds of animals to the *demotai* in the Athenian Agora.¹³⁸ The condition of the inscription does not, however, allow for such an elaborate, though perhaps elegant restoration. Still, the reference to 200 Athenians, presumably divided among ten *phyletic* teams to lift the bulls, nevertheless indicates that certainly more than three and probably no less than ten animals were sacrificed by the Athenians on the occasion of the Hephaisteia.¹³⁹

On the other hand, the limitations reflected in the fact that metics only received the meat of three oxen can also be placed in perspective. Although the invitation to participate in the Hephaisteia did probably not cover the whole metic population, metics might nevertheless have received a fair share of meat. Rosivach has cautiously suggested on the basis of African cattle that Athenian oxen might yield as much as 100-120kg of meat per animal. This would mean that three oxen could provide 1200 metics each with a portion of 250g of meat, or 1500 metics with portions of 200g.¹⁴⁰ Even though this indicates that only a percentage of the metics living in Attica could actually participate in the Hephaisteia –Thucydides (2.31.2) already refers to no less than 3,000 metic hoplites and the total number of metics living in Attica at this time is sometimes estimated at ca. 28,000¹⁴¹– this number is clearly far from being a mere token representation. In addition, if the Athenians indeed sacrificed ten oxen and the metics three, this ratio would more or less agree with modern estimates the relative size of Athens' metic population around 430. Mainly based on Thucydides' remarks (2.31.2) on the size of the Athenian army before the invasion of Megaris in 431 (i.e. 3,000 metic hoplites next to 10,000 Athenian

¹³⁸ Clerc, *Métèques athéniens* (1893) 152-4.

¹³⁹ Despite the efforts of the German professor Stengel, who asked some butchers whether it was possible to lift an ox, we do not know how many Athenians were needed for this ritual. Cf. Van Straten, *Hiera kala* (1995) 109-13.

¹⁴⁰ Rosivach, *Public sacrifice* (1994) 157-8.

¹⁴¹ R. Garland, *The Piraeus*² (Bristol 2001) 61, following M.I. Finley, *Studies in land and credit in ancient Athens, 500-200 BC; the horos inscriptions* (New Jersey 1951) 64, cautiously calculates a total number of 28,000-30,000 metics around 431. H. van Wees, *Greek warfare. Myths and realities* (London 2004) 241-3 argues that Athenian hoplites probably constituted around 40% of the total citizen (male) population. He calculates a total of 5,300 metic hoplites (=3,000 of Thuc. 2.31.2 and another 2,300 among the 16,000 old, young and metic soldiers mentioned in Thuc. 2.13.6) which would thus indicate around 13,250 (male) metics in total. Note that metic wives and children are not included. Cf. R.P. Duncan-Jones, 'Metic numbers in Periclean Athens', *Chiron* 10 (1980) 101-9.

ones), it has been argued that we should envisage one metec to every four Athenians around this time.¹⁴² If correct, this would mean that the animals offered by metecs to Hephaistos were proportional to their numerical presence in Athenian society and not, perhaps, a sign of their limited sharing in the *hiera* of Hephaistos.

However, there still remains a clear sign of limitation in the way metecs participated in the Hephaisteia: the specification that the meat of the animals offered to Hephaistos by the metecs was to be given to them raw ([νε]μουτον [α]υτοις ὄμα τὰ κρέα – 24). This is something not commented on by previous scholarship, even though most acknowledge, in the words of Michael Jameson, that “how meat of sacrificial animals was distributed was important socially because it recognised membership in a defined community and status and privilege within it.”¹⁴³

In polis and deme decrees it was often regulated how sacrificial meat was to be handled: after customary parts of the sacrifice had been given to the gods by the butcher (the *mageiros*), officiating priests usually also received certain shares, often a hide. After this customary distribution, there were several ways to distribute the remaining meat. So, meat could, for instance, be sold, sending the participants away from rites that usually only included a single victim, as Jameson noted.¹⁴⁴ Or it could be stated to the opposite that the meat was not to be taken away (οὐ φορὰ) or even more explicitly that the participants had to dine right on the spot (δαινύσθων αὐτοῦ).¹⁴⁵ Sterling Dow explained this οὐ φορα-requirement as a secular regulation ensuring that meat was equally shared amongst the participants and not unfairly pre-empted by a priest.¹⁴⁶ Dow, however, still firmly believed that the priestly families known as *gene* were aristocratic houses who exploited “the commoners” whenever they could. Jameson, by contrast, convincingly argued that there is probably a more cultic origin to the οὐ φορα-rule, as it prolonged the religious, performative momentum, encouraging further identification of the core members of the worshipping

¹⁴² See footnotes 6 and 11 of the Introduction.

¹⁴³ M.H. Jameson, ‘The spectacular and the obscure in Athenian religion’ in: S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance culture and Athenian democracy* (Cambridge 1999) 324.

¹⁴⁴ Jameson (1999) 328-30.

¹⁴⁵ Van Straten, *Hiera kala* (1995) 145 n. 93, lists decrees with these clauses.

¹⁴⁶ S. Dow, ‘The Greater Demarkhia of Erkhia’, *BCH* 89 (1965) 208-10.

community.¹⁴⁷ Banqueting in public can be understood as an elaboration of this rule being equally significant for identifying the main players within the sacrificial community.¹⁴⁸

In line with Jameson, I propose that the condition that the meat of the sacrifices to Hephaistos was given to the metics raw had the opposite effect of the οὐ φῶρα-rule, that is, that it debarred a large group of people from any further involvement in the ritual programme of the festival, visibly excluding them from what now became the Athenian core of the worshipping community. Whereas the Athenians perhaps consumed the sacrificial meat on the spot near the Hephaisteion or in the Agora near the Kerameikos, strengthening their group identity and displaying their shared membership, the metics were sent away with their shares, either to consume the meat in the much smaller and less public company of their families or perhaps as a group but away from the site where the Athenians feasted on the meat of their sacrifices to Hephaistos and Athena.¹⁴⁹

This exclusionary aspect of the raw meat stipulation is corroborated by another instance in which we find sacrificial meat being distributed raw. The distribution of raw meat is only attested in three inscriptions; besides the Hephaisteia decree, we find it in the famous but fragmentary Skambonidai decree (*IG I³ 244.16-19, 19-22*), dated to the middle of the fifth century, and the decree recording the outcome of an arbitration in a dispute between two branches of the *genos* of the Salaminioi of 363/2 (*SEG 21.527. 22-24*). For our present concern the stipulation in the Skambonidai decree can be ignored as it is concerned with the sale of raw meat and not the distribution to specific groups of participants. The Skambonid specification was not “socially important” in that way as the religious momentum was cut short at the time of the sale. The Salaminioi decree, on the other hand, is highly relevant; dealing with the settlement of a dispute between the Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and the Salaminioi of Sounion the decree sets out which *hiera* and *hosia* belong to the Salaminioi of Heptaphylai, to the Salaminioi of Sounion, or to both.¹⁵⁰ So, for instance, it is stated that the ancestral

¹⁴⁷ Jameson (1999) 326-31. Cf. Rosivach, *Public sacrifice* (1994) 19 n. 28.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. P. Schmitt-Pantel, *La cité au banquet: histoire des repas public dans les cités grecques* (Rome 1992) on the socially defining and integrative role of banqueting in archaic Greece.

¹⁴⁹ Agora: Clerc, *Métèques athéniens* (1893) 152-4; Schmitt-Pantel, *Cité au banquet* (1992) 308-9, 332-3 ; Blok (2007).

¹⁵⁰ The decree was first published by W.S. Ferguson, ‘The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion’, *Hesp.* 7 (1938) 1-5, no. 1. Cf. S. Lambert, ‘The Attic *genos* Salaminioi and the

to be given to them raw, the Athenians sent out a clear message about how far metics were integrated in the Athenian community.

3.3 The reorganisation of the Hephaisteia and the metics of Athens

Scholars have commonly explained the incorporation of metics into the ritual programme of the Hephaisteia as an understandable exception to a general rule of exclusion because of the obvious link between the god of fire and forge and the many metic craftsmen present in fifth-century Athens.¹⁵² This, however, seems to be a misinformed or at least partial explanation for two reasons. First, the Hephaisteia were far from being the only festival at which metics were present; we have already looked at the Panathenaia, the Lenaia and the City Dionysia and in the next section will deal with the role of metics at the Eleusinian Mysteries. So, although I do not wish to argue to the contrary for a general rule of inclusion as our sources are too few for such a far-reaching conclusion, the participation of metics in the Hephaisteia can by no means be taken as a special case of inclusion. A second reason for rejecting the common opinion is that the decree ordering the reorganisation of the Hephaisteia states that metics and Athenians in general are to share in the sacrifices and not metic and Athenian craftsmen specifically as most scholars seem to imply.¹⁵³

True, the association between Hephaistos and craftsmen probably facilitated the incorporation of metics into the Hephaisteia. But what were the historical circumstances that informed the grand reorganisation of this festival including the organisation of the metic participation in 421, and why did the participation of metics take this form? I think the inclusion of metics in the Hephaisteia should be seen as an acknowledgement of the increasing participation of metics in Athenian society as they were greatly contributing to the extensive building projects that had started under Perikles and participated in the Athenian army and fleet fighting off the Peloponnesians together with the Athenians from 431 onwards. It is my opinion that this increased involvement of metics in Athenian public life

¹⁵² E.g. Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 171: "Hephaestus was a god of crafts, and many metic craftsmen were active in Athens. Their role at this festival may represent a special case, therefore, rather than an instance preserved by chance of a more general inclusiveness". Cf. Clerc, *Métèques athéniens* (1893) 153-4.

¹⁵³ This in contrast to the other Athenian festival in honour of Hephaistos, the Chalkeia, in which indeed, at least according to a quotation of Apollonius, only craftsmen participated (Suda s.v. Χαλκεία). On the Chalkeia also see n. 121 above.

eventually led to the further acknowledgement and incorporation of metics into the Athenian community by having them share in the *hiera* of the polis, *inter alia* the *hiera* of Hephaistos, while it also created a greater need to mark off a separate status for metics since it became increasingly more difficult to distinguish metics and Athenian citizens. Given that the Hephaisteia and Hephaistos were connected both with craftsmen and with the young and strong men of Athens who built and fought, this festival was an obvious candidate to articulate the changed position of metics within the community.

3.3.1 The increasing involvement of metics in the community

Although resident foreigners had long been living in Attica, the period of Athens' rise to greatness, from ca. 454, when the treasury of the Delian League was moved from Delos to Athens, to the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War in 431, witnessed the arrival of more foreigners than ever before. The size of Athens' metic population is notoriously hard to establish. Still, it is commonly agreed, as already mentioned, that in the mid-fifth century around one fifth of the people living in Attica, perhaps 28,000 in total, were metics.¹⁵⁴ Although this percentage must have been seriously affected by the Peloponnesian War and the succeeding struggles with Sparta, Thebes and Persia, Isokrates' statement that in 355 Athens was "bereft of traders (*emporoi*), foreigners and metics" is surely exaggerated (8.21). We can only say that the number of metics most likely reached a peak before the outbreak of the war against Sparta in 431. This peak was probably never reached again. Our sources nevertheless indicate that even after 431 metics continued to be involved in Athenian public life. Perhaps the two most important areas in which metics were especially involved were in the construction business that boomed under Perikles who decided to rebuild many of the temples that had been destroyed by the Persians in the early fifth century, and, from the 430s onwards, in the army and the fleet.

The so-called Erechtheion accounts (*IG I³ 474-478 + II²1654*) record the work on this still puzzling sanctuary built on the Akropolis between ca. 430 and 400.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁴ See *supra*, n. 141.

¹⁵⁵ On the Erechtheion accounts see most importantly: R.H. Randall Jr., 'The Erechtheum workmen', *AJA* 57 (1953) 199-210 and most recently S.D. Lambert, 'The Erechtheum workers of *IG II²1654*', *ZPE* 132 (2000) 157-60, who convincingly argues that *IG II² 1654* belongs to the main set in *IG I³* and should therefore also be dated to ca. 406. C. Feyel, *Les artisans dans les sanctuaires grecs aux époques classique et hellénistique à travers la*

They excellently illustrate the metic contribution to the restoration of Attica after the Persian Wars. The extant accounts list the payments made to the workmen concerned with completing the sanctuary in the final decade of the fifth century. Of the 110 names that can be made out with certainty a staggering forty-two belong to metics who are referred to with their name and deme of residence, like Manis who lived in the deme Kollytos (Μάνιδι ἐν Κολλυτῶι οἰκοντ. – the inscription is rife with abbreviations) and who is mentioned no less than six times or Simias living in Alopeke (Σιμίας Ἀλοπεκεῖσι οἰκῶν.) who also had five of his own slaves working on the Erechtheion. We even find a female metic, Satyra, who lived in Skambonidai (Σατύρας ἐς [Σκαμβωνιδων] - *IG* II² 1654.40), employed by the Athenians to work on the Erechtheion. Another twenty-one names contain a *demotikon* and can therefore safely be attributed to Athenian citizens, like Philostratos of Paiania (Φιλόστρατος Παιανιεύς) or Laossos of Alopeke (Λάοσσοσ Ἀλοπεκεῖθεν) who had at least two of his own slaves working on the Erechtheion. Sixteen names are furthermore inscribed with a genitive. These are probably best understood as the names of slaves with their owner's name; thus five slaves of the metic Simias (Sindron, Sannion, Hepigenes, Sokles and Sosandros) are recorded with the name of Simias in the genitive, *e.g.* Σίνδρον Σιμίου.¹⁵⁶ Interestingly, there are no distinctions in payment according to social status; citizens, metics and slaves all received the same payment. Citizens and metics were moreover not busying themselves with different jobs; among both we find, for instance, contractors, masons, sculptors and stoneworkers.¹⁵⁷

documentation financière en Grèce (Athens 2006) considers, besides the Erechtheion accounts, also those from Eleusis, Delphi, Epidauros and Delos. He includes a prosopography of the workmen and stresses the lack of homogeneity among these crews. On the Erechtheion: J.M. Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis: history, mythology and archaeology from the Neolithic era to the present* (Cambridge 1999) 200-9. K. Jeppesen, *The theory of the alternative Erechtheion: premises, definition, and implications* (Aarhus 1987) suggested that the site on the north slope of the Akropolis previously identified as the House of the Arrephoroi should be identified as the Erechtheion while the building labelled thus is a separate sanctuary for Athena Polias. His views have generally not been accepted.

¹⁵⁶ This was first noted by W.B. Dinsmoor, 'The burning of the opisthodomos in Athens. I. The date', *AJA* 36 (1932) 145 n. 5. There remain thirty-one single names of which nothing can be said with certainty. Through lack of rigid uniformity it is impossible to tell with absolute certainty whether the same name refers to the same man. For instance, is Euainetos mentioned in *IG* I³ 475.204 is probably the same Euainetos mentioned seven lines earlier with the *demotikon* of Alopeke? We also have Prepontis, Medos and Apollodoros mentioned in *IG* I³ 476.138-9 and listed in the same order in *IG* I³ 476.14-8 where they are recorded as metics living in the demes Agryle and Melite.

¹⁵⁷ Randall (1953) presents no less than seven tables combining all these data.

Although these accounts date to the final decade of the fifth century, this situation of metics, citizen and slaves working side by side in Athenian building projects will not have differed greatly earlier on when the Parthenon, the Propylaia, the Temple of Poseidon in Sounion, and also the Hephaisteion were built during Athens' acme as the imperial, economical and cultural capital of the Greek world. Metics moreover continued to contribute greatly to the building projects in Attica; in Eleusinian building accounts of 329/8 (*IG II² 1672*) fifty-four of the ninety-four listed workmen can be identified as metics.

The battlefield was another important area where citizens and metics co-operated. I already referred to the involvement of metics in the Athenian army. Pivotal to this topic are Thucydides' remarks (2.31.2) on the size of the metic hoplite forces in 431 before the invasion of Megaris. On that occasion, according to Thucydides, the Athenian forces consisted of 10,000 Athenian hoplites next to an additional 3,000 metic hoplites. From these numbers and other remarks in Thucydides, Hans van Wees inferred that perhaps around 20% of the Athenian hoplite forces consisted of metics in 431, while Richard Duncan-Jones even arrived at 43%, also suggesting an even greater proportion rowed in the fleet.¹⁵⁸

Many metics also rowed in the fleet. In his 2008 dissertation on the Athenian navy, Sam Potts discusses the essential sources on the social background of the rowers in the Athenian fleet in the classical period. He argues that citizens were not dominant in the fleet as they were much outnumbered by metics, slaves and mercenaries. This is perhaps most clearly illustrated on the list of trireme crews of ca. 410-390 (*IG I³ 1032*) on which we find all four groups rowing in the Athenian fleet. Concerning the presence of metics in the fleet he also points to the *locus classicus* in the Old Oligarch (1.12) who says that "the city needs metics in view of the many different trades and the fleet" and to Perikles' speech to the Athenian *Ekklesia* in 431 in which Thucydides (1.143.1) has him state that "Even if they [i.e. the enemy] were to [...] try to seduce our foreign sailors by the temptation of higher pay, that would only be a serious danger if we could not still be a match for them, by embarking our own citizens

¹⁵⁸ Van Wees, *Greek warfare* (2004) 241-3 and Duncan-Jones (1980) 101-9, both also using Thuc 3.16.1, 4.90 and 2.13.6-7 where Perikles explains that in 431 the Athenian forces consisted of 13,000 Athenian hoplites next to another 16,000 garrisoning the country and guarding the Walls who included the youngest and oldest Athenians and the metic hoplites. It can be noted that Athenians and metics were also buried side by side in the *demosion sema*, honoured jointly with a public funeral (cf. Lys. 2.66).

and the metics among us”.¹⁵⁹ We may conclude, then, that metics were a considerable presence both in the army and in the fleet.

3.3.2 Acknowledgement of the increased metic involvement in society

As I argue throughout this dissertation, one of the main contexts in which membership of the Athenian community was acknowledged, put into action and expressed was Athenian polis religion. Metics had long been involved in the community and their position had already been acknowledged by their inclusion in the Panathenaia in the first decades of the fifth century. With the growing involvement of thousands of metics in the reconstruction of the city and in the army and fleet after the middle of the fifth century, it was to be expected that the Athenians should grant this influential group a larger share in the *hiera* of the polis. And in fact, metics now came to be included in the *hiera* of Dionysos Lenaios, Dionysos Eleuthereus, and of Demeter. It is in this context that we should also consider the inclusion of metics in the *hiera* of Hephaistos and Athena Hephaisteia from 421 onwards. It was in this year, the same year in which the Peace of Nikias was signed by Athens and Sparta ending a period of war and turmoil, that the Athenians decided to reconsider not only their relationship with their gods but also their relationship with the metic inhabitants of Attica.¹⁶⁰ There was a need to articulate the vital position of metics in Athens and the choice for the Hephaisteia to achieve this seems particularly appropriate.

¹⁵⁹ S. Potts (2008 dissertation Cardiff University), *The Athenian navy. An investigation into the operations, politics and ideology of the Athenian fleet between 480 and 322 BC*, 91-3. Via email Sam Potts also mentioned the Themistokles decree (M&L 23) to me, which seems to suggest metics were already employed in 480 to row on the Athenian triremes. I find it difficult, however, to see the reference to τοὺς ξένους τοὺς οἰκοῦντας Ἀθήνησι (7) in this complex decree as authentic, on which see also above chapter one, footnote 154. On metics in the navy also see: Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 84-6.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Thuc.5.20. Besides the reorganisation of the Hephaisteia, other decisions relating to religious matters and probably deriving from the same anxiety to restore proper relationships with the gods are the introduction of the cult of Asklepios in 421 and the decision to repair a bridge over the Rheitoi-river over which the initiates crossed on their way to Eleusis (*IG I³ 79*, dated to 422/1). The introduction of the cult of Asklepios is recorded on the so-called Telemachos-monument (*IG II² 4961+60*) on which see: L. Beschi, ‘Il monumento di Telemachos fondatore dell’ Asklepieion Ateniese’, *ASAtene* 29/30 (1967-1968) 381-436; idem, ‘Il rilievo di Telemachos ricompletato’, *AAA* 15 (1982) 31-43; K. Clinton, ‘The Epidauria and the arrival of Asclepius in Athens’ in: R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Stockholm 1994) 21-5. Cf. S.B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion. The people, their dedications, and the inventories* (Amsterdam 1989); idem, *Asklepios at Athens, epigraphic and prosopographic essays on the Athenian healing cults* (Amsterdam 1991); Parker (1996) 175-85; R. Garland, *Introducing new gods* (London 1992) 116-35, on the introduction of the cult of Asklepios in Athens.

Hephaistos was of course the god of crafts and that the acknowledgment of the contributions of metics to the rebuilding of Athens should take place at a festival in his honour is therefore not surprising, as many scholars have already pointed out. In addition, I want to emphasise that the Hephaisteia were already in place long before 421 as an agonistic festival celebrated by and thus concerned with the young and adult men of Athens. These were the same young and adult men who by 421 were rebuilding and defending the city. The choice to grant metics a share in the *hiera* of this specific festival thereby becomes more intelligible if we not only take into consideration Hephaistos' role as patron of crafts but also the nature of the Hephaisteia as an agonistic festival catering to the needs of the young and strong men of Attica who had increasingly proven their worth to society in the decades preceding the reorganisation of the Hephaisteia in 421. By including metics in these *hiera* of Hephaistos, the Athenians could thus present metics not only as members of their community but more specifically as members who similar to the other participants in the Hephaisteia were young and male and agonistic and active in building and defending the city. From 421 onwards metics – together with the young Athenians who participated and competed in the Hephaisteia in *agones* that focussed on physical training and excellence – were thus presented as belonging, albeit to a limited degree, to those whose role in society it was to rebuild and defend the polis.

It can additionally be noted that, if we can deduce anything from the names in the Erechtheion accounts, it seems that several of the metics who were rebuilding the city were in fact of a non-Greek background. In general, it is difficult to say anything about the background of metics on the basis of their names as our view is considerably obscured by the fact that both free-born metics and freedmen often carried double names, i.e. their own name and a Greek/Athenian version.¹⁶¹ It seems, however, that many of the metics working on the Erechtheion were listed by their own, non-Greek name; in the accounts we come across forty-two names of metics who are listed with their deme of residence and of these forty-two metics, nineteen carry names that have ten hits or less in the Greek volumes of *LGPN* (I-III B). Among the forty-two metics

¹⁶¹ Cf. Ch. Habicht, 'Foreign names in Athenian nomenclature' in: S. Hornblower and E. Matthews (eds.), *Greek personal names. Their value as evidence* (Oxford 2000) 120-7, on the (rare) intrusion of foreign names, among them e.g. Seuthes, into Athenian nomenclature. Also note the Greek names of the Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis, on which see below 285-302.

working on the Erechtheion we find super-Greek names like Apollodoros, Dionysodoros, and Sostratos or the particularly Athenian name of Kephisodoros, but also names like Axsiopeithes and Adonis from Melite, Soklos who lived in Alopeke, or Agorandros and Stasianax both living in Kollytos.¹⁶²

Most of these “exotic” names have the appearance of slave names, or at least names from the Levant. It has been argued that in the late fifth and fourth century the composition of the metic population in Attica became more heterogeneous, perhaps as a result of the ever growing group of manumitted slaves, who registered as metics on release.¹⁶³ These more foreign, formerly enslaved metics were, apparently, now working on the Erechtheion and the other structures that were built in the second half of the fifth century. In the context of the army the more heterogeneous background of Athens’ metics did not go unnoticed either: in ca. 350, for instance, Xenophon remarked (*Ways* 2.3) that in the army the Athenians “found themselves in the same company with Lydians, Phrygians, Syrians, and other barbarians of all sorts, of whom a large part of our metic population consists”.¹⁶⁴ We do not know of which background the metic youths and girls were who marched in the Panathenaic *pompe* but it seems obvious that the metics who participated in the Lenaia and City Dionysia were mostly of a Greek background as they had to understand the plays. Could it be, then, that the Hephaisteia constituted the first context in which non-Greek foreign residents were conceptually included among the metics of Attica, who now collectively received three oxen to sacrifice to Hephaistos?

¹⁶² In the *LGPN* (I-III B) we come across 803 Apollodoroi, 370 Dionysodoroi, and 427 Sostratoi. For Attica 146 Kephisodoroi are securely attested and only 24 for outside Attica. Axsiopeithes is only attested twice, Adonis four times, Soklos and Agorandros both once, and Stasianax thrice. Other names in the accounts with 10 hits or less: Neseus (2), Mynnion (7), Rhaidios (2), Sisyphos (9), Patroklos (6), Manis (6), Kroisos (10), Dropides (9), and Ameiniades (10).

¹⁶³ Cf. P. Spahn, ‘Fremde und Metöken in der athenischen Demokratie’ in: Demandt, A. (ed.), *Mit Fremde leben: ein Kulturgeschichte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (1995) 37-56, esp. 50-2. S. Isager and M.H. Hansen, *Aspects of Athenian society in the fourth century: a historical introduction to and commentary on paragraphe-speeches and the speech against Dionysodoros in the corpus Demosthenicum* (Odense 1975) 69, argue that the regions where more and more metics originated from in the fourth century were the same regions the Athenians recruited their slaves from.

¹⁶⁴ See also: Garland, *Piraeus* (2001) 62-7, on the various backgrounds of the metics buried in Piraeus.

3.3.3 The limitations: demarcating metic status

That the metic participation was in addition quite limited compared to the participation of the Athenians at the Hephaisteia can, I think, similarly be explained by reference to the greater involvement of metics in society. For the flip side of the coin of this greater metic involvement in Athenian society was that it also resulted in a greater need to distinguish between metics and Athenians.¹⁶⁵ We can cautiously detect this need for a stricter demarcation of the different groups in Athenian society in the famous statement in the *Old Oligarch* (*Ath. Pol.* 1.10) that in the streets of Athens, metics (and even slaves) could hardly be distinguished from the Athenian citizens as “people are no better dressed than the slaves and metics, nor are they any more handsome”. In his treatise *Ways and Means* Xenophon argues almost in the same way, though with less indignation, when he suggests that metics should be relieved of several burdens, among them serving in the army together with the Athenians. Relieving metics of this duty, Xenophon continues, will have an additional advantage as “It will also benefit the polis if the citizens served in the ranks together and no longer found themselves in the same company with [...] barbarians of all sorts, of whom a large part of our metic population consists” (2.3).

This need, or rather desire, to be able to distinguish metics from Athenians more clearly was, moreover, not only felt by a couple of elitist writers but seems to have been a general concern in public Athenian discourse. For in the same period in which metics became more involved in Athenian affairs we also find several measures indirectly affecting or even exclusively aimed at metics, demarcating their status more clearly, making it easier to distinguish metics, or non-Athenians in general, from Athenian citizens. In 451/0 Perikles’ Citizenship Law, restricting Athenian citizenship to those Athenians born of two Athenian *astoi*, created a situation in which Athenian citizens became more strictly separated from the other inhabitants of Attika, mainly metics, who were now practically excluded from marrying an Athenian and therefore from integrating more firmly into society in that way. In addition, the “metic” *demotikon*, the “οἰκεῖν ἐν”-formula, which made it easier to distinguish between Athenians and metics living in the same deme, perhaps indicating some form of registration in

¹⁶⁵ On the heterogeneous nature of the Athenian population and the fact that it was often hard to distinguish Athenian citizens, metics and slaves in general: Cohen, E.E., *The Athenian nation* (Princeton 2000) *passim* and Vlassopoulos, K., ‘Free spaces: identity, experience and democracy in classical Athens’, *CQ* 57 (2007) 33-52.

the demes, first appears in a decree dated to 414/3 (*IG I³ 421.33*). From then onwards it quickly gains ground as can be seen for instance in the many occurrences in the Erechtheion accounts. Finally, in Harpokration's gloss on the specific tax to be paid by metics (*σ.ν. μετουκίου*) the comic poet Aristomenes is cited, whose career ran from ca. 439 to 388, which could mean that this tax was already paid by metics in the late fifth century.¹⁶⁶ Analogue to these legal, fiscal, and administrative measures, the demarcated participation of metics in the Hephaisteia should similarly be understood as facilitating the differentiation between metics and Athenians that was desired in the second half of the fifth century after metics had become more involved in Athenian society.

4 Metics at the Eleusinian Mysteries

In book eight of his *Histories*, Herodotus (8.65.1-4) tells the story of the Spartan king Demaratos and an Athenian informer of the Persians, Dikaios, who, on the eve of the Battle of Salamis, witness a cloud of dust advancing from Eleusis “as if raised by the feet of about 30,000 men”. Hearing the mystic cry “Iakkhos”, Dikaios explains to the startled Demaratos that the dust cloud and the Iakkhos cry normally point to the annual *pompe* of the Eleusinian Mysteries and he informs him that “every year the Athenians observe this festival in honour of the Mother [i.e. Demeter] and Kore, and any Athenian who wishes and any other Greek may be initiated”. In 480, however, Attica is deserted, laid waste by Xerxes, and the cloud, as it advances towards Salamis, will turn out to be an ominous sign of Demeter for the Persians of things to come.¹⁶⁷

In this short comment, Herodotus nicely encapsulates some fascinating aspects of the Eleusinian Mysteries, one of the major Athenian festivals. While exaggerated, his number of 30,000 people moving along the 14 mile long Sacred Way from Athens to Eleusis nonetheless suggests an enormous group of people normally participating in the Mysteries every year. In fact, it has been estimated that the classical Telesterion, the building in which the main rite, the τελετή, took place and which was built under Perikles, could accommodate 3,000 people

¹⁶⁶ On the carving out of metic status in this period: Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 151-4.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. D. Boedeker, ‘The View from Eleusis: Demeter in the Persian Wars’ in: E. Bridges, E. Hall, and P.J. Rhodes (eds.), *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium* (Oxford 2007) 65-82 on Demeter's support of the Greeks/Athenians during the Persian Wars.

– although the earlier Peisistratid Telesterion was admittedly much smaller.¹⁶⁸ The comment that not only Athenians but also Greeks could be initiated further testifies to the extremely open nature of the festival; from other sources we know that anyone could participate in the classical period, male, female, free, or slave. Finally, it should be noted that although any Greek could participate, Herodotus makes it clear that the Mysteries remained an Athenian affair: these were *hiera* observed by the Athenians.

Interesting to our present concern is the fact that the participants in the various rituals of the Mysteries were not further divided into subgroups through demarcated participation. The main identity that was highlighted during this festival was the shared Greek identity of the individual participants. The Athenians nevertheless held a special position, mainly through their control of the administration of and access to this Panhellenic festival, a position intimately tied up with the polis who controlled the cult, in this case the Athenian *demos*. It is surprising therefore that Lysias, one of Athens' most renowned metics, could promise to introduce (μυεῖν) his lover in the Athenian polis cult of the Mysteries himself, as is recorded in Apollodoros' *Speech against Neaira* ([Dem.] 59.21), thereby performing an act associated with those in charge of the polis.

4.1 The Eleusinian Mysteries: Panhellenic attendance

Although the origins and nature of the cult of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis remain objects of heated debate, we can infer that at least from the sixth century onwards the cult and the Mysteries were under Athenian control.¹⁶⁹ Although

¹⁶⁸ First noted by F. Noack, *Eleusis: die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Heiligtumes* (Berlin 1927) 235. More recently: K. Clinton, 'The sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis' in: N. Marinatos and R. Hägg (eds.), *Greek sanctuaries. New approaches* (London 1993) 110-24. On the basis of the receipts for 407/6 (*IG I³ 386.144-6*) M.B. Cavanaugh, *Eleusis and Athens: documents in finance, religion and politics in the fifth century BC* (Atlanta 1996) 189, tenuously suggested 2,200 initiates for that year.

¹⁶⁹ Arguments in this debate are mostly speculative and often *e silentio*. So, it has often been claimed that the absence of Athens in the *Homeric Hymn for Demeter*, composed ca. 650-500, signals Eleusinian independence from Athens. But see now Clinton (1993), who, however, on pages 110-2, equally speculatively suggests that the fact that when Thucydides (2.15.1-2) discusses the synoikism of Attica in Theseus' time he does not refer to an autonomous status of Eleusis, should be seen as signalling early Athenian control over Eleusis. The orientation of the earliest sanctuary towards Athens is also believed to signal Athenian control, e.g. C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Reconstructing change: ideology and the Eleusinian mysteries' in: M. Golden and P. Toohey (eds.), *Inventing ancient culture: historicism periodization and the ancient world* (London 1997) 133-6 but see F. van den Eijnde's forthcoming dissertation for a rebuttal of these claims.

evidence is scant, it seems probable that the Eleusinian cult of Demeter and Kore originated in the late eighth or early seventh century as a local cult controlled by an Eleusinian elite.¹⁷⁰ From the archaic period we get a clearer image: control of the cult was now in the hands of several priestly families, so-called *gene*, who ran the archaic cults of the polis. Of the five (!) *gene* in charge of the cult at Eleusis the Eumolpidai and the Kerykes were the most famous ones. In classical times these *gene* still had a considerable say in the organisation of the cult and the Mysteries, although from the late archaic period onwards other, more democratic, Athenian polis authorities gradually intruded. In the Aristotelean *Ath. Pol.* (57.1), for instance, we read that, in addition to members of the *gene*, the Archon Basileus was now also in charge of this festival.¹⁷¹

The role of the Archon Basileus, the archon in charge of ancestral rites, indicates that the Athenians were in control of the cult in Eleusis from at least the early sixth century onwards. This date is further corroborated by the enclosing of a sanctuary for Demeter at the foot of the Athenian Akropolis perhaps signalling its transformation into the City Eleusinion ca. 600-550 and also by the major reconstruction of the sanctuary at Eleusis commonly referred to as “Solonian” around the same time.¹⁷² There is also a reference in Andokides (1.111) to a Solonian law (τὸν Σόλωνος νόμον) ordering the *Boule* to convene in the City Eleusinion after the Mysteries to review the festival. Although, without a reference to its position on the so-called *kurbeis*, this cannot be taken as an authentic law of Solon at face value, it at least indicates that around 399 the

¹⁷⁰ On this early history of the cult and the archaeological finds dated to the second half of the eighth century, among which remnants of a terrace wall, votives and figurines: F. van den Eijnde, forthcoming, who argues for a semi-autonomous position of Eleusis within Attica until the sixth century. The assumed Mycenaean origins of the cult were refuted by P. Darcque, ‘Les vestiges mycéniens découverts sous le Téléstérion d’Éleusis’, *BCH* 105 (1981) 593-605 and J. Binder, ‘The early history of the Demeter and Kore sanctuary at Eleusis’ in: R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek cult practice from the archaeological evidence* (Stockholm 1998) 131-9.

¹⁷¹ The text of *Ath. Pol.* 57.1 is cited and discussed in the section on the Lenaia. On the religious personnel at Eleusis: K. Clinton, *The sacred officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Philadelphia 1974). On the *gene* of Eleusis: Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 293-7 (Eumolpidai), 300-2 (Kerykes), 302-5 (Krokonidai/Koironidai), and 317 (Philleidai). The Kerykes are attested earlier than any other *genos* in a fragment attributed to Solon’s *kyrbeis* (Athen. 234e-f).

¹⁷² On the City Eleusinion: M.M. Miles, *The City Eleusinion (The Athenian Agora 31)* (New Jersey 1998). On the “Solonian” Telesterion still most importantly: G.E. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton 1961) 64-73.

review of the festival could be presented to have quite ancient origins.¹⁷³ The increasing appearance of Eleusinian themes on Attic vases from the mid-sixth century onwards, like the adventures of the Attic hero Triptolemos who had received Demeter's gift of grain, and the replacement of the "Solonian" Telesterion by a much larger construction in the third quarter of that century moreover indicate the rising popularity of the cult and early Athenian attempts to tap into this popularity among a wider audience.¹⁷⁴

In the following centuries the cult only grew more popular, becoming truly Panhellenic in nature. In classical times it appealed and was promoted to worshippers from all over the Greek world, as most clearly illustrated in the so-called First-Fruit decree (*IG I³ 78 = M&L 78*), now securely dated to ca. 435 by Maureen Cavanaugh. In this decree the Athenians and the cult personnel of Eleusis invite not only all Athenians to bring 1/600 of their barley and 1/1200 of their wheat to Eleusis "in accordance with ancestral custom and the Delphic oracle" (4-10) but also Athens' allies and even all other Greek *poleis* (14-26).¹⁷⁵ Later on in the classical period we often find the idea that the whole of Hellas came together in Eleusis. In 321/0 or 318/7, for instance, a certain Xenokles was honoured by the Eleusinians for taking good care of "the congregation of the Greeks who come to Eleusis and the *hieron*" (*IG II² 1191.17-19*).

The extremely open nature of the Mysteries is often emphasised in ancient sources. At least in the classical period it was a festival open to all Greeks, while it appears that in Roman times practically anyone could participate.¹⁷⁶ There is,

¹⁷³ It has been argued that the law cannot have been Solonian as both the *Boule* and City Eleusinion were believed to postdate the time of Solon's legislative activities in the 590s, but see now Rhodes, *Commentary² ad loc.* 4.3 on the *Boule* and Miles, *Eleusinion* (1998) 25-7 for the City Eleusinion in this period. Still the term "Solonian" should be handled with caution as even in the same speech Andokides refers to a law as Solonian (1.96-8) which by its preamble can be dated to 410.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. K. Clinton, 'The Eleusinian Mysteries and Panhellenism in democratic Athens' in: W.D.E. Coulson et al. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the democracy* (Oxford 1994) 161-72. The Telesterion previously connected with Peisistratos is now dated to the third quarter of the sixth century by T.L. Shear Jr., 'The demolished temple at Eleusis', *Hesp. Suppl.* 20 (1982) 131.

¹⁷⁵ Cavanaugh, *Eleusis* (1996) 29-95, 155. See also the edition of the First-Fruit decree in K. Clinton, *Eleusis. The inscriptions on stone: documents of the sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and the public documents of the deme* vol. 1 (Athens 2005) no. 28 a+b, for an updated bibliography.

¹⁷⁶ Most Roman emperors were in fact initiated at Eleusis. Cf. K. Clinton, 'The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman initiates and benefactors, second century BC to AD 267', *ANRW II* 18 (1989) 1499-1539.

however, a slight possibility that in an earlier, pre-classical period access had been restricted to Athenians. Xenophon (*Hell.* 6.3.6) mentions that Herakles and the Dioskouroi were the first strangers (πρώτοις ξένοις) to whom Triptolemos revealed the mystic rites of Demeter and Kore, which suggests that, at least in Xenophon's time, the Mysteries were believed to have once had a more restrictive access policy when only Athenians could participate.¹⁷⁷ Iconographical references to Herakles' initiation into the Mysteries before descending into the underworld to capture the hellhound Kerberos make their appearance on Attic vases from the mid-sixth century onwards and it has been argued that these images of the first initiation of a *xenos* might signal a change towards a more open policy at Eleusis at this time.¹⁷⁸

That things changed is certain. In Herodotus' time any Athenian and any Greek could be initiated into the Mysteries. In an Athenian decree of the 470s-460s concerning the organisation of the festival (*IG I³ 6*) we find the announcement of a sacred truce, which is to apply "to foreign initiates, *epoptai* [i.e. second-year initiates], their servants and their luggage and to all Athenians (B 8-17). And in the speech *Against Andokides*, the jury is asked to consider "the thoughts of the [...] Greeks who come for the festival, intending either to sacrifice or attend at this great public assembly (πανήγυριν)" ([Lys.] 6.5-6) in case the impious Andokides would act as Archon Basileus at the Mysteries. It is clear, then, that in the classical period participation and initiation in the Mysteries was commonly regarded as open to all Greeks. Literally all Greeks could participate: even children and slaves could be initiated.¹⁷⁹ The only people who

¹⁷⁷ Cf. H.A. Shapiro, *Art and cult under the Tyrants in Athens* (Mainz am Rhein 1989) 78-80 and Sourvinou-Inwood (1997) 144.

¹⁷⁸ F. van Straten, 'Herakles and the uninitiated' in: A.N.Z.J. Jitta and J.S. Boersma (eds.), *Festoen* (Groningen 1975) 563-72, presented a black-figure amphora, now in Reggio (no. 4002), dated to the 530s, on which Herakles is depicted with Kerberos in the upper band and with Demeter (or Kore?), Triptolemos and Athena on the main body of the vase. He suggested that an Attic black-figure neck amphora in Munich (1493), dated to 530-520 depicting Herakles and Kerberos on one side and Sisyphos and water-carriers in the underworld on the other also refers to Herakles' initiation. Cf. J. Boardman, 'Herakles, Peisistratos and Eleusis', *JHS* 95 (1975) 1-12, who, however, presented a too political interpretation of Peisistratos' "manipulation" of Herakles instead of associating this development with the increasing cultic cohesion within the polis, on which see: J.H. Blok, 'Phye's procession: culture, politics and Peisistratid rule' in: H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), *Peisistratos and the tyranny: a reappraisal of the evidence* (Amsterdam 2000) 17-48.

¹⁷⁹ Children: every year a child was chosen by the Basileus to act as hearth- initiate (*Hesp.* 49 (1980) 264 A41-42) and children are depicted walking in procession on vases with Eleusinian themes (e.g. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (1966) pl. 5.2, a black-figure *loutrophoros*

were expressly excluded from the rites by an announcement of members of Kerykes and the Eumolpidai were murderers and people incomprehensible in Greek.¹⁸⁰

With such an open policy, how was the participation of all these different people organised? When we consider the rites of the Mysteries, it becomes clear that, except for the exclusion of murderers and barbarians, hardly any attempt was made to further demarcate the participatory community at the Mysteries through differentiated participation. The Panhellenic cult at Eleusis was in fact exceptional in the sense that everyone, Athenian, non-Athenian, male, female, young, old, free, slave, participated equally and individually. This seems to have been a consequence of the individual focus in the initiation rites as the afterlife was entered upon alone.

4.2 The Mysteries in the classical period

The Mysteries at Eleusis, or Greater Mysteries, took place in late summer, in Boedromion.¹⁸¹ Before participating in these Mysteries, aspirant initiates had to be introduced to the officials in charge by an Athenian or, as will be treated in more detail below, by a metic. Next, they had to be officially pre-initiated by a member of the Kerykes or the Eumolpidai. This pre-initiation most likely entailed a general instruction in the rites, probably including emphasis on the secrecy to be observed concerning the Mysteries.¹⁸² In addition participants were required to attend the so-called Lesser Mysteries in the sanctuary of Mother at Agrai in

dated to ca. 520 and a vase by the Swing Painter (Eleusis 1215)). In *IG I³ 6 C40-4* the initiation of orphans is regulated. Cf. Clinton, *Sacred officials* (1974) 98-114. Slaves: Theophilos, fragm.1 where a master wants to have his slave initiated and *IG II² 1672.207 + 1673.24-5* on the initiation of public slaves who were to perform repairs inside the sanctuary.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Ar. *Wasps* 369, with the scholion *ad loc.* Isokrates (*Paneg.* 15) explains the exclusion of barbarians from the Athenian hatred for the Persians. Although in later centuries initiation became available to Romans, the exclusion of murderers was still in operation in Nero's time: according to Suetonius (*Nero* 34.3), the emperor, having killed his mother and his aunt, refrained from participating in the Mysteries.

¹⁸¹ The following mainly derives from Deubner, *Attische Feste* (1966) 69-91; Parke, *Festivals* (1977) 55-72; Clinton (1993); Parker, *Polytheism* (2006) 342-50. The festival's exact dates remain debated, cf. Mikalson, *Calendar* (1979) 54-61

¹⁸² Initially, μυστήρια had nothing to do with mystic knowledge as it was derived from the Greek μύω meaning "to close (one's eyes or mouth)".

Athens seven months before the Mysteries took place, probably as a preliminary purification rite.¹⁸³

After these preliminaries, the festival started on the 14th of Boedromion with the bringing of “the sacred objects” (τὰ ἱερά) from Eleusis to Athens, where they were stored in the City Eleusinion.¹⁸⁴ It was perhaps here that some sacrifices were performed by the Archon Basileus.¹⁸⁵ On the next day, a day called *Agyrmos* (“the Gathering”), all participants assembled in the Athenian Agora in front of the Stoa Poikile where members of the *Kerykes* and *Eumolpidae* announced the exclusion of persons who were polluted by bloodguilt or incomprehensible in speech (i.e. barbarians) during an event called *Prorrhesis*.¹⁸⁶ On the 16th each initiate went to the sea at Phaleron (ἀλαδε μῦσται – “initiates to the sea!”) to wash a piglet and sacrifice it for purification.¹⁸⁷ On the 17th and 18th the initiates had some time off. We are told that on one of these days a procession for Asklepios took place in connection with a festival for the healing god called the *Epidauria* “while the initiates stayed at home” ([Aristot.] *Ath.Pol.* 56.4). Perhaps these days were reserved for latecomers, to give them a chance to catch up with all (preliminary) rites, just as Asklepios had been given a chance to get initiated into the Mysteries even though he arrived in Athens too late.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸³ The institution of the Lesser Mysteries is aetiologically associated by Diodoros (4.14.3) with the initiation of Herakles, who after killing the Centaurs had to be purified at Agrai before going to Eleusis. Apollodoros (2.5.12) says the Eleusinian king Eumolpos purified the hero.

¹⁸⁴ Escorting *hiera*: *IG I³ 79* (422/1) and *IG II² 1078* (3rd c. AD).

¹⁸⁵ [Lys.] 6.4 refers to the Archon Basileus performing sacrifices in the Eleusinion, although these could also belong to the 17th, a day called ἱερεῖα δεῦρο (“sacrifices hither”). Cf. K. Clinton, ‘Sacrifice at the Eleusinian Mysteries’ in: R. Hägg, N. Marinatos and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), *Early Greek cult practice* (Stockholm 1988) 69-80, argues, quite unfoundedly, for many sacrifices at the Mysteries, starting with large sacrifices on the first two days based on the inferred space above a small fragment from Nikomachos’ calendar concerning the *Epidauria* (*Ag. I 7471*).

¹⁸⁶ Cf. A.M. Bowie, *Aristophanes: myth, ritual and comedy* (Cambridge 1993) 238-44, who brilliantly interprets the parodic equivalent of the *Prorrhesis* in Aristophanes’ *Frogs* (354-434; 679-713) as evoking contemporary concerns with participation of “barbarians” (Kleon in the play) and “the impure” (Kleigenes) both in the Mysteries and in Athenian society at large.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Ar. *Frogs* 338, where Xanthias longs for the sweet smell of the roasted meat of the piglets. Plutarch (*Phok.* 28) tells how once, when the Macedonians had taken over Piraeus, this ritual was the occasion of a gruesome event when one of the initiates, who was bathing his piglet in the sea, was attacked by a shark that devoured his lower body “by which the god gave them manifestly to understand, that having lost the lower town and seacoast, they should keep only the upper city”.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Clinton (1994).

Probably on the 20th of Boedromion the great procession from Athens to Eleusis took place. This *pompe* is often described as the escorting out of Iakkhos, an Eleusinian hero honoured in the procession by the Iakkhos-cry so vividly described by Herodotus (8.65.1-4) and uttered by the chorus of initiates in Aristophanes' *Frogs* several times when they escort Dionysos on his way to Hades in a journey reminiscent of the initiation of the Mysteries (316-459).¹⁸⁹ This was probably the same procession by which the sacred objects that had been brought to Athens earlier were brought back to Eleusis with an escort of several officials, among them the priestesses of Demeter and Athena Polias, the hierophant, the *dadouchos*, and, at least in Roman times, epehebes.¹⁹⁰ In Roman sources it is stated that on the way to Eleusis these dignitaries and Athenian youths stopped at several sites along the Sacred Way to Eleusis to offer sacrifices, make libations, dance, and sing paeans. At least in later times officials and epehebes were thus paying their respect to several of the gods and heroes they encountered on their way to Eleusis. In the classical period the enormous group of participants, by contrast, seem to have walked in procession in a rather undifferentiated manner, without any strict ritual programme or rules of ordering to comply with; the initiates participated on their own account, at their own pace and with their own personal aspirations, freely enjoying the joyful rituals as can be glimpsed, for instance, in Aristophanes' account of the *pompe* in his *Frogs* (316-459). The passage powerfully conveys the disorderly nature of the *pompe* and especially focuses on the intermingling of the two sexes.

After the arrival of the procession, Iakkhos was officially received, perhaps with the sacrifices that are enlisted in a decree dating to ca. 500 (*IG I³ 5*), and the same evening a *pannychis* was celebrated.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Bowie, *Aristophanes* (1993) 228-53, on the association of Aristophanes' *Frogs* with the Mysteries, including evocations of the recent associations of the Mysteries with Orphism and Dionysiac worship.

¹⁹⁰ Plut. *Alk.* 34.4 and *IG II² 1078.29-30* (ca. 220 AD). There is some uncertainty whether the Iakkhos *pompe* and the escorting back of the sacred objects were two separate processions, on which see, for instance, N. Robertson, 'The two processions to Eleusis and the program of the Mysteries', *AJP* 119 (1998) 547-75. Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 348 n. 90, convincingly argues, however, based on the participation of epehebes in both events (*IG II² 1078.29-30; 1006.9*), there was only one procession.

¹⁹¹ Sacrifice: Clinton (1988) 70-1, although he is perhaps a bit overconfident in the sources concerning sacrifice at the Mysteries in general. The *pannychis* is described by Euripides in his *Ion* (1074-1086) and also features in Ar. *Frogs* 371, 448.

Over the following days the τελετή, the main rite of the festival, took place. Information about these rites mainly derives from Christian authors who clearly felt no constraint to write about them. From these accounts many modern scholars have attempted to reconstruct the rituals that apparently involved several light effects and the showing of sacred and secret objects.¹⁹² For our present concern it is, however, not of great importance to know what exactly went on inside the Telesterion. We rather need to focus on who participated and in what way. Again, as in the meeting in the Agora and in the *pompe*, it seems that all initiates participated equally, both on an individual basis being initiated on his or her own behalf, focussing on one's own particular fate in the afterlife, and as a large homogeneous group of initiates worshipping Demeter and thanking her for the gift of grain.¹⁹³ The only demarcation that was applied to this large group of participants in the τελετή appears to have been between participants who were new to the Mysteries and the *epoptai*, who were already initiated and who could participate in the *epopteia* ("the beholding") at which more secrets were probably revealed.¹⁹⁴ In that way the participatory community was divided between two grades of worshippers, rather than demarcated according to societal criteria of age, sex, or ethnic background.

Finally, probably on the 23rd of Boedromion, the festival was concluded with a day called *Plemochoi*, after the vessels from which two libations were made "one eastward, one westward, reciting a mystical formula over them" (Ath. 496a-b).¹⁹⁵

Reviewing the participation of the various worshippers who attended the rites at Eleusis we can conclude that the Mysteries were exceptional both 1) in its

¹⁹² E.g. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (1966) 78-91; Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 350-60; C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Festival and Mysteries. Aspects of Eleusinian cult' in: M.B. Cosmopoulos (ed.), *Greek Mysteries. The archaeology and ritual of ancient Greek secret cults* (New York 2003) 26-41.

¹⁹³ Sourvinou-Inwood (1997), rather unconvincingly, argued that the conversion of (what she and many other scholars thought to be) the eight-century apsidal temple into the square shaped precursor of the later Telesterion signalled a change in the nature of the dominant cult from an agrarian cult with collective participation to an eschatological one with individual participation. Although such a development cannot be traced on the ground, it is irrefutable that the cult in Eleusis contained both elements.

¹⁹⁴ E.g. *IG I³ 6. B 8-17*, dated ca. 470s-460s. The Christian author Hippolytos (*Phil.* 5.8.39) informs us that a freshly cut ear of grain was shown in silence during the *epopteia*.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Kritias *TrGrF* 43 F1. On these typical Eleusinian vessels: Miles, *Eleusinion* (1998) 95-103.

extremely open policy as any Greek, male or female, free or slave, could participate and 2) in its total neglect of social differences between the participants, as the Athenians refrained from demarcating different (social) groups of participants by means of differentiated participation, even when they themselves were concerned. This extreme “egalitarian ethos”, illustrated so clearly in the topsy-turvy *pompe* in Aristophanes’ *Frogs*, is also nicely captured in a Plutarchan story about Lykourgos ([Plut.] *X Orat.* 842a-b), according to which the famous fourth-century politician proposed a law ordering the rich to go on foot to Eleusis and not in buggies as had occurred before. The objective of the law was “so that the women of the people do not appear inferior to the rich”. Any woman who was caught doing so was to be fined 6,000 drachma. As luck would have it, Lykourgos was the first to experience the consequences of his own law as “his wife disobeyed, the informers caught her in the act, and he gave them a talent”.¹⁹⁶ A similar concern seems to have been already expressed in the 420s when a decree regulating repairs on the bridge over the Rheitoi over which the initiates crossed on their way to Eleusis (*IG I³ 79*) stated that “the width should be made five feet in order that wagons cannot pass through but that for those who are going it is possible to go on foot to the *hiera*” (11-14). In the Mysteries everybody was to participate without distinction.

4.3 The Mysteries: an Athenian affair

From classical times onwards, the venerable Eleusinian cult for Demeter and her festival of the Mysteries had become the focus of a worshipping community that was perceived and conceptualised as homogeneous in nature and Panhellenic in identity. The Athenian *demos*, who had gradually tightened its grip on the Eleusinian cult from the sixth century onwards, nevertheless held a special position within the context of the Mysteries, mainly due to its organisation of the festival and its growing control over who had access to the rites. As Herodotus (8.65.4) already makes clear, despite its Eleusinian roots and personnel and despite the Panhellenic attendance, the Mysteries should nonetheless be understood as *hiera* in the care of the Athenians. The proper worship of Demeter and Kore was correspondingly perceived as intimately tied up with the well-

¹⁹⁶ Women going to Eleusis on buggies: Ar. *Wealth* 1013-15 and Dem. 21.158 on Meidias taking “his wife to the Mysteries [...] in a carriage drawn by the pair of white horses he got from Sikyon”.

being of the Athenian community as it could sustain (or spoil) the good relationships with these goddesses.

This close association between the sanctity of the Mysteries and the Athenian community is illustrated in the events of 415 when, on the eve of the (disastrous) Athenian expedition to Sicily, the news spread that the Mysteries had been profaned in a domestic context by Alkibiades, one of the generals to go to Sicily, and some of his companions, among them Andokides. Several of the court speeches of the ensuing trials have come down to us and they clearly demonstrate that, in addition to the well-being of all the Greeks seeking hope for a better afterlife, it was the well-being of the Athenian polis community that depended on the proper worship of the goddesses of Eleusis. So, after enumerating Andokides' impious acts, among which revealing the sacred things to the uninitiated and speaking the forbidden words, the author of the *Speech against Andokides* concludes ([Lys.] 6.51-53) that "in punishing Andokides and in ridding yourself of him, you are cleansing the polis, you are solemnly purifying it from pollution".

From this dependency of Athens' well-being on the proper worship of Demeter it follows that those who were responsible for the polis and its well-being in general, i.e. the Athenian *demos*, should naturally interfere with the running of the Eleusinian cult to see to it that due worship was given to these polis deities in the right manner and by the right persons. An early sign of the Athenian *demos*' concern with the Eleusinian cult and Mysteries is the official role of the Archon Basileus, who was in charge of the Mysteries together with a board of *epimeletai* from the early sixth century onwards. Of these *epimeletai* two were appointed by the *demos*, while another one came from the Kerykes and yet another one from the Eumolpidai (cf. [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 57.1), thus neatly illustrating the continuing co-operation between archaic *gene* and new Athenian polis authorities.¹⁹⁷ Elsewhere we read that the Basileus also offered prayers and performed sacrifices "on your behalf according to ancestral custom, sometimes in the Eleusinion here (i.e. the city), sometimes in the temple at Eleusis" ([Lys.] 6.4) and reported to the prytaneis "on all that had occurred during the performance of the ceremonies over there" (Andok. 1.111). Through these responsibilities of the

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Rhodes, *Commentary ad loc.* and *SEG* 30.61 A29-31. Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 127, reasons that the increase in popular control over the cult should not be seen as a takeover by the *demos* of a hitherto independent, private cult controlled by a local elite: "control by the *demos* succeeded, not independence, but control by previous organs of the state". Cf. R. Garland, 'Religious authority in archaic and classical Athens', *BSA* 79 (1984) 75-123.

Basileus the Athenian *demos* could take its first steps in gaining ground in Eleusis.

The right to perform the τελετή and the official pre-initiation traditionally lay with the several *gene* in charge of the Eleusinian cult. But the Athenian *demos* got involved in this field too; in a fourth-century decree (*SEG* 30.61) the *demos* stipulates that only members of the Kerykes and Eumolpidae should perform the official pre-initiation (27-9, 38-9), thus implicitly marking the *demos* as the ultimate source of authority in these matters. Already in the early fifth century, the fees to be paid to members of the *gene* for initiation were regulated by a law of the *demos* (*IG* I³ 6 C6-28). This law also forbade the Eumolpidae and Kerykes to initiate groups *en masse* (28-30), which apparently had become a lucrative business by this time.

Similarly, only members of the Eumolpidae could perform *exegesis*, as vividly illustrated by Kephalos' reproach of Kallias in the *Boule* that, as he belonged to the Kerykes, it had not been his father's right to interpret the ancient law (νόμος πατήριος), which according to him contained the statement that the penalty for placing a bow in the Eleusinion during the Mysteries was instant death (Andok. 1.115-116).¹⁹⁸ Although it was clearly an ancient prerogative of the *genos* to "explain the law", in the late fourth century this Eumolpid *exegesis* could, however, be presented as supplementary to the written laws of the polis by the author of the speech *Against Andokides* ([Lys.] 6.10) – another clear sign of the *demos*' intervention with the rites in Eleusis.¹⁹⁹

The involvement of Athenian polis authorities in the cult in co-operation with the *gene* is also nicely brought out in the already mentioned First-Fruit decree (*IG* I³ 78). In this decree of the *Boule* and the *demos* we find the leaders of the demes (the demarchs) and the *hieropoioi* of Eleusis working together with the *dadouchos* of the Kerykes and the hierophant of the Eumolpidae, who are to

¹⁹⁸ In addition to his illegal *exegesis*, Kallias father Hipponikos had explained the ancient law in a wrong way. For, at least according to Andokides (1.116), the penalty for placing a bow in the Eleusinion during the Mysteries was not instant death but a fine of 1000 dr. as stated on "the stone at your side".

¹⁹⁹ [Lysias] 6.10: "Yet Perikles, they say, advised you once that in dealing with impious persons you should enforce against them not only the written but the unwritten laws also, which the Eumolpidae expound (ἐξηγοῦνται)". Cf. S.B. Aleshire, 'Towards a definition of 'state cult' for ancient Athens' in: R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Stockholm 1994) 9-16, who discussed several criteria which could allow for the identification of a cult as a polis cult. She especially focuses on administrative and financial control by polis authorities as signs of a polis cult.

invite the Greek cities to send their first fruits to Eleusis (24-26). The names of the groups expected to bring first-fruits to Eleusis were written on wooden boards, one to be set up in Eleusis and one in the Bouleuterion in Athens (26-30), thus representing the two poles of influence in this cult.

We can concur with Robert Parker, then, that “the Mysteries remained in a strong sense an Athenian festival”. In addition to the Athenian organisation of the festival and the connection between the Mysteries and the well-being of the Athenians, Parker also refers to the *pompe* starting in Athens, the presence of an Eleusinion in central Athens, the procedure by which any Athenian could propose a child to become the so-called hearth-initiate, and the fact that foreigners who wished to be initiated first came to Athens to walk to Eleusis with an Athenian host.²⁰⁰ At least from the sixth century onwards the Mysteries were understood as part of the religious obligations of the Athenians. These were *hiera* taken care of by the Athenians *demos*, the *Boule* and elected officials, be it in close co-operation with the *gene* of Eleusis.

4.4 Lysias and his lover: metic μύησις

Since the Mysteries are thus to be understood as *hiera* of which the Athenians were in charge, it is surprising to hear that the famous metic Lysias, who lived from ca. 445 to ca. 380, could promise to initiate (μυῆσαι) his lover Metaneira, as it was to be expected that only members of the Athenian *demos* could control access to their *hiera*. In his *Speech Against Neaira*, delivered in the late 340s, Apollodoros wishes to prove to the jury that Neaira was a *xene*, a foreign woman. He begins his exposé by telling the jury that Neaira was bought, together with six other girls, by an Athenian freedwoman of the name Nikarete. Trying to show that Neaira was living at Nikarete’s in these early days, Apollodoros tells the story of the initiation of Metaneira, one of the other girls bought by Nikarete, through the mediation of her lover Lysias.

Λυσίας γὰρ ὁ σοφιστὴς Μετανείρας ὢν ἐραστής, ἐβουλήθη πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀναλώμασιν οἷς ἀνήλισκεν εἰς αὐτὴν καὶ μυῆσαι. ἡγούμενος τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἀναλώματα τὴν κεκτημένην αὐτὴν λαμβάνειν, ἃ δ’ ἂν εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν καὶ τὰ μυστήρια ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἀναλώσει, πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν ἄνθρωπον χάριν καταθήσεσθαι. ἐδεήθη οὖν τῆς Νικαρέτης ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὰ μυστήρια ἄγουσαν τὴν Μετάνειραν, ἵνα μυηθῆ, καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπέσχετο μύησειν.

²⁰⁰ Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 342-3.

Lysias, the sophist, being the lover of Metaneira, wished, in addition to the other expenditures which he lavished upon her, also to initiate her; for he considered that everything else which he expended upon her was being taken by the woman who owned her, but that from whatever he might spend on her behalf for the festival and the Mysteries the girl herself would profit and be grateful to him. So he asked Nikarete to come to the Mysteries bringing with her Metaneira that she might be initiated, and he promised that he would himself initiate her. ([Dem.] 59.21)²⁰¹

According to Apollodoros, Lysias then made arrangements for Nikarete and Metaneira to stay at a friend's house at which the woman and the girl arrived accompanied by Neaira. The orator then produces a witness to this story as to proof that Neaira was indeed already owned by Nikarete as a slave girl from the beginning.

So, what exactly was it that Lysias could promise his lover Metaneira? The verb *μυέω* is translated in Liddell and Scott (9th ed.) as “to initiate into the Mysteries”. More specifically, *μύησις* seems to have been related to the preparatory process before the grand rite of the Mysteries that was commonly referred to as the *τελετή*, which probably included both the first, initial initiation and the *epopteia*.²⁰² A fragmentary fourth-century decree (*SEG* 30.61) seems to include a statement on this preliminary *myesis*. It is stated (27-28) that if someone who does not belong to the Kerykes or Eumolpidai performs *myesis*, or if someone introduces someone to the wrong authorities that person can be brought before an Athenian court by the Basileus.²⁰³ The restoration of a similar clause restricting the right to *μυεῖν* to the two *gene* has attractively been suggested by Kevin

²⁰¹ The translation is derived from: N. W. DeWitt and Norman J. DeWitt, *Demosthenes vol. VI* (Cambridge [MA] London 1949), with slight modifications.

²⁰² On the often overlapping terms used to denote these different stages: K. Dowden, ‘Grades in the Eleusinian Mysteries’, *RHR* 197 (1980) 409-27; R.M. Simms, ‘Myesis, Telete, and Mysteria’, *GRBS* 31 (1990) 183-95; K. Clinton, ‘Stages of initiation in the Eleusinian and Samothracian Mysteries’ in: M.B. Cosmopoulos (ed.), *Greek Mysteries. The archaeology and ritual of ancient Greek secret cults* (New York 2003) 58-68.

²⁰³ Ll. 27-28: ἐάν δέ τις μῆ[ι Ε]ὐμόλ[πιδῶν ἢ Κηρύκων οὐκ ὦν ..]ιδῶς, ἢ ἐὰν προσάγη τις μῆσόμενον [..... 23τοῖ][ν] Θεοῖν, φαίνεν δὲ τὸμ βολόμενον[ν Ἶθηναίων, καὶ ὁ βασι]λεὺς εἰσαγέτω εἰς τὴν Ἶηλιαίαν. The state of this part of the inscription is too fragmentary to come to any coherent translation. The general gist is nevertheless still comprehensible. On this inscription see: K. Clinton, ‘A Law in the City Eleusinion Concerning the Mysteries’, *Hesp.* 49 (1980) 258-88, esp. 278-9 on ll. 27-28.

Clinton for a decree that was issued over a century earlier in the 470s-460s: *μυεῖν δὲ εἶ[ναι τοῖς] ὄσι Κερύκων καὶ Εὐ[μολπιδῶν]* (*IG I³ 6.30-31*).²⁰⁴ It thus appears that in the classical period a prospective initiate first had to receive *myesis* at the hands of a member of the Kerykes or the Eumolpidae before attending the *τελετή* in Eleusis. The occurrence of the verb *μυέω* in the Apollodoros-passage therefore needs explaining as Lysias was obviously not a member of either *genos*.

Fortunately, there are other examples of non-Kerykes and non-Eumolpidae initiating (*μυεῖν*) someone. Andokides, for instance, claims (1.132) to have “initiated (*μυῶν*) A[---] from Delphi and other foreign friends of mine”.²⁰⁵ Also, in the fifth-century comic poet Theophilos (frg.1) we come across a master who has initiated (*ἐμμήθην*) his favourite slave. What to make of this discrepancy? Already in 1930, Pierre Roussel convincingly argued that the verb *μυέω* not only pertained to the mandatory preparatory rite referred to as *myesis* that was to be performed only by a member of the Kerykes or the Eumolpidae but also and more generally to the initial presentation of a candidate to the responsible cultic personnel prior to this *myesis*, a process which included the payment of the costs for *myesis*, as Lysias’ case demonstrates, to be paid to the member of one of the two *gene* performing the pre-initiation.²⁰⁶ It was to be expected that this presentation could only be performed by the members of the Athenian polis community responsible for the proper execution of the obligations to the gods, that is, Athenian insiders who could act as sponsors for those outsiders who wanted to share in the *hiera* of Eleusis. Lysias’ case suggests, however, that the line between insider and outsider was not as sharply drawn as was to be expected.

In our sources all candidates for *myesis* who were introduced by a mediator are clear-cut foreigners: Lysias wants to introduce (*μυῆσαι*) his lover Metaneira, a slave girl bought by the freedwoman Nikarete, Andokides had introduced (*μυῶν*) someone from Delphi and “other foreign friends”, and in Theophilos a master introduces (*ἐμμήθην*) his slave. By contrast, in Aristophanes’ *Peace* (375), performed in 421, the Athenian Trygaios needs three drachma since he wishes

²⁰⁴ Clinton, *Sacred officials* (1974) 11.

²⁰⁵ [Plutarch] (*Mor.* 834c), perhaps misled by this same passage, claimed that Andokides was a member of the Kerykes, but several modern scholars have proven this claim to be false. See Davies, *APF* 27, no. 828 on Andokides’ family with bibliography.

²⁰⁶ P. Roussel, ‘L’initiation préalable et le symbole Eleusien’, *BCH* 54 (1930) 51-74, esp. 54-5. Payment for *myesis* is regulated in the fifth-century decree mentioned above (*IG I³ 6*). Cf. Clinton, *Sacred officials* (1974) 13 and Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 342 n. 65, who claims, based on Lysias’ promise to initiate that *μυεῖν* could mean “to pay for *myesis*”.

“to have myself initiated (μυηθῆναι) before I die”. A picture thus emerges where a foreigner, either a visiting *xenos* or a slave, first had to find a sponsor in Athens who could introduce (μυεῖν) him or her to the authorities in charge before receiving *myesis* from a member of the Kerykes or the Eumolpidae and eventually participating in the Mysteries (τελετή). This situation is similar to the one at Olympia where candidates for the Olympic Games were formally accepted or rejected by the Eleans, who were in charge of this Panhellenic festival. At the Mysteries, however, it turns out that besides the Athenians metics, too, could perform this role; Lysias could act as mediator and introduce a foreigner, an outsider, to the *hiera* of Demeter and Kore, just like an Athenian citizen.

At other Panhellenic festivals and sanctuaries it was common to find a distinction between the people who belonged to the polis in control of the sanctuary and the other participants, who generally participated as *xenoi*, like at Delphi or Olympia. In her magnificent article on polis religion, Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood established that even at these Panhellenic sanctuaries and festivals the polis was still the basic framework through which religion, or sharing in *hiera*, was experienced: people participated through the mediation of their polis; they were honoured by their polis if they obtained a victory at one of the Crown Games; if only one member misbehaved his entire polis could be excluded from further participation. She further emphasised that Panhellenic sites were usually controlled by a single polis, which was often expressed in demarcated participation by the members of that polis. As an example she presented the order of consultation of the oracle in Delphi where Greeks came before barbarians, Delphians before other Greeks, and members of the Delphic Amphictiony after the Delphians but before the other Greeks.²⁰⁷ It is surprising therefore that the Athenian influence over the *hiera* of the Mysteries was not expressed in any way through differentiated participation that would single out the Athenians as a special class of worshippers.

The special position of the Athenians among the worshippers was nonetheless expressed in their control of access to the Mysteries: a non-Athenian who wanted to participate in the Mysteries first had to find an Athenian who

²⁰⁷ C. Sourvinou-Inwood, ‘What is polis religion?’ in: O. Murray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek city from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990) 295-300, reprinted in R. Buxton (ed.), *Oxford readings in Greek religion* (Oxford 2000) 13-37, esp. 13-9. Cf. H. Bowden, *Classical Athens and the Delphic oracle: divination and democracy* (Cambridge 2005) 21.

could introduce him or her to the officials in charge. This principle by which an outsider could only gain access to the *hiera* of the Mysteries with the support and approval of an Athenian insider also appears to be at the centre of a late and admittedly distorted story concerning the mythological initiation of Herakles. Apollodoros (2.5.12) tells us how the *xenos* Herakles first had to be adopted by the Athenian Pylios before being initiated into the Mysteries, since “it was not then lawful for foreigners to be initiated”. Similarly, Plutarch (*Thes.* 33.2) relates the initiation in the time of Theseus of the Tyndaridai, who collectively wished to be initiated and were granted this privilege “after they had been adopted by Aphidnos, as Pylios had adopted Herakles”. Surely adoption was not the (highly complex) means by which *xenoi* were granted access to the Mysteries but it is very well possible that these stories refer to a time when the Athenians struggled with the question how to deal with foreign interest in their *hiera*.²⁰⁸ For although the Mysteries quickly became a Panhellenic cult in the sixth and fifth centuries, the Athenians still wanted to have the final word in who had access to Demeter and Kore, whose proper worship was intimately tied up with the well-being of the Athenian community. The Athenian *demos*, as it was responsible for the well-being of the polis at large, was also responsible for looking after the *hiera* of these goddesses and it was natural that they were the ones on whose tutelage outsiders could participate. Similarly, a non-Delphian could only consult the oracle when accompanied by a Delphian who acted as sponsor, and in Olympia, controlled by the polis Elis, the Eleans decided who could compete in the Games.²⁰⁹ Although not demarcated by differentiated participation in the Mysteries, this intermediation still drew a clear line between the members of a polis who controlled access to the *hiera* of their community and who were therefore responsible for securing divine favour for its members, and the outsiders, the *xenoi* who could only participate in these *hiera* through the mediation of an Athenian insider. What, then, did it mean that Lysias could also promise to μνησται his lover?

²⁰⁸ Adoption furthermore only became prominent much later, in the context of the tightening up of inheritance legislation, on which see: L. Rubenstein, *Adoption in fourth-century Athens* (Copenhagen 1993).

²⁰⁹ Delphi: Bowden, *Delphic oracle* (2005) 21. Olympia: Thuc. 5.50, where the historian relates how “the Lacedaemonians were excluded from the temple, the sacrifice, and the games” by the Eleans.

I want to propose that by allowing metics to act as sponsors for visiting *xenoi* and slaves who wished to be introduced into the secrets of the Mysteries, the foreign residents of Attika were conceptualised as different from these foreign outsiders. It seems likely that Lysias himself, just like Aristophanes' Trygaios, did not need an Athenian sponsor to introduce him to the Eleusinian officials like a visiting *xenos*; it was probably sufficient for a metic to introduce oneself to the Kerykes and Eumolpidae and pay them to undergo *myesis*. More importantly, metics could themselves perform this role of mediator between the *hiera* of the Athenian community and *xenoi* wishing to participate in those religious activities. This role as mediator, acting on behalf of the Athenian *demos*, demonstrates that in the context of the Mysteries resident foreigners were not perceived as *xenoi*, as could be expected in analogy to the examples at other Panhellenic sanctuaries at other *poleis*, but rather as part of the free Athenian "insiders" in charge of the community, in charge of the *hiera* of the Athenians.

4.5 Conclusion

"Every year the Athenians observe this festival in honour of the Mother and Kore, and any Athenian who wishes and any other Greek may be initiated" Herodotus tells us (8.65.4). We have seen that the Mysteries were quite exceptional in its openness; indeed every Greek who wished to be initiated could participate. It was even more striking that unlike at other Panhellenic festivals all these different participants were not split up through differentiated participation; everybody participated equally. Yet the Mysteries were at the same time an essentially Athenian festival, as Herodotus also expresses. The Athenians considered the *hiera* of the Mysteries part of their ritual obligations, to be observed by the Athenians themselves, thus securing divine support for the well-being of the Athenian polis. It is therefore surprising that the metic Lysias could act on behalf of the Athenians and introduce (μυῆσειν) foreign initiates to these Athenian *hiera*. I have suggested that by allowing metics to act as sponsors for visiting or enslaved *xenoi* on the occasion of the Mysteries, they were conceptualised as different from these *xenoi*. Slaves and visiting *xenoi* were on the outside, while, apparently, Lysias was on the inside together with the other members in charge of the Athenian community. In this context, metics checked the access to the *hiera* of the Athenian community together with the Athenian male citizens. Although Lysias was still not welcome in the *ekklesia*, the *Boule* or

the other decision-making institutions of the Athenian polis, by allowing him to act as mediator between the participants in the Mysteries and the Athenian gods, he became at least partly responsible for the well-being of the community.

Immigrants in the demes

Metics in Skambonidai, Ikarion, Phrearrhioi, and Eleusis

Let us now turn to the role of foreign immigrants in the religious activities of what are probably the most important subdivisions of the classical Athenian polis, the demes. Similar to the polis at large, the identity of a deme community, both as a community on its own and as part of the larger polis system, was largely embedded, expressed and articulated in the particular religious rites of a particular deme.¹ Thucydides (2.16.2) nicely illustrates this polis-like nature of the demes *and* the religious aspects of that nature when he writes about the stressful evacuation of the Attic countryside in 431 and famously states that

ἐβαρύνοντο δὲ καὶ χαλεπῶς ἔφερον οἰκίας τε καταλείποντες καὶ ἱερά ἃ διὰ παντὸς ἦν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον πολιτείας πάτρια δίκαιάν τε μέλλοντες μεταβάλλειν καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ πόλιν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολείπων ἕκαστος.

Deep was their trouble and discontent at abandoning their houses and their ancestral rites which all belonged to them according to their ancient constitution, and at having to change the ways of living of their ancestors, each man abandoning his own native polis.²

Although it has often been acknowledged that demes had an important religious side that was essential to a deme's sense of self and agency, most scholars still mainly focus on constitutional and political aspects when they wish to define a

¹ Cf. C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'What is polis religion?' in: O. Murray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek city from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990) 295-322.

² On the translation of οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ πόλιν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολείπων ἕκαστος not as referring to the distress of the *demotai*, who *felt like* leaving their polis, but rather to a factual situation see: D. Whitehead, 'Athenian demes as poleis (Thuc. 2.16.2)', *CQ* 51 (2001) 604-7.

deme and its membership. However, in what follows I hope to demonstrate that in classical Athens deme membership did not solely depend on enrolment in a deme register resulting in the right to participate in local and central politics but also, and perhaps even more so, on active participation in a deme's *hiera*. The members of a deme expressed their unity and identity primarily by taking care of the religious obligations of a particular locality. This, at least, seems to have been the situation in the proto-deme communities that already existed before Kleisthenes' reforms in 508. But even after Kleisthenes, when constitutional powers had been conferred upon these local communities, did religion remain essential to the identity and membership of a deme. After 508, sharing in communal rites and cults was still of utmost importance for the cohesion between the members of a deme and thus for the continued existence of that community.

It is likely that initially, in 508, the ca. 139 deme communities had quite homogeneous populations with a relatively coherent group of recently enrolled demesmen with their wives and children making up a deme. In the course of the fifth and fourth centuries this situation altered, sometimes radically, as several Athenians moved away from their home demes, usually from a rural deme into the city, and as the ever growing group of foreign immigrants who arrived in Attica settled in a deme of choice.³ Soon several demes were faced with the presence of sometimes considerable groups of people who did not originally belong to the community. One way in which demes seem to have dealt with the presence of these outsiders was to grant them a carefully considered share in the deme's *hiera*. In that way, the original members of a deme could both guarantee the continued cohesion of their changing community and express distinct memberships for both themselves and the new members.

Concerning foreign immigrants, we have a couple of instances in which metics as a group or individual metic benefactors were incorporated into a deme

³ On these migration trends see most importantly the work of A. Damsgaard-Madsen, 'Attic funeral inscriptions: their use as historical sources and some preliminary results' in: E. Christiansen, A. Damsgaard-Madsen and E. Hallager (eds.), *Studies in ancient history and numismatics presented to Rudi Thomsen* (Aarhus 1988) 55-68; R. Osborne, 'The potential mobility of human populations', *OJA* 10 (1991) 231-52; and the excellent recent discussion of Claire Taylor, 'A new political world' in: R. Osborne (ed.), *Debating the Athenian cultural revolution. Art, literature, and politics, 430-380 BC* (Cambridge 2007) 84-7. Both Osborne and Taylor emphasise the many complicating aspects (changing ideology of display, deme specific contexts, wealthy owners of residences in both home deme and city, etc) in tracing migration through the occurrence of demotics on grave-monuments. On the spread of metics over the Attic demes: D. Whitehead, *The demes of Attica, 508/7 - ca. 250 BC. A political and social study* (Princeton 1986) 81-5.

community by allowing them a share in deme *hiera*; we hear of *metoikoi* sharing in a sacrifice to the hero Leos in Skambonidai in ca. 460 and in fourth-century Eleusis a Theban metic is being honoured for providing choruses for Demeter, Kore and Dionysos. In addition to these admittedly few instances, we will occasionally adopt a wider perspective in this chapter, for it seems that in some demes foreign immigrants were not differentiated as a separate group in the context of deme religion but were rather subsumed under the broader category of “other residents” (i.e. those besides the original members of the deme), or simply as “others”, which in both cases seems to have designated a group that included both Athenians from other demes and foreign immigrants.

Regarding the practical implementation and articulations of deme membership, we are confronted with the typically great plurality in practices among the 139 attested demes. Although deme membership in general, like membership of the Athenian community at large, was greatly informed by a shared responsibility for a deme’s religious obligations, the different ways in which individual demes articulated this membership varied significantly; every deme had its own cultic observances and every deme seems to have responded to the presence of outsiders in its own way. It is thus impossible to look at The Integration of Metics in Attic Demes through their differentiated sharing in deme *hiera* as a uniform policy resulting in a coherent conceptualisation of metic status on deme level. This chapter on the participation of metics in deme *hiera* therefore rather focuses on specific implementations of a common notion of membership concerning the position of resident foreigners in several demes.

1 Deme membership: active participation in deme affairs

1.1 Demes before and after Kleisthenes

That the Attic deme was not a completely new creation of Kleisthenes has long been acknowledged.⁴ Some deme communities are already attested in archaic times. Large demes like Rhamnous and Thorikos, for instance, already existed as coherent communities long before 508. These proto-deme communities were, however, usually not known as demes. Sometimes a local community that was

⁴ Most importantly on this topic and on demes in general: Whitehead, *Demes* (1986), with 5-16 on the demes before Kleisthenes, though only looking into local communities in general and into communities already known as “demes” before 508.

known as a “polis” later became a deme, like Thorikos, mentioned as a polis by Hekataeus (*FGrH* 1 F126), and Eleusis, so described in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (114; 151). Such a “polis” could also be split up into several separate demes, like in the case of the Tetrapolis, which encompassed the later demes Marathon, Oinoe, Probalinthos and Trikorinthos. In other cases we find a village, a *kome*, or a group of *komai* grouped together as a Kleisthenic deme, like in the case of the deme Aphidnai and perhaps Erchia, while conglomerates of *komai* also existed that encompassed several communities, like the Tetrakomoi, which at least comprised the *komai* Xypete, Piraeus, Phaleron and Thymaitadai, all four in later times co-existing alongside their homonymous demes.⁵ Although demes as such were thus not familiar structures in pre-classical Attica, many of the communities that would become demes later on were already present before 508. The great variety in size and name among the demes of classical Athens furthermore strongly hints at a pre-Kleisthenic antiquity for most classical deme communities in general.

It is unfortunately still largely unclear what the position and function of these proto-demes was in the institutional structure of archaic Attica. In 508, Kleisthenes undertook his major reform of the basic administrative units of the Athenian polis when he divided Attica and all Athenians over ca. 139 demes, divided among 30 trittyes, 3 of which each formed one of the ten Kleisthenic *phylai*. The Aristotelian *Ath. Pol.* (21.6) furthermore famously comments that Kleisthenes left the old structures of “the *gene*, the phratries and the priesthoods” untouched.⁶ After 508 the phratries thus remained important groups for checking

⁵ On *komai*, still playing an important structuring role in Attic society in classical, Lykourgan times, when perhaps as many as 70 *komai*, and at least 25 were still in existence, see: S.D. Lambert, *Rationes Centesimarum: sales of public land in Lykourgan Athens* (Amsterdam 1997) 220-1, 253-5 (also with 190-1 on the Tetrakomoi and 194-5 on the Tetrapolis), and H. Lauter, *Attische Landgemeinden* (Marburg 1993) 136-8. That Erchia perhaps existed of three *komai* was suggested by S.D. Lambert, ‘Two notes on Attic *leges sacrae*’, *ZPE* 130 (2000) 78-80. He also proposes some likely *kome*-candidates, among them a homonymous *kome* Erchia. Some of these larger associations encompassing several smaller communities, like the Tetrapolis and probably also the Tetrakomoi, were thought to be components of the ancient Athenian Dodekapolis, recalling a time when Attica was composed of twelve quite independent communities (Strabo 9.1.20 = Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F94 with Jacoby *ad loc.*).

⁶ On the contradiction of this statement with Aristot. *Pol.* 1319b 19-27, in which it is claimed that to establish an “extreme” democracy, like Kleisthenes or the democrats of Cyrene had done, one needs to create new tribes and phratries, reduce private religious rites, mix everyone up, and loosen bonds of previous associations, see E. Kearns, ‘Change and continuity in religious structures after Cleisthenes’ in: P.A. Cartledge and F.D. Harvey (eds.), *Crux. Essays in Greek history presented to G.E.M. de Ste. Croix on his 75th birthday*

Athenian descent, while the priestly families known as *gene* remained important administrators of Attic polis religion. Before this time, Attica was divided into four Ionic tribes that were also subdivided into trittyes and into deme-like groups known as *naukraries*, all probably mainly military structures.⁷ In addition, we hear of village-like communities, like *poleis*, *komai* and phratries, and more personally based associations, like the Attic *gene* that all seem to have had an acknowledged position and structuring role in the polis at large. But what was the position and nature of (proto-)demes in Attica in this period?

Before the reforms of 508, “demes” seem to have been local communities that were often concentrated around one or several habitation centres.⁸ The few scraps of evidence explicitly connected with these proto-demes suggest that the main concern of the inhabitants of these communities was observing local religious traditions, though admittedly religious issues were just the kind of issues that tended to be inscribed on permanent record. It nevertheless seems that, while the *gene* seem to have taken care of cults of the polis at large and the phratries probably acted as mediators between *oikos* and local or even polis level, proto-demes fulfilled an important role in observing local rites and cults in archaic times, as Robert Parker has suggested.⁹ For instance, around 550 the people of Sounion, referring to themselves as a coherent collective of [Σ]ουμιῆς, made a dedication to Zeus (*IG I³ 1024a*).¹⁰ Also, writing on the deme Hagnous, the lexicographer Stephanus of Byzantium (*s.v.* τὸ τοπικὸν Ἄγνουυτόθεν)

(Exeter 1985) 189-207; S.D. Lambert, *The phratries of Attica* (2nd ed.) (Ann Arbor 1998) 245-8; R. Parker, *Athenian religion. A history* (Oxford 1996) 112-7.

⁷ The *locus classicus* is [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 21.2-5. For a short, though thorough sketch (with extensive bibliography) of the political organisation of the Attic polis before Kleisthenes: Lambert, *Phratries* (1998) 251-61.

⁸ Cf. R. Osborne, *Demos: the discovery of classical Attika* (Cambridge 1985) 37-42, and Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 16-30. Recent surveys suggest a shift in Greek residential patterns in classical times from nucleated settlements to dispersed and isolated residences, cf. S.E. Alcock, *Graecia Capta: the landscape of Roman Greece* (Cambridge 1993) 33-49 and E.E. Cohen, *The Athenian nation* (Princeton 2000) 121 ns. 96-98, for a bibliography. Despite the growing number of examples of isolated farms and demes without a clear residential centre, it is probably still correct to define pre-Kleisthenic demes as essentially locally based communities, as dispersion seems to have been a later development.

⁹ Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 114-8. On phratries before Kleisthenes: Lambert, *Phratries* (1998) 245-67.

¹⁰ *IG I³ 1024a*: [---]ϕον Διὶ ἀ[ρ]χ[ε]γέτει | [---]Σουμιῆς ἀ[ν]έθεσαν | Cf. H.R. Goette, *Ho axiologos demos Sounion. Landeskundliche Studien in Südost Attika* (Rahden 2000) 34-5, for an examination of the fragments of the two thighs of a *kouros*, on which this (NM 3450) and another inscription (*IG I³ 1024b*, NM 3449) are inscribed. He concludes that the date can only be determined on the basis of the letterforms, which suggest a date of 550-540.

informs us that on the *axones* of Solon (F83R) there was mention of a sacrifice at Agnous (i.e. the later deme Hagnous) to the hero Leos.¹¹ These scraps of evidence show us the inhabitants of proto-deme communities creating and expressing a common identity through an act of collective worship.

In Athenaeus (6.234-235) we furthermore find citations of what seem to be fifth-century reworkings of genuinely archaic regulations concerning a group of ritual diners (*parasitoi*) and their leaders (*archontes*) associated with the cult of Athena Pallenis.¹² Perhaps in an attempt to bring this local cult under polis control, it was stated in a νόμος τοῦ βασιλέως that after the archons of the cult had been chosen by the Archon Basileus they, in turn, had to choose the *parasitoi* “from the demes”, which, according to Robert Schlaifer, should probably be understood as a league of neighbouring deme communities in charge of the cult of Athena Pallenis, among them Pallene, Pithos, Gargettos, and Acharnai.¹³ These cultic “leagues” consisting of several proto-deme communities were quite common in Attica. Probably the most famous example is the Marathonian Tetrapolis, consisting of four separate (deme) communities and in classical times still acting as an independent unit with its own Tetrapolis archon, as can be seen in its sacrificial calendar (*IG II² 1358* with Lambert’s edition in *SEG 50.168 A*, col. 2, 39-40).¹⁴

¹¹ Stephanus of Byzantium: τὸ τοπικὸν Ἀγνουπτόθεν, καὶ ἐν τόπῳ Ἀγνοῦντι ἐν τοῖς ἄξοσι, “ἐπειδὴ Ἀγνουπτι θυσία ἐστὶ τῷ Λεῷ”. According to Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 12, this is “a seemingly genuine extract from the *axones* of Solon”.

¹² On this passage: R. Schlaifer, ‘The cult of Athena Pallenis (Athenaeus VI 234-235)’, *HSCP* 54 (1943) 35-67.

¹³ *Ibidem*, 44-7. Surprisingly among the twenty-eight parasites listed in a mid fourth-century inscription (*AM* 67 (1951) 24-9, no. 26) we can restore at least twelve different demotics, which probably points to an opening up of the cult to a wider clientele in classical times, as suggested by Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 330-1. Cf. G.R. Stanton, ‘Some Attic inscriptions’, *BSA* 79 (1984) 292-8, on the fourth-century inscription and M. Korres, *Horos* 10-12 (1992-8) 83-104 and H.R. Goette, ‘Athena Pallenis und ihre Beziehungen zur Akropolis von Athen’ in: W. Hoepfner (ed.), *Kult and Kultbauten auf der Akropolis*. (Berlin 1997) 116-31, on the possibility that the relocated temple of Ares in the Agora used to be the shrine of Athena Pallenis, the foundations of which are probably located in Pallene.

¹⁴ The Tetrakomia near Phaleron, a league of four *komai* centring on a common shrine of Herakles (Pollux 4.105, Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἐχελίδαί) and still celebrating a festival there in the fourth century (*IG II² 3102, 3103*) could, for instance, also be mentioned. Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 328-32, provides a handy checklist of these “local religious associations”. At the other end of the classical period, in 331/0, we also find the members of two small demes, the Kydantidai and the Ionidai, jointly honouring two financial administrators and the priest of Herakles (*SEG 39.148*).

The religious nature of the pre-Kleisthenic demes is perhaps best borne out by the most important sources on (proto-)deme religion, the sacrificial calendars from Theitras (Hesp. 30 (1961) 293-6, no. 1 = *LSGS* 132), Eleusis (*SEG* 23.80), the Marathonian Tetrapolis (*SEG* 50.168), Erchia (*SEG* 21.541), and Thorikos (*SEG* 33.147), dating from the 430s to the late fourth century, listing many archaic rites and sacrifices besides some, though not many, recently established ones.¹⁵ These calendars seem to support the casual comments in the two most famous peregrines of antiquity, Pausanias (1.14.7) and Strabo (9.1.21-22), on the venerable and ancestral rites of the ancient Attic communities. It seems, in sum, that before Kleisthenes, proto-demes were largely responsible for observing the local cultic obligations of Attica.¹⁶

What Kleisthenes did then in 508 was to invest many of these local communities with a new, systemised role in the running of the official subdivisions of Attica and in the administration of the polis at large.¹⁷ It should, in addition, be noted that several of the other archaic communities, most importantly perhaps the *komai*, often did not cease to exist but rather coexisted with or within the Kleisthenic demes.¹⁸ However, from 508 onwards the deme became the ultimate source of authority in local Attic affairs and became of structural importance to the administration of the democratic polis as they scrutinised and enrolled male citizens in deme registers at the age of eighteen and facilitated the participation of its members in several political, juridical, military

¹⁵ On the sacrificial calendars and on deme religion in general: S. Dow, 'Six Athenian sacrificial calendars', *BCH* 92 (1968) 170-86; J.D. Mikalson, 'Religion in the Attic demes', *AJP* 98 (1977) 424-35; Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 177-222, with 185-208 on the calendars; V. Rosivach, *The system of public sacrifice in fourth-century Athens* (Atlanta 1994) 14-36; S.C. Humphreys, *The Strangeness of gods. Historical perspectives on the interpretation of Athenian religion* (Oxford 2004) 130-96; R. Parker, *Polytheism and society at Athens* (Oxford 2005) 50-78, with 65-78 on the calendars. Recently doubts have been raised as to whether these calendars are really the calendars of demes or rather of pre-Kleisthenic communities that still existed in the classical period, like the Tetrapolis by: M.H. Jameson, 'Religion and Athenian democracy' in: I. Morris and K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Democracy 2500? Questions and challenges (AIA Colloquia and conference papers 2)* (1997) 193 and S.D. Lambert, 'Parerga III: the Genesia, Basile and Epops again', *ZPE* 139 (2002) 81 n. 21.

¹⁶ Interesting, several of these local rites were taken care of by associations of communities, something we rarely find in the classical period (but see the interesting exception of the joint cult for Herakles, mentioned in n. 14). This can perhaps be explained as both part of and response to the growing political and religious unification of Attica in archaic times.

¹⁷ Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 24: "the raw materials were already at hand; and Kleisthenes gave them their due as such".

¹⁸ See *supra*, n. 5.

and religious activities of the polis at large. The demes thus became vital components in the institutional and administrative structure of the classical polis. In addition, the demes remained essential components in Attica's religious structure; while the *demos* increasingly took care of Athens' *hiera* on polis level next to the *gene*, and while smaller groups like *orgeones* and *thiasoi* controlled smaller, more privately organised cults, the demes remained the key associations in observing the local rites and cults of Attica.

1.2 The constitutional deme

Modern scholars commonly understand a deme as a constitutional community made up by a descent group of politically active *demotai*, who belonged to a particular deme on account of their male ancestors being enrolled in that deme in 508. The main role of these *demotai*, according to these scholars, was to attend assemblies and sit on juries on both deme and polis level. More and more scholars, however, recognise that this narrow constitutional definition fails to encompass all defining aspects of a deme and its membership. David Whitehead already spoke of two interlocking models of the deme, one consisting of its "true members", i.e. the *demotai*, and one including not only *demotai* from other demes but also women, who "in the strictest sense [...] were simply ignored by the deme system" but who nonetheless performed important public duties in the context of the religious life of the deme.¹⁹ More recently, Nicholas Jones fervently defended his hypothesis that there simultaneously existed two separate conceptualisations of "deme" in Attica. He argued that in reaction to the single emphasis on a citizen minority within the narrowly defined "constitutional deme" an alternative "territorial deme" came into existence that was defined by strict boundaries and encompassed all inhabitants living on its territory including demesmen from other demes, women and metics.²⁰

Jones' ideas were, however, largely rejected, mainly because of the not wholly convincing evidence he presents for the "victory" of a territorial deme over its separate constitutional counterpart in the fourth century, and because evidence for strict deme boundaries is largely absent before the late fourth

¹⁹ Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 77-81, on page 77.

²⁰ N.F.H. Jones, *The associations of classical Athens. The response to democracy* (1999) 51-81. Cf. Cohen, *Athenian nation* (2000) 113-29.

century.²¹ What remains, however, is the fact that defining a deme from a constitutional perspective alone is not wholly satisfying as it represents only part of the picture. It is simply impossible to ignore the pre-Kleisthenic history and religious nature of demes.

Of course, no one will deny that religion was important to the demes of Attica, even in the classical period. Robert Parker referred to the fact that “of about forty-five demes from which we have relevant documents of any type, about thirty demonstrably had cults of their own” and he concludes that “the demesmen probably assembled much more often for religious purposes than for political.”²² Earlier, Jon Mikalson, in his groundbreaking article on deme religion, already claimed that demes “functioned [...] as religious units as well as political units” and Whitehead similarly stated that it is “idle to pretend that deme religion is anything but an amorphous and intractable topic to treat in its own right”.²³ However, when the latter discusses the position of women in demes and notes the

²¹ See for instance the review by Mark Golden in *JHS* 120 (2000) 181. After Wesley Thompson’s influential article on ‘The deme in Kleisthenes’ reforms’, *SO* 46 (1971) 72-9, arguing for a local community focussed around a nucleated centre without strict boundaries, M.K. Langdon, ‘The territorial basis of the Attic demes’, *SO* 60 (1985) 5-15, followed by H. Lohmann, *Atene: Forschungen zu Siedlungs- und Wirtschaftsstruktur des klassischen Attika*, vol. 1 (Cologne 1993) 57-9, revived the notion of a territorial deme, i.e. with strict boundaries. The strongest evidence for a territorially defined deme is a *horos*-stone from Piraeus (*IG* II² 2623: ὄρος Π[ετ]ραίων [χώ][ρ]ας) and several so-called rupestral inscriptions found on living rock surfaces throughout Attica, first listed by J.S. Traill, *Demos and trittys: epigraphical and topographical studies in the organization of Attica* (Toronto 1986) 116-22, with additional finds listed in Jones, *Associations* (1999) 60 n.45. These “boundary stones” are all dated to the late fourth century and are perhaps best understood as the result of a growing bureaucracy and rising boundary disputes between demes and not part of deme communities *ab initio*. S. D. Lambert. ‘A house of the Piraeans?’, *ZPE* 146 (2004) 91-2, has furthermore convincingly refuted the common restorations of *IG* II² 2623, suggesting the space available makes it likely that the stone recorded the marking of a house of the Piraeans (perhaps in the city), instead of territory, for which there are plenty of good parallels. Despite all this, Gerald Lalonde, both in his *Horos Dios: an Athenian shrine and cult of Zeus* (Leiden 2006a) and ‘*IG* I³ 1055 B and the boundary of Melite and Kollytos’, *Hesp.* 75 (2006b) 93-100, has made an interesting case for early deme boundaries, referring to 1) demarchic duties that concerned residency and landed property with a single deme, like a landed deme tax, 2) the official “*oikein en*”-formula for metics designating them as metics by referring to their deme of residence and the Skambonidai decree with its reference to metics in ca. 460 (*IG* I³ 244.8-9), for which see further down, 3) the demarch’s collection of *eisphora* taxes and his recruitment of liturgists on deme level, and finally 4) to the law quoted in [Dem.] 43.57-58, which ordered the demarch to pick up and bury any corpse “in the deme”, suggesting the demarch had knowledge as to where a deme’s influence began. S.C. Humphreys, ‘Family tombs and tomb cult in ancient Athens: tradition or traditionalism?’, *JHS* 100 (1980) 98 dates this law to ca. 430, i.e. the time of the Great Plague.

²² Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 64.

²³ Mikalson (1977) 424 and Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 176.

important role they played in deme religion he is quick to add that “the sphere of religion and cult operated under a different, older set of imperatives”, thus suggesting the role of women in deme religion was a relic of the religious inclusiveness of archaic times and no longer of importance to the classical deme communities.²⁴ In contrast, I argue that religion and cult remained of great importance to the conceptualisation of a deme community and continued to be an effective means to articulate current concerns and express different identities for different groups of people living within the same community. When we want to define what a deme was we have to account for the fact that a deme was not only a constitutional unit but a religious one as well.

1.3 δημοτευόμενος: active participation in deme affairs

Now that the conventional constitutional definition of demes appears unsatisfying, or at least incomplete, I wish to offer an alternative understanding of demes and deme membership with an emphasis on the participation of the deme members in communal deme rites. Ancient sources abundantly demonstrate that belonging to a deme did not merely consist of being officially enrolled in a deme but also depended on participation in the deme-community. Several lexicographers testify to the fact that active participation in common activities could be considered a defining feature of being a member of a deme, of being a δημότης or a δημότις. For instance, the Suda (δ 465), referring to Demosthenes, describes δημοτευόμενος (i.e. being a δημότης or a δημότις) as μετὰ τῶν δημοτῶν, “[being/acting] with the *demotai*”, while δημοτεύεσθαι (i.e. to be a δημότης or a δημότις) is defined as τὸ τοῦδέ τινος δήμου κοινωνεῖν καὶ χρηματίζειν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, “to take part in such-and-such a deme and to take one’s name from it”.²⁵ Hesychius (s.v. δημοτεύεσθαι) uses similar terminology when he glosses δημοτεύεσθαι as τὸ μετέχειν δήμου καὶ πολιτείας κατὰ νόμον, “to share in the deme and the polis community according to the law”, thus powerfully evoking the phrase that was used to describe what it meant to be an

²⁴ Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 79. A similar point was recently defended by Maurizio (1998) 297-317.

²⁵ According to Harpokration (s.v.) δημοτεύεσθαι was likewise employed by the late fifth-century orator Antiphon (fr.65).

Athenian as sharing in the polis or in the *hiera* and *hosia* of the polis.²⁶ According to these late glosses, being a member of a deme largely consisted of sharing (μετεχέειν) or taking part (κοινωνεῖν) in the affairs of a deme.

Fortunately, we do not need to believe these late lexicographers on their word, for the Attic orators abound with passages that corroborate the notion that deme membership consisted of active participation in a deme's affairs. This is most clearly brought out by several court speeches in which deme membership is at issue as, for instance, in Demosthenes' speech *Against Euboulides* (57). This speech deals with the deme membership of one Euxitheus, who during the general revision of deme registers in 346/5 had been taken of the deme register of Halimous on the instigation of the demarch Euboulides. Defending his decision, Euboulides had apparently referred to the fact that Euxitheus' father spoke with a foreign accent while his mother sold ribbons in the Agora. To demonstrate that both his father and his mother were, on the contrary, Athenians and that he himself had been previously accepted as a member of the deme Halimous, Euxitheus refers to a number of communal events during which his family's status had been acknowledged by their fellow deme members. Euxitheus emphasises that the father was "chosen to offices by lot, and passed the scrutiny, and held office" (25). This approval of the demesmen of Halimous of the father's status in the past is then presented as pivotal in establishing Euxitheus' current position in the deme for "does any one of you imagine that the demesmen would have suffered the foreigner and non-citizen to hold office among them?" (26). The same goes for the repeated acceptance of Euxitheus' deme membership by his fellow demesmen on several occasions; not only was he enrolled in the deme (26), he was also nominated to draw lots for the priesthood of Herakles, passed the scrutiny and held offices (46).²⁷ According to Euxitheus this would surely not have occurred if he was, as is now claimed, not a member of the deme Halimous:

οὐκ οὐκ δεινόν, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, εἰ μὲν ἔλαχον ἱερεὺς, ὡς περ προῦκρίθη
ν, δεῖν ἄν με καὶ αὐτὸν θύειν ὑπὲρ τούτων καὶ τοῦτον μετ' ἐμοῦ συνθύειν
νῦν δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς τούτους ἐμὲ μεθ' αὐτῶν μηδὲ συνθύειν ἔαν; φαίνομαι
τοίνυν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τὸν μὲν ἄλλον χρόνον ἅπαντα παρὰ πᾶσιν
τοῖς νῦν κατηγοροῦσι πολίτης ὡμολογημένος· οὐ γὰρ ἂν δήπου τὸν γε
ξένον καὶ μέτοικον, ὡς νῦν φησιν Εὐβουλίδης, οὐτ' ἀρχὰς ἄρχειν οὐθ'

²⁶ See most importantly on this phrase: W. R. Connor, "“Sacred” and “secular”": *Hiera kai hosia* and the classical Athenian concept of the State', *Ancient Society* 19 (1988) 161-88, and Josine Blok, forthcoming.

²⁷ Later on in the speech (63) we hear Euxitheus also held the office of demarch.

ἱερωσύνην κληροῦσθαι μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ προκριθέντ' εἴασεν· καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ἦν τῶν κληρουμένων καὶ προκριθέντων, οὐδε γ' ἄν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, παλαιὸς ὢν ἐχθρὸς ἐμοὶ τοῦτον τὸν καιρὸν περιέμενεν, ὃν οὐδεὶς ἤδει γενησόμενον, εἴπερ τι συνήδει τοιοῦτον.

Is it not an outrage, men of the jury, that, whereas, if I had been chosen by lot as priest, even as I had been nominated, it would have been my duty to offer sacrifice on behalf of these people and Euboulides would have had to join in the sacrifice with me? Is it not an outrage, I ask, that these same people should not allow me even to share in the sacrifices with them? It is plain, then, men of Athens, that in all previous time I have been acknowledged as a citizen by all those who now accuse me; for surely Euboulides would never have suffered the *xenos* or metic, as he now calls me, either to hold offices or to draw lots with himself as a nominee for the priesthood. (47-48)²⁸

It thus appears that Euxitheus' deme membership did not solely depend on official enrolment in a deme but also consisted of sharing and taking part in a deme's communal affairs, among which drawing lots for priesthoods and sharing in communal sacrifices. Other speeches also attest to the importance of participation in communal activities for the assertion and acknowledgement of a person's status and identity as deme member, just as it was for a member of the polis at large.²⁹ These activities varied from collective participation in military campaigns to political deliberation and collective legal help to a fellow member.³⁰ Interesting in the current context is the fact that orators also frequently refer to sharing in common sacrifices as an important quality of deme membership. This is already apparent in Demosthenes' claim (57.48) that if Euxitheus was in fact not a member of the deme Halimous he would never have been allowed to share in the sacrifices with the other demesmen. We come across a similar notion in Isaeus' speech *On the estate of Astyphilos*. The case concerns the estate of one

²⁸ The translation is derived from: N. W. DeWitt and Norman J. DeWitt, *Demosthenes vol. VI* (Cambridge [MA] London 1949) *ad loc.*

²⁹ A.C. Scafuro, 'Witnessing and false witnessing: proving citizenship and kin identity in fourth-century Athens' in: A.L. Boegehold and A.C. Scafuro (eds.), *Athenian identity and civic ideology* (Baltimore and London 1994) 156-98, emphasises the pivotal role of witnesses in Athenian courts, who could testify to a person's participation in events that are only open to members of a particular status in cases where (deme) registers could have easily clarified someone's identity and status. Cf. Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 227-34.

³⁰ Collective military activities by demesmen: Lys. 20.23, 31.15-16, 16.14; Is. 2.42. Political meetings: Lys. 20.2; Dem. 57.7. Legal help: Lys. 27.12; Is. 2.44-45; Dem. 43.35.

Astyphilos that was seized by Kleon, Astyphilos' first cousin in the male line, on behalf of Kleon's son who, as Kleon asserts, was adopted by Astyphilos. However, Astyphilos' half brother is now contesting the adoption in court, arguing that it is simply impossible that Astyphilos adopted the son of Kleon, who was Astyphilos' sworn enemy as it was rumoured that Kleon's father had murdered Astyphilos' father. According to the speaker, the enmity between Kleon and Astyphilos reached such a high pitch that even though the two were members of the same deme their fellow demesmen could think of no occasion when Kleon and Astyphilos had attended sacrifices together (9.21). In the same way the speaker argues (9.33) that the fellow-demesmen of Astyphilos, "well knowing that Astyphilos never adopted Kleon's son [...] have never given him any share of the meat of sacrificed animals". The clear implication is that being fellow demesmen normally meant sharing in the same communal sacrifices, while not belonging to the deme or being at enmity with one's fellow *demotai* likewise meant being excluded from the *hiera* of the *demotai*.³¹

The position of women within demes was also established through participation in the *hiera* of a deme. In Isaeus' speech *On the estate of Kiron* the speaker argues (8.18-20) that if the speaker's mother was not the legitimate daughter of Kiron it would have been impossible for her to have been chosen by the other wives of demesmen to administer the Thesmophoria and carry out the ceremonies. The contrary could also be argued: in his speech *On the estate of Pyrrhos*, Isaeus claims (3.80) that the defendant's sister was not legitimately married to the wealthy Pyrrhos, for then he would surely have organised the Thesmophoria on her behalf and entertained the wives of his fellow demesmen on that occasion. The fact that he had not done so, even though he possessed over three talents, is presented as proof that she could not possibly be the legitimate wife of Pyrrhos and her daughter could therefore not possibly claim to have any right to the property of Pyrrhos.

We can conclude, then, that belonging to a deme consisted of participating in deme affairs and that similar to membership of the polis community at large deme membership also consisted of sharing in the *hiera* of the deme one belonged to. We should therefore not envisage two distinct and disparate entities of a constitutional deme next to a territorial one, but rather see the deme as a

³¹ Also see Isaeus fr. 2.6 in which the speaker is at enmity with his fellow demesmen, which he describes as "the most grievous thing possible [...] since I am obliged to share in their sacrifices and attend their common meetings".

locally based community, membership of which was defined by descent and by active participation in deme affairs, not the least in deme religion.

1.4 The deme and its “foreign” residents

Within a deme community the *demotai* and their wives obviously had first right to share in the deme’s *hiera* as they were the core members. The flexible conceptualisation of deme membership based on participation in communal activities, however, in addition allowed new residents, either as individuals or as groups, to be incorporated into the deme community by granting them a share in the deme’s *hiera*. In that way the members of a deme could secure the cohesion of their community, while differences in participation could express differences in membership.

It is not entirely clear what the situation was in 508: either *all* free men living in Attica registered in a deme as *demotai*, or perhaps a separate status was already conceptualised for resident foreigners at this early date, as Whitehead has suggested.³² All pivots around the question whether the new citizens who were enfranchised by Kleisthenes in 508 only included the men who were struck off the phratry lists during the revisions of 510 or also the other free inhabitants living in Attica in 508, including all free resident foreigners.³³ But whatever the situation in 508, it seems clear that many demes were soon faced with the arrival and permanent presence of families who had not originally belonged to their deme, consisting of *demotai* from other demes and foreign immigrants.

It is now commonly thought that in the course of the classical period, and probably especially after the evacuation of the Attic countryside in 431 when the whole Attic population was packed within the city walls of Athens, many Athenian *demotai* moved away from their ancestral demes in the Attic countryside to settle in a deme in or near the city. It seems, in addition, that many wealthy Athenians from rural demes increasingly owned multiple residencies, including one in the city. This mobility resulted in a mixing of many deme populations, particularly those of urban and suburban demes, now consisting of

³² D. Whitehead, *The ideology of the Athenian metic* (Cambridge 1977) 143-7.

³³ The main sources are: Aristot. *Pol.* 1275b 32-37 and [Aristot.], *Ath. Pol.* 21.2-4. Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 143-5, is perhaps too eager to reject the statement in *Pol.* 1275b 32-37 that those enfranchised in 508 included metics and manumitted slaves.

hereditary members and Athenians from other demes.³⁴ Despite this mobility, the Athenians who had moved *oikos* still sustained strong ties with their ancestral demes, both because of familial reasons and because the ancestral deme was the essential level of mediation between an Athenian and his (or her) participation in central communal activities on polis level, including politics, and military and religious matters. The Athenian who had moved from one deme to another thus found himself in a dual position with one foot in his ancestral deme and another in his new deme of residence. But while his position in his ancestral deme was clearly delineated, it was probably entirely up to the new deme to devise a new position for the newcomer. In most demes we find no acknowledged status for these Athenian immigrants, but in some demes, like Piraeus (*IG II² 1214.25-28*), we find taxes for which only people who possessed landed property in a deme other than his own seem liable, and for which they could accordingly be exempted.³⁵ In other cases the differentiation between original *demotai* and new resident Athenians was less pronounced and more focussed on the original *demotai*, for instance by specifying that some specific deme rites were only open to the original deme members or by making more use of demotics in deme contexts.³⁶ But whatever his new position in his new deme of residence, the newcomer would never lose his position in his ancestral deme, which remained the basis of his/her position in the polis at large.

The situation was rather different concerning the presence and position of foreign immigrants in demes. Despite the common paucity of our sources, we have quite a good idea of the spread of metics among the demes. The distribution of metics among the Attic demes was clearly discussed by Whitehead. Facilitated by the standard official designation of individual metics as “living in deme X” in official polis records, he emphasises that of the 366 metics of whom we know their place of residence, 302 lived in only eight demes (Melite 75, Piraeus 69, Kollytos 42, Alopeke 31, Kydathenaion 31, Skambonidai 28, Keiriadai 16, Eleusis 10)

³⁴ See footnote 3 above. Cf. Cohen, *Athenian nation* (2000) 49-78 and 104-29, who nicely sketches the heterogeneity of the Athenian and deme community.

³⁵ Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 75-7 and 150-2.

³⁶ We find deme rites explicitly restricted to *demotai* in fourth-century Piraeus (*IG II² 1214*) on which see 234-6 below. Osborne (1991) 241, discussing the high occurrence of demotics on graves of Rhamnousians who were buried in their own deme, referred to the very large number of strangers living in the deme, which could have encouraged the Rhamnousians to emphasize their hereditary association with and within their own deme more emphatically than *demotai* in other demes.

with 223 living in urban and suburban Athens, and 69 living in Piraeus. More importantly perhaps is the fact that the remaining 64 metics were scattered across more than thirty demes all over Attica and Whitehead correctly emphasises that an entirely metic-less deme was probably a rarity.³⁷ So what was the relation of a metic with his deme of residence?

It is very probable that foreign immigrants who arrived in Athens had no official position in the Athenian polis, other than *xenoi* that is, until they enrolled in a deme of choice and registered at the polemarch's office in Athens, which facilitated their participation in the polis as metics. Through the polemarch's, who probably kept lists of all metics, a metic could probably be called upon for military services. He was also the archon who resided over court cases concerning metics.

Metics in addition had to pay the so-called *metoikion* tax, first attested for the late fifth, early fourth century, consisting of twelve drachma per year for a metic man and six drachma for an independent metic woman, and there is a possibility they had to pay these sums at deme level.³⁸ The clearest indication for an association of metics with the Attic demes is however the designation of metics in official polis records, which recorded a metic as "living in (*oikein en*) deme X". An embryonic form of this "*oikein en*"- formula is first attested on one of the *stelai* listing the confiscated property of the so-called Hermokopidai (*IG I³ 421 = ML 79*), dated to 414/3, on which we find the possessions of one Kephisodoros who is recorded as "a metic living in Piraeus" (μετοίκο ἐμ Περα[ιῆ] οἰκοντος]- 1.33). Despite its relatively late occurrence, the official "*oikein en*"-formula should probably be seen as a later, official recognition of an already long established link between metics and their demes of residence, as Gerald Lalonde has recently suggested, referring to the Skambonidai decree of ca. 460 in which *metoikoi* were recorded as recipients of sacrificial meat (*IG I³*

³⁷ Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 84. A metic's deme of residence is only clear when the "*oikein en*"- formula is used, i.e. in official cataloguing inscriptions, including building accounts, *phialai* lists, and naval catalogues. A comprehensive list of individual metics was first published by A. Diller, *Race mixture among the Greeks before Alexander* (Urbana 1937) 161-79. Although the absolute number of known inscriptions has grown enormously since 1937, because of the severely limited types of records in which we come across metics with their demes of residence Whitehead could only give 36 new names in 1986, while since then only few individual metics have been identified, for instance one in Halai Aixonides and one in Anagyrous, on which see: G. Steinhower, 'Παρατηρήσεις στην οικιστική μορφή των αττικών δήμων' in: W.D.E. Coulson et al. (eds.), *The archaeology of Athens and Attica under the democracy* (Oxford 1994) 189, n.51.

³⁸ Whitehead, *Metic* (1977) 75-7, 152-3.

244.4-10), at which we will look very shortly.³⁹ Although many aspects are still largely obscured, a deme's role towards its metic population, at least from the second half of the fifth century and perhaps even earlier, thus seems to have been largely one of recording Attica's metic population and perhaps of facilitating the collection of the *metoikion* tax.

In addition we find demes dealing with their metic population in their own way, regulating the differentiated participation of metics in the deme community. In Eleusis, for instance, we find metics paying "taxes over which the Eleusinian have authority" (*IG II² 118624-25*). But also in the context of the religious obligations of a particular deme could metics be incorporated into the community and differentiated from the *demotai*.

2 Metics in the city deme Skambonidai

Our single most important and unfortunately only evidence for the incorporation of foreigner immigrants into a deme community as a coherent and clearly definable group of *metoikoi* comes from the deme Skambonidai. Skambonidai was a city deme, located north of the classical Agora.⁴⁰ The deme belonged to the *phyle* Leontis and each year the Skambonid *demotai* could send three representatives to sit on the *Boule*, which indicates that at the time of Kleisthenes' reforms the population of Skambonidai was considered to be of a relatively average size compared to other demes. From this centrally located community derives a decree (*IG I³ 244*), dated very roughly to ca. 460, which stipulates several sacrifices, among which a sacrifice to the hero Leos from which both the Skambonidai and the metics received an equal share.

³⁹ Lalonde (2006b) 95-6. Whitehead, *Metic* (1977) 145, himself is very reluctant to date any deme registration of metics to before 414/3, i.e. to before *IG I³ 421*. In his review of Whitehead's *Ideology of the Athenian metic* Nick Fisher, 'How to be an alien', *CR* 29 (1979) 266-8, already suggested a date closer to Perikles' Citizenship Law of 451/0 and his building programme for the first registration of metics in demes.

⁴⁰ The location of the deme Skambonidai is mainly based on the find-spot of *IG I³ 244*, found in a house near, probably north of the Hephaisteion. Cf. J. Travlos, *Pictorial dictionary of Athens* (New York 1971) fig. 218, no. 241 and Traill, *Demos* (1986) 130. There was probably also a phratry located in or near Skambonidai, on which see Lambert, *Phratries* (1998) T22. On the location of demes in general see: J.S. Traill, *The political organization of Attica. A study of the demes, trittyes, and phylai, and their representation in the Athenian council* (*Hesp. Suppl.* 14) (Princeton 1975) 37-54.

2.1 Resident foreigners in Skambonidai

Due to the central location of the deme in the heart of the city of Athens it was to be expected that the Skambonidai were faced with the presence of many immigrants from an early date onwards. And indeed several individual metics are attested as living in Skambonidai in the classical period: among the metics working on the Erechtheion in the late fifth century we find Heumelides, a bronze worker (*IG I³ 476.330-331*), Kephisodoros, a stone worker (*IG I³ 465.108-110; 476.97-98; 215-216*), Kroisos, who was a servant (*IG I³ 476.12-13; 22-23*), Philios, a bronze worker (*IG I³ 476.331-332*), and Satyra, a woman who provided something now lost (*IG II² 1654.40*), who were all metics living in Skambonidai at the time.⁴¹ The close proximity of the deme to the Akropolis must have been a strong incentive for several of the metics working on the Periklean building programme to settle in Skambonidai. But also in other contexts do we find metics who were living in Skambonidai: among the crews of triremes listed in an inscription dated to the late fifth century we find the metic Lykon who lived in Skambonidai (*IG I³ 1032.434*) and among the men working at Eleusis in 329/8 (*IG II² 1672*) we find Agathon, who was hired *inter alia* to build bleachers (179), Archiades (241), Enyton, who provided two stone blocks for a twelve feet long cornice (132), and Leukon (238). Only two years later Sikon, also a metic living in Skambonidai, was working among those who were hired to continue work at Eleusis (*IG II² 1673.11*). And in a naval account (*IG II² 1631*), dated to 323/2, we come across the metic Areios who lived in Skambonidai and who manufactured catapults (καταπέλτ]αφέτ[ηι – 514).

Finally, in the so-called *phialai exeleutherikai* (*IG II² 1553-1578+ SEG 46.180*), dated to ca. 330-322, listing the names of at least 353 manumitted slaves who were set free by their masters after dedicating a *phiale*, we find that of the 215 manumitted slaves for whom we can determine where they choose to live at least fifteen decided to settle in Skambonidai: besides four fragmentary references (*IG II² 1553.29; IG II² 1557.7-8, 11-12; IG II² 1558.14-15*) we find Dionysios, who was a farmer (*IG II² 1559.51-52*), Hestiaios, who lived in Skambonidai as a cobbler of shoes (*IG II² 1557.80-81*), the two wet nurses Lampris (*IG II² 1559.59-60*) and Eupeithe (*IG II² 1559.63-64*), Olympos, whose occupation is not attested (*IG II² 1567.9-10*), a weaver (*IG II² 1572.4-5*), the

⁴¹ On the Erechtheion accounts see above 144-6, with footnotes 155-157.

women Philainis (*IG II² 1575.3-4*) and Aristonoë (*IG II² 1575.8-9*), the child Hediste (*IG II² 1554.67*), another cobbler of shoes (*IG II² 1576.8-9*), and a fishmonger (*IG II² 1576.13-14*). Finally, among those people who set their slaves free we also find a man “living in Skambonidai” (*IG II² 1569.18-19*).⁴²

In total, of the ca. 366 metics of who we know where they lived no less than twenty-eight (7.7%) lived in Skambonidai. Despite the fact that these numbers only represent a tiny section of the total metic population of classical Attica – remember that it is commonly thought that before the Peloponnesian War there was roughly one metic to every three to four Athenians, perhaps adding up to as much as 20.000 to 30.000 metics in total⁴³ – the conclusion presents itself that in the classical period the Skambonidai were faced with a significant presence of foreigner immigrants; of all metics who are known with their place of residence 79.8 % lived either in one of six city demes (Melite, Kollytos, Alopeke, Kydathenaion, Skambonidai, Keiriadai) or in Piraeus, and no less than 9.6 % of these city and harbour dwelling metics lived in the averaged sized community of the Skambonidai.⁴⁴

2.2 A *lex sacra* from Skambonidai

So how did the Skambonidai deal with the presence of this significant group of foreigners who settled in their community? A Skambonid decree (*IG I³ 244*) that can be very roughly dated to around 460 is most informative.⁴⁵ This decree is

⁴² On the *phialai* lists: D.M. Lewis, ‘Attic manumissions’, *Hesp.* 28 (1959) 208-38 and idem, ‘Dedications of *phialai* at Athens’, *Hesp.* 37 (1968) 368-80. S.C. Todd, ‘Status and gender in Athenian public records’ in: *Symposium 1995: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (Cologne 1997) 120-4, examines the gender, occupation and names of the 375 ex-slaves mentioned in these catalogues noting that the prevalence of *talasiourgoi*, i.e. weavers, should not be seen as evidence for a booming Athenian wool trade, but was rather an umbrella term for women whose occupation could not be properly described, thereby tying in with V.J. Rosivach, ‘*Talasiourgoi* and *Paidia* in *IG 2² 1553-78*: a note on Athenian social history’, *Historia* 38 (1989) 365-70, who suggested that *talasiourgoi* probably simply means “housewives”.

⁴³ See Introduction, n. 6 and 7 for the bibliography.

⁴⁴ The numbers are derived from Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 83. For the large deme Melite (bouleutic quota of seven) 75 metics are attested; for Kollytos (bouleutic quota of three) 42 metics; Alopeke (bouleutic quota of ten) 31 metics; Kydathenaion (bouleutic quota of twelve) 31 metics; Keiriadai (bouleutic quota of two) sixteen metics. For Piraeus 69 metics are attested.

⁴⁵ Most recently this text was discussed by Humphreys, *Strangeness* (2004) 145-6. I would like to thank Peter Thonemann in Oxford for kindly providing me with his notes on this decree. The date given in *IG I³* is “c.a. 460”, probably based on the combined occurrence of

probably the earliest attested decree issued by a Kleisthenic deme – perhaps in joint cooperation with a *kome* of the same name as not both a demarch (C2) and a komarch (A12-13) appear to be mentioned in the decree as executive officials.⁴⁶ *IG I³ 244*, moreover, contains the first epigraphic attestation of the use of the plural “*metoikoi*”. Although it is impossible to tell from the word “*metoikoi*” itself whether it only refers to foreign immigrants or to immigrants in general (i.e. including Athenian immigrants from other demes), as the term “*metoikos*” and cognate terms – first used in the funerary epigram for the Naxian Anaxilas (*SEG* 22.79) – were never used to designate native Athenians, I find it most likely that it refers to *foreign* immigrants only in this case as well.⁴⁷ The occurrence of *metoikoi* in the Skambonidai decree might even be the first attestation of the collective noun “*metoikoi*” ever if we wish to date *IG I³ 244* to before the first performance of Aeschylus’ *Eumenides* in 458, which otherwise contains the earliest reference to *metoikoi* in line 1011, where the Eumenides are called by that name.⁴⁸

Whatever the exact date of *IG I³ 244*, both the decree and Aeschylus’ *Eumenides* indicate there was a growing concern in the 460s and 450s with the ways in which the Athenians should deal with the growing number of foreigners living in Athens. G.W. Bakewell has even argued that Aeschylus’ *Suppliant Women*, performed in ca. 463 and dealing with protocols for accepting strangers, provides support for a date in the 460s for the institutionalisation of the

the tailed rho and the three-bar sigma, usually dated to before the 440s, the appearance of the chi (e.g. in line C 16) and the intermittent use of double and triple interpuncts in fragment C. But see, of course, H.B. Mattingly’s arguments against using the occurrence of the three-bar sigma as an accurate dating criterion, first stated in ‘The Athenian coinage decree’, *Historia* 10 (1961) 148-68, and restated in *The Athenian Empire restored* (Michigan 1996) 281-314.

⁴⁶ On a similar situation of homonymous demes and *komai* maintaining separate institutional identities, even in the fourth century, see Lambert, *Rationes* (1997) 190-2, on the occurrence of the *kome* Phaleron, one of the four *komai* of the Tetrakomai, in the records of the grant sale of public land in the 330s. He argues that the four *komai*, i.e. Phaleron, Piraeus, Xypete and Thymaitadai (Pollux 4.105), existed separately from their homonymous demes.

⁴⁷ In addition, as the Skambonid sacrifice to Leos was, as I will argue later on, most likely a sacrifice to the *phyletic* hero Leos, the sacrificial community on that occasion probably consisted of the Skambonidai and foreign immigrants, while Athenian immigrants from other demes could join in the sacrifices to the hero of the *phyle* their ancestral deme belonged to.

⁴⁸ Note that in Aeschylus’ play of 458, the Eumenides were in a state of ξυνοικία (line 833 and 916) before they receive their new status of *metoikoi* in Athens. In that context the term *metoikoi* thus seems to refer to outsiders who were already living with the Athenians, i.e. ξυνοίκειν, before being officially accepted by the demos in some way.

metoikia.⁴⁹ I argued earlier that the development of metic status should probably not be pinned down to one moment in time, but should rather be seen as a continuing discourse. Still, foreign presence in Attica and metic status were clearly hot issues in these decades. One way in which a deme community could deal with the presence of foreigner residents in their midst is shown in the Skambonidai decree: it stipulates that of the full-grown victim sacrificed to Leos each of the Skambonidai and the metics receive a share worth a now lost amount of obols in the agora of the Skambonidai (C 4-10).

The Skambonidai decree consists of three fragments, all three written in stoichedon, that were found in a house in the vicinity of the Hephaestion. Based on the letterforms (the three-bar sigma, the tailed rho and the appearance of the chi in line C 16) and the intermittent occurrence of double and triple interpuncts, Peter Thonemann suggests we can almost be certain that the side listed as C in *IG I³* was first inscribed, which seems to be corroborated by the first four lines of this fragment that can probably be restored as θέσ]μια Σ[καμβονι][δ]ον τὸν δέ[μαρχηον] | [κ]αὶ τὸς ἡ[ιεροποι]ῶς: “(These are) the traditional regulations (*thesmia*) of the Skambonidai; the demarch and the *hieropoios* (are to)”.⁵⁰ These *thesmia* are subsequently listed. The first entry is also the most interesting one in the present context. It reads:

4. [...] τῶι Λεῶ[ι δρᾶν τ]-
 [ε]λεον λῆχ[σιν...]
 [ὀ]βολῶν ἡε[κάστον]
 Σκαμβονι[δῶν καὶ]
 τος μετοικ[ος λαχ]-
 εν (οἱ νέμ]εν?) ἐν ἀγορᾶ[ι τῆι Σ]-
 10. [κ]αμβονιδῶ[ν ...]

Although the Greek is slightly obscure, the essence of this passage is still quite clear: the demarch and the *hieropoios* are to sacrifice a full-grown victim to Leos

⁴⁹ G.W. Bakewell, ‘Μετοίκια in the *Supplices* of Aeschylus’, *CA* 16 (1997) 209-28. On metics in Aeschylus: Whitehead, *Metic* (1977) 35-6.

⁵⁰ The comments on the date and restoration of the first lines come from Peter Thonemann, who also refers to a parallel for the first lines: *IG I³* 243.30-33, an even more fragmentary decree, dated to 480-450, from the deme Melite, which seems concerned with specifying (ritual) obligations of the demarch and the *hieromnemos*. Humphreys *Strangeness* (2004) 145-6, already suggested restoring θέσ]μια Σ[καμβονι][δ]ον. On *thesmia*: M. Ostwald, *Nomos and the Beginnings of the Athenian Democracy* (Oxford 1969) 12-56, esp. 12-9.

of which they are to give each of the Skambonidai and the metics a share of a now lost amount of obols in the agora of the Skambonidai. The decree continues with listing more *hiera* of the Skambonidai. On side C we can further make out the festival of the Synoikia celebrated on the Akropolis (16-19), an otherwise unattested festival, probably in honour of Apollo, called the Epizephyria, celebrated “in the Pythion” (19-22). The only securely datable festival in this list is the Synoikia, which was celebrated on 16 Hekatombaion.⁵¹ Thucydides (2.15.2) calls the festival an ἑορτὴν δημοτελεῖν, i.e. a festival paid for by the *demos*, which celebrated the unification of Attica in Theseus’ time and to find the Skambonidai joining the celebrations on the Akropolis should not surprise us.⁵² As the Synoikia were celebrated in Hekatombaion, that is, in the first month of the Attic year, it is possible that what we have here is the beginning of a sacrificial calendar that lists Skambonid sacrifices in a chronological order.

Because of its poor condition, not much can be said with certainty about the next side, side A in *IG I³*. It seems to list yet more religious obligations to be performed by the demarch of the Skambonidai and, as seems likely from the context (they both seem to be designated as the recipients of perquisites in lines 10-14), the *komarchos*, an official connected with the archaic subdivisions of the polis.⁵³ The list appears to contain a reference to the Panathenaia (l. 19), celebrated around 28 Hekatombaion, and possibly to the Dipolieia (l.18), celebrated 14 Skirophorion, or the Olympieia, probably held on 19 Mounychion.⁵⁴

⁵¹ J.D. Mikalson, *The sacred and civil calendar of the Athenian year* (Princeton 1975) 29-30, referring to Plut. *Thes.* 24.4, who probably got the date right but not the name of the festival, which he calls the Metoikia.

⁵² Besides the participation of these Kleisthenic units, we also have some evidence for the participation of pre-Kleisthenic subdivisions: in the calendar of Nikomachos we find a reference to a biennial sacrifice offered by the trittys Leukotainiai of the pre-Kleisthenic tribe Gleontis on 15 and 16 Hekatombaion (S.D. Lambert, ‘The sacrificial calendar of Athens’, *BSA* 97 (2002) fr.3.31-58), which should probably be associated with the Synoikia. On pages 376-7, Lambert calls these biennial sacrifices “a small-scale sideshow to an annual festival”. On the Synoikia: N. Robertson, *Festivals and Legends: the formation of Greek cities in the light of public ritual* (Toronto 1992) 32-40, to be consulted with due caution, and Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 480-1.

⁵³ For the official known as *komarchos*: e.g., *IG II²* 1213.6 (τὸν τρικώμαρχ[ον]), found “*in vico Spata*” and dated to the fourth century; *IG II²* 3103, commemorating a dramatic victory in Piraeus in 3302/9; *IG II²* 3104 from Acharnai and dated to either 340/39 or 313/2; *IG I³* 247.9-10 (?) with Lambert (2000) 29, dated 460-440.

⁵⁴ Dipolieia on 14 Skirophorion: Mikalson, *Calendar* (1975) 171. Olympieia: a cavalry procession in honour of Zeus is attested for 19 Mounychion (Plut. *Phok.* 37.1 with Mikalson, *Calendar* (1975) 145-6) which probably belonged to the Olympieia.

The last preserved fragment of the decree is side B, which contains the formula for an oath to be taken by a deme official swearing by three gods and promising to give money to a scrutiniser (παρὰ τὸν εὐθυνοῦν), who was responsible for the scrutiny (εὐθυνία) of new officials.

What can be said about the conceptualisation of metic status in the deme Skambonidai from this decree? The decree seems mainly concerned with stipulating several sacrifices of the Skambonidai, some of which performed in the context of the deme, some in relation to a (homonymous?) *kome*, one in relation to the, probably *phyletic*, hero Leos, and some at polis festivals. I find it very significant that in one of the earliest deme decrees concerned with the recording of the *hiera* of a deme both as a community on its own and in relation to other associated communities (i.e. *kome*, tribe, polis) we find the Skambonidai explicitly acknowledging the relatively recent arrival of immigrant residents, collectively referred to as τῶς μετοίκος. It seems likely that the focus on the deme and its associated institutional structures in the decree called for an articulation of the groups of people associated with the deme, including the metics living in Skambonidai. This mechanism is perhaps similar to the one of the Panathenaic procession, including *and* articulating the Attic community in its widest sense, where not only colonists, allies and demes participated but also young girls, ephebes, metics and even a *genos*, although the latter perhaps participated “around the fringes of the festival” as Parker suggests.⁵⁵ I therefore fully agree with Sally Humphreys when she writes that

IG I³ 244 seems [...] concerned to assert and define the identity of the deme (with its unaffiliated residents) as a meat-sharing group within a wider sacrificial context, which also indicates the deme’s structural position as a part of the tribe Leontis and of the citizen body.⁵⁶

However, the Skambonidai did not merely register the presence of a group of metics in their deme. By allowing resident foreigners to share in the *hiera* of the Skambonidai, the *demotai* also incorporated these metics into their midst and lay

⁵⁵ Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 267-8. For a discussion of the participants in the Panathenaic procession see chapter 1. On the participation of the Salaminioi: *SEG* 21.527.88 = RO 37.88, dated to 363/2,: “In Hekatombaion: at the Panathenaia, to Athena a sow, 40 dr. Wood for the sacrifices and other purposes, 3 dr.”

⁵⁶ Humphreys, *Strangeness* (2004) 146.

the ground for a new position for them within their community. Metics were now allowed to participate in one of the most defining aspects of communal deme life. They should therefore not be described as “unaffiliated residents”, as their sharing in a deme sacrifice expressly made these metics very much affiliated to the deme community. It appears, moreover, that the share which metics received from the sacrifice to Leos was equal to that which the Skambonidai received; although both groups were separately designated in the Skambonid decree, both received an equal share worth a now lost amount of obols.

2.3 A sacrifice to the hero Leos

Can we say anything else about the specific context in which the incorporation of resident foreigners into the community of the Skambonidai took place? In other words, who was Leos and what kind of connotations could a sacrifice to him invoke? Two different strands of aetiological myth and associated cultic honours are related with an Attic hero named Leos: one concerns the Hagnousian Leos who prevented a rebellion against Theseus and the other concerns the Athenian hero who became eponymous of the Kleisthenic *phyle* Leontis.⁵⁷ We already came across a sacrifice to a Leos in the rural deme Hagnous that was apparently recorded on the Solonian *axones* (F83 R). This cultic worship seems to be connected with a story captured in Plutarch, probably going back to Philochoros (*FGrH* 328 F108). Discussing the longstanding enmity between the demes Pallene and Hagnous, Plutarch (*Thes.* 13) writes that when Theseus became king the sons of Pallas (i.e. the so-called Pallantidai from whom the later deme Pallene derived its name) planned a coup. This Pallantid rebellion was, however, effectively thwarted by the betrayal by their own herald, the Hagnousian Leos, who informed Theseus about the plans of his masters. The people of the deme Pallene found Leos’ betrayal so appalling that they would not allow any future intermarriage between Pallenes and Hagnousians and did “not even allow heralds to make their customary proclamation there of “ἀκούετε λεῶν” (hear, people!) as they hate the word on account of the treachery of the man Leos” (*Thes.* 13.3). The sacrifice in Hagnous to Leos recorded on the Solonian *axones* indicates that the Hagnousians were, by contrast, quite proud of their famous ancestor; only through Leos’ betrayal was Theseus able to claim what was rightfully his.

⁵⁷ U. Kron, *Die zehn attischen phylenheroen: Geschichte, Mythos, Kult, und Darstellungen* (Berlin 1976) 194-201.

An even more heroic act is ascribed to the daughters of the Athenian hero Leos who were sacrificed in order to save the city. Late sources give us the details: Aelian (*VH* 12.28), the *Suda* (*s.v.* Λεωκόριον) and Photios (*s.v.* Λεωκόριον) inform us that when Athens found itself faced by a famine, the Delphic oracle advised the Athenians to sacrifice a child, upon which Leos of his own free will offered his three daughters, called Praxithea (or Prasi-thea (Photios) or Phasitea (*Suda*)), Theope and Euboule. Imminent disaster was indeed diverted and Leos' daughters received divine honours in a hero shrine known as the Leokoreion.⁵⁸ According to the fourth-century Attidographer Phanodemos (*FGrH* 325 F4) this shrine was located “in the middle of the Kerameikos”, probably on the spot where the girls were thought to have died. At least in the late sixth century, it was a familiar landmark in Athens; both Thucydides (1.20.2; 6.57.1-3) and the Aristotelian *Ath. Pol.* (18.3) inform us that it was the backdrop of the murder of Hipparchos, who was attacked by Harmodios and Aristogeiton when he was marshalling the Panathenaic procession nearby the Leokoreion. The self-sacrificing *korai* of Leos thus received their due honour, at least from the sixth century onwards. In addition, the Delphic oracle “decided” in 508 that one of the ten new Kleisthenic *phylai* should be named after their noble father, thus establishing a special relationship between this pan-Athenian hero and the people of the *phyle* Leontis.⁵⁹

Now, which Leos was honoured by the Skambonidai with a full grown animal? Was he the Hagnousian Leos who had assisted Theseus in his claim to supremacy, or the Athenian Leos who had given his name to the *phyle* Leontis, or were they in fact one and the same, as Uta Kron suspected?⁶⁰ It is usually assumed that we are dealing with the *phyletic* Leos as the deme Skambonidai was part of the *phyle* Leontis. Thus, Humphreys reasonably claims that she does “not find it inconceivable that Skambonidai should have introduced a sacrifice to the

⁵⁸ The testimonia concerning the Leokoreion are listed in: R.E. Wycherley, *Literary and epigraphical testimonia (Agora III)* (London 1973) 108-13.

⁵⁹ Despite what the Aristotelian *Ath. Pol.* 21.6 seems to claim about the random selection of the ten eponymous heroes from Kleisthenes' list of hundred, Kearns (1985) 196-7, and again in *The heroes of Attica* (London 1989) 82- 92, emphasises the centralising aspects that seem to have been deliberately stressed in the selection and the positive connotations with the synoikism of Attica.

⁶⁰ Kron, *Phylenheroen* (1976) 198.

tribal hero Leos on the occasion of a new-year deme meeting [i.e. in early Hekatombaion] in which metics also took part.”⁶¹

Agreeing that the Skambonid sacrifice to Leos was probably offered to the eponymous *phyle* hero, i.e. the embodiment of the *phyle* one belonged to, I find it very likely that it did not solely focus on the civic side but also on the military aspects of the *phylai*. *Phylai* were the basic subdivisions of the polis through which not only the Athenian *Boule* but also the Athenian army and fleet were mustered. Athenian soldiers were, moreover, not only mustered on a *phyletic* basis but also buried according to the *phylai* they belonged to. This is most vividly represented in the ten cypress coffins that were carried out to the Kerameikos during the public funeral of the war dead of that year, each with the bones of the fallen members of a single *phyle* (cf. Thuc. 2.34). That the *phyletic* heroes played a part in this context is also illustrated by the funeral oration often ascribed to Demosthenes in which each *phyletic* hero is presented as an *exemplum* for the fallen members of a single *phyle* ([Dem] 60.27-31).⁶² Emily Kearns has thus convincingly suggested that for the members of a specific *phyle* the connection with the *phyletic* hero was probably most strongly felt when the people of a single *phyle* assembled for civic *and* military matters.⁶³

The Athenian army and fleet were, as we have already seen several times important contexts in which metics and Athenian citizens co-operated.⁶⁴ Although it remains remarkable that metics were included in a sacrifice with *phyletic* connotations, it is not wholly unconvincing that by doing so the Skambonidai could express the close cooperation between them and metics in the *phyletic*-military field. Much has already been said about this aspect of Athenian-metic interaction and perhaps the Skambonidai, being particularly aware of their special relationship with Leos in the context of civic and military matters, chose a sacrifice to their eponymous tribal hero to emphasise this.

⁶¹ Humphreys, *Strangeness* (2004) 146, n.42.

⁶² On which see. Kearns, *Heroes*, 86-7.

⁶³ *Ibidem*, 80-92, especially 86-7. For the dominating role of the *phylai* (vs. *trittyes* and *demes*) in the military organisation of Athens: N.F. Jones, *Public organization in ancient Greece: a documentary study* (Philadelphia 1987) 53-7, with 56-7 for the naval arrangements. Also note the tribal arrangement of the monuments of the Athenian war dead, on which see D.W. Bradeen, ‘Athenian casualty lists’, *Hesp.* 33 (1964) 6-62 and *idem*, ‘The Athenian casualty lists’, *CQ* 19 (1969) 149-51.

⁶⁴ See my Introduction n. 6 and 146-7.

However, despite some strong reasons for placing the Skambonid sacrifice to Leos in a *phyletic*-military context, there remains a slight possibility that it had no *phyletic* connection at all. It has been proposed that the shrine of Leos' daughters, the Leokoreion, can be identified with a small enclosure that is located on the north-west corner of the Agora and as such might have been part of the Skambonid deme community.⁶⁵ The Leokoreion could thus have been the focus of a local sacrifice of the Skambonidai to Leos, a possibility Kearns put forward.⁶⁶ However, several objections can be raised. For instance, as Kearns herself admits, the Skambonid sacrifice was offered to Leos whereas the Leokoreion was first and foremost concerned with his daughters. It can be noted, in addition, that the identification of the Leokoreion is not entirely certain; the peak of cultic activity at the enclosure is rather short and late (the latter part of the fifth century), no archaic traces have been found, and, as Kron points out, the enclosure seems too small for such a well-known cult.⁶⁷ The connection between the Leokoreion and the Skambonidai can therefore not be taken as assured.

It is also often argued to the contrary, that the Leokoreion in fact functioned as the central shrine of *phyle* Leontis, just as the Eurysakion, the shrine of Ajax' son Eurysakes, probably served as the central shrine of the *phyle* Aiantis.⁶⁸ This

⁶⁵ That this small rectangular building was the Leokoreion was first suggested by H.A. Thompson, *The Agora of Athens: the history, shape, and uses of an ancient city center* (Agora XVI) (Princeton 1972) 123, even before the excavation report in T.L. Shear Jr., 'The Athenian Agora: excavations of 1972', *Hesp.* 42 (1973) 360-9. Most recently, S. Batino, 'Il Leokorion. Appunti per la storia di un angolo dell Agora', *ASAA* 79 (2001) 55-82, presented an exhaustive discussion of the testimonia, physical remains, pottery and other finds associated with Thompson's "Leokoreion". S. Rotroff, 'An anonymous hero in the Athenian agora', *Hesp.* 47 (1978) 206-7, pointed out that the Skambonidai decree is recorded to have been found "*Athenis ad Theseum*", that is, near the Hephaisteion. On the location of Skambonidai also see footnote 40 above.

⁶⁶ Kearns, *Heroes* (1989) 195.

⁶⁷ Kron, *Phylenheroen* (1976) 199-200.

⁶⁸ Other locations are suggested by the findspots of decrees that are related to the *phyle* Leontis, like the dedication of the *epimeletai* of 357/6 to Leos (*IG II²* 2818), found in present-day Daphni, or a fragmentary honorific ephebic decree, dated to 333/2, dedicated [τῶι ἥρῳι (*Hesp.* 9 (1940) 59-66, no. 8, col. I.1) that was to be set up "in the shrine of the hero" (col. I.31-33) and was found in the northeast corner of the Agora. Other documents related to Leontis were found away from their original locations: a mid fourth-century dedication of Leontis to Leos (*IG II²* 1742) was found reused in a medieval tower on the Akropolis and a prytany list (*IG II²* 1744) was found inside Hadrian's gymnasium. Cf. Kron, *Phylenheroen* (1976) 200-1; Kearns, *Heroes* (1989) 181; Jones, *Associations* (1999) 158. Most *phylai*, with the exception of Hippothontis in Eleusis, seem to have had the shrine of their eponymous hero, which moreover functioned as *phyletic* headquarters, in the city on which see N.F. Jones, 'The Athenian *phylai* as associations: disposition, function, and purpose', *Hesp.* 64 (1995) 506-11, presenting all evidence associated with the shrines of the

would bring back the *phyletic* connection. Unfortunately, there is no way to decide on the specific context of the Skambonid sacrifice to Leos in which metics shared; although a sacrifice to the *phyletic* hero Leos is an obvious option and would nicely reflect and cement the military cooperation between Athenians and metics in a *phyletic* context, non-*phyletic* sacrifices by demes to individual eponymous *phyle* heroes were not entirely uncommon in Attica and a deme sacrifice to Leos in another capacity than *eponymos*, for instance to Leos who sacrificed his daughters for the Athenian community as a whole, or to the Hagnousian Leos who probably also had a Pan-Attic appeal, or to a local Leos who encompassed both, can therefore not be ruled out with absolute certainty.⁶⁹

2.4 The answer of the Skambonidai

In one of the earliest deme decrees, in which the Skambonidai assert their identity as a sacrificial community both as deme and in relation to the archaic organisation of a *kome*, to the polis, and to the Kleisthenic *phyle*, we read that *metoikoi* were to share in a sacrifice to the hero Leos together with the Skambonidai. In the agora of the Skambonidai, the heart of the community, the metics were to receive a share that was equal to that of the demesmen, probably worth two obols. It seems that the focus on the interrelationships of the Skambonidai deme with several other communities and institutional structures in the decree also triggered an articulation of the constituent members of the community, among them the newly arrived *metoikoi*. Thus, in celebrating and expressing the common identity of the deme, the constituent group identities were also articulated.

The occurrence of the term *metoikoi* both at this time and within a deme context is extraordinary. At the time of the Skambonidai decree, roughly the 460s, the term *metoikoi* and the concomitant notion of a separate metic status

ten eponymous heroes and the *phyletic* decrees associated with these. In an appendix (540-1), Jones provides a handy list of known *phyletic* inscriptions.

⁶⁹ Kearns, *Heroes* (1989) 81 n. 2 and 88, refers to deme sacrifices to unassociated *phyletic* heroes. In Marathon, belonging to the *phyle* Aiantis, we find a sacrifice to Erechtheus (Nonnus 39.210.3) and to Akamas (*IG* II² 1358 col.2 32), and, as we saw earlier, in Hagnous there was a sacrifice to Leos. Deme sacrifices to their *phyletic* heroes are rare to begin with; beside the Skambonid sacrifice to Leos, if in fact a *phyletic* sacrifice, we have a third-century altar, found in the deme Kerameis at the Dipylon Gate, that was dedicated to Zeus Herkeios, Hermes and Akamas, the *eponymos* of the *phyle* Akamantis, to which Kerameis belonged.

were still very novel; in fact the plural *metoikoi* is perhaps first attested in this decree. Before this period the only attested interference with a special metic status seems to be the incorporation of four groups of metics into the procession of the Panathenaia, which I argued should be dated to the first decades of the fifth century. It appears that the growing presence of an immigrant population again led to a heightened awareness and discourse among the Athenians in the 460s. Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women*, also dated to the 460s, can be understood as focussing attention on how to deal with the arrival, presence and integration of strangers, in this case the fifty Danaids and their father, in a polis community, while the *Eumenides*, dated to 458, contains explicit references to the incorporation of metics in society through their participation in a *pompe* for Athena. *IG I³ 244* provides us with the answer of the Skambonidai on how to treat strangers. The demesmen of Skambonidai decided to include the foreigners who were living in their deme as a coherent group of metics in a sacrifice to Leos, in that way perhaps strengthening the metic-Athenian cooperation in *phyletic*-military contexts.

The Skambonid answer was very specific to this deme; nowhere else do we find metics being included in the *hiera* of a deme as a demarcated group of *metoikoi*. There are several possible reasons for this, most of which concern Skambonidai being a city deme. For, besides the fact that a decree from a city deme is a rarity in itself, the location of the deme in the city generally entailed having a larger metic presence than a rural deme, while it probably also made the Skambonidai more likely to mimic the ways of the large polis festivals that were held in the city, among them the Panathenaia in which metics were included in the early fifth century.⁷⁰

⁷⁰ The rarity of city deme decrees was first noted by O. Broneer, 'The Thesmophorion in Athens', *Hesp.* 11 (1942) 270. He suggested that in contrast to rural demes, city demes probably did not have many cultic activities separate from those of the city. Although the absence of city festivals in the relatively complete calendars from coastal Thorikos (*SEG* 33.147) and rural Erchia (*SEG* 21.541) might suggest, *e negativo*, that these demes were indeed less dependent on city festivals, a reference in a decree from the rural deme Plotheia (*IG I³ 258*, dated ca. 420) to participation in *hiera* "both those which are common to the Plotheians and those made to the Athenians on behalf on the *koinon* of the Plotheians and the four-yearly festivals" (25-28), suggests the picture is more complicated than this.

3 The other residents in Ikarion and Phrearrhioi

Skambonidai is the only deme for which it is attested that the demesmen integrated the foreign immigrants living in their community as a coherent group by giving them a share in the deme's *hiera* as *metoikoi*. We do, however, have two other instances where it is very likely that resident foreigners were integrated in a deme community by arranging they share in that deme's *hiera*, though not as a distinct group of metics but rather as belonging to a wider group of "other residents", which also included Athenians who lived in that deme but who were enrolled elsewhere. From the deme Ikarion comes a decree (*IG I³ 254*), which can probably be dated to ca. 440-431, in which it is stated that for the Ikarian Dionysia two *choregoi* are to be selected not only from "the *demotai*" but also from "those living in Ikarion" (3-4). And from Phrearrhioi comes a very fragmentary *lex sacra* (*SEG 35.113*), dated to ca. 300, in which we read that the *demotai* will share in a rite or sacrifice, probably to Pluton, together with another group of people who are simply referred to as "the others" (8). These instances suggest that other demes also incorporated foreign immigrants by allowing them to share in the deme's *hiera*, though not as a separate group of metics.

3.1 The Ikarian *choregia* for Dionysos: *IG I³ 254*

Our first concern will be with the deme Ikarion. Ikarion was an inland deme of the *phyle* Aigeis. It was located on the north slope of Mt. Pentelikon near present Dionysos, in the northeast of Attica at about a 20 km distance from Athens, that is, as the crow flies over Mt. Pentelikon.⁷¹ The Ikarian demesmen could send four to five representatives to sit on the *Boule* every year, which indicates that Ikarion was an average to large sized deme in 508. From this deme comes a fragmentary decree (*IG I³ 254*) in which the Ikarieis set out in detail various regulations concerning the local *choregia* for the famous Ikarian Dionysia, including the role of non-Ikarieis therein.⁷² In *IG I³* David Lewis suggested a date "a. 440-415?"

⁷¹ On the location of Ikarion see: Traill, *Political organization* (1975) 41, referring to the finding spots of *IG I³ 253, 254* and *IG II² 1178, 1179*. What was probably the heart of the community was excavated by Carl Darling Buck in 1888-1889 for which see now: W.R. Biers and T.D. Boyd, 'Ikarion in Attica: 1888-1981', *Hesp.* 51 (1982) 1-18.

⁷² On this decree: A.K. Makres, 'The rediscovery of *IG I³ 253-4*' in: A.P. Mattaiou (ed.), *Attikai epigraphai. Praktika symposiou eis mnemen A. Wilhelm* (Athens 2004) 123-40; Humphreys, *Strangeness* (2004) 150-1; P. Wilson, *The Athenian institution of the khoregia:*

though a more precise date between 440 and 431, when the Attic countryside was evacuated in view of the threat from the Peloponnesians, is perhaps possible, for, as Andronike Makres recently emphasised, “it is hard to imagine how the deme Ikarion would be decreeing on the *choregia* if the deme was empty or almost empty of its population”.⁷³ Even if the Attic countryside was not completely deserted, that the rural Dionysia were largely neglected across Attica during the Peloponnesian War is implied in Aristophanes’ *Acharnians* (195-202), performed in 425, where Dikaiopolis rushes back to his home deme as soon as he has signed his personal peace treaty with the Spartans to celebrate his own Dionysia.

IG I³ 254 concerns the Ikarion *choregia* and indicates that Dionysos was receiving his own Dionysia including a dramatic *agon* in Ikarion by this date and that the Ikarieis wanted to secure the funding of this festival by their most wealthy fellow-members for the choral performances and stipulate who was to be responsible. This concern with cultic responsibility and financing is also borne out by the other side of the stone that bears this inscription. On that side we find a somewhat earlier inscription (*IG I³ 253*), dated to 450-425, which records an inventory of three funds in charge of the demarch in six, not necessarily consecutive, years. The funds are divided among “Ikarios”, “Dionysos” and a fund labelled “*hosion*”, which, as Josine Blok argues, should probably be understood as public money (the interest of which) was to be set aside for sacred matters (like a Dionysian festival) in addition to the sacred (*hieros*) money that belonged to Ikarios and Dionysos.⁷⁴ Similar to other demes in this period, the epigraphical habit of the Ikarieis thus seems to have been mainly concerned with inscribing financial responsibility for the cultic life in the deme.⁷⁵ So, how did the Ikarieis arrange their *choregia*?

After the preamble of *IG I³ 254*, which states that the Ikarieis decided the following on the proposal of one Menestratos, the decree opens with stipulating

the chorus, the city and the stage (Cambridge 2000) 79-80; Jones, *Associations* (1999); Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 215-7.

⁷³ Makres (2004) 137-8. In what follows I will use Makres’ edition of *IG I³ 254*.

⁷⁴ J.H. Blok, ‘Deme accounts and the meaning of *hosion* money in fifth-century Athens’, *Mnemosyne* 62 (2009) forthcoming.

⁷⁵ This epigraphic trend was first noted by L.J. Samons II, *Empire of the owl. Athenian imperial finances* (Stuttgart 2000) 312-7. In that context Blok (2009) also refers to an inventory of the money of Nemesis in Rhamnous (*IG I³ 248*), dated to the 440s, a decree of the Plotheians (*IG I³ 258*), dated to ca. 420, and an early account from Rhamnous (*IG I³ 247bis*) dated to ca. 500.

who could be selected to perform the duty of *choregos* at the Ikarian Dionysia. This, right away, is the most interesting passage for our present concern for, if the restoration is correct, and most epigraphists think it is, it is stated that the Ikarieis decided that

ηλέσθα]ι τῶν δεμοτῶν καὶ τῶν Ἴκα[ριῶν οἰκόντ]||[ον δύο] τῶν ἀχορευγέτων
(3-4).⁷⁶

two *choregoi* [are to be chosen] from the *demotai* and from those living in Ikarian who have not served as *choregoi* before

Thus, the Ikarieis allowed wealthy non-Ikarieis who lived in their deme to join in the *choregia* for their Dionysia.

The decree continues with the specification that the appointed *choregoi* had twenty days to approach the demarch to challenge their appointment by means of so-called *antidosis* (5-6), a procedure attested for the first time in Attica in this decree, by which a *choregos* could challenge his appointment by claiming another person was a more suitable, i.e. wealthier, candidate than himself.⁷⁷ The other person subsequently either had to perform the *choregia* or, if he claimed to be the “poorer” man, exchange his property (specified as τῶν χρ[εμάτων] (5) in the Ikarian decree) with the first candidate. In that way, it was guaranteed that the wealthiest men would always serve as *choregoi*, while “impoverished” members of the elite and, in the case of Ikarian, those who had already served as *choregoi* could not be unfairly burdened.

Although the decree becomes increasingly more difficult to read after this point it appears that in case no *choregos* wished *antidosis* (7), or ten days after a case of *antidosis* had occurred (11), the next step for the *choregoi* was to register their *tragoidoi* (9), who were probably the members of the tragic choruses.⁷⁸ After this, they and the demarch were to swear an oath in connection with τὸ ἀγάλματος (10-15), most likely to be identified with Dionysos’ archaic cult

⁷⁶ C.D. Buck, ‘Discoveries in the Attic deme Icaria, 1888. VII. Inscriptions from Icaria. No. 8-17’, *AJA* 5 (1889) 308, first suggested Ἴκα[ριῶν εἶναι]. Wilamowitz in *IG I²* gave Ἴκα[ριῶσιν οἰκόντων] but in the addenda gave the current restoration followed by Lewis in *IG I³* and Makres (2004) 133.

⁷⁷ On *antidosis*: V. Gabrielsen, ‘The *antidosis*-procedure in classical Athens’, *C&M* 38 (1987) 7-38 and M. Christ, ‘Liturgy avoidance and *antidosis* in classical Athens’, *TAPA* 120 (1990) 147-69, esp. 160-8.

⁷⁸ Cf. Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 79.

statue, to which I will return later on, which in this decree appears in a prohibitory clause, probably directed to those who had not fulfilled certain obligations, as Makres suggests.⁷⁹

The remainder of the decree is too fragmentary to restore but seems in the main concerned with the financial obligations of future *choregoi*: the verb ἀποτίνεν, ἀποτινέτο (to pay) appears four times (20, 26, 31, 40), [δ]ραχμὰς appear in line 40, and the various numbers that are recorded (πέν[τε] (20) and ἑβδόμ[ει] (28)) could represent sums of money.⁸⁰ In addition, we come across references to *protochoroi* (15, 17), of who we unfortunately know nothing, to a group of fifteen men (22), who could perhaps be identified as the members of a single chorus as Peter Wilson proposed, to Dionysos (24) and to the Pythion (30), a shrine of Apollo Pythios, which has been excavated in the ancient centre of Ikarion.⁸¹

3.2 “Those living in Ikarion”

Now, who were “those living in Ikarion” who did not belong to the *demotai* of Ikarion but who could serve as *choregos* for Dionysos nonetheless? Most scholars understand them to be Athenian citizens who lived in Ikarion but who were enrolled in another deme. They often refer to David Whitehead, who has pointed out that all *choregoi* attested throughout Attica appear to have been Athenians, with only one exception, the Theban Damasias in mid fourth-century Eleusis (*IG II² 1186*), who apparently voluntarily undertook his duty as *choregos* and as such was “no real exception to what seems to have been the general rule [...] that *choregoi* were demesmen.”⁸² Whitehead concluded that, conform this general rule, the *choregoi* in Ikarion could only have been Ikarian demesmen or

⁷⁹ Makres (2004) 135. On the archaic cult statue of Dionysos: I.B. Romano, ‘The archaic statue of Dionysos from Ikarion’, *Hesp.* 51 (1982) 389-409.

⁸⁰ Makres (2004) 136. ἑβδόμ[ει] could, as Makres admits, also be referring to the date of the Dionysia, which is referred to as τὸν ἑορτὴν in the line before.

⁸¹ Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 79. The Pythion was excavated in 1888-1889 by C.D. Buck and identified as such by the inscription (*IG II² 4976*: Ἰκαριῶν τὸ Πύ[θιο]ν) on its threshold. We also have a fourth-century inscription (*IG II² 2817*) from Ikarion that records the dedication of the Pythaist Peisikrates, son of Akrotimos.

⁸² Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 76-7, n. 41;215-6. Including Ikarion we have evidence for ca. fifty-four *choregoi* from nine different demes. They are: Acharnai, Aigilia, Aixone, Athmonon, Eleusis, Ikarion, Paiania, Rhamnous, and Thorikos. For the primary sources see the appendix at the end of this chapter.

Athenians from other demes, which he sees confirmed in the fact that all known *choregoi* from Ikarion appear without demotics, which strongly suggests that they were in fact Ikarieis, at least in the fourth century.⁸³

Although the general trend indeed seems to be that usually only Athenians served as *choregoi* at rural Dionysia, I nonetheless propose that in our case “those living in Ikarion” could perfectly well include both non-Ikarian Athenians *and* metics living in Ikarion. First, a word on the likely presence of foreign immigrants in Ikarion. To make his point that metics were probably excluded from the Ikarion *choregia*, Nicholas Jones argued that the location of Ikarion, in the rural region beyond Mt. Pentelikon, must have rendered the deme unattractive for metics to settle – indeed not a single metic is attested as living in Ikarion.⁸⁴ But this must be equally true for Athenian immigrants. Sally Humphreys is, however, surely correct in stating that “even one or two significant purchases of land in the deme by outsiders would have been enough to motivate a decision to make them liable for service” and the same must have applied to one or two significant leases of land by wealthy metics.⁸⁵ In addition, it should be noted that although the rural region beyond Mt. Pentelikon may have rendered Ikarion

⁸³ In fact, Whitehead’s prosopographical section on known demesmen from Ikarion in his *Demes* (1986) 435-6 and *LGPN* II tell us that of the ten known *choregoi* from Ikarion no less than eight were certainly Ikarieis. *Choregoi* in Ikarion: *IG* II² 3094 (Archippos son of Archedektos (PA 2555)), *IG* II² 3095 (Ergasos son of Phanomachos (PA 5048), Phanomachos son of Ergasos (PA 14074), Diognetos son of Ergasos (PA 3861)), *IG* II² 3098 (Xanthides (PA 11154), Xanthippos (PA 11166), Hagnias (PA 131)), *IG* II² 3099 (Mnesilochos son of Mnesiphilos (PA 10326)), *IG* II² 1178 (Epikrates (PA 4893) , Praxias (PA 12159)). Those underlined can be identified as Ikarieis.

⁸⁴ Jones, *Associations* (1999) 71.

⁸⁵ Humphreys, *Strangeness* (2004) 151. In note 52 she furthermore suggests that the seeming repetition of *demotai* and Ikarieis in a fourth-century honorary decree for the Ikarian demarch Nikon (*IG* II² 1178) might reflect a notional difference between the demesmen (the *demotai*) and all those living in Ikarion, including not only *demotai*, but also non-Ikarian Athenians and metics. A similar case was again made by Jones, *Associations* (1999) 71. However, if this was the case one would have expected this to be spelled out more clearly, e.g. as “those living at Ikarion”. For other decrees with the occurrence of both the term “*demotai*” and a more descriptive term referring to the (hereditary) members of a deme see, e.g., the Plotheians in *IG* I³ 258 (e.g. line 11) next to the *demotai* (line 33) or the Phrearrhians in *SEG* 35.113 (in line 12) next to the *demotai* (restored in line 8). In all these cases there seems to be a complete overlap between the two (decreeing) bodies, suggesting they were one and the same. Also see Lambert, *Phratries* (1998) 367 and Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 325, who both doubt the previously raised suggestion, e.g. Lewis in *IG* II², that the Ikarieis are perhaps to be understood as a body distinct from the *demotai* but with the same name, perhaps analogous to the House/phratry of the Dekeleians. Lambert thinks “it may be simpler to suppose that we have here just one group, the deme, indulging in grandiose tautology.”

unattractive to both Athenian and foreign immigrants, the famous Dionysia of Ikarion and the mythological strands that associate the deme with the advent of Dionysos in Attica and even mark the deme as the Urort of drama itself must have acted as a strong stimulus for outsiders to come to Ikarion, perhaps for even longer than a short visit. Because of their famous past and present claims the Ikarieis must have been used to the presence of (many) outsiders in their midst, both Athenian and foreign ones. There is therefore no obvious reason to deny that metics were present at Ikarion and the Ikarian Dionysia.

Whitehead's point that it seems that only Ikarian *choregoi* are attested should, moreover, not tempt us to exclude non-Ikarieis from the Ikarian *choregia*, for this is exactly what is explicitly stated in our decree: besides the Ikarieis others living in the deme were also liable for service. We could think of several other reasons why we only seem to have choregic inscriptions and monuments of Ikarieis. Perhaps this is due to chance survival, perhaps Ikarian *choregoi* were more likely to commemorate their victories in their own deme, or perhaps most *choregoi* were indeed Ikarieis. What it does *not* imply is that *only* Ikarieis could be *choregoi* in Ikarion. Again, there is no compelling reason to exclude metics from "those living in Ikarion".

In addition to these negative indications, there is also a positive argument to include metics among those liable for the Ikarian *choregia* as their inclusion is perhaps suggested by the language used in the decree to refer to the other persons living in Ikarion who could act as *choregos*. For, while the lack of precision should probably warn us not to equate τῶν Ἰκα[ριῶν οἰκόντων] with Athenian citizens from other demes, the term τῶν οἰκόντων, with its emphasis on residency, could perhaps be considered an early forerunner of the metic *demotikon* that gave a metic's place of residence with the "οἰκεῖν ἐν"-formula, first attested in 413/2 (*IG I³ 421 b.33*).⁸⁶ All in all, I consider it most likely that the term τῶν Ἰκα[ριῶν οἰκόντων] included both Athenians from other demes and metics living in Ikarion, the wealthiest among them now liable to act as *choregos* for the Ikarian Dionysia.

⁸⁶ In Hellenistic decrees from Eleusis and Rhamnous Athenians from other demes could be distinguished in several ways: e.g. "οἱ οἰκοῦντες Ἐλευσίτι Ἀθηναίων" (*SEG 22.127.21*, mid 3rd c., Eleusis), "καὶ οἱ οἰκοῦντες τῶν πολιτῶν" (*SEG 38.127.5*, ca. 220, Rhamnous), or "καὶ Ἀθηναίων οἱ οἰκοῦντες" (*SEG 25.155.10-11*, 236/5, Rhamnous), on which see: R. Osborne, 'The *demos* and its subdivisions in classical Athens' in: O. Murray and S., Price (eds.), *The Greek city form Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990) 277-85 and Jones, *Associations* (1999) 73-81.

3.3 Dionysos in Ikarion

Significantly, the cult of Dionysos was quite prominent in Ikarion; one could even say that the worship of Dionysos and his heroic receiver Ikarios were of pivotal importance to the identity of the Ikarieis. Ikarion is best known as the home of the Athenian hero Ikarios, who received Dionysos when he first came to Attica and who was given a vine branch and was taught the art of winemaking by the god. Apollodoros (3.14.7) tells us that Ikarios was so delighted about his new learnt technique that he gave some shepherds a taste of his wine. The shepherds, however, drank the wine unmixed, became drunk and, supposing he had tried to poison them, they killed Ikarios. The next day the ungrateful shepherds realised what they had done and buried Ikarios. The tragedy did not end here, for when Ikarios' daughter, Erigone, found her father's buried body with the help of her dog, she hung herself.

Some versions (*e.g.* Σ Ar. *Ach.* 243a, Σ Lucian 211.14-212.8) add that, to punish Ikarios' murderers, Dionysos came to the shepherds in the guise of a lovely young man who vanished every time they were most turned on. As a consequence, they found themselves in a permanent state of arousal. In an attempt to escape their priapism the shepherds made clay *phalloi* and dedicated these to the god. It was thus in the later deme Ikarion that Dionysos was received and worshipped on Attic soil for the first time. In fact, Thespis, who is famously said to have been the first to have won a prize with tragedy in ca. 534, was born in Ikarion. And Athenaeus (2.40a-b) even claims that Ikarion was not only the birthplace of Thespis but also of dramatic performances in honour of Dionysos in general – although his mention that tragedy was invented in Ikarion “at the very time of the vintage” should caution us as the rural Dionysia were commonly celebrated in the winter month Poseideon.⁸⁷

Whatever the origin of these late stories and aetiological myths, we have secure evidence that Ikarion was in fact the site of a significant cult for Ikarios and Dionysos from an early date onwards.⁸⁸ From Ikarion comes a colossal

⁸⁷ On the Hellenistic, and highly dubious, *Parian Marbles* (39) we find that Ikarion was also associated with the first competitive performance of comedy some time between 581/0 and 561/0.

⁸⁸ A black-figure amphora in the British Museum (B153) painted by the Affecter (ca. 550-500) shows Ikarios welcoming Dionysos, which demonstrates that the myth was already known in this period. Perhaps the wreath presented to Ikarios by Dionysos refers to victory in *agones* in honour of the god.

archaic statue, dated to ca. 520 and over two metres in height, of a seated deity who has been identified as Dionysos. As it is almost certainly a cult statue we can assume there also was a shrine for Dionysos in Ikarion at this early date to accommodate the image and the excellent state of preservation of some of the statue's fragments indeed suggests it was housed indoors.⁸⁹ Early cultic worship is also attested by a dedication (*IG I³ 1015*), dated to ca. 525, to both Dionysos and Apollo (Pythios), who also held a prominent position in Ikarion, as is clear from the modest fourth-century Pythion (ca. 11.30 x 7.50 m) that was excavated in the deme's centre, and which was identified as such by its threshold (*IG II² 4976*) recording its name: Ἰκαριῶν τὸ Πύθ[ι]ον.⁹⁰

In later centuries, Dionysos and Ikarios continued to be worshipped by the Ikarieis. In the fifth-century, we find the inventory of the three funds labelled "Ikarios", "Dionysos" and "*hosion*" (*IG I³ 253*) and the deme decree discussed above (*IG I³ 254*), which included the specification that non-Ikarieis living in Ikarion could share in the *choregia* for Dionysos. In later times we learn that the Ikarian demarch, who was in charge of Ikarion's sacred funds and of Dionysos' *choregia*, was also the main official in charge of the whole Dionysian festival: in *IG II² 1178*, dated to before the middle of the fourth century, the Ikarian demarch Nikon is honoured for taking care of the Dionysian *heorte* and *agon* in a good and just manner.

In the fourth-century, the cult and festival for Dionysos in Ikarion still flourished. The Ikarian Dionysion is securely attested by an honorary decree for an Ikarian demarch (*SEG 22.117*), dated to ca. 330, to be set up "ἐν τῷ Διονυσίῳ" (8). And another fourth-century inscription (*IG II² 2851*) seems to record some kind of repairs in relation to the statue.⁹¹ We furthermore have several choregic inscriptions commemorating tragic victories at the Ikarian Dionysia.⁹² Some of the choregic monuments to which these inscriptions belonged have been identified: we have a 1.7 m high pillar, which probably supported a sculptural dedication on top (*IG II² 3095*), a quadrangular tripod

⁸⁹ Romano (1982). The archaic Ikarian cult statue of Dionysos is one of the few archaic specimens we have and one of the earliest made of stone. Cf. Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 74.

⁹⁰ On *IG I³ 1015*: D. M. Robinson, 'Three new inscriptions from the deme Ikarion', *Hesp.* 17 (1948) 141-3, n. 2. On the Pythion: Biers and Boyd (1982) 15-8. Also supra n. 81.

⁹¹ *IG II² 2851* reads: ἐπιμεληταὶ τῆς ἐπ[ισκευῆ]ς τοῦ ἀγάλματο[ς ἀνέ]θεσαν τῷ Διον[ύσι]ῳ.

⁹² Choregic inscriptions from Ikarion: *IG II² 3094, 3095, 3098, 3099; SEG 44.131.*

dedication (*IG II² 3099*), and a large fragment of relief representing four (satirical) masks (*SEG 44.131*).⁹³

Most impressive is the mid fourth-century choregic monument, still *in situ*, of Hagnias, Xanthippos and Xanthides (*IG II² 3098*), three victorious *choregoi*, who were almost certainly related, probably father and sons as was the case in another Ikarian monument (*IG II² 3095*). They celebrated their victory at the Ikarian Dionysia with a semicircular marble monument, over three metres in height and almost five metres long in its interior arch. Along the inside wall ran a bench, the architrave carried the inscription and the roof supported sculptural ornamentation, probably *akroterion* figures on the corners and a larger sculpture in the centre.⁹⁴ A more spectacular monument to the prosperity of the Ikarieis and their Dionysia in the fourth century cannot be imagined. It was also in this century that the theatral area in Ikarion received a row of marble thrones for honorary guests to watch the Dionysian performances.⁹⁵

So, from the sixth century onwards one of the main focuses in the communal life of the Ikarieis was the worship of Dionysos and his heroic host Ikarios, who, as eponymous hero probably functioned as unifying symbol for the whole deme.⁹⁶ It would seem obvious that sharing in these deme defining cultic activities would be the exclusive right of the Ikarieis who were named after the hero and whose identity as demesmen was largely anchored in these rites. It is therefore peculiar to find the Ikarieis decreeing that non-Ikarieis could share in these *hiera*.

3.4 The rural Dionysia in Attica

The rural Dionysia that were held all over Attika were generally very open affairs in which not only demesmen from the organising deme but also demesmen from other demes, metics and even slaves participated. The Ikarian Dionysia were most likely no different in this respect. This open policy of the rural Dionysia could, at least partly, explain why the Ikarieis chose to delegate some of the responsibility for these deme *hiera* to outsiders.

⁹³ On the Ikarian masks: Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 241-2.

⁹⁴ Biers and Boyd (1981) 9-11; Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 249-50.

⁹⁵ Biers and Boyd (1981) 12-4, with plates 4a and 5a-b.

⁹⁶ Cf. Kearns, *Heroes* (1989) 92-102.

The rural Dionysia (τὰ κατ' ἀγροῦς Διονύσια) were a festival in honour of Dionysos, celebrated in several medium-sized and large demes around Attika in the winter month Poseideon.⁹⁷ Currently, around nineteen demes are attested to have celebrated the Dionysia and Nicholas Jones has convincingly argued that the relatively large size of most of these demes and their fairly even distribution over Attica suggest that the “Dionysia in the fields”, as he refers to them, were probably only celebrated in some of the larger demes around Attica, with demesmen from smaller and/or neighbouring demes visiting the Dionysia at their larger neighbours who, people- and moneywise, could afford to organise such a spectacular festival.⁹⁸

With the exception of Piraeus, where polis officials were largely in charge of the Dionysia, the organisation of this ancestral festival seems to have been the responsibility of the demesmen alone and we have to constantly remind ourselves of this potential source of variation when we consider the rural Dionysia.⁹⁹ The freedom of demes in organising the Dionysia is clear most of all in the different dates on which the festival was celebrated in different demes in the month Poseideon and from the fact that dithyrambic *agones* and sacrifices are only attested for Acharnai, Eleusis and Piraeus, while they appear to have been absent in other demes.¹⁰⁰ Despite these discrepancies, the different rural Dionysia

⁹⁷ Most importantly: Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 212-22; *DFA*², 42-55; E. Csapo and W.J. Slater, *The context of ancient drama* (Ann Arbor 1995) 121-32; N.F Jones, *Rural Athens under the democracy* (Philadelphia 2004) 124-58. On the date: Mikalson, *Calendar* (1975) 97.

⁹⁸ Jones, *Rural Athens* (2004) 128-41. He lists nineteen demes with their most important evidence. They are: Acharnai, Aigilia, Aixone, Anagyrous, Cholleidai, Eleusis, Euonymon, Hagnous, Halai Araphenides, Ikarion, Kollytos, Lamprai, Myrrhinous, Paiania, Piraeus, Phlya, Rhamnous, Sphettos, and Thorikos. In addition, Brauron and Salamis also held Dionysia. Athmonon, located near present day Amarousion, can probably be added to this list as it was the find spot of a choregic inscription (*SEG* 51.193).

⁹⁹ The Piraean Dionysia are listed in the skin-sale records of 333/2 (*e.g.* *IG* II² 1496.70-73). The demarch of Piraeus was in charge of the festival, who, by exception, was chosen directly by the Athenian *demos* (cf. [Arist.] *Ath.Pol.* 54.8). Also see the mention of the Piraean Dionysia in the law of Euegoros next to the Lenaia, the city Dionysia and the Thargelia (Dem. 21.10), the participation of ephebes who sacrificed a bull at the Dionysia in Piraeus (*IG* II² 1008.13-14, 1028.16-17, 1029.10-11, 1039.55), the polis law ordering the so-called *agoranomoi* to clean the streets of Piraeus to receive the *pompe* for Dionysos (*IG* II² 380.17-25), the sacrifice of the Eleusinian *epistatai* during the Piraean Dionysia (*IG* II² 1672.106) and the polis decree (*IG* II² 456), dated to 307/6, ordering the ambassadors from Kolophon should be seated in the theatre to watch the *agones* of the Piraean Dionysia. Cf. R. Garland, *The Piraeus* (2nd ed.) (London 2001) 124-5.

¹⁰⁰ Acharnai: *IG* II² 3092 (honouring dithyrambic *choregoi* in the early fourth century); *SEG* 43.25 B12-14 (*thusia* in 315/4). Eleusis: *IG* II² 1186 (honours the Theban Damasias in the

nevertheless shared some general characteristics; the festival always seems to have included a procession escorting a *phallos* (or *phalloi*) and dramatic *agones*, at least including tragedy, with associated ceremonials like the announcement of honours or the public seating of honourable guests in the front row of the theatre (*proedria*).¹⁰¹

Then again, the nature of the procession for Dionysos could vary from deme to deme. Piraeus, for instance, staged a grand procession; a special polis decree (*IG II² 380*), dated to 320/19, ordered a group of so-called *agoranomoi*, i.e. market-overseers, to prepare the streets of Piraeus through which the *pompe* passed and collect fines from anyone who poured wash-water or human waste into the streets on the day of the Dionysia (17-25).¹⁰² The Piraean procession ended in large sacrifices, in 334/3 adding up to 311 drachmas from the sale of hides (*IG II² 1496.70*), which comes down to the sacrifice of 40 to 70 animals.¹⁰³

A more rustic, and probably more widespread, procession for Dionysos is captured in two famous ancient accounts.¹⁰⁴ In Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (238-262), performed in 425, we read that as soon as Dikaiopolis has signed his personal peace treaty with the Spartans he rushes back to his home deme to

mid fourth century for providing choruses of boys and men); *IG II² 949* (sacrifices in 165/4). *Piraeus*: e.g. *IG II² 1672.106* (skin-sale records 330s); [Plut.] *X Orat.* 842a (records that Lykourgos instituted dithyrambic *agones* in Piraeus).

¹⁰¹ This division of the festival between procession and dramatic competitions is also apparent in the honorary inscription for the Ikarian demarch Nikon (*IG II² 1178*), who was honoured by the Ikarieis "as he had organised the *heorte* and the *agon* for Dionysos in a good and just manner" (6-9). Cf. *SEG* 43.26, dated to 315/4, in which it is stated that the demarch of Acharnai, a *tamias* and an *epimeletes* have "well and honourably supervised the *thusia* to Dionysos and the *pompe* and the *agon*" (B 1-7) and *IG II² 949*, dating to 165/4, in which the demarch of Eleusis is honoured for *thusia*, sending the *pompe* and organising the *agon* in the theatre (30-33). Jones, *Rural Athens* (2004) 142-52 adds to this list of commonalities several "entr'actes", like the so-called *askoliamos* (referring either to a game of hopping on one leg or jumping onto a greased wine-skin) and a cock-fight, which is depicted under Poseidion on frieze of the little Byzantine church for Hagios Eleutherios in Athens. Although these events are possible for some Dionysia, I am hesitant to see them as general characteristics.

¹⁰² On this decree see: D. Hennig, 'Staatliche Ansprüche an privaten Immobilienbesitz in der klassischen und hellenistischen Polis', *Chiron* 25 (1995) 242-8, discussing the responsibilities of the *agoranomoi* for the maintenance of the streets and agora of Piraeus. Cf. Garland, *Piraeus* (2001) 195-6, n. 77.

¹⁰³ For these calculations see chapter 2, n. 11. In the second century the Dionysia in Piraeus seem to mimic the City Dionysia by including ephebes providing services for both a *pompe* and an *eisagoge* (*SEG* 15.104).

¹⁰⁴ Cf. *DFA² 43*, who suggests that a mid sixth-century black-figure cup in Florence (3897) depicting six men carrying a *phallos* on a pole perhaps portrays the *pompe* of the rural Dionysia.

celebrate his own rural Dionysia.¹⁰⁵ After he calls for silence, Dikaiopolis and his family start arranging the procession: Dikaiopolis has his daughter act as *kanephoros*, his slave Xanthias has to hold the phallos upright, and Dikaiopolis' wife is to pour soup over a cake, which is to function as opening sacrifice. Then, Dikaiopolis sends the *pompe* on its way.

247. καὶ μὴν καλὸν γ' ἔστ'. ὦ Διόνυσε δέσποτα,
κεχαρισμένως σοι τήνδε τὴν πομπὴν ἔμε
πέμψαντα καὶ θύσαντα μετὰ τῶν οἰκετῶν
250. ἀγαγεῖν τυχηρῶς τὰ κατ' ἀγροὺς Διονύσια,
στρατιᾶς ἀπαλλαχθέντα· τὰς σπονδὰς δέ μοι
καλῶς ξυνενεγκεῖν τὰς τριακοντούτιδας.
ἄγ', ὦ θύγατερ, ὅπως τὸ καιοῦν καλῆ καλῶς
οἴσεις, βλέπουσα θυμβροφάγον. ὡς μακάριος
255. ὅστις σ' ὀπίσει κάκποιήσεται γαλᾶς
σοῦ μηδὲν ἥττους βδεῖν, ἐπειδὰν ὄρθρος ἦ.
πρόβαινε, κὰν τῶχλω φυλάττεσθαι σφόδρα
μή τις λαθῶν σου περιτράγη τὰ χρυσία.
ὦ Ξανθία, σφῶν δ' ἐστὶν ὄρθρος ἐκτέος
260. ὁ φαλλὸς ἐξόπισθε τῆς κανηφόρου·
ἐγὼ δ' ἀκολουθῶν ἄσομαι τὸ φαλλικόν
262. συ δ', ὦ γύναι, θεῶ μ' ἀπὸ τοῦ τέγους. πρόβα.

There, that's fine! Oh, lord Dionysos, may this procession which I hold and this sacrifice be pleasing to thee, and may I and my household¹⁰⁶ celebrate with all good fortune the rural Dionysia, now that I am released from soldiering; and may the thirty years' peace prove a blessing to me. Come now, my fair daughter, make sure you carry the basket fairly, looking savoury-eating. What a happy man he'll be who marries you and begets a set of ferrets as good as you at farting in the gray dawn! Set forward, and take great care in the crowd that no one snaffles your golden ornaments on the sly. And, Xanthias, walk behind the *kanephoros* and hold the *phallos* upright; and I'll follow, singing the phallic hymn. And you, missus, watch me from the roof! Forward!¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ Jones, *Rural Athens* (2004) 131, thinks Dikaiopolis' deme can be identified as Cholleidai.

¹⁰⁶ Note that μετὰ τῶν οἰκετῶν can mean both "with the members of my *oikos*", or, more exclusively, "with the house-slaves". In both cases Dikaiopolis' slaves should be included.

¹⁰⁷ The translation comes from: A.H. Sommerstein, *Acharnians* (Warminster 1980) 63, with small modifications.

We come across a similar image no less than seven centuries later in Plutarch's *Moralia* (527D), where the historian describes "the traditional Dionysia" (ἡ πάτριος τῶν Διονυσίων ἑορτή) as a "homely and merry procession" that included jugs of wine, vine branches, he-goats, baskets of dried figs, and, at the end of the line, a *phallos*. It thus appears that the procession of the Dionysia was generally a cheerful, festive escorting of *phalloi* for Dionysos with a wide range of participants; besides Athenian men, represented by Dikaiopolis, we come across a *kanephoros* heading the procession and moving through a crowd of spectators, slaves carrying *phalloi* or, as another passage in Plutarch (*Mor.* 1098B-C) might indicate, simply joining in the procession, and Athenian wives, represented by Dikaiopolis' missus watching the *pompe* from the roof.

Wide attendance is also attested for the dramatic *agones* that followed after the *pompe*. Dramatic *agones* for Dionysos or related aspects (*choregia*, theatres, or *proedria*) are attested in fifteen demes and seem to have been a standard event of rural Dionysia.¹⁰⁸ Similar to the Dionysia in the city, these *agones* in the demes were a principally male affair; although Dikaiopolis' daughter participated in the *pompe* and his wife watched the marchers from the roof, we hear nothing about them in the context of the *agones*.¹⁰⁹ In addition, it seems that, even though outsiders were definitely present in the deme theatres, some specific events and duties were reserved for the *demotai* of the organising deme. So, Jones is surely right in suggesting that the chorus members probably came from the deme itself, just like Whitehead is right that the people who paid for these choruses, the *choregoi*, were most often wealthy *demotai* of the organising deme. At least from a practical concern it was probably preferable that the chorus members and the *choregoi* belonged to the organising deme as they probably had to train throughout the year to put on the best performance in their own community.¹¹⁰

From a more ideological perspective this focus on the *demotai* is not surprising either, as the rural Dionysia were above all a festival of the deme: it was supervised by the demarch and was celebrated by the *demotai*. These were

¹⁰⁸ Although Dionysia are attested, no dramatic or dithyrambic *agones* are linked with: Cholleidai (Dikaiopolis' deme), Hagnous (*IG* II² 1183.36-7), Lamprai (*IG* II² 1161.4-5), and Phlya (Is. 8.15-16).

¹⁰⁹ As with the audience at the City Dionysia, this does not, of course, come down to a complete absence of women among the spectators of the *agones* of a rural Dionysia.

¹¹⁰ Jones, *Rural Athens* (2004) 140, Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 216.

hiera of Dionysos for which the organising deme was responsible, even though outsiders were welcome to join. A powerful association between local *agones* in honour of Dionysos and *demotai* is, for instance, borne out by the elaborate choregic monuments set up in the demes by wealthy *choregoi* to commemorate the victories they had won with their choruses at the local Dionysia.¹¹¹ In that way, a *choregos* could remind his fellow demesmen of the prestige he and his family had brought to the community and the future goodwill he deserved and expected from them. The main point of reference of these monuments was the deme. It thus appears that in general the *choregia* of the rural Dionysia was strongly associated with the deme's most wealthy members.

This association between the rural Dionysia's *choregia* and *demotai* also seems to be reflected in the fact that the twenty attested choregic monuments commemorating "rural" victories rarely give demotics: of the twenty-eight *choregoi* attested on these monuments only three are recorded with their demotics and on the six deme decrees honouring a total of twelve *choregoi* we find no demotics at all.¹¹² This suggests, at least, that these men were well-known in the deme in which the monuments were set up and no less than eighteen of the twenty-five *choregoi* who are recorded without demotics on their own monuments can indeed be identified or associated with well-known *demotai* from the organising deme.¹¹³ Significantly, choregic monuments set up in the city and commemorating "city" victories, by contrast, from the late fifth century onwards regularly give demotics of *choregoi* (next to patronymics), probably in an attempt to clarify the identity of the liturgist and his deme to a wider public.¹¹⁴

We may conclude, therefore, that *choregia* at rural Dionysia was mostly a concern of the *demotai* of the organising deme. This focus on the *demotai* was probably further strengthened by the public announcement of honours to people who had benefited the deme community and the public allocation of privileged seats or thrones in the front row of the theatre to guests who were honoured by the demesmen, which was instrumental in directing the gaze of the participants and the spectators on the organising deme community in a similar manner as the

¹¹¹ On "Remembering Dionysos in the demes" see Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 244-52.

¹¹² See appendix.

¹¹³ I arrived at this by cross checking the known *choregoi* with the list of known demesmen in Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 408-54, *LGPN* II, and J.S. Traill's, *Persons of ancient Athens* (Toronto 1994).

¹¹⁴ On which see, Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 214-6.

pre-play ceremonials of the City Dionysia focussed the audience's gaze on the community of Athenian citizens.

On the other hand, it is also abundantly clear that spectators came from all over Attika to watch the *agones* in the demes, while many "outsiders" also actively participated in rural Dionysia as poets, flute-players, actors, and *didaskaloi*. Most famous is Plato's remark (*Rep.* 475d) about people who are anxious to watch the Dionysian *agones*, "who run around to every chorus at the Dionysia, missing none in the cities or in the villages" (πάντων χορῶν περιθέουσι τοῖς Διονυσίοις οὔτε τῶν κατὰ πόλεις οὔτε τῶν κατὰ κώμας ἀπολειπόμενοι). As Jones points out, Plutarch's reference (*Mor.* 1098B-C) to the presence of slaves (οἱ θεράποντες) at rural Dionysia includes the statement that they go around (περιιόντες), suggesting that slaves were included in the audience and belonged to those people who Plato referred to.¹¹⁵

Many "foreign" performers are in addition attested as participating in many rural Dionysia. We know that Aristophanes, a demesman of Kydathenaion, and Sophokles, who belonged to the deme Kolonos, were both *didaskaloi* in Eleusis (*IG I³* 970). In Aelian (*VH* 2.13) we read that Sokrates went to the Dionysia in Piraeus to see plays by Euripides, a demesmen of Phlya, while Demosthenes (18.180) refers to the pitiful acting performance of Aeschines, who belonged to Kothokidai, as Oinomaos at the Dionysia in Kollytos. Finally, in a fourth-century choregic inscription (*IG II²* 3106) commemorating a dithyrambic and comic victory at the Dionysia at Acharnai we come across the Theban flute-player Chares. It seems that organising demes attracted and contracted well-known poets, actors, and flute-players from other demes and even from other *poleis* to boost the prestige of their local Dionysia, in turn attracting widely diverse crowds.

The participatory community of a typical rural Dionysia, in sum, presented a twofold focus. First and foremost it was a festival of the deme community. But while the pre-play ceremonials of announcements and *proedria* and the deme's *choregia* clearly emphasised and strengthened this focus on the *demotai*, the spectacle in the theatre with its extra-deme allure in addition attracted many others, including *demotai* from other demes, foreign immigrants, visiting *xenoi*, and probably even slaves, thus widening the scope of the festival to the whole of Attika. The procession, finally, is perhaps best described as containing both these

¹¹⁵ Jones, *Rural Athens* (2004) 153.

focuses with all those who wanted to do so joining the festive celebration but with demarcated roles for some of the demesmen's daughters acting as *kanephoroi* and some of their slaves acting as *phallophoroi*, while Dikaiopolis' prominent role in the *Acharnians*-passage perhaps reflects a special role of the organising *demotai* in leading the procession, offering preliminary sacrifices of cakes and singing hymns to Phales, the god of the *phallos*.

3.5 The motivation of the Ikarieis

With this twofold focus of the rural Dionysia on both deme and beyond established, we return to the *choregia* in Ikarion. Like other Dionysia, the Ikarian Dionysia were foremost a concern of the *demotai*, with the demarch in charge and most *choregoi* being Ikarieis. It is interesting, however, that the Ikarieis, in addition, had an especially inclusive policy concerning their Dionysia. For although demes hosting the Dionysia usually reserved some rites and duties for their own demesmen, particularly the *choregia*, the Ikarieis decided to select their *choregoi* not only from their own but also from the other residents living in their deme, including both Athenian and metic immigrants – although it should perhaps not surprise that the one deme in which we find outsiders participating in a rural *choregia* was actually the “Urort” of drama itself.

Significantly, Athenian and metic immigrant residents are not referred to separately in the Ikarian decree, rather they are collectively designated as “those living in Ikarion” besides the *demotai*, perhaps as a result of the small number of immigrants who settled in the deme. In that way, the Ikarion community was conceptualised as consisting of *demotai* and immigrant residents.

It seems, however, that the size of the immigrant population was not so small that they could be ignored by the Ikarieis. They probably constituted a more or less permanent and substantial presence in the deme community, which eventually made the *demotai* set out a mechanism for these newcomers to participate in the deme's most important *hiera*. It was perhaps the involvement of these outsiders in the deme's *hiera* that, in turn, motivated the Ikarieis to be very specific in the organisation of their Dionysia, one might say Ikarion's *raison d'être*, leading to the detailed provisions that were set out in *IG I³ 254* (and *IG I³ 253*) and inscribed on stone some time between 440-431.

By stipulating that “mere” residents could participate and compete in the *choregia* for Dionysos, the Ikarieis delegated a significant part of their

responsibility for Ikarion's most venerable *hiera* to outsiders, thus including and acknowledging them as members of their deme community, even though the choregic monuments from Ikarion might suggest these residents did not participate in the *choregia* with the same vigour as the Ikarieis. A nice parallel to what such a service entailed for the financial contributor is given in Isaeus in relation to that other famous deme festival, the Thesmophoria. In his speech *On the estate of Pyrrhos* Isaeus (3.80) argues that if the sister of the defendant Nikodemos was legitimately married to the wealthy Pyrrhos the latter would surely have organised the Thesmophoria on her behalf and entertained the wives of his fellow demesmen on that occasion. In other words, providing such services as *choregia* or paying for the Thesmophoria was an important responsibility and a defining aspect of the wealthy members of a deme; since Pyrrhos had not organised the Thesmophoria on behalf of Nikodemos' sister, she was not an accepted deme member. By the same token it can be argued that by decreeing that "those living in Ikarion" should share the burden and the glory of Ikarion's *choregia* with the Ikarian demesmen these non-Ikarieis were (at least partially) acknowledged as members of Ikarion. Together the *demotai* and those living in Ikarion took care of the Ikarian *hiera* of Dionysos.

Although the resulting incorporation of (wealthy) non-Ikarieis into the Ikarian community was perhaps an underlying motive behind the Ikarieis' decision to include non-Ikarieis in their service to Dionysos, there seems, in addition, to have been another, perhaps more immediate cause behind this inclusion. The decree on the Ikarian *choregia* indicates that a major concern in Ikarion in ca. 440-431, as in other Attic demes in this time, was to put the funding of deme *hiera* on a more solid footing.¹¹⁶ This is also borne out by the other side of the inscription which records the sacred funds of Ikarion. It is quite plausible, therefore, that in order to achieve financial security for their choregic *agones* the Ikarieis considered it wise to attract "foreign" capital. The inclusion of non-Ikarian residents in the Ikarian *choregia* for Dionysos would in that way both secure "foreign" contributions and strengthen and maintain the stability and the cohesion of the community by integrating those people who were living in Ikarion but who did not belong to it by descent.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Humphreys, *Strangeness* (2004) 147-51; supra n. 75.

3.6 The others in Phrearrhioi

Conceptualised as a coherent group of immigrant residents, both Athenian and metic immigrants thus became liable to serve as *choregoi* for the choruses for Dionysos in Ikarion. A similar broad and inclusive notion is found over a century later in the deme Phrearrhioi, from which derives a decree (*SEG* 35.113) stipulating that the *demotai* and “the others” are to share together in an Eleusinian rite (8).

Phrearrhioi was a coastal deme of the *phyle* Leontis in the south of Attica. It can be considered a large deme, for every year the Phrearrhians could send no less than nine representatives to sit on the *Boule*. Contrary to what one might expect from such a large deme, we do not know much about this community and its residents. For instance, only one metic is attested as living in Phrearrhioi: on a fourth-century curse tablet (*IG* III *App.* 81) we come across Pataikon who is recorded as living in Phrearrhioi. From Phrearrhioi comes a very fragmentary inscription (*SEG* 35.113.8), which seems to deal with the participation of the Phrearrhians in several rites of Demeter and her Eleusinian companions.¹¹⁷ Based on the letterforms and the transitional endings of the imperatives the inscription can be dated to ca. 300.¹¹⁸

Very generally speaking, the decree appears to deal with several rites for several typical Eleusinian deities: we come across Demeter Thesmophoros (2), Demeter (12), Kore (12-13), Pluton (7, 19), and even Iacchos (26). In addition to several references to sacrifice (7, 12), meat distribution (6), *hierosyna* (5,19), and several officials like priestesses (11, 20), a priest (21), a herald (6) and *hieropoioi* (1, 5-6, 10), we also come across torches (4, 18) and a court (23) and an altar (9) in an Eleusinion, strengthening the idea that the decree is dealing with Eleusinian rites and deities. Interestingly, in relation to what seems to be a sacrifice to Pluton, it is stated that “together with the *demotai* the others” are to receive or share in something, probably a distribution of meat: Π]λούτωνι θυόντωσαν κρ<ιό>[ν-----][[δημ]όταις μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ ὕ [-----] (7-8).

¹¹⁷ *Ed. princ.* E. Vanderpool, ‘A *lex sacra* of the Attic deme Phrearrhioi’, *Hesp.* 39 (1970) 47-53. For a recent discussion and edition of the text: E. Lupu, ‘A note on *SEG* XXXV 113’ in: D. Jordan and J. Traill (eds.), *Lettered Attica. A Day of Attic Epigraphy. Proceedings of the Athens Symposium, 8 March 2000* (Toronto 2003) 69-77 (= E. Lupu, *Greek Sacred Law. A Collection of New Documents* (Leiden 2005) no. 3). In what follows I use Lupu’s edition.

¹¹⁸ R. Simms, ‘The Phrearrhian *lex sacra*. An interpretation’, *Hesp.* 67 (1998) 91-107.

As the beginning of the decree is missing we do not know on whose authority it was issued and, therefore, in which context we should understand the reference to “the others”. Because of the references to *demotai* (8) and to Phrearrhians (12), Eugene Vanderpool suggested it was a deme decree dealing with deme *hiera* and recently Robert Simms, in reaction to Robin Osborne’s suggestion that it was a decree issued by a local Eleusinion, pointed out that the decree seems to represent a typical sacred calendar of a deme and, more convincingly, that civic officials like *hieropoioi* and heralds are normally not exclusively associated with a single sanctuary but rather with a deme or with the polis at large.¹¹⁹ We thus seem to be faced with a deme decree, though a joint decision with a (homonymous) *kome*, as was perhaps the case in Skambonidai, cannot be ruled out. Confronted with (at least) a deme decree we should therefore probably understand “the others” as “the others in the deme”.

Now what kind of *hiera* were these other residents allowed to share in with the Phrearrhian *demotai*? This is also a matter of debate, mainly pivoting around the identification of the Eleusinion that is mentioned in the text (9, 18, 23), which is usually thought to refer to the Eleusinion in Eleusis. Many editors correspondingly argue that the decree deals with the participation of the Phrearrhioi in the Eleusinian Mysteries. So, Simms points out that the preoccupation with minute detail of procedure suggests that the rites and the participants were quite unfamiliar to the *demotai* and their local officials and therefore probably took place outside the deme. He further argues that the reference to an Eleusinion, its court and altar, and the mention of Iacchos, who is not attested outside Athens and Eleusis, further suggest the Mysteries in Eleusis as the focus of the decree.¹²⁰

On the other hand, it can perhaps be seen as a general rule of this kind of “calendars” that if the location of a shrine or the site of a sacrifice is not further

¹¹⁹ Vanderpool (1970) 50. Simms (1998) 93, in reaction to Osborne, *Demos* (1985) 251, n. 39.

¹²⁰ In line 27 of our decree we come across a reference to ἐβδο[μη], i.e. seven[---]. Simms (1998) 99-106, therefore connects the Phrearrhian decree with 16 and 17 Boedromion on which days, according to Simms, took place the ritual of the Mysteries called ἱερεῖα δεῦρο and the polis festival for Asklepios called the Epidauria for latecomers. On the Epidauria see: K. Clinton, ‘The Epidauria and the arrival of Asclepius in Athens’ in: R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Stockholm 1994) 17-34. Cf. N. Robertson, ‘New light on Demeter’s Mysteries: the festival Proerosia’, *GRBS* 37 (1996) 351 n. 93, who, tenuously, connects the Phrearrhian decree with 5 and 7 Pyanopsion, on which were held the proclamation of the Proerosia and the festival for Apollo called the Pyanopsia.

specified, and the Eleusinion does not seem to be specified as “ἐν ἄστει” in our decree, that it almost always refers to a local site.¹²¹ This makes it more likely that the decree lays down regulations concerning a local, Phrearrhian Eleusinion. An important argument, moreover, against the suggestion that the decree stipulates the participation of the Phrearrhioi in the Mysteries is the fact that deme participation in the Mysteries is very unlikely. The participatory community of the Mysteries was characterised by both a Panhellenic attendance and individual participation, as I argued in the previous chapter. Participation by demes is very much at odds with this individual focus. Initiation into the rites of Demeter and Kore for a good afterlife was not entered upon with one’s entire deme community as it was an affair of the individual initiate. It is therefore very improbable that the Phrearrhian decree regulates the participation of the deme Phrearrhioi in the Eleusinian Mysteries. It is, in sum, most likely that the Phrearrhian decree sets out to regulate participation in a Phrearrhian Eleusinion.

Local Eleusinia are attested all over Attika: besides the one in Phrearrhioi and the famous one in Athens they are attested in Paiania (*IG I³ 250, passim*), the Marathonian Tetrapolis (*SEG 50.168.17*), Phaleron (*IG I³ 32.22-28*), Thorikos (*SEG 26.136.21, 38*), and perhaps Brauron (Bekker, *Anektd.* 1, 242).¹²² Concerning these local Eleusinia, Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood made the interesting observation that, with the exception of the ones in Athens and Phaleron, which were part of the ritual nexus of the Eleusinian Mysteries, they were all located in east Attica at a relative distance from the Athens-Eleusis axis that was so important to the ritual agenda of the Mysteries. As an explanation of this “spread” she suggested that local Eleusinia seem to cater to a need in these far away demes to secure the protection of the Eleusinian deities and she concluded that

¹²¹ Compare the debate about the location of the Eleusinion mentioned in the calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis (*SEG 50.168.17*), which according to S.D. Lambert, ‘The sacrificial calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis’, *ZPE* 130 (2000a) 52, refers to a local Eleusinion as it was not further specified as the one ἐν ἄστει. Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 332-3, is quite hesitant to see the Eleusinia mentioned in decrees from Paiania, Phrearrhioi and Marathon as local Eleusinia as they would be remarkably faithful replica’s of the one in the Eleusis or in the city, which, I argue, was sort of the point.

¹²² On the City Eleusinion: M.M. Miles, *The City Eleusinion (The Athenian Agora 31)* (New Jersey 1998).

it is thus possible that these local Eleusinia were local foundations generated by the desire to reinforce symbolically the Eleusinian dimension, and thus Demeter's blessings, on their territory.¹²³

In 1985, Osborne had similarly argued that the local Eleusinia throughout Attica expressed a continued link with the cult of Demeter in Eleusis, perhaps offering opportunities to worship Eleusinian deities or even get initiated to those who were unable to attend the festivals in Eleusis, while at the same time it offered a deme a means to assert its identity as worshipping community both on its own and as dependent on what happened in Eleusis.¹²⁴

In line with Sourvinou-Inwood and Osborne I want to propose that the Phrearrhian decree concerns the participation of the deme community in rites that took place in their local Eleusinion. The way from Phrearrhioi to Eleusis via Athens is ca. 69 km long and would take a person wishing to participate in the Mysteries at least fifteen hours. Although the ancient Athenians were much more accustomed to long walks than we are, this lengthy trip was perhaps still felt as an impediment to (some of) those living in Phrearrhioi to attend the Mysteries, while the distance from the ritually potent Athens-Eleusis nexus could in addition be thought to stand in the way of a good relationship between the Phrearrhioi and the Eleusinian deities. A local Eleusinion would offer a perfect solution to these obstacles. In that way the Phrearrhians could worship the deities of Eleusis and secure their divine support for their community.

The occurrence of Iacchos in the Phrearrhian decree, furthermore, need not necessarily indicate a location in Athens or Eleusis. The mention of this deity could in fact suggest that the Phrearrhians did not only establish a link with Eleusis through their local Eleusinion but also mimicked the rites of Eleusis.¹²⁵ This could also explain the unique vagueness in the designation of the other

¹²³ C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Reconstructing change: ideology and the Eleusinian mysteries' in: M. Golden and P. Toohey (eds.), *Inventing ancient culture: historicism periodization and the ancient world* (London 1997) 148-9.

¹²⁴ Osborne, *Demos* (1985) 176-8.

¹²⁵ A similar instance of a deme mimicking a polis festival can probably be found in the deme calendar from Erchia (*SEG* 21.541) where on 3 Skirophorion (A58-66, B56-60, Γ60-65, Δ57-61, E66-67) we find a sacrifice on the Erchian Akropolis to Kourotropos, Aglauros, Zeus Polieus, Athena Polias, Poseidon and another power, perhaps Pandrosos, on which Michael Jameson, 'Notes on the sacrificial Calendar from Erchia', *BCH* 89 (1965) 156-8, saw an Erchian Arrephoria. Also see n. 99 and 103 on Piraeus mimicking the City Dionysia.

participants besides the *demotai* as “the others”. Simms is right in emphasising that it is curious that “the others” are not further specified, as was common in inscriptions, and he suggests these other participants were perceived as an unidentifiable mass of participants at the Mysteries.¹²⁶ However, instead of the designation “τῶν ἄλλων” referring to an international clientele at Eleusis, I find it more likely that in imitation of the Eleusinian Mysteries the Phrearrhians also set in place a very inclusive policy concerning their own “Mysteries”. Similar to the Mysteries in Eleusis, in which, as Herodotus (8.65.4) tells us, “any Athenian who wishes and any other Greek may be initiated”, everybody could participate in the “Eleusinian” rites in Phrearrhioi, both the Phrearrhian *demotai* and all others living in the deme wishing to participate. These “others” therefore probably encompassed both Athenian and foreign immigrants living in Phrearrhioi. In reproducing the policy of the Mysteries in Eleusis there is even the possibility that slaves also participated in the Phrearrhian rites and were thus notionally included in the term “the others”.

We can conclude, then, that similar to Ikarion, but over a century later, and in imitation of the Eleusinian Mysteries, Phrearrhioi seems to have accepted outsiders who were merely resident in their deme by allowing them a share in their *hiera* for several Eleusinian deities. In that way these “others” were included in the community of the Phrearrhians, while the separate mention of *demotai* in our decree might suggest that *demotai* kept a special position among the worshippers in the Eleusinian similar to the Athenians who controlled the Mysteries in Eleusis. Although the inclusion of “others” in some of the *hiera* in the Phrearrhian Eleusinion can thus be explained it unfortunately remains to be guessed why the Phrearrhians decided on this inclusive policy so late. From ca. 300 onwards we mainly have inscriptions from demes like Piraeus, Eleusis, and Rhamnous that were characterised by a considerable military presence and quick political turnovers. The decree from Phrearrhioi presents us with a notable exception to this epigraphic pattern. The Phrearrhian decree does, however, have one important thing in common with several of the decrees from the “garrison demes” Eleusis and Rhamnous, for many of these seem to acknowledge and deal with the large and influential presence of both Athenian and foreign non-*demotai* in the deme, which is sometimes seen as a sign of the breakdown of demes as real

¹²⁶ Simms (1998) 99.

communities.¹²⁷ While the decrees from Eleusis and Rhamnous deal with these large groups of outsiders mainly in a laudatory context, honouring “foreign” benefactors and garrison leaders and including “other residents” as honouring parties in decrees issued by the deme, Phrearrhioi, although not known to have been faced with a large presence of outsiders, in the same period decided to stipulate that “others” could participate in their *hiera* in the Eleusinion.

4 Awarding individual benefactors – a Theban in Eleusis

The final concern of this chapter will be with the Theban Damasias, who, in the mid fourth century, lived in Eleusis, trained two choruses from his own means, one of boys and one of men, and dedicated them to Demeter and Kore and Dionysos at the Eleusinian Dionysia. To praise Damasias for these services and his continuing benevolent disposition towards all those living in Eleusis the Eleusinians decided to honour him with a golden crown worth a thousand drachmas, announce this award at the Eleusinian Dionysia, grant him the privilege to sit in the front row of the theatre, and grant him and his descendants exemption from local Eleusinian taxes. In addition, Damasias was given no less than 100 drachmas from the common fund for a sacrifice.

In what follows we will take a closer look at the honorific decree for the metic Damasias (*IG II² 1186*) against the background of other deme decrees that record the decisions of *demotai* to bestow honours upon powerful and wealthy individuals who were from other demes and who were in that sense technically outsiders. I will argue that some honours that were bestowed upon these local giants for their *philotimia* towards the deme community, not least among them the right to share in the *hiera* of the deme, should not be considered as empty words of flattery; they were rather a pivotal means to make these outsiders part of the deme community, to which, as was sometimes explicitly hoped, they would be of continuing importance in the future.

¹²⁷ Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 360-3. Cf. Osborne (1990) 277-93, on the various parallelisms between decrees from the polis and its subdivision in this case Rhamnous, and Jones, *Associations* (1999) 70-81, who sees the involvement of different groups in these “deme” decrees as signs of the victory of the territorial deme over the constitutional one. For a similar notion of the breakdown of phratries as real communities as reflected in the sharp fall in the epigraphical record concerned with phratries around 250 see, Lambert, *Phratries* (1998) 273-5.

4.1 The Eleusinians honour Damasias son of Dionysos of Thebes

The honorific decree *IG II² 1186*, dated to the middle of the fourth century, records the decision of the Eleusinians to honour the Theban Damasias for his services towards the Eleusinians. It is stated that

1. [Κα]λ[λί]μαχος Καλλικράτους ἔειπεν· ἔπε-
[ιδῆ] Δαμασίας Διονυσίου Θηβαῖος οἰ[κ]-
[ήσ]ας Ἐλευσίην κόσμιός τε ὤ[ν] διατετ[έ]-
[λ]κε καὶ φιλανθρώπως ἔχει πρὸς πάντ-
5. [α]ς τοὺς ἐν τοῖ δήμοι οἰκούντας καὶ α[ὐ]-
[τ]ὸς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτο, καὶ Διονύ[σ]ια
[π]οιούντων Ἐλευσινίων ἐσπούδασε[ν κ]-
αὶ ἐφιλοτιμήθη πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κ[αὶ τ]-
ὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ Ἐλευσιν[ί]ω-
10. [ν], ὅπως ὡς κάλλιστα γένηται τὰ Διονύ[σ]-
ια, καὶ παρασκευάσας τοῖς αὐτοῦ τέλ[ε]-
[σ]ι χοροὺς δύο. τὸν μὲν παίδων, τὸν δὲ ἀν-
δρῶν ἐπέδωκεν τεῖ Δῆμητρι [κ]αὶ τεῖ Κό-
ρει καὶ τοῖ Διονύσῳ, δεδόχθαι Ἐλευσ-
15. ινίοις, ἐπαινέσαι Δαμασίαν Διονυσί-
ο Θηβαῖον σωφροσύνης ἕνεκα καὶ εὐσε-
βείας τῆς πρὸς τὴν θεὸν καὶ στεφανῶσαι
αὐτὸν χρυσῶι στεφάνῳ ἀπὸ Χ δραχμῶν.
ἀνειπάτω δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ μετὰ Γνάθῃν δήμα-
20. ρχος Διονυσίων τῶν Ἐλευσίνι τοῖς τρ-
αγοιδόις, ὅτι ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἐλευσινίων στ-
εφανοῖ Δαμασίαν Διονυσίου Θηβαῖον
σωφροσύνης ἕνεκα καὶ εὐσεβείας τῆς
πρὸς τὴν θεὸν· ἔστω δὲ αὐτῷ προεδρία κα-
25. ἰ ἀτέλεια ὧ εἰσὶν κύριοι Ἐλευσίνιο-
ι καὶ αὐτῷ <καὶ> ἐγγόνιοις καὶ ἐάν τ[ι] ἄλλο [β]-
ούληται ἀγαθὸν εὐρέσθαι παρὰ τοῦ δή-
μου τοῦ Ἐλευσινίων, καὶ ἐπι[μ]ελέσθω α-
ὐτοῦ ὁ δήμαρχος ὁ ἀεὶ δημαρχῶν ὅτου ἄ-
30. ν δέηται· ἐλέσθαι δὲ αὐτίκα μάλα ὅστι-
ς ἐπιμελήσεται, ὅπως ἂν ἀναγραφῆί τό-
δε τὸ ψήφισμα καὶ σταθεῖ ἐν τῷ Διονυ-
[σ]ίῳ, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν δοῦναι Δ δρ-
[α]χμᾶς τὸν δήμαρχον· δοῦναι δὲ εἰς θυσ-
35. [ί]αν Δαμασίαι Η δραχμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινο.
[Κ]αλλίμ[α]χος Καλλικράτους ἔειπεν· ἐπ[ε]-

[ιδῆ] Φρυνίσκος Θεβα[ῖ]ο[ς] οἰ[κή]σας Ἐλευ]-
[σί]νι κό[σ]μιός κτλ. -----]

Kallimachos, son of Kallikratos proposed: as Damasias, son of Dionysos of Thebes has settled in Eleusis and always lived a modest life and acts philanthropic towards all those living in the deme, both he and his students, and as he has supported the Dionysia which the Eleusinians put on, and has been honour-loving towards the gods, and the *demos* of the Athenians and of the Eleusinians, and (as he), in order that the Dionysia be the best possible, has trained, from his own means, two choruses, and gave one chorus of boys and one of men to Demeter and Kore and Dionysos, it is decided by the Eleusinians to praise Damasias, son of Dionysos, of Thebes for his sophrosyne and his piety toward the two goddesses and to crown him with a golden crown of 1000 drachmas. And he who is demarch after Gnathis is to announce at the tragedies of the Dionysia at Eleusis that the demarch of the Eleusinians crowns Damasias son of Dionysos of Thebes for his sophrosyne and his piety towards the two goddesses; he is to have *proedria* and immunity to both him and his descendants from those taxes over which the Eleusinians have authority, and to find from the *demos* of the Eleusinians whatever good he wants and the demarch, being in charge, is always to take care of him, whatever he requests. To elect at once someone who will take care that this decree is inscribed and placed in the Dionysion, and the demarch is to give ten drachma for its inscription and to give Damasias one hundred drachma for a sacrifice from the common fund. Kallimachos, son of Kallikratos proposed: as Phryniskos of Thebes has settled in Eleusis and always lived a modest life [---].

What we have here is a typical honorific deme decree, in which the *demotai* of Eleusis recorded the significant honours they decided to bestow upon a powerful individual who lived in the deme and who had acted as a modest, philanthropic, *sophron*, pious, and honourable benefactor towards the deme community, in this case as provider of two choruses for the Eleusinian Dionysia. There are many other examples of this kind of deme decree. As a matter of fact, they represent the majority of deme decrees by far; Whitehead estimated that around two thirds of all deme decrees were honorific in nature.¹²⁸ Moreover, of the ca. 116 people who were honoured in these decrees at least eighteen, ca. 15 %, were people who

¹²⁸ Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 41, 238 n. 70.

did not technically belong to the deme community that honoured them. But before we consider these informative parallels let us take a closer look at the decree for Damasias.

In *IG II² 1186* we read that the Theban Damasias financed two choruses for the Eleusinian Dionysia, which, as it turns out, were not only dedicated to Dionysos but also to Demeter and Kore, the quintessentially Eleusinian deities. Since the choruses are specified as consisting of boys and men it is very likely that they were to compete in dithyrambic competitions. The exact nature of Damasias' services is not, however, entirely clear. For it is peculiar, as Peter Wilson observed, that although Damasias is said to have trained the choruses and paid for them himself, he is never acknowledged as a *choregos*; in the decree Damasias is never explicitly referred to as a *choregos* and instead of acting as *choregos* (χορηγέω) he is said to have supported (ἐσπούδασε[ν]) the Dionysia, and trained (παρασκευάσας) and donated (ἔπέδωκεν) the two choruses. Wilson seems therefore right to suggest that Damasias' services were probably an exceptional addition to the Eleusinian Dionysia.¹²⁹

Despite the fact that Damasias' gift of two choruses was exceptional, it is remains remarkable that the Eleusinians allowed the Theban Damasias to interfere with the Eleusinian *hiera* of Dionysos, Demeter and Kore and honoured him for it afterwards. Although in the decree his status is not referred to with the usual “οἰκεῖν ἐν”-formula but rather with the more colloquial statement that he “has settled in Eleusis” (οἰ[κῆσ]ας Ἐλευσίνι – 2-3) in unique combination with an ethnicon (Θηβαῖος), Damasias was clearly a metic.¹³⁰ The Eleusinians thus allowed a metic, and a wealthy one at that, to perform all aspects of a normal *choregia* for the Dionysia in their deme, a duty usually reserved for the *demotai* of the organising deme, as we saw in the previous section. For this he was, in

¹²⁹ Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 244. Cf. Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 216 who places emphasis on the fact that the services seem to have been voluntarily undertaken.

¹³⁰ On this exceptional reference to Damasias' status: Whitehead, *Metic* (1977) 32, referring to Clerc, *Les métèques athéniens* (1893) 241 n. 11. Besides Damasias and the Theban Phryniskos who is honoured below Damasias' decree, eight more metics are known to have lived in Eleusis. They are all attested as artisans who worked at the sanctuary in Eleusis: on *IG II² 1672*, dated to 329/8, we come across the metics Daos (25-6), Dionysios (67), Nikon (119), Hephaistion (121-2), Diodoros (128-9), and one more metic whose name can not be recovered (77) and on *IG II² 1673*, dated to 327/6?, we see Chanes (38) and another anonymous metic (38). All are recorded as Ἐλευσίνι οἰκοῦντι/οἰκουντος, “living in Eleusis”. In addition, there is a very real possibility that the Theban who was honoured in another Eleusinian deme decree of the mid fourth century (*IG II² 1185*) was also a metic.

addition, honoured with the right to participate in even more *hiera* as he received 100 dr. from the communal fund to make a sacrifice.

Even though the open nature of the rural Dionysia in general and the cosmopolitan composition of the population in Eleusis specifically appears to be reflected in the mention that Damasias' philanthropy reached "all those living in the deme" (πάντ[α]ς τοὺς ἐν τοῖ δήμοι οἰκούντας – 4-5), a sense of discomfort about having a metic perform a *choregos*' duties might nonetheless be reflected in the opaque language used to refer both to Damasias' status and his services. However, in a time when Athenians became increasingly more dependent on wealthy individuals to finance their religious obligations, it was probably thought prudent to allow this wealthy Theban who, together with his students, had shown himself benevolent towards the Eleusinians before to share in the *hiera* of the deme. It is also a possibility that the decree dates to the period of close alliance between Athens and Thebes and Thebes' membership of the Second Athenian league in the 370s. In that context the Eleusinians could symbolically tie a Theban to their community parallel to what the Athenians did on polis level. Thebans were, moreover, much involved both in Eleusis itself, a deme close to Boeotia, as can be seen, for instance, from another deme decree from Eleusis honouring a Theban (*IG II² 1185*), and in the City Dionysia, as we saw in the previous chapter. To find Thebans involved in Eleusinian Dionysia is therefore not a complete surprise and perhaps even highly symbolical at this time.

In return for his gift of two choruses and for his modest (κόσμιός), philanthropic (φιλανθρώπως), pious (εὐσεβείας, attested here for the first time in Attica as a reason to be honoured), *sophron* (σωφροσύνης), and honour-loving (ἐφιλοτιμήθη, also one of the earliest occurrences) behaviour towards the deme and the gods, Damasias received several honours. We read about a precious golden crown, the announcement in the theatre of this award, the right to sit in the front row of the theatre with other honoured notables (so-called *proedria*), and exemption from local Eleusinian taxes not only for himself but also for his descendants (17-26). The decree will moreover be inscribed and set up in the Dionysion and Damasias is given no less than one hundred drachmas from the common fund to make a sacrifice (30-35), which could probably finance the

purchase of a single cow.¹³¹ It is even stated that if Damasias can think of anything else the Eleusinian demarch will provide it (26-30).

Of these honours the awarding of crowns, *proedria*, announcement in the theatre, and the order to inscribe and publish the decree were commonly awarded to benefactors, both on deme and on polis level and both to outsiders and insiders. These type of honours, their bestowal and their historical context have all been studied to good effect by numerous scholars; it is now commonly believed that lauding powerful men for their (liturgical) gifts to the community (and, from the middle of the fourth century onwards, for their *philotimia*) had the threefold effect of encouraging Athens' wealthy men to use their resources to benefit the polis community and of thus channelling elite competitive behaviour for the common Athenian good, while simultaneously announcing the overriding authority of the Athenian *demos* in awarding honours and thus in valuating the behaviour of its wealthy components.¹³²

Interesting for our present concern are the tax exemption (*ateleia*) and the grant of 100 drachmas to Damasias from the common fund of the Eleusinians for a sacrifice as these honours seem specifically concerned with attempts to integrate a powerful outsider in a relatively small community. It is stated that the *ateleia* concerns those taxes over which the Eleusinians have authority (25-26), probably local deme taxes that were paid by non-*demotai* on landed property located in the deme, similar to the *enktesis* tax in Piraeus for which the non-*demotes* Kallidamas from Cholleidai could be exempted in the third century (*IG* II² 1214.26-28).¹³³ Damasias was thereby no longer liable to pay taxes normally

¹³¹ The cows that were distributed as prizes at the Panathenaia in the first half of the fourth century cost 100 dr. each (*IG* II² 2311.72-76), while in 363/2 the Salaminiotai budgeted 70 dr. for the sacrifice of an ox to Herakles (*SEG* 21.527. 86 = RO 37).

¹³² A small selection would at least have to include: A.S. Henry, *Honours and privileges in Athenian decrees* (Hildesheim et al. 1983); M.J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens* 3 vols. (Brussels 1981-1983); J. Peçirka, *The formula of the grant of enktesis in Attic inscriptions* (Prague 1966); Whitehead (1983); S.D. Lambert, 'Athenian State Laws and Decrees, 352/1-322/1: I Decrees Honouring Athenians', *ZPE* 150 (2004) 85-120; idem., 'Athenian State Laws and Decrees, 352/1-322/1: III Decrees Honouring Foreigners. A. Citizenship, Proxeny and Euergety', *ZPE* 158 (2006) 115-58; idem., 'Athenian State Laws and Decrees, 352/1-322/1: III Decrees Honouring Foreigners. B. Other Awards', *ZPE* 159 (2007) 101-54; on crowns: C. Veligianni, 'Belobigung und Bekr anzung von Rat und Magistraten in Zusammenhang mit der Rechenschaftsablegung', *Hellenika* 40 (1989) 239-56.

¹³³ Also see the *ateleia* granted by coastal Lamprai to Philokedes of Acharnai in the late fourth century (*IG* II² 1204), the *ateleia* in *IG* II² 1187.16-17 for Derkylos of Hagnous, the mysterious ἀτέλειαν τοῦ πλοῦ in Rhamnous for Menandros of Eitea (*SEG* 15.122.26) and the largely restored reference to *ateleia* in *IG* II² 1188.28-30. Cf. Whitehead, *Demes* (1986)

paid by outsiders to the deme Eleusis. He thus lost an important label that was attached to non-*demotai* living in Eleusis. Significantly, despite the many parallelisms between (honorary) decrees of the polis and its subdivisions so excellently explored by Robin Osborne, polis decrees granting *ateleia* from polis taxes to outsiders are rather rare, with the notable exception of the grant given to the Bosporan rulers in 347/6 (Dem. 20.29-30, 34.36).¹³⁴ Far more often the polis granted fiscal honours like paying *eisphora* on similar terms as the Athenians, or *isoteleia*, a right often granted to metics which meant paying taxes on similar terms as the Athenians, or *ateleia* from the metic tax only.¹³⁵ It just might be, then, that the *ateleia* granted to Damasias reflects the attempts of a smaller community to integrate a powerful outsider as much as they can, which went further than what occurred on polis level.

The grant of 100 drachmas could be interpreted along similar lines, for it gave Damasias the right to use money ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ, i.e. money that was owned, collected and handled by the collective of Eleusinian *demotai* and that was most likely to be used for communal purposes only, like repairs on communal (mostly religious) buildings and property, sacrifices, festivals, etc. Damasias was, however, not allowed to use this money any way he wanted; he had to spend it on a sacrifice, thus acknowledging Damasias even more as a member of the *koinon* of Eleusinians as he would use communal money for religious purposes in the context of the deme. It is again interesting to compare this honour with the honours granted on polis level for it seems that the honour to use communal money to make a sacrifice was never granted to foreign honorands on polis level, only to Athenian ones.¹³⁶ Again the smaller Eleusinian community seems to

76 n.38. Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 150-2, moreover suggests that these instances indicate that some kind of deme taxation was probably widespread. Interestingly, he also proposed that the *tele* paid by the *demotai* themselves, as, for instance, the Piraeans (*IG II² 1214.25-28*) did in the third century, were perhaps “not so much taxes for general administrative purposes as subsidies for particular cult activities”, comparable, for instance, to what the Plotheians did in the fifth century (*IG I³ 258.28-29*), thus “[reinforcing] their collective identity as *demotai*”.

¹³⁴ Osborne (1990). On the Athenian honours granted to the Bosporan rulers in an attempt to strengthen good relations with this corn region: RO 64. A unique epigraphical instance is Lambert (2006) no. 53, in which we find a grant described as ἀτέλεια πάντων, on which see Lambert’s n. 99.

¹³⁵ See for instance, Lambert (2006) nos. 5, 42, 43 and Lambert (2007) nos. 61, 64, 84, 98 (?), 101 (?), 102, 110 and 131 (?).

¹³⁶ Lambert (2006) 116. For some examples of this honour granted to Athenians: Lambert (2004) nos. 1 (50 dr.), 11 (30 dr.), and 17 (100 dr.). We find two similar cases in the context

trump the honours that were granted on polis level to outsiders, perhaps reflecting the more immediate concerns of a smaller, perhaps even face-to-face deme community with maintaining and securing its cohesion and integrating outsiders.

4.2 Demes honouring outsiders

Besides the honorary decree for Damasias we have eighteen other deme decrees, dating from around the middle of the fourth to the middle of the third century, that record honours awarded by a deme community to someone who did not belong to that community by descent. Unfortunately the Eleusinian decree for Damasias is our only deme decree honouring a metic; all others honour Athenians who were members of other demes. Still, these decrees are very informative in the ways in which a deme community dealt with powerful outsiders. Most of those honoured in these deme decrees were relatively well-known Athenians who belonged to prominent families and who had performed important duties, like a liturgy or a military function, in connection with the deme. For instance, we come across the famous politician Demetrios of Phaleron, who ruled in Athens in the late fourth century and who was honoured by Aixone (*IG II² 1201*), Eleusis (*IG II² 2971*) and Sphettos (*SEG 25.206*), or the *hierophant* Hierokleides of Paiania, who as *hierophant* obviously held an important position in the Eleusinian cult for Demeter and was honoured for it by the Eleusinians some time in the middle of the fourth century (*IG II² 1188*), or Arethousios of Pelekes and Melesias of Lamprai who, together with two Piraeans, were honoured by the deme Piraeus as lessees of the theatre in 324/3 (*IG II² 1176*), or the well-known mid fourth-century general Derkylos of Hagnous, who was honoured by the Eleusinians (*IG II² 1187*), or Kallippos of Melite who in the middle of the third century was honoured by the Rhamnousians for garrison duties in the deme (*SEG 22.120*).¹³⁷

of the *phyle* Pandionis: *Hesp.* 32 (1963) 41, no. 42.4-7 and *IG II² 1152.7-9*, on which see Jones (1995) 518, in both cases concerning a member of the decreeing *phyle*.

¹³⁷ The other decrees include: Smikythion of Kephale, the *peripolarchos* who was honoured by the Eleusinians (*IG II² 1193*), Menandros son of Teisandros of Eitea honoured as trierarch by the Rhamnousians (*SEG 15.112*), Philokedes son of Aristarchos of Acharnai honoured by coastal Lamprai for “being *philotimos* towards the sacrifices and the common things in the deme” (*IG II² 1204.4-7*), Kallidamas son of Kallimedos of Cholleidai honoured by the Piraeans in ca. 280 (*IG II² 1214*), Adeitos son of Antimachos of Athmonon who was *sophronistes* for the *phyle* Kekropis and who was honoured by the deme Eleusis for his care taken of the garrison in Eleusis (*IG II² 1156*), Xenokles son of Xeinidos of Sphettos who

Similar to the honorary decrees on polis level, these deme decrees show us communities that both try to contain and take advantage of powerful, wealthy individuals by honouring them and encouraging them to focus their competitive behaviour on the wellbeing of the deme. Besides their particular services they are usually also praised in general for their *philotimia* towards the deme in return for which they commonly receive a gold or foliage crown.¹³⁸ In addition, we regularly come across the statement that this award is to be announced at the deme's Dionysia, often specified as "in the theatre" (*IG* II² 1187.10-11), "before the (tragic) *agon*" (*IG* II² 1299.76-77; *IG* II² 1193.15-16; *SEG* 22.120.6-7), or as both (*IG* II² 1214.28-29).

The right to sit in one of the honorary seats in the front row of the theatre is also regularly awarded to these benefactors; we have at least five decrees in which it is stated that the honorand is to have *proedria* in the theatre during the Dionysia.¹³⁹ A decree from Piraeus of 324/3 (*IG* II² 1176) gives a nice impression in whose company our benefactors would find themselves: in the honorary decree for four lessees of the theatre it is stated that "*proedria* is to be to the priests, and the demarch and the treasurers and the herald and to the others who are given *proedria* by the *demotai*" (6-8).¹⁴⁰

Finally, and this is already borne out by the simple fact that we have these decrees, all decrees seem to include a formula for inscribing the deme's decision

was honoured by the Eleusinians for religious services (*IG* II² 1191), Epikydes of Philokydos honoured by Gargettos (*MDAI* (A) 67 (1942) 7-8, no.1), Endion of Aithalides honoured by the Rhamnousians for his services as *epimeletes*, Dikaiarchos son of Apollonios of Thria honoured by the Rhamnousians for garrison duties (*SEG* 25.155), Aristophanes son of Aristomenes of Leukonoion honoured as general by the Eleusinians (*IG* II² 1299), Tharrhias, son of Tharrhiades of Erchia honoured by the Sounians (?) (*IG* II² 1181), and, finally, an unknown man from Phyle who was honoured by Eleusis in the late fourth century (*IG* II² 1192).

¹³⁸ No crowns: both *IG* II² 1181 from Sounion for Tharrhias from Erchia and *MDAI* (A) 67 (1942) 7-8, no.1 from Gargettos for Epikydes of Philokydos are too fragmentary to say anything about the honours bestowed and *IG* II² 1201 from Aixone to Demetrios of Phaleron breaks off at the points where the honours were probably listed. This leaves us with *IG* II² 3467, which simply states that "the Rhamnousians and those of the *politai* who live in Rhamnous (honour) Endion Aisch[---] of Aithalides" and *IG* II² 1204 for Philokedes of Acharnai who is praised by Lamptrai for his *philotimia* towards the *thusia* and the *koina* of the *demos* and is given *ateleia* and a share in the sacrifices of the *demotai*. Cf. Lambert (2004) 88, on crowns awarded to Athenians, usually of gold, and idem (2006) 16, on crowns, both foliage and gold, awarded to foreigners.

¹³⁹ *IG* II² 1194.10-11 (Eleusis); *IG* II² 1214.19-21 (Piraeus); *IG* II² 1187.17-18 (Eleusis); *IG* II² 1193.21 (Eleusis); *SEG* 22.120.5-6 (Rhamnous).

¹⁴⁰ The part of the decree in which we should expect to find the grant of *proedria* for the four lessees is no longer extant.

on a stone *stele*, often explicitly ordered to be set up in a prominent location within the deme, like the deme's agora (*IG II² 1188.33* (Eleusis); *IG II² 1176.19-20* (Piraeus)) or in one of the deme's main sanctuaries, like in the Hestia in Piraeus (*IG II² 1214.37-38*), at the Propylaia of Demeter and Kore in Eleusis (*IG II² 1187.25-27*), in the sanctuary of Artemis Tauropolos at Halai Araphenides (*AE (1925-26) 168.15-17*), or in the sanctuary of Nemesis in Rhamnous (*SEG 22.120.8-9*). The decision where to set up the stone bearing the decree could also be postponed to a later moment: once it is stated "to set up [the *stele*] in a place which [the demarch Isarchos] judges to be the best" (*IG II² 1193.30-31*). Although this inscribing of the decree is often treated as a mere formality we should guard against such simplistic interpretations and rather see this public recording of honours and the reasons of the *demotai* for doing this as a significant honour in itself; it made the decision and honours known and accessible to a much wider audience and prolonged the honorary momentum beyond the moment of the decision in the deme's assembly and the announcement in the theatre, even up till our present time.¹⁴¹

4.3 νέμειν δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ μερίδα ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν: a means to integrate

Besides these more or less regular aspects of honorary decrees that seem mainly concerned with expressing the community's gratitude towards the benefactor and encouraging others to emulate his *philotimia* towards the deme, we also occasionally find honours specified that seem directed at incorporating these outsiders into the honouring deme community more firmly, namely 1) the exemption from deme taxes and 2) the right to share in the *hiera* of the deme. In addition to being honours in themselves, these privileges seem to have constituted an important means to integrate powerful outsiders into the honouring community. Interestingly, both awards, i.e. *ateleia* and a share of the deme's *hiera*, commonly occur together, suggesting they constituted a significant set of particular awards that immediately sprung to mind when the honouring *demotai* were interested in tying wealthy and influential outsiders to their community.¹⁴²

¹⁴¹ On which see: Lambert (2006) 16, who refers to his no. 66 (= *IG II² 220*), passed in 344/3, which contains the Athenian response to an embassy from the city of Pellana in Achaia. The sole purpose of the decree was to provide for the inscribing of the honours granted to Pellana the year before and the erecting of the *stele* on the Akropolis.

¹⁴² Only in the late and hybrid decree from "the Rhamnousians and the *politai* living in Rhamnous" (*SEG 15.122.26.1-2*), dated to 225/4, honouring a trierarch with tax exemption

Although the mechanisms and implications of *ateleia* on deme level are very interesting, not least for the existence of local deme taxes and registers of non-*demotai* in demes, for our present concern we will focus on the mechanisms and implications behind the specification that “benefactor A from deme X is to receive a share of the *hiera* of deme Y”.

Besides the honorary decree for Damasias, we have four other examples of deme decrees, dating from the fourth to the early third century, that grant non-*demotai*, in these cases Athenians from other demes, a share in a deme’s *hiera*. In its most simple form it could be stated that “person X was to receive a share of the *hiera*”, as is probably found in very fragmentary and stoichedon, mid fourth-century decree from Halai Araphenides (*AE* (1925-26) 168), in which the honorands are honoured with a foliage crown and *proedria*. In addition, it was stated that:

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 8. | νέμειν δὲ
[καὶ μερί]δα αὐτῶν ἕκατ-
[έρωι τοὺς] ἱεροποιούς
[...8...] π[οι]οῦντας Ἄ- |
| 12. | [ρχίαν τὸν] δήμαρχον· |

If the inscription has been correctly restored, the meaning would seem to be that “the *hieropoioi* performing the [sacrifice/festival and the demarch Archias? or sacrifice/festival in the demarchy of Archias?] shall give to each of the two of them [i.e. the honorands] a share.” While it is not quite clear from the rest of this inscription that the honorands are non-demesmen, this is probably a case of outsiders being honoured by the deme Halai Araphenides by being given a share of sacrifices, which were normally shared among demesmen only. The decree ends with the instruction for the demarch Archias to inscribe the decision and erect the *stèle* in the *hieron* of Artemis Tauropolos (12-18).

In this decree the honorands, who unfortunately remain unnamed in what is left of the decree, thus receive the right to share in the *hiera* of Halai Araphenides. Although the size of the shares and the sort of *hiera* do not appear to have been further specified, it is stipulated that the honorands will receive

from τοῦ πλοῦ, and in the mid fourth-century fragmentary decree of the Eleusinians (*IG* II² 1188) for the *hierophant* Hierokleides of Paiania, who obviously already shared in most *hiera* of Eleusis, is *ateleia* alone specified with not mention of the right to share in the deme’s *hiera*.

Whenever the Piraeans sacrifice in the communal *hiera* Kallidamas is to receive a share as well equal to that of the other Piraeans and Kallidamas is to dine together with the Piraeans in all the *hiera* except in those where the Piraeans themselves customarily enter and no one else.

Apparently, there remained a core of Piraean *hiera* – in this case perhaps to be understood as “shrines” instead of “rites” as implied by the verb εἰσιέναι¹⁴⁶ – that would by law always remain exclusive to the Piraean *demotai* and Kallidamas was excluded from them. It must be observed, however, that the Piraean decree does not seem to exclude Kallidamas from entire rites, as most scholars assume it does, but rather only from the final act involved in sacrifice; it is only stated that Kallidamas is not to dine together with the Piraeans (συνεστιᾶσθαι Καλλιδάμαντα μετὰ Πειραιέων) in some restricted *hiera* that were specified by law, while it seems he will always receive a share from the communal sacrifices.¹⁴⁷ Similar to the Hephaisteia decree, which stipulated that metics received their shares of meat raw (IG I³ 82.24) indicating they were excluded from further participation, it seems that the Piraeans reserved for themselves the prerogative to feast on the meat in some particular *hiera* solely in the company of fellow Piraean *demotai*. In other words: Kallidamas seems to have been entitled to receive shares from all *hiera* of the Piraeans, but in some *hiera* he was excluded from the *hestiasis* with the other members of the deme that commonly followed after meat distribution.

It is very likely that faced with an enormous presence of outsiders in the deme of Piraeus, the Piraean *demotai* felt a strong need to highlight their own particular relationship with their deme by keeping some part of their *hiera* completely to themselves; in the cosmopolitan port, lines between different groups of people probably had to be drawn more clearly than in smaller rural demes that were faced with the presence of only few outsiders.¹⁴⁸ Although Kallidamas was accepted as a member of the deme Piraeus up to a very high

¹⁴⁶ Parker (2006) 66, understands the *hiera* in the decree as shrines. The infinitive εἰσιέναι means “to enter, to go into” but this could be used both literally, as to enter a structure, or in a more metaphorical sense, as to enter on an office (examples given in LSJ (9th ed.), or to enter on a rite or a group (e.g. IG II² 1283.30-31, which seems to refer to the new right of entrance a new group of *orgeones* of Bendis has to the *orgeones* in Piraeus and its rites).

¹⁴⁷ E.g. Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 205 and Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 66.

¹⁴⁸ This was already hinted at by Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 151 n.10. A similar argument was developed by Osborne (1991) 241, concerning the high occurrence of demotics on graves of Rhamnousians, for which see supra footnote 36 .

level, he did not become an equal of the *demotai*; there always remained some *hiera* that remained inaccessible to even the most honoured non-*demotai* living in Piraeus.

4.4 “Granting” deme membership

Let me end this section on awarding outsiders with a modern observation. In his eloquent article on ‘The *demos* and its subdivisions in classical Athens’ of 1990 Robin Osborne emphasised the extensive parallelisms between the *demos* as a whole and its subdivisions, which, according to him, could account for the solidarity of the citizen body throughout two centuries of democracy. He observed this parallelism not only in the technical language, nomenclature and the institutions of both *demos* and demes but also in the type of motions inscribed: on both levels honorific decrees seem to have been dominant. According to Osborne, however, one pivotal difference between the honours of the *demos* as a whole and the demes was that

though [demes] may honour members of other demes they can never give them membership of their own deme, in the way that the *demos* could grant citizenship. The closest parallel to the grant of citizenship is perhaps the local tax exemption which demes could grant.¹⁴⁹

In this section, and throughout this dissertation, I argue that membership of the Athenian community at large and, as we saw at the beginning of this chapter, of a deme community did not solely consist of a formal, legal status that was obtained by birth with certain civic rights and duties but also depended on active participation in that community, not least on participation in communal *hiera*. Although Osborne acknowledges the integrative implications of tax exemption for outsiders he only refers to the privilege of sharing in a groups’ *hiera* when he considers smaller religious communities, like the worshippers of the hero Paralos who granted one Meixegenes son of Mikon of Cholleidai a share in their sacrificial meal (*IG* II² 1254).¹⁵⁰ However, the *demos* and the demes were first and foremost religious communities whose full members had a right and obligation to look after and share in that community’s religious rites. Granting

¹⁴⁹ Osborne (1991) 273.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibidem*.

outsiders like the Theban Damasias a share in a deme's rites thus meant granting these individuals (partial) membership of the deme community. I therefore wish to nuance Osborne's view and suggest that the highest awards offered respectively by *demos* and deme were not so very different. While the *demos* could grant the formal award of citizenship to influential foreigners who had assisted the Athenians in their struggles against oligarchs, foreign enemies, or famine, demes could similarly award powerful outsiders the right to share in their *hiera* and thus mark them as members of their community. In the end, the two grants overlapped significantly: the honorands were granted the right to participate in one of the most defining activities of the honouring community.

In addition, it should be noted that similar to grants of citizenship, the grants of sharing in a deme's *hiera* could also be demarcated and toned down. So similar to the restriction in the grant of citizenship to the Plataians which probably contained the clause that they "shall be Athenians from this day, and shall have the same rights as the other Athenians, and shall share in everything in which the Athenians share, both in the *hiera* and the *hosia*, save any priesthood or religious office which belongs to a *genos*" ([Dem.] 59.104), the people who were honoured by the *demotai* of Halai Araphenides could share in the *hiera* of that deme but only for one year. Similarly, although acknowledged as member of the deme Eleusis both by his activities as (quasi-)choregos for the Eleusinian Dionysia and by the award of 100 drachmas from the communal fund to make a sacrifice, Damasias' sharing in the *hiera* of Eleusis nevertheless seems to have been of an exceptional nature.

Conclusion

We started this chapter by looking at the religious nature of the Kleisthenic demes. I proposed that deme membership did not solely depend on getting one's name recorded on a deme list but also on active participation in the deme community, especially in communal religious activities; the members of a particular deme were those people who took care of that deme's obligations to the gods.

Although it is likely that in 508 most deme communities consisted of the *demotai* who were enrolled in their native demes and their families, many demes were soon faced with the growing presence of many Athenian and metic immigrants. One way to integrate these newcomers in the deme community was

to grant them a share in the deme's *hiera*, while differences in shares could express differences in membership. We have seen that, although all demes shared a similar notion concerning deme membership, the implementations of that notion varied widely from deme to deme. This variety should not surprise us as it was itself a typical feature of Athenian sub-divisions.¹⁵¹ Some concluding remarks may nevertheless serve to highlight this variety even more and draw attention to the innovative developments that went on in the demes.

Some scholars have tried to classify deme *hiera* according to who could participate in them between (1) *hiera* from which outsiders were always excluded, (2) *hiera* in which outsiders could be included by honorific decree, and (3) *hiera* in which outsiders were normally included.¹⁵² This chapter has hopefully shown that such a view is highly problematic. For although the rural Dionysia, for instance, can generally be said to have had a very inclusive character variation nevertheless reigned supreme both in the context of single celebrations, for instance between the focus on *demotai* as *choregoi* and the others as spectators, and from deme to deme as we saw in the case of the Ikarian *choregia* which was extremely open compared to the organisation of the *choregia* in other demes. Another example of the problems of these modern categories is the fact that the only instance in which we find a core of deme *hiera* from which outsiders were always excluded comes from Piraeus, which, as we saw, can probably be explained by the particular, cosmopolitan nature of that deme.

We should therefore treat every deme as a community in its own right, one might even say as a polis in its own right. In that way we saw how in ca. 460 the Skambonidai decreed that *metoikoi* should receive a share from a sacrifice to Leos equal to that of the Skambonidai. Interestingly enough, this deme was the only one, as far as we know, to have conceptualised a separate label for foreign immigrants in a religious context. We have seen that other demes either grouped Athenian and foreign immigrants together as “the others living in the deme” or focussed on individual immigrant benefactors. That Skambonidai conceptualised

¹⁵¹ On uniformity vs. diversity concerning deme practices: Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 56-63. Cf. C. Patterson, *Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451/0 BC* (Ann Arbor 1976) 179-89, on PCL as a uniform policy replacing the varying marital practices and enrolment procedures in the demes. On diversity in the phratries: Lambert, *Phratries*² (1998) 143-89, on differences in organisation of the Apatouria and the admission of new members at that festival.

¹⁵² E.g. Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 205-6: “It is probably legitimate to assume that most demes did divide their cults and festivals threefold along these lines”, followed by Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 66-7.

its own metic status is probably best explained by the large group of metics living in the deme and by the location of the deme in the city, which made it likely that Skambonidai was easily influenced by the ways of the polis, like the incorporation of metics into the Panathenaic ritual in the early fifth century. A similar case of a deme mimicking the polis was found in Phrearrhioi where in ca. 300 the *demotai* decided to include “others” in the *hiera* of their local Eleusinion in a way which recalls the inclusive policy of the Eleusinian Mysteries.

From this we should not conclude, however, that demes were compliant followers of developments on polis level. This is already clear from some of the deme decrees that were discussed in this chapter. Several fundamental evaluative and technical terms made their first appearance in a deme context; the Ikarian decree regulating the *choregia* for their Dionysia contains the earliest attestation of *antidosis* (*IG* I³ 254.5), epigraphically *philotimia* first occurs in an honorary decree in a deme context before becoming a key laudatory concept on polis level, and *eusebeia* is first mentioned as a reason to be honoured in the honorific decree for the Theban Damasias (*IG* II² 1186.16-17, 23). Perhaps most significant in the current context is the fact that the plural designation of resident immigrants as *metoikoi* is possibly first attested in the Skambonidai decree regulating their participation in the deme’s rites. In that sense the demes can be considered true testing grounds for notions that would eventually be taken over by the polis.¹⁵³

The opening up of the Ikarian *choregia* to outsiders in ca. 440-431 was not a completely new innovation as metics had become liable to serve as *choregos* at the Lenaia around the same time, but it was exceptional on deme level. It was probably in an attempt to put the funding of their Dionysia on a more solid footing that made the *demotai* decide to include wealthy immigrants in the organisation of their festival, possibly one of the most famous rural Dionysia as Ikarion was named after the hero who received Dionysos in Attica. In that way the Ikarians could achieve financial security for their main *hiera* and at the same time incorporate the newcomers in their deme. The collective designation of these newcomers as “those living in Ikarion”, in addition, demonstrates that the

¹⁵³Although *philotimia* first appears in the middle of the fourth century in the context of deme decrees (our decree from Eleusis, *IG* II² 1182 from Myrrhinous, *AE* (1925-1926) 168 from Halai Araphenides, and *SEG* 42.112 (RO 46) from Halai Aixonides), Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 244 n.99, finds it “scarcely imaginable that this terminology originated in the demes”. Cf. D. Whitehead (1983). I see no good reason why this would not have been the case. Also see Blok (2009) 30-1, discussing the first occurrence of *hosios* money, i.e. in the Ikarian decree *IG* I³ 253, and on developments originating in the demes.

Ikarians did not care to differentiate between Athenian and metic immigrants, perhaps because of the relatively small immigrant presence in the deme.

Finally, a truly unique feature of the demes was the honouring of powerful benefactors with a share in a deme's *hiera*. We never find these kinds of honours awarded to outsiders in polis decrees and I suggested that such a grant should probably be understood as a grant of citizenship on deme level. Additionally, it can be noted that most deme communities should probably be understood as face-to-face societies in which people were more concerned with each other on an individual basis than the Athenian *demos* was on polis level.¹⁵⁴ On polis level the Athenians often placed the people living in the polis in abstract categories, like metics, *politai*, *xenoi*, and slaves, encompassing widely diverse groups of people. The honorific decrees for outsiders like Damasias, by contrast, demonstrate that in the much smaller deme communities people were more disposed to negotiate and express the different backgrounds of the inhabitants living in their deme in a more detailed manner and on a more individual basis. Whereas on polis level a foreigner who decided to settle in Athens could be labelled either a *xenos* or a metic, the relative autonomy of demes resulted in a variety of labels and practices concerning the immigrants living in their community, not least concerning their participation the deme's *hiera*.

¹⁵⁴ The key passages that emphasise the vastness of the Athenian polis are: Thuc. 8.66.3 on how the *demos* did not know how many oligarchic conspirators there were in 411 because of the great size of the Attika and Aristot. *Pol.* 42.1 who states that “for *xenoi* and aliens it is easy to participate politically in an overpopulated polis; because of the excessive number of inhabitants it is not difficult to elude notice”. Cf. Cohen, *Athenian nation* (2000) 104-29, for a convincing rebuttal of the “modern myth” that the ancient Athenian polis was a face-to-face community.

Appendix: the rendering of the names of choregoi in demes¹⁵⁵

n=name

p=patronymic

d=demotic

e=ethnikon

Choregoi on choregic monuments

1. <i>IG</i> II ² 3094 (Ikarion, early 4 th)	(<i>choregos</i>) n+p	Archippos s. of Archedektos
2. <i>IG</i> II ² 3095 (Ikarion, mid 4 th)	(3 <i>choregoi</i>) n+p	Ergasos s. of Phanomachos Phanomachos s. of Ergasos Diognetos s. of Ergasos
3. <i>IG</i> II ² 3098 (Ikarion, mid 4 th)	(3 <i>choregoi</i>) n	Hagnias Xanthippos Xanthides
4. <i>IG</i> II ² 3099 (Ikarion, mid 4 th)	(<i>choregos</i>) n+p	Mnesilochos s. of Mnesiphilos
5. <i>SEG</i> 44.131 (Ikarion, ca. 300)	---	---
6. <i>Thorikos</i> 9.85 (Thorikos, 400-350)	(<i>choregos</i>) n (+?)	Py[---]
7. <i>IG</i> I ³ 970 (Eleusis, 402/1)	(2 <i>choregoi</i>) n+p	Gnathis s. of Timokedes Anaxandrides s. of Timagoros
8. <i>IG</i> II ² 3100 (Eleusis, mid 4 th)	(<i>choregos</i>) n+p	Athenodoros s. of Go[---]
9. <i>IG</i> II ² 3107 (Eleusis, 4 th)	(<i>choregos</i>) n+p	Hieron of A[---]
10. <i>IG</i> II ² 3092 (Acharnai, early 4 th) ¹⁵⁶	(4 <i>choregoi</i>) n+p	Mnesistratos s. of Misgones Dioppeithes s. of Diodoros Mnesimachos s. of Mnesistratos Theotimos s. of Diotimos
11. <i>IG</i> II ² 3106 (Acharnai, 4 th)	(<i>choregos</i>) n+p	[---] s. of Demostatos(?)
12. <i>SEG</i> 54.302 (Acharnai, 4 th) ¹⁵⁷	(3 <i>choregoi</i>) n+p	Kleophon s. of Kleomedontes

¹⁵⁵ A complicating factor in identifying deme *choregoi* is the phenomenon of choregic dedications erected in the deme but celebrating an “urban” victory or victories, on which see Whitehead, *Demes* (1986) 234-5 and Wilson, *Khoregia* (2000) 246-9, who both mention three candidates (*SEG* 23.102; *IG* II² 3101; *IG* II² 3091). Although the corpus of such commemorations remains small, we always have to remind ourselves of the possibility that a choregic monument found outside Athens can in fact commemorate an urban victory. In this appendix I have included those monuments and inscriptions as found in Wilson and the *SEG* of the past twenty years that have not (yet) given rise to debate.

¹⁵⁶ See A. Makres, *Horos* 10-12 (1992-98) 63-70, for the publication of text that was inscribed on the right side of the stone, including the reference to two *choregoi* (*EM* 10301).

		Theodotos s. of Dorotheos
		Theopropos s. of Pheidyllos
13. <i>IG</i> II ² 3097 (Paiania, mid 4 th)	(<i>choregos</i>) n+p+d	Demosthenes s. of Demainetes of Paiania
14. <i>IG</i> II ² 3108 (Rhamnous, 4 th ?) ¹⁵⁸	(<i>choregos</i>) n(+p)+d	[---] of Rhamnous
15. <i>IG</i> II ² 3109 (Rhamnous, early 3 rd) ¹⁵⁹	(<i>choregos</i>) n+p+d	Megakles s. of Megakleos of Rhamnous
16. <i>SEG</i> 40.181 (Rhamnous, c. 250?) ¹⁶⁰	---	---
17. <i>IG</i> II ² 3096 (Aigilia, ante mid 4 th)	(3 <i>choregoi</i>) n+p	Timosthenes s. of Meixonides Meixonides s. of Timosthenes Kleostratos s. of Timosthenes
18. <i>SEG</i> 51.193 (Athmonon, 4th)	---	---

Deme decrees honouring *choregoi*

1. <i>Thorikos</i> 9.83 (Thorikos, 4 th)	(3 <i>choregoi</i>) n+p (+?)	Ameipsias s. of Mnesi[---] Lido s. of Mnesi[---] [---]os s. of Dorokles
2. <i>IG</i> II ² 1198 (Aixone, 326/5)	(2 <i>choregoi</i>) n+p	Demokrates s. of Euphiletos Hegsias s. of Lysistratos
3. <i>IG</i> II ² 1200 (Aixone, 317/6)	(2 <i>choregoi</i>) n+p	Leontios s. of Dion Glaukon s. of Kallikrates
4. <i>SEG</i> 36.186 (Aixone, 313/2)	(2 <i>choregoi</i>) n+p	Auteas s. of Autokleos Philoxenides s. of Philippos
5. <i>IG</i> II ² 1186 (Eleusis, mid 4 th)	(“ <i>choregos</i> ”) n+p+e ¹⁶¹	Damasias, s. of Dionysios of Thebes
6. <i>IG</i> II ² 1178 (Ikarion, ante mid 4 th)	(2 <i>choregoi</i>) n	Epikrates Praxias

¹⁵⁷ D. Summa, ‘Una dedica coregica inedita’, *ZPE* 150 (2004) 147-8, has brought to light a choregic inscription from Acharnai that was recorded in Kirchner’s notebook but never published. In the 1940s, W. Peek offered a restoration, also unpublished, which I follow. For both texts see *SEG* 54.302.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. B.C. Petrakos, Ο Δῆμος του Ραμνοῦντος II. Οἱ Ἐπιγραφές (*BAAH* 181/182) (Athens 1999) no. 115.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Petrakos, no. 120.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Petrakos, no. 141.

¹⁶¹ It is debatable whether Damasias was a true *choregos* or simply performed all duties associated with *choregia*, on which see above p. 225.

Bend it like Bendis

The integration of Bendis and her Thracian worshippers

From the mid-sixth century onwards Athens witnessed the arrival of an enormous group of Thracian immigrants, who brought with them one of their most important native deities: the huntress-goddess Bendis. Initially a foreign cult mainly practiced by Thracians, the cult of Bendis in Piraeus became an important Athenian polis cult in the fifth and fourth centuries. The cult continued to flourish at least until the third century when a group of Thracian worshippers, now called *orgeones*, could still boast that in the past

4. τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων δεδωκότος τοῖς Θραιξί μ-
όνοις τῶν ἄλλων ἔθνῶν τὴν ἔγκτησιν καὶ τὴν ἴδρυσιν τοῦ
ἱεροῦ κατὰ τὴν μ[α]ντείαν τὴν ἐγ Δωδώνης καὶ τὴν ποιπὴν π-
8. ἐπεὶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας τῆς ἐκκ του πρυτανείου

the Athenian *demos* had given to the Thracians alone of all *ethne* the right to own property and to build a shrine in accordance with the oracular response from Dodona and to send the *pompe* from the Hestia outside the Prytaneion (*JG* II² 1283.4-7).

The introduction of the cult of Bendis at Athens is often described as exceptional as it seems to have been one of the few foreign cults officially accepted by the Athenians. It is also often emphasised that this was one of few cases in which metics were allowed to play an active role in Athenian polis religion. Although, as we have seen, metics shared in more polis *hiera* than is commonly recognised, and although other foreign gods, like Egyptian Isis, Phrygian Kybele and Thracian Boreas, to name but a few, were also accepted in Attica in the classical period, the cult of Bendis should indeed be understood as exceptional for several reasons.

First, Athenian interest in Bendis and her cult was exceptional compared to Athenian interferences with other foreign cults. The Egyptians, for instance, were, like the Thracians, granted the right to own property to build a sanctuary for their native goddess Isis. Isis, however, never received a grand polis festival like Bendis did.¹ Secondly, the position of the Thracian worshippers within the cult is also remarkable: as Bendis was gradually incorporated into the Athenian pantheon, her Thracian worshippers continued to play an important role in the running of her cult, the control of her sanctuary, and in the organisation of her major polis festival, the Bendideia. Finally, it was the common ethnic background of the Thracian worshippers that was expressed and negotiated through demarcated participation in the polis cult of Bendis and not a somewhat artificially conceptualised label that grouped together a widely diverse amalgam of immigrants under the general heading “metics”, as happened, for instance, in the context of the Panathenaia. The polis cult of Bendis was, as far as we can tell, the only one in which attention was paid to a specific group of immigrants, thus signalling the importance of Thracians as a group within the Athenian community. The exceptionality of Bendis’ cult in Athens was, in other words, a matter of degree: Athenian interest in a foreign cult was never so strong, the involvement of metics in a polis cult never again became so pronounced, and Athenian attention for immigrants was never so specifically focussed on one particular ethnic group.

It is evident, then, that a dissertation about the integration of resident foreigners in the Athenian community through their regulated sharing in polis *hiera* is incomplete without looking at the extraordinary integration of Bendis and her Thracian worshippers. Although Bendis’ cult has been thoroughly discussed before, I hope to offer some new insights by focussing on the process by which Bendis and her worshippers were gradually accepted as part of Athens’ official religious structure and what this says about the ways in which the Athenian *demos* incorporated these foreigners into their polis community.²

¹ On Isis in Athens: R.R. Simms, ‘Isis in classical Athens’, *CJ* 84 (1988/9) 216-21.

² P. Hartwig, *Bendis. Eine archaologische Untersuchung* (Leipzig and Berlin 1897) was the first to discuss the cult in detail. Important contributions were made by R.R. Simms, ‘The cult of the Thracian goddess Bendis in Athens and Attica’, *Ancient World* 18 (1988) 59-76 and R. Parker, *Athenian Religion. A history* (Oxford 1996) 170-5. Most recently: C. Planeaux, ‘The date of Bendis’ entry into Attica’, *CJ* 96 (2000/1) 165-92, who tenuously argues for a full-blown organisation of Bendis’ shrine, cult, *orgeones* and festival in ca. 429-13, and C.O. Pache, ‘Barbarian bond: Thracian Bendis among the Athenians’ in: S.R. Asirvatham, C.O. Pache and J. Watrous (eds.), *Between Magic and Religion. Interdisciplinary studies in ancient Mediterranean religion and society* (Lanham 2001) 3-11 and E. Stavrianopoulou,

It has often been argued that the official acceptance of Bendis' cult should be placed in the context of foreign diplomacy between Athens and the kings of Thrace in the 430s.³ However, this theory can explain only a few pieces of the puzzle. Instead, it seems that the gradual acceptance of Bendis and her worshippers is rather to be understood as a way to gradually accept and integrate the many Thracians living in Attica. By accepting Bendis' cult as a polis cult, the Athenians accepted both Bendis and her Thracian worshippers as members of the Athenian community, while differentiation between Thracian and Athenian worshippers highlighted the fact that they were still different as a group. In the following I will treat all aspects of the gradual acceptance of Bendis and her Thracian worshippers in a chronological order to demonstrate how a foreign cult could become a polis cult and how a foreign goddess and her foreign worshippers could become accepted members of the Athenian community. But let us first look at the Thracians who were accepted in this way.

1 Thracians in Attika

1.1 From plague to συγγένεια

Faced with the extraordinary position of Bendis in Athens, scholars have formulated various explanations as to why her cult should have become such an important polis cult in the classical period. William Scott Ferguson, for instance, argued that the introduction of Bendis' cult around 430 should be associated with the plague that ravaged Athens in this period.⁴ Bendis is, however, never described as a healing deity and this explanation has now largely been rejected.

M. P. Nilsson was the first to explain the official recognition of Bendis' cult as politically motivated. He argued that the evidence for Bendis in Attica can be divided into three periods – the 430s, the Lykourgan period in the 330s, and around

‘Gemeinsam feiern, getrennt verehren: zum Kult der thrakischen Göttin Bendis in Attika’ in: C. Ambos et al. (eds.), *Die Welt der Rituale. Von der Antike bis heute* (Darmstadt 2005) 144-55, who both (over)emphasise that although Thracians and Athenians both worshipped Bendis they did so separately.

³ Foreign diplomacy: M.P. Nilsson, ‘Bendis in Athen’, *From the collections of Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek* 3 (1942) 169-88 = *Opuscula Selecta* vol. 3 (Lund 1960) 55-80. This view was most recently defended by R. Garland, *Introducing new gods: the politics of Athenian religion* (New York 1992) 111-4.

⁴ W.S. Ferguson, ‘Orgeonika’, *Hesp. Suppl.* 8 (1949) 157-62. Cf. Planeaux (2000/1) 179-81, who associates Bendis' companion Deloptes with the plague.

260 – two of which were marked by intensified diplomacy between Athens and Thrace. In Nilsson’s view, the Athenian decision to accept Bendis and celebrate her festival on a grand scale was motivated by the Athenian wish to ensure Thracian support of the Odrysian kings against Sparta in the fifth century and again against Macedonia in the fourth.⁵

Although diplomacy may certainly have heightened interest in the cult, Nilsson’s explanation seems incomplete. The acceptance of Bendis occurred more gradually than Nilsson was willing to admit, as we will soon see. Robert Parker has therefore argued for a broader approach, which takes into consideration the status of Thrace among the Athenians not only as savage country but also as “indispensable for economic and strategic reasons” as it was located on the way to the grain supplies of the Black Sea and could operate as buffer state against the growing power of Macedonia. He further points to the Athenian colonies at Brea and Amphipolis and emphasises the ideological link between Athens and Thrace.⁶ This ideological link was described as a kinship, a *συγγένεια* by Xenophon (*Anab.* 7.2.31), which the historian saw embodied in the mythological marriage of the Thracian Tereus and Prokne, the daughter of the Athenian king Pandion. Parker also refers to the physical presence of Thracians in Attica, especially to Thracian slaves and mercenaries.⁷ I suggest taking this approach even further. To understand the reasons behind and the implications of the acceptance of Bendis in Attica we should, in addition to the rather abstract notion of a *συγγένεια* between Thrace and Athens, take into full consideration the very real and influential presence of many Thracians in Attica in the classical period.

1.2 Thracian mercenaries: from Peisistratos onto the Parthenon Frieze

The first time we hear of the presence of Thracians in Athens is in the context of Peisistratos’ second return to Athens around 540 when, according to Herodotus (1.64), the tyrant tried to root “his power in a strong guard and his possessions collected both from Athens and from the district of the river Strymon”, a river in

⁵ See footnote 3.

⁶ Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 174-5. Cf. Z.H. Archibald, ‘Thracian cult - from practice to belief’ in: G.R. Tsetschladze (ed.), *Ancient Greeks west and east* (Leiden 1999) 456-61, who sees religious compatibility as a likely explanation for the cult’s acceptance.

⁷ Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 174. However, he finds it unlikely these groups were responsible for getting Bendis accepted in Athens.

western Thrace.⁸ It appears that from that moment onwards Thracians constituted a considerable force among the mercenaries who were fighting for the Athenians. In 415, for instance, Athens witnessed the arrival of 1,300 Thracian soldiers, probably so-called peltasts, named after their crescent shields (πέλται). They had been sent on the request of the Athenians to assist them on their expedition to Sicily. Unfortunately, they arrived too late. As the Athenians did not wish to lose any money on them – the pay was a drachma a day per soldier – they were immediately sent back with the order to do as much damage to the enemy as possible. And so it happened: after taking some booty in Tanagra, the Thracians continued their way to Boeotia where they marched onto Mykalessos. The following events were captured by Thucydides (7.29.4-5):

ἐσπεσόντες δὲ οἱ Θραῖκες ἐς τὴν Μυκαλησσὸν τὰς τε οἰκίας καὶ τὰ ἱερά ἐπόρθουν καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐφόνευον φειδόμενοι οὔτε πρεσβυτέρας οὔτε νεωτέρας ἡλικίας, ἀλλὰ πάντας ἐξῆς, ὅτῳ ἐντύχοιεν, καὶ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας κτείνοντες, καὶ προσέτι καὶ ὑποζύγια καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα ἐμψυχαῖ ἴδοιεν τὸ γὰρ γένος τὸ τῶν Θρακῶν ὁμοίᾳ τοῖς μάλιστα τοῦ βαρβαρικοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἂν θάρσῃ, φονικώτατόν ἐστιν. καὶ τότε ἄλλη τε ταραχὴ οὐκ ὀλίγη καὶ ἰδέα πᾶσα καθειστήκει ὀλέθρου, καὶ ἐπιπεσόντες διδασκαλείῳ παιδῶν, ὅπερ μέγιστον ἦν αὐτόθι καὶ ἄρτι ἔτυχον οἱ παῖδες ἐσεληλυθότες, κατέκοψαν πάντας· καὶ ξυμφορὰ τῇ πόλει πάσῃ οὐδεμιᾶς ἦσσαν μᾶλλον ἑτέρας ἀδόκητός τε ἐπέπεσεν αὕτη καὶ δεινὴ.

The Thracians bursting into Mykalessos, sacked the houses and temples, and butchered the inhabitants, sparing neither youth nor age, but killing all they fell in with, one after the other, children and women, and even beasts of burden, and whatever other living creatures they saw; the Thracian race, like the bloodiest of the barbarians, being ever most so when it has nothing to fear. Everywhere confusion reigned and death in all its shapes; and in particular they attacked a boys' school, the largest there was in the place, into which the children had just gone, and they massacred them all. In short, the disaster

⁸ Cf. [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 15.2: “and first he collected a settlement at a place near the Gulf of Thermae called Rhaecelus, but from there he went on to the neighborhood of Pangaeus, from where he got money and hired soldiers, and in the eleventh year went again to Eretria, and now for the first time set about an attempt to recover his power by force”. J.G. Best, *Thracian peltasts and their influence on Greek warfare* (Groningen 1969) 5-7 and 120-33, lists images of Thracian soldiers on Attic vases from the Peisistratid period. There is a *loutrophoros* in the National Museum of Athens (AM 1170) dated to 465-460, the decoration of which is described as “Thracian knights”.

falling upon the whole town was unsurpassed in magnitude, and unapproached by any in suddenness and in horror.⁹

After 415 we still find many Thracians fighting for Athens: on a fragmentary naval catalogue of around 400 (*IG I³ 1032*) we find eight Thracians (115; 248; 283; 390; 391; 395; 406; 466). On a similar, though more complete list dated to around 300 (*IG II² 1956*) we find no less than forty-eight of them (1-46; 184-86) – they constitute the largest group by far.¹⁰

The presence of Thracian soldiers in the streets of Athens was even such a familiar sight that they appear several times in the comedies of Aristophanes. In the famous opening scene of his *Acharnians* (133-171), the wage for a group of Odomanti, a Thracian tribe living east of the Strymon river, is one of the first points on the agenda to be discussed by the assembly. And in *Lysistrata* the heroine of the play describes the Agora by referring to how “nearby a Thracian was wildly shaking his shield (πέλτην) like Tereus, to frighten a fig-girl while unseen he snatched from her fruit-trays the ripest away” (563-564).

Already in the sixth century Thracian soldiers made their appearance on Attic vases. Jan Best lists around seventy examples from the 540s onwards.¹¹ Interestingly, we also frequently find Athenian men, usually horsemen (*hippeis*), dressed in typical Thracian clothes. In his catalogue of barbarians in Attic art, W. Raeck lists ten certain and four probable examples of this “Thrakermode” among the Athenians.¹² The earliest example is probably found on a black-figure belly amphora in Toronto (inv. no. 299) dated to around 530, i.e. only two decades after Peisistratos had brought with him a group of Thracians to protect him. On the right we see a man on horseback looking back at a woman who has both arms raised in the air. The man is dressed in high boots, a *chiton* covered by a patterned cloak, and a fur hat with long ears and a neck flap, a so-called *alopekis*. The boots (*embades*),

⁹ See also Thuc. 4.129.2, on the presence of 1,000 Thracian mercenaries among the Athenian forces going to Skione and Mende in 423. On Thracian peltasts in Greek military service: Best, *Peltasts* (1969).

¹⁰ Cf. V.J. Rosivach, ‘The Thracians of *IG II² 1956*’, *KLIO* 82 (2000) 379-81.

¹¹ Best, *Peltasts* (1969) 144-5, lists depictions of twenty-three peltasts, eleven *akontists*, thirty-one horsemen, and seven archers in Thracian dress.

¹² W. Raeck, *Zum Barbarenbild in der Kunst Athens im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Bonn 1981) 67-100, discusses depictions of Thracians and Athenians in Thracian dress. Among the latter he includes depictions of 1) men dressed in a mixture of Athenian/Thracian dress or armour, 2) those in Thracian dress in a strictly Athenian context, like a farewell scene, and 3) those depicting typical Athenian elite behaviour, like the hunt or horsemanship.

the patterned cloak (a *zeira*), and the *alopekis* are typical Thracian clothing items, while the context, a farewell scene, is distinctively Athenian. We should therefore probably identify the man as an Athenian horseman dressed in Thracian clothes. The most famous examples of this “Thrakermode” are the eight horsemen on the Parthenon Frieze, who are rendered with *embades*, *zeirai* and *alopekoi* (S2-S7, W8 and W15).¹³

It seems, then, that from ca. 530 to the end of the fifth century, when we find our latest examples, it was not uncommon and perhaps even chic, as Jennifer Neils suggested, for Athenian *hippeis* to be depicted in costly Thracian dress.¹⁴ Although we cannot be certain of the origins and motives behind the adoption of this fashion – practicality¹⁵ or imported by Athenians with belongings in Thrace as foreign status symbols – the Thracians and their dress apparently made quite an impact on the Athenian elite.

1.3 Athenian-Thracian marriages: Tereus and Prokne in real life

That the Athenian elite were interested in Thrace and its inhabitants is also clear from the many belongings they had in Thrace and from the several attested marriages between renowned Athenians and Thracians. The tyrant Peisistratos, Miltiades the elder, who established a colony in the Thracian Chersonese around 540, and the historian Thucydides all had belongings in Thrace, mostly consisting of mines.¹⁶ These belongings were probably not sufficient ground to adopt a Thracian deity and escort her back to Athens, although it could of course result in a more tolerant disposition toward foreign gods in general.

The same can be argued for the many Athenians who in the fifth and fourth centuries went on colonising or military expeditions to Thrace to fight against

¹³ J. Neils, *The Parthenon Frieze* (Cambridge 2001) 135-6. Cf. M. Robertson and A. Frantz, *The Parthenon Frieze* (London 1975) 46, who suggest that the two bearded horsemen (W8, W15) are probably to be identified as the two hipparchs, whose responsibility it was, according to Xenophon (*Hipp.* 3.1), “to make the processions during the festivals worth seeing”.

¹⁴ Neils, *Frieze* (2001) 136. It seems no other barbarian dress was adopted in Athens; M.F. Vos, *Scythian archers in archaic attic vase-painting* (Groningen 1963) showed that archers in Scythian dress were Scythians and not Athenians as was sometimes assumed.

¹⁵ Raeck, *Barbarenbild* (1981) n.269 and K.D. Morrow, *Greek footwear and the dating of sculpture* (Madison 1985) 66. Cf. Xen. *Anab.* 7.4.4, who gives a description of these Thracian clothing items.

¹⁶ Peisistratos: Hdt. 2.64.1; [Arist.] *Ath.Pol.* 15.2. Miltiades: Hdt. 6.34-37, 132-136. Thucydides: Thuc. 4.105; Plut., *Kim.* 4.

Thracians, Persians, Spartans and Macedonians, for instance, in 437 when Athens wanted to colonize the Nine Ways (later Amphipolis) during which, according to Thucydides (1.100), 10,000 Athenian colonists were killed by Thracians, or during Athenian campaigns to Amphipolis against the Spartan general Brasidas, or during Iphikrates' campaigns in Thrace in the 380s.¹⁷ These men might have become more open toward Thracian customs but it seems unlikely they were the ones who introduced Bendis at Athens. In fact, as we will soon see, Bendis was initially worshipped by Thracians in Athens and not by Athenian soldiers or colonists.

What seems of greater importance for the Athenian acceptance of Bendis' cult is the presence of many Thracians in Athens and it is in this context that the many marriages between prominent Athenian men and Thracian women should be considered. Perhaps the most famous example is the marriage between the celebrated general of the battle of Marathon, Miltiades, and the Thracian Hegesipyle, the daughter of Oloros, king of the Thracian Sopaia. This meant that the leading politician of the 460s, Kimon, the son of Miltiades, descended from Thracians on his mother's side.¹⁸ He was by no means the only one. The father of the historian Thucydides went by the Thracian name Oloros (Thuc. 4.104-5), while his maternal grandmother was probably a sister of Kimon. It is even stated in Marcellinus (*Vita Thuc.* 19) that the historian himself married a rich Thracian wife. The politician Kleophon was mocked in comedy (*e.g.* Ar., *Frogs* 680-681) for being of Thracian descent on his mother's side.

We also hear that the Thracian king Sitalkes married the sister of the Athenian *proxenos* Nymphodoros of Abdera in 437, that king Kotys married the daughter of the Athenian general Iphikrates, and that king Seuthes promised his daughter to Xenophon.¹⁹ Later sources further indicate that the Athenian general Timotheos was the son of Konon and a Thracian *hetaire* (Ath. 577b) and that Antisthenes, a philosopher from the circle of Sokrates, was the son of an Athenian and a Thracian maid (Diog. Laert. 6.1). Plutarch (*Them.* 1.1) mentions that Themistokles, too, had a Thracian mother. Analogue to the mythological marriage of the Thracian king Tereus and the Athenian princess Prokne, these marriages created a very real *συγγένεια* between Athens and Thrace.

¹⁷ Cf. B.H. Isaac, *The Greek settlements in Thrace until the Macedonian conquest* (Leiden 1986).

¹⁸ Hdt. 6.39-40; Plut. *Kim.* 4.1.

¹⁹ Sitalkes + Nymphodoros' daughter: Hdt. 7.137; Thuc. 2.29.1. Kotys + Iphikrates' daughter: Anaxandr. fr. 42; Ath. 4.131. Seuthes' promise to Xenophon: Xen. *Anab.* 7.2.37.

There are two grave monuments that also indicate that Athenian men were marrying Thracian women. On a grave monument found near the Dipylon Gate and dated to after 350 (*IG II² 10208*) we read:

Πειθίας Λέοντος
Σαλαμίσιος.
Θραίττα.

Λέων
Πειθίου
Σαλαμίσιος.
Πλαγγών
Χαρίου γυνή.
Πειθίας Λέοντος Σαλαμίσιος.

In her discussion of grave monuments of barbarians in Attica, Balbina Bäbler suggested that the father of the first-mentioned Peithias can perhaps be identified with the Leon Salaminios whom Sokrates, at the risk of his own life, refused to arrest when ordered to do so by the Thirty Tyrants – but who was subsequently arrested by one Meletos and put to death without a trial.²⁰ Who Thraitta was, who is associated with the first Peithias, is less clear. Her name, however, obviously indicates a Thracian link.²¹ No other woman is associated with Peithias in the

²⁰ B. Bäbler, *Fleissige Thrakerinnen und wehrhafte Skythen. Nichtgriechen im klassischen Athen und ihre archäologische Hinterlassenschaft* (Stuttgart and Leipzig 1998) no. 112, 273-4. On Leon Salaminios: Andoc. 1.94, Plat. *Apol.* 32c, and Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.39.

²¹ Osborne, *LGPN* lists several, mostly late sixth and early fifth-century, Thraittas and Thraixes as “Athenian?”. I could not securely link an Athenian with a Thracian name like Thraitta, Thraix, or Bendidora. However, in light of Perikles’ Citizenship Law and the later law against Athenians marrying a foreigner, our Thraitta cannot have been a Thracian woman, though her name clearly hints at a Thracian connection. On ethnics used as personal names: P.M. Fraser, ‘Ethnics as personal names’ in: S. Hornblower and E. Matthews (eds.), *Greek personal names. Their value as evidence* (Oxford 2000) 149-57, who shows that the practice probably derived from the slave market. He argues that an ethnic as name does not necessarily indicate a specific ethnic background, though it does represent an individual relationship with a foreign country or city. See, for instance, the many Athenodoroi in Athens with a non-Athenian background or the famous names of the sons of Kimon and Themistokles. On slaves and slave names, among them many derived from ethnics: S. Lauffer, *Die Bergwerksklaven von Laureion* (Mainz 1956) and C. Fragiadakis, *Die attischen Sklavennamen von der spätarchaischen Epoche bis in die römische Kaiserzeit , eine historische und soziologische Untersuchung* (Mannheim 1986), though in the case of Thracians these works are largely overtaken by Bäbler, *Fleissige Thrakerinnen* (1998).

inscription and there is therefore a possibility that the son of an Athenian victim of the Thirty was married to a woman with Thracian ties.²²

On another grave stele dated to the same period and found at Keratea we read: Τίμων. Θραῖτα (*sic*). Ἑρπυλλίς (*IG* II² 12808). The *stèle* is topped with a relief on which we see a seated woman reaching out her hand to a standing bearded man. In between them stands another woman.²³ Timon was a common Greek name; *LGPN* II lists fifty-three Timons living in Athens. One of the two named women in the inscription was probably his wife, who is depicted on the relief as reaching out to him. Herpyllis was a common *hetaire* name. Could it be then that Thraitta was the concubine (if Timon was an Athenian citizen) or wife (if he was a metic) of Timon? Unfortunately it is impossible to obtain certainty about the status of both these Thraittas.

1.4 Thracians commemorated: slave or metic?

Thracians or people with a Thracian association are often mentioned on grave monuments.²⁴ In fact, they constitute the largest group among the barbarians with grave monuments in Attica by far: we have twenty-five grave monuments for Thracians while the second largest group, the Phoenicians, only counts eighteen. Many of these Thracians were slaves: we find typical slave names like Agathon (Good) and Kteson (Possession or Thing) followed by the Thracian ethnicon (Θραῖξ) or a more common Greek name like Eirene followed by her Thracian ethnicon and with the comment that she was χρηστή (useful), a quality that was attributed to slaves on many grave monuments.²⁵

However, not all Thracians commemorated on these graves are unmistakably slaves. What to make, for instance, of Philonikos whose fourth-century grave stele (*IG* II² 8927) was found near Laureion? Bähler emphasises that it is uncertain whether he is a mining slave since he is mentioned with his father's name and the

²² In light of Perikles' Citizenship Law and the later law against Athenians marrying a foreigner, Thraitta can not have been a Thracian woman, though her name clearly hints at a Thracian connection.

²³ Cf. Bähler's no. 118.

²⁴ For the use of Thracian derived names, like Thraix or Thraitta, as indication of a Thracian association and not necessarily a Thracian background, see the article on ethnic s as personal names by Fraser (2000).

²⁵ Agathon: *IG* II² 8896 = Bähler's no. 102 = *FRA* 2489 and *IG* II² 8897 = Bähler's no. 103 = *FRA* 2488. Kteson: *IG* II² 8913 = Bähler's no. 105 = *FRA* 2552. Kteso: *Ag. XVII* 508 = Bähler's no. 106 = *FRA* 2551. Eirene: *Ag. XVII* 506 = Bähler's no. 124 = *FRA* 2525.

inscription is carefully inscribed.²⁶ And what was the status of Thraitta who was commemorated with a relief on which we see a woman with a spindle (Bäbler no. 122)? Does the spindle reflect Thraitta's past occupation in the weaving industry in which both enslaved and free foreign women found a living? Similar concerns can be expressed for those Thracians who are only mentioned with their single name, like on the fifth-century *stèle* of Thraitta in Athens (*IG II² 11686*) or on the fourth-century *stèle* with palmette for another Thraitta at Kalamo (*IG II² 11687*). To these examples can be added several more; of the twenty-five Thracian grave-monuments listed by Bäbler only eight securely belong to Thracian slaves (nos. 102-106 and 124-126).

That being said, it nevertheless seems that, in addition to the many Thracian mercenaries present in classical Athens, many of the Thracians living in Attica were indeed slaves. Besides the grave monuments, we find them, for instance, on the Attic *stelai* that record the public sale of the possessions of the men who were found guilty of mutilating numerous Herms around Athens in 415/4; of the forty-three slaves listed on these accounts, no less than seventeen can probably be identified as Thracians.²⁷ Thracians slaves were in fact so common in Athens that when Aristophanes wanted to introduce a typical slave girl she was usually called Thraitta.²⁸

It should be noted, however, that in contrast to the several negative descriptions of the Thracian people in general, and by Herodotus (5.3-8) specifically (they sold their relatives into slavery, let their women work the fields, sacrificed humans, were not to be trusted etc.), it seems that in daily life Thracian slaves were often greatly appreciated.²⁹ The grave monuments erected by their

²⁶ Cf. Bäbler's no. 107 = *FRA* 2592.

²⁷ M. Miller, *Athens and Persia in the fifth century BC: a study in cultural receptivity* (Cambridge 1997) 82-5, tabulates the ethnic distribution of the foreign slaves on these *stelai*. On the Attic *stelai* still: W. Kendrick-Pritchett, 'The Attic *stelai*', *Hesp.* 22 (1953) 225-99 and *Hesp.* 25 (1956) 178-281. Cf. S.C. Todd, 'Status and gender in Athenian public records' in: *Symposium 1995: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (Cologne 1997) 113-24, for a study of the sex, occupation, and ethnic origin of the forty-three slaves listed in these accounts.

²⁸ E.g. Ar. *Thesm.* 279, 280, 284; *Ach.* 273; *Wasps* 828; *Peace* 1138.

²⁹ D. Tsiafakis, 'The allure and repulsion of Thracians in the art of classical Athens' in: B. Cohen (ed.), *Not the classical ideal. Athens and the construction of the Other in Greek art* (Leiden 2000) 364-89, very eloquently discusses the two-sided Athenian evaluation of Thrace. Also note this two-sided valuation in myth; besides the horrid myths of the Thracian god Boreas abducting the Athenian princess Oreithyia and the story of Eumolpos claiming that Attica belonged to his father and invading Attic territory with a Thracian force (e.g. Lyk.

owners already attest to this relatively high regard for Thracian slaves within numerous Attic households. In addition, we find many positive references to the special talents of Thracian slaves in many ancient sources. For instance, Thracians were known to be devoted house-slaves and excellent wet nurses (*trophoi*); on several Attic vases we find Thracian slaves, depicted with their typical tattoos, intensely mourning the death of a master or mistress or fetching water at a fountain house.³⁰ That Thracian slaves made good servants is also reflected in myth: Herakles' nurse Geropso was a Thracian as can be seen on a red figure skyphos by the Pistoxenos Painter dated to ca. 460 where she is depicted with tattoos.³¹ The example of the Thracian slave Sosias, who, as Xenophon (*Ways* 4.14) tells us, was employed by the Athenian Nikias as overseer of his 1,000 mining slaves, nicely illustrates how the proverbial Thracian untrustworthiness was generally ignored in Athenian daily life.³²

Thracian slaves, then, were often highly regarded in Athens and occupied relatively important positions within many Athenian households and within Athenian society at large. Parker, however, rightly emphasises that we should not expect Athenians to accept the cult of their slaves.³³ When we think about the Thracians who brought Bendis to Athens we should rather focus on Thracian metics, who probably constituted a large middle group between the many slaves on the one hand and the Thracian princesses on the other.

1.5 Thracian “metics”

Unfortunately, Thracian metics are even more difficult to identify than Thracian slaves; Michael Osborne's *Foreign Residents in Attica (FRA)* only lists the princess

Leokr. 98-100, referring to one of Euripides' now lost plays, *Erechtheus*), we also find that most mythological musicians, most famously Orpheus, were from Thrace.

³⁰ K. Zimmermann, 'Tätowierte Thrakerinnen auf griechischen Vasenbildern', *JDAI* 95 (1980) 163-96, esp. 192-6 and Tsiafakis (2000) 372-6.

³¹ Schwerin, *Kunstsammlungen Staatliches Museum*, 708.

³² Cf. Xenophon *Mem.* 2.5.2, for a discussion of the relative value of different servants: "For one servant, I suppose, may be worth two minas, another less than half a mina, another five minas, another no less than ten. Nikias, son of Nikeratos, is said to have given a whole talent for an *epistates* of his silver-mine (i.e. Sosias)." In an international context the "untrustworthiness" of Thracians almost led to a conflict with Athens when the Thracian king Sitalkes in 430 waited in vain for the Athenian fleet to support him against Macedonia "for not believing that Sitalkes would come [the Athenians] only sent gifts and envoys to him" (Thuc. 2.101).

³³ Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 174.

Hegesipyle and the naturalised Rheboulas of the Odrysian dynasty as certain metics under Θράκη and suggests that the Thraix who is mentioned in a fragmentary early fifth-century decree in connection with the tribe Leontis (*IG II² 1035.12*) is perhaps also one. However, despite the fact that only few Thracians can be identified as metics with certainty, we find many rather self-sufficient Thracians living in classical Athens.³⁴ The scant information we have about their lives often indicates the relatively high level of their integration in Athenian society. For instance, the Thraix who was commemorated on a grave monument of around 400 (*IG II² 11689*) was a cobbler of Persian shoes and in Eupolis (fr. 262) we find a Thracian woman selling fillets. Similarly, the fact that a Thraitta was commemorated around 400 on a grave stele with reference to her past occupation as a perfume-mixer (*IG II² 11688*) or that the potter Thraix inscribed his name on a vase around 540 (*ABV 178*) indicate their semi-autonomous positions in Athens.³⁵

Already in the late sixth century we find a Thraix, son of Kortynios, making a dedication to Athena (*IG I³ 639*). From the fragments of the base and the fact that it was signed by the artist Gorgias, Antony Raubitschek argued the dedication probably consisted of a bronze horse or a horse and rider.³⁶ It thus seems that we are confronted with a Thracian, or at least someone with a Thracian connection, who already in the sixth century was competing in elite behaviour with his Athenian contemporaries. More than a century later a certain Bendidora, the pious daughter of Zenos, also made a dedication to Athena (*IG II² 4866*). *LGPN II* lists Bendidora as “certainly Athenian”, probably due to the Greek name of her father, but then she would be the only attested Athenian Bendidora. The only other attested Bendidora living in Athens (*IG II² 9233 – 3rd c.*) came from Lysimacheia, a Thracian region, and is therefore certainly Thracian. It could equally well be, then, that the telling name of Zenos’ daughter also belonged to a Thracian woman. We

³⁴ Most of the following people are listed by Osborne and Byrne in *LGPN* under the categories of “likely Athenians” and “free residents”. Also see my remarks in footnote 21.

³⁵ In an Eleusinian building-account of ca. 327 (*IG II² 1672. 96-97*) we come across a fragmentary reference to a Θραι[κ---], who had been working on the doors of the sanctuary, but was he a metic or a slave? On the hidden face of a block from the north entablature of the *pronaos* of the Parthenon we find painted in red: Ξανθίας Θραξ (*SEG 38.32*). Even if Θραξ is a personal name and not the *ethnikon* of Xantias, there is no way of telling whether he was a metic or a slave who worked on the Parthenon. Cf. Fraser (2000), on ethnics as personal names.

³⁶ A.E. Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: a catalogue of the inscriptions of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.* (Cambridge (MA) 1949) no. 77. On the dedications on the Akropolis see now the excellent monograph by C.M. Keesling, *The votive statues of the Athenian Acropolis* (Cambridge 2003).

have, then, one certain and one probable example of a Thracian actively participating in the religious life of the Athenian polis, worshipping the most important polis deity of the Athenians on the Akropolis. Beside these we also have a mid-fifth-century dedication from Piraeus (*IG I³ 1018*) made to Hermes by one Python from Abdera, a polis on the Thracian coast, and a fourth-century dedication to Aphrodite made by “Malthake on behalf of Thraïttis” (*SEG 21.784*) both attesting to Thracian interest in the gods of the Athenians.

In the political field, too, we can detect a Thracian influence as people with Thracian names were contributing to the well-being of the polis: in the decree that was proposed by Thrasyboulos in 401/0 (*RO 4*) to honour the *xenoi* who helped restore the democracy in 404 with grants of citizenship and equality in taxation with the Athenians (*isoteleia*) we find a vegetable-seller with the Thracian name Gerys (iii.13) and another foreigner with the telling name Bendiphanes (vii.1).³⁷ David Middleton furthermore suggested that Belpon (iii.14) and Egersis (vii.6) were probably also Thracians.³⁸ To sum up: despite the fact that only few Thracians can be certainly identified as metics, it seems that several Thracian-oriented people were rather self-sufficient and took a keen interest in the religious and political life of the polis.

If we add to this catalogue the people listed in *FRA* under their respective cities that were located within Thracian territory we could easily add another sixty-one Thracians living in Attica in the classical period.³⁹ Among them we find, similar to the Thracians under Θράκη, many slaves and mercenaries. But we also find, for instance, Pythagoras, son of Dionysios of Selembria, a town on the north coast of the Propontis. Pythagoras was a *proxenos* of the Athenians, who in the mid-fifth century was buried in the Kerameikos and honoured with the following epigram:

προξενίας ἀρετῆς τε χάριμ προ(γ)όντων τε καὶ αὐτο
 ἐνθάδ' Ἀθηναῖοι Πυθαγόρημ ἔθεσαν
 υἱὸν δημοσίαι Διονυσίοι, ἱππόβοτον δὲ

³⁷ M.J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens II: Commentaries on the decrees granting citizenship* (Brussels 1982) 26-43, no. D6. Gerys is commonly identified with Γῆρυς ἰσοτελής, who is mentioned on a fourth-century grave inscription (*IG II² 7863*)

³⁸ D.F. Middleton, ‘Thrasyboulos’ Thracian support’, *CQ* 32 (1982) 298-303. He is otherwise quite unconvincing in arguing that most of the foreigners fighting for Thrasyboulos were Thracians.

³⁹ I have included persons from Abdera, Ainos, Amphipolis, Apollonia, Byzantion, Istros, Kardia, Lysimacheia, Mesembria, Perinthos, Selymbria, and Sestos.

πατρίδα Σαλυβρίαν ἵκετ' ἄχος φθιμένο

The Athenians, paying honour to the *proxenos*, to the excellence of his forefathers and of himself, buried Pythagoras, son of Dionysios, at public expense; the grief over his departure reached all the way to horse breeding Selymbria (*IG I³ 1154*).⁴⁰

We also find the five men from Byzantion, located at the Bosphorus, who betrayed their city to Athenians in the late fifth century. In 408 Byzantion was being neglected by the Spartans, who were in control of the city, when Alkibiades launched an attack. In his attempt to take the city he was aided by Anaxikrates, Anaxilaos, Ariston, Kydon and Lykourgos of Byzantion. When the city again fell into Spartan hands, in 405, the five Byzantine men fled to Athens and were subsequently granted Athenian citizenship.⁴¹

In the context of foreign diplomacy many prominent Thracians were in fact granted citizenship: of the 103 grants of citizenship attested until the battle of Charoneia in 338, twenty-one were to Thracians or to people from Thracian regions.⁴² Although these grants should largely be considered as purely honorific in nature, we also have few indications that some Thracians actually came to Athens to enjoy their new rights there. For instance, Osborne suggests that the son of the Odrysian king Sitalkes, Sadokos, who in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (141-50) is presented as longing for sausages at the Apatouria, perhaps spent some time in Athens and was introduced into a phratry.⁴³ Another son of a Thracian king, Rheboulas, the son of Seuthes, is mentioned in a decree dated to 331/0 (*IG II² 349 + Add. p. 659*); the odd beginning of the decree (Ὶ Ρηβούλας Σεύθου υἱὸς Κότυος ἀδελφὸς Ὶ Ἀνγελ[ῆθεν]) perhaps contains a reference to a the *demotikon* of Angele, a deme in south-east Attica, suggesting that he actually spent some time in Athens to be properly enrolled in a deme.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ The translation comes from U. Knigge, *The Athenian Kerameikos. History-Monuments-Excavations* (Athens 1991) 97-9.

⁴¹ *FRA* 1384 (Anaxikrates); 1396 (Kydon); 1390 (Ariston); 1397 (Lykourgos); 1385 (Anaxilaos). Cf. Osborne, *Naturalization* (1982) T11-T15. On these events: Xen. *Hell.* 1.3.18 and 2.1.1.

⁴² Osborne, *Naturalization* (1982) T4; T11-15; TD6; PT128-130; T36; T54-55; PT131-132; T58; PT133; T65-66.

⁴³ Sadokos: Osborne, *Naturalization* (1982) T4.

⁴⁴ Rheboulas: *FRA* 2574; Osborne, *Naturalization* (1982) T66. Cf. S.D. Lambert, 'Athenian state laws and decrees, 352/1-322/1: III Decrees honouring foreigners. B. Other awards', *ZPE*

We can conclude that the classical period witnessed a strong Thracian influence and presence in Athens. Most of the Thracians in Attica were mercenaries and slaves but we also encountered numerous Thracians who were quite autonomous. It furthermore seems likely that the latter group probably only grew bigger: on an inscription dated to 330-320 listing manumitted slaves whose owners had to dedicate a *phiale* (IG II² 1557), we read that “Thraitta (who is now) a shopkeeper in Melite is manumitted by the metic Menedemos who lives in Melite, (who dedicated) a *phiale* that weighs one hundred (drachma)” (51-52).⁴⁵

I argue that it was this strong Thracian influence and presence in Athens at every social level that was responsible for the acceptance of Bendis’ cult as an Athenian polis cult. When we consider the incorporation of Bendis and her Thracian worshippers into the Athenian community we have to remind ourselves of these Thracians; they were the ones who brought Bendis to Athens, they were the ones who continued to play an important role in the running of the cult and in the organisation of the festival and they were the ones who through regulated and differentiated sharing in the *hiera* of Bendis were accepted as members of the Athenian community in their own right.

2 The first steps of integration: a temple for Thracian Artemis

2.1 Kratinos’ *Thracian women*

The first we hear of Bendis in Athens is in a comedy of Kratinos with the telling name *Thracian women* (Θράτται). This play was probably performed in the late 440s as can be inferred from a reference to the Odeion, which was built in the mid-440s, and a probable allusion to the unsuccessful attempt to ostracise Perikles in

159 (2007) no. 97 with n. 45, who notes that “the absence of the secretary from the prescript may imply that the decree was erected at private initiative and expense”. For the relief accompanying this decree see C.L Lawton, *Attic document reliefs; Art and politics in ancient Athens* (Oxford 1995) no. 46.

⁴⁵ Cf. D.M. Lewis, ‘Attic manumissions’, *Hesp.* 28 (1959) 208-38 who first published a full edition of all known fragments. That Thraitta’s activities as a shopkeeper or inn holder should be dated to the period after her manumission I infer from the fact that many manumitted slaves in these lists are given with their deme of residence, which is only used for metics; e.g. *SEG* 18.36a 100-4: [Κ]ίτιος ἐμ Πει οἰκῶν χαλκεὺ ἀποφυγῶν Διονύσιον ἰσοτελῆ φιάλη σταθμὸν : Η.

443 (fr.73).⁴⁶ We only have fragments, making it impossible to decide what the main theme of the play was and who the Thracian women of the title were. Bendis' appearance in the play, however, is secured by a reference in Hesychius (*s.v.* δίλογχον= fr.85), who informs us that “Kratinos called Bendis δίλογχον”, which most likely referred to the two spears (λόγχαι) she traditionally carried, emphasising her relationship with the wild.⁴⁷ In addition, ἀρκύωρος (fr.84), which means “the watcher of hunting-nets”, perhaps also referred to Bendis' competence as a hunting goddess.⁴⁸ It thus seems that the Athenians were already quite familiar with Bendis and her field of expertise in the late 440s.

Two other words used by Kratinos might further suggest that the worship of Bendis was still perceived by the Athenians as something strange and foreign, perhaps to be associated with the Thracian women of the play's title, who probably made up the chorus. So, Hesychius (*s.v.* συρβηνεύς) attests that Kratinos used the word συρβηνεύς (fr.89). Photius (*s.v.* συρβηνεύς) explains that this word meant “tumultuous, from those who play the flute noisily or confusedly” and that it was regularly used in combination with a chorus, in which case it denoted “a chorus which was disorderly and pig-like (συνώδος)”. Photios (*s.v.* κύβηβον) also informs us that Kratinos used κύβηβον, which can be translated as “possessed by a god or goddess”, or “possessed by the Mother of the Gods” more specifically. Perhaps these words denote that in the late 440s the worship of Bendis was still something essentially exotic in Athenian eyes.

2.2 Thracian Artemis, the first steps of acceptance

So, from Kratinos we learn that Bendis was a familiar goddess in Athens by the 440s but that her worship was possibly still perceived as a principally Thracian affair. However, around the same time we find Bendis on a red-figure *phiale* by the Phiale Painter in Verona, which seems to represent the first steps of the acceptance of Bendis into the Athenian pantheon.⁴⁹ The vase is dated to 440-430. On the inside

⁴⁶ I refer to the fragments as they are numbered in R. Kassel and C. Austin (eds.), *Poetae Comici Graeci* vol IV (Berlin and New York 1983) 157-66. For Kratinos' *Thracian women* see fragments 71-89. A date of 443/2 has been suggested by J.M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy* vol.1 (Leiden 1957) 45.

⁴⁷ Cf. Photios *s.v.* δίλογχον. J.G. Best, ‘Bendis’, *Hermeneus* 35 (1963/4) 124, suggested δίλογχον could refer to a two-pointed spear rather than to two separate spears.

⁴⁸ Harpokration *s.v.* ἀρκύωρος.

⁴⁹ Verona, *Museo Civico* 52 (= *LIMC s.v.* Bendis 1).

of the cup we see a Thracian woman running to the left and holding two spears; she is Bendis δῖλογχον. The goddess is wearing a short *chiton*, a so-called *chitonikos*, partly covered by a *nebris*, an animal skin that was often connected with Dionysiac worship. In addition, she is wearing typical Thracian clothing items: on her head we see an *alopekis*, a bonnet made from fur, and on her feet we see the typical Thracian *embades*. The outside of the cup seems to correspond with Bendis' *nebris*: on each side we see two satyrs dancing with a maenad. One might be tempted to see these images of satyrs and maenad as corresponding with Kratinos' use of κύβηβον and συρβηνεύς, as representing Bendis' worship as a tumultuous and exotic affair. John Oakley, however, has argued that this *phiale* in Verona should be seen in relation to another cup of the Phiale Painter in Verona, with which it created a pair.⁵⁰ On the inside of the other cup we see the Greek huntress goddess Artemis at an altar with a *kanoun* and an *oinochoe*, while on the outside two deeds of Theseus are depicted. Oakley concludes that with Bendis on one *phiale* and Artemis on the other “the pair of cups would form a well balanced Athens-Thrace duet”.⁵¹ The pair of cups by the Phiale Painter associating Bendis with Artemis can, in other words, be seen as signalling the first steps of the “Athenianization” of the Thracian hunting goddess.

This early association between Bendis and Artemis is also explored on a red-figure Attic *skyphos* in Tübingen dated to around 425.⁵² We come across an image of Bendis dressed in her familiar exotic, Thracian clothes with a short *chiton* covered by a *nebris*, an *alopekis*, this time consisting of a complete fox, and the characteristic high leather boots. Again, she is holding two spears, again, she is Bendis δῖλογχον. Although her appearance is almost identical with the *phiale* in Verona, her association with the wild is expressed in a different manner; instead of running, she is now shown standing gracefully still, while behind her we can see a hind. Approaching Bendis from the left is the goddess Themis, who is carrying a torch and a *kanoun*, ready to make a sacrifice. According to Folkert van Straten, the message is clear: to sacrifice to Bendis was the “customary and natural” (θέμις) thing to do.⁵³

⁵⁰ Verona, *Museo Civico* 51.

⁵¹ J.H. Oakley, *The Phiale Painter* (Mainz am Rhein 1990) 34-5, nos. 147-148.

⁵² Tübingen, *Universität S/10* 1347 (= *LIMC s.v. Bendis* 2).

⁵³ F. van Straten, ‘Assimilatie van vreemde goden: archeologisch bronnenmateriaal’, *Lampas* 9 (1976) 43-4.

The image on the other side of this *skyphos* further explores this notion. There we see Artemis in a pose similar to Bendis. She too holds two spears and is wearing a short *chiton*. Opposite Artemis we see Kephalos, the son of Hermes and Herse, who accidentally killed his great love Prokris during the hunt with an arrow of Artemis. Kephalos is seated and holds two crudely rendered spears and a *kanoun*, ready to make a libation to Artemis. Behind him we see a hound dog pulling at a hedgehog and a strange, primitive herm erected on top of a pile of rocks. The link between Bendis and Artemis on the Tübingen *skyphos* could not be more pronounced: Artemis and Bendis are depicted on the same cup, in a similar composition, in the same pose, both wearing a short *chiton* and holding two spears. If not for Bendis' exotic dress, the female deities are exactly alike.

It seems, then, that in ca. 440-425 Bendis became included in the Athenian pantheon. Despite, or in conjunction with, Kratinos' representation of the goddess, it seems that from the 440s onwards Bendis was gradually accepted in Athens as Thracian Artemis. In the following centuries Bendis was consistently associated with Artemis, her Greek companion in the wild.⁵⁴ Herodotus, for instance, who has a tendency to call foreign gods by the names of their Greek counter-parts, refers to Bendis as Royal Artemis (τῆ Ἀρτέμιδι τῆ βασιλείῃ – 4.33 and 5.7) and, as we shall see, the public sanctuary of Bendis in Piraeus was located close to the one of Artemis on Mounychia Hill. This association with Artemis was probably the first step that smoothed the way for Bendis' transition from Thrace to Athens. By 425 it could be already considered *themis* to worship Thracian Artemis.

2.3 A treasury on the Akropolis: Bendis as an Other God

After these early signs of Athenian goodwill, the first positive evidence for the official acceptance of Bendis by the Athenian *demos* dates to 429/8, when she is mentioned in an inventory of the Treasurers of the Other Gods (*IG I³ 383.143*). This indicates that the *demos* had acquired some kind of control of the hitherto presumably mainly Thracian cult of Bendis.

⁵⁴ Bendis is always figured in an “Artemis-like” manner but also always dressed in exotic, Thracian clothes, with a short *chiton*, a *nebris* and high boots. Only a Phrygian cap sometimes replaces her *alopekis* and a *zeira* later covers her shoulders: e.g. the Attic relief in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek in Copenhagen, honouring the *epimeletai* Euphyes and Dexios (329/28) (cf. Hartwig, *Bendis* (1897) 4-8); the Attic relief in the British Museum (no. 2155) honouring a winning team of the torch-race (350-300), which will be discussed later (= *LIMC s.v.* Bendis 3) and a statue from Attika (Laureion district?) (late fourth) (= *LIMC s.v.* Bendis 7).

In the late 430s, at a time when tensions between Athens and Sparta were building up rapidly, the Athenian Kallias proposed to repay the debts to the gods of the Athenians that had occurred some time before (*IG I³ 52*).⁵⁵ It was decided to create a special fund on the Akropolis for these reimbursements and to subsequently transfer τὰ χρήματα of these gods from their local shrines to the Akropolis for safekeeping (13-18). In the decree it is set out how a new board of treasurers (*tamiai*) of the Other Gods (i.e. besides those of Athena) is to be organised and what its duties are: ten *tamiai* are to be selected and after they have received the treasures from the local officials who were hitherto in charge, the new board is to weigh and count these on the Akropolis in the presence of the *Boule* and prepare a inventory (18-27). From then onwards they are to keep annual accounts to keep track of all the belongings of the Other Gods under control of the new, centralised board of treasurers (27-30).

Among the thirty-something deities listed in the inventory of 429 (*IG I³ 383*) we also find Bendis (142-143), who by this time apparently held some kind of publicly recognised status among the gods worshipped in Attica. The fragmentary entry in the accounts reads ΑΔΡΑ[---] ΚΑΙ ΒΕ[---]. Since no other deity's name is known to begin with Βε- it seems certain that this is a reference to a treasury of Bendis. The deity with whom she shared a treasury is usually identified as Adrasteia, of whom we only know that she lived on Mount Ida in Phrygia, which would make her an appropriate companion of Bendis, as Parker already suggested.⁵⁶ It seems, then, that in 429 Bendis shared a treasury with Adrasteia, which, after it had been moved to the Akropolis in late 430s, was controlled by a centralised board of treasurers who were answerable to the Athenian *demos*.

⁵⁵ For a thorough discussion see: L.J. Samons II, *Empire of the Owl: Athenian imperial finance* (Stuttgart 2000) 113-38. Especially the date and the relationship between the two decrees on the stone are matter of debate. The decrees, both probably proposed by Kallias, are conventionally thought to be passed on the same day in 434/3. See, however, the strong arguments proposed by L. Kallet-Marx, 'The Kallias decree, Thucydides and the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War', *CQ* 39 (1989) 94-113, for disconnecting the two decrees and dating the first, concerned with the removal of the treasures of the other gods to the Akropolis, to 430.

⁵⁶ Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 195. Adrasteia: Phoronis fr. 2.4 and Aeschylus fr.158.2. It can be noted that another (overlooked) candidate is Adrastos, the Argive king who famously attacked Thebes with six other warriors and who was perhaps worshipped in the Attic city deme Lousia, on which see: S.D. Lambert, *Rationes Centesimarum. Sales of public land in Lykourgan Athens* (Amsterdam 1997) F 47, 201-2. Cf. E. Kearns, *The heroes of Attica* (London 1989) 140-1, on Adrastos. However, there is not much evidence connecting Adrastos with Bendis. Also, the treasurers' account of 423/2 (*IG I³ 369.68*) tends to support Adrasteia.

Bendis is perhaps also referred to in the accounts of the treasuries of the Other Gods of 423/2 (*IG I³ 369*), as these might include a reference to a loan of 86 drachmas to the Athenian *demos* from Bendis' treasury, as Benjamin Meritt suggested. In line 68 he restored: Ἄδρασ]τείας Ἰ^Δ ΔΔΔΓΙ τ[όκος τούτο Ι] [Βενδ]ιδος Ἰ^Δ ΔΔΔΓΙ τόκος τού[το Ι...], although he admits that Themis ([Θέμ]ιδος) is an alternative reading.⁵⁷ If Bendis is indeed correctly restored, this would mean that Adrasteia is probably correctly restored in the inventory of 429.

The appearance of Bendis among the Other Gods in the inventory indicates that the status of Bendis had changed considerably since her arrival in Athens probably some time in the late sixth century. It appears that by the late 430s, Bendis' worship had partly left the worlds of privately organised worshipping groups, typically called *thiasoi*, in the context of which most foreign deities were worshipped. It is likely that Thracians had initially worshipped Bendis in these private associations. And even after Bendis had become the object of a public polis cult they continued to do so: three statuettes of Bendis were found near Laureion suggesting a separate cult location in the mining district and in the third century we hear of a *thiasos* of Bendis on Salamis.⁵⁸ The appearance of Bendis in the accounts of 429 shows, however, that, in addition to these private worshipping groups, the Athenian *demos* had now also taken an interest in her cult. Bendis was now considered one of the Other Gods with whom the Athenians had at least a financial liaison as they could borrow money from them without any clear obstacles.

What the status of "Other God" exactly entailed is difficult to establish. They clearly did not encompass all gods beside Athena Polias: important cults like that of Demeter in Eleusis and Nemesis in Rhamnous are absent in the accounts.⁵⁹ Antiquity does not seem to have been a criterion either: next to venerable polis cults like those of Artemis Brauronia and Zeus Polieus we find more recent cults like that of Hephaistos. We also find many cults that are only attested in these lists, like that of Athena Itonia or the Heros Epitegios. Still, Tullia Linders' contention that these cults, or their treasuries, were considered the responsibility of the polis at

⁵⁷ B.D. Meritt, *Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century* (Ann Arbor 1932) 140, line 67-68.

⁵⁸ Laureion: P.G. Themelis, *Horos* 7 (1989) 23-9. Salamis: *IG II² 1317; 1317b; SEG 2.10.*

⁵⁹ It should be noted that the Eleusinian funds seem to have been held on the Akropolis and used by the *demos* since ca. 460 (*IG I³ 6. 32-38*). However, the Eleusinian deities are never included among the Other Gods.

large and that they were so perhaps even prior to Kallias' decree seems reasonable.⁶⁰ In any case, that the cults of these Other Gods were considered to be polis cults *after* ca. 430 seems beyond doubt, as the main criterion to consider a cult a polis cult was control by the *demos* of a deity's treasure, as Sara Aleshire proposed in an influential article.⁶¹

2.4 The Bendideion on Mounychia Hill and the grant of *enktesis*

So, from at least 429 onwards the management of Bendis' treasury was considered a polis affair. It has often been argued that a treasury presupposes that Bendis had her own public sanctuary at this time where such a treasury would have been kept for safekeeping before the move to the Akropolis.⁶² However, these scholars seem to overlook the fact that Bendis shared a treasury with another deity. She therefore probably also shared a *hieron*, and perhaps even an entire cult with personnel, with this deity. It has to my knowledge never been recognised that what the inventory indicates is that before receiving a public *hieron* of her own, Bendis was accommodated in the sanctuary of another deity. It seems, then, that after Bendis' acceptance had been facilitated by her association with Artemis, she was to share a *hieron* with another polis deity.

In addition, we know that some time after 429 Bendis indeed acquired her own public shrine. In his account of the events in 404/3, when the democrats from *Phyle* and the oligarchs from the city clashed in Piraeus, Xenophon (*Hell.* 2.4.11) refers to this shrine, known as the Bendideion, when he tells us that the democrats

⁶⁰ T. Linders, *The treasurers of the Other Gods in Athens and their functions* (Meisenheim 1975) 12-6 with n. 36, where she provides a handy list of the Other Gods mentioned in the accounts and inventories. The topic of the Other Gods is so complex that it calls for a separate enquiry. Especially the cult of Apollo Zoster seems to challenge the notion that these treasuries all belonged to polis deities since in an honorary deme decree (RO 46) his priesthood and sanctuary seems to be the exclusive concern of the demesmen of Halai Aixionides. Another inscription (*AD II* (1927-8) 39 no.3), however, shows the *demos* and the *Boule* praising a priest of Apollo Zoster, which signals the larger reach of this cult. Cf. Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 59 n.35, who also refers to the story of how the young Euripides was a *pyrophoros* in the cult of Apollo Zoster as indicating non-local involvement in the cult. He concludes that "we appear as often to be faced with a hybrid".

⁶¹ S.B. Aleshire, 'Towards a definition of "state cult" for ancient Athens' in: R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Stockholm 1994) 9-16.

⁶² First suggested by Ferguson (1949) 132. See more recently: Simms (1988) 60.

συνεσπειράθησαν ἐπὶ τὴν Μουνυχίαν οἱ δ' ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεως εἰς τὴν Ἴπποδάμειον ἀγορὰν ἐλθόντες πρῶτον μὲν συνετάξαντο, ὥστε ἐμπλήσαι τὴν ὁδὸν ἣ φέρει πρὸς τε τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Μουνυχίας Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τὸ Βενδίδειον.

gathered in a compact body on Mounychia Hill. And the men from the city, when they came to the agora of Hippodamos, first formed themselves in line of battle, so that they filled the road that leads to the temple of Artemis Mounychia and the Bendideion.

Mounychia Hill lies in the north-eastern corner of Piraeus, at the point where the Long Walls made their way from Piraeus to the city. Why was the Bendideion located here? Robert Garland is probably right that the likely presence of many Thracian metics in Piraeus quite naturally led to her initial worship in the cosmopolitan port. He also points to the fact that the presence of an important sanctuary of Artemis on Mounychia Hill could have informed the location of the new Bendideion.⁶³ As we saw earlier, Bendis was associated with the Greek huntress-goddess Artemis, who traditionally lived on what the Athenian perceived as outer limits, i.e. in places close to town walls, or, as was usually the case, in the wild, on the borders of a polis.⁶⁴ Artemis had long been dwelling on Mounychia Hill and to locate Bendis' sanctuary in her proximity must have seemed an obvious choice.

The next question to be considered is how a Thracian deity, in principle a divine metic, received a sanctuary of her own. Fortunately, we are exceptionally well informed on this point and it is here that we can finally see that not only Bendis but also her Thracian worshippers were accepted as members of the Athenian community; it were the Thracians who were granted the right to own real property, a right intimately tied up with Athenian citizenship, to build Bendis a sanctuary.⁶⁵

A glimpse of what happened is given in a late inscription, dated to 261/0, of a Thracian worshipping group in Piraeus whose members were called *orgeones* (*IG*

⁶³ R. Garland, *The Piraeus* (2nd ed.) (London 2001) 121.

⁶⁴ Cf. S.G. Cole, *Landscape, gender and ritual space. The ancient Greek experience* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 2004) 178-97.

⁶⁵ That the sanctuary built by the Thracians was the Bendideion on Mounychia Hill and not a separate one, for example next to an "Athenian" Bendideion as W.S. Ferguson, 'The Attic *orgeones*', *HThR* 37 (1944) 103, proposed or near Zanneion Hospital at Zea Port as Garland, *Piraeus*² (2001) 162, has suggested, can be deduced from the fact that there was only one group of *orgeones*, and not two, as I will argue later on.

IG II² 1283). The decree of these *orgeones* is concerned with establishing a good cooperation between them and a new group of *orgeones* of Bendis in the city. In lines 4-9 we read:

4. ἐπειδὴ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων δεδωκότος τοῖς Θραιξί μ-
όνοις τῶν ἄλλων ἔθνῶν τὴν ἔγκτησιν καὶ τὴν ἴδρυσιν τοῦ
ἱεροῦ κατὰ τὴν μᾶντείαν τὴν ἐγ Δωδώνης καὶ τὴν πονπὴν π-
ἔπειν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας τῆς ἐκ τοῦ πρυτανείου καὶ νῦν οἱ
ἠῖρημένοι ἐν τῷ ἄστει κατασκευάσασθαι ἱερὸν οἶοντα-
9. ι δεῖν οἰκείως διακεῖσθαι πρὸς ἀλλήλους.

After the *demos* of the Athenians had given to the Thracians alone of all the *ethne* the right to own property and to build a shrine in accordance with the oracular response from Dodona and to send the procession from the Hestia outside the Prytaneion, and now they in the city have decided to build a shrine, there has to be a good cooperation amongst each other.

The Thracian *orgeones* in this decree refer to the privilege of *enktesis*, the right to own real property, in this case specified as the right to own property for the single purpose of building a shrine, which was granted to the Thracian *ethnos* some indefinite time before the decree was published in 261/0.⁶⁶ In 261/0 it was no longer true that the Thracians “alone of all the *ethne*” had received this right: in 333/2 the Athenian *demos* had granted the same privilege to a group of merchants from Kitium, a town on Cyprus, who had requested the *demos* the right to build a shrine for their goddess Aphrodite Ourania (IG II² 337). In an amendment to that decree there is mention of another grant of *enktesis* to another *ethnos*: the Kitians are going to build their shrine for Aphrodite “just as the Egyptians have founded the sanctuary of Isis” (42-45).⁶⁷

So, by 333/2 both the Egyptians and the Kitians had been granted *enktesis* and the Thracians could in 261/0 not truly claim to be the only *ethnos* ever to have received this privilege. Why they nonetheless claimed to be the only *ethnos* honoured in this way has been explained by a *verbatim* copying of the original decree in which the *enktesis* grant was mentioned, although, as A. S. Henry has

⁶⁶ The present concerns are introduced with καὶ νῦν in line 7. On *enktesis* see most importantly: J. Peçirka, *The formula of the grant of enktesis in Attic inscriptions* (Prague 1966), although he focuses on the epigraphical details of the inscriptions and hardly on the socio-economic aspects of *enktesis*, except in his Conclusions. Cf. A.S. Henry, *Honours and privileges in Athenian decrees* (Hildesheim et al. 1983) 204-40, esp. 204-5.

⁶⁷ Peçirka, *Enktesis* (1966) 59-61 and RO 91 for discussions of this decree.

suggested, a summary of the original grant is perhaps more likely.⁶⁸ What, in the latter case, the original grant consisted of exactly is only to be guessed. We could imagine a similar grant as the one the Kitians received, i.e. *enktesis choriou*, probably indicating that these groups of foreigners were not entirely free in choosing a location to accommodate their gods, as *choriou* usually refers to a specific, previously appointed plot of land.⁶⁹ However, uncertainties predominate: the formula “*enktesis choriou*” only occurs in the Kitian decree, which is a singular decree in itself, probably erected on the private initiative of the Kitians.⁷⁰ We should therefore stick with what we know for certain: that some time before 333/2 “the Thracians alone of all the *ethne* were granted the right to own property and to build a shrine in accordance with the oracular response from Dodona”.

Can we establish a firmer date for this grant of *enktesis* to the Thracians? Xenophon’s remark shows that the Bendideion was a familiar landmark in 404. Scholars have taken the appearance of Bendis in the inventory of the Other Gods in 429 as a *terminus ante quem* for a public shrine of Bendis. They also point out that the reference to Dodona suggests the first period of the Peloponnesian War when, according to most, Delphi was inaccessible to the Athenians because of the pro-Spartan stance taken by the oracle (Thuc. 1.118.3). They accordingly date the grant between 431 and 429.⁷¹ However, as I argued above, the inventory does not imply that Bendis had her own sanctuary in 429, she instead shared one with Adrast[...]. Dodona can, in addition, alternatively be explained by a Thracian initiative to get their Thracian goddess a home in Athens. Dodona was an appropriate place to ask for divine favour for a Thracian cult, whereas Delphi was known to be rather conservative towards the acceptance of foreign gods in general.⁷² Both Dodona and

⁶⁸ *Verbatim* repetition: Ferguson (1949) 134 and Nilsson (1960) 65-6, who, however, noted that “μόνοις” could perhaps also have applied to the whole set of privileges granted to the Thracians, i.e. *enktesis* together with the right to send a procession from the Prytaneion, a right not known to have been granted to another ethnic group. In my opinion “μόνοις” can only apply to the grant of *enktesis* since the phrase in which the *enktesis* is included is ended by the reference to the oracle from Dodona. Summary: Henry, *Honours* (1983) 204-5.

⁶⁹ Peçirka, *Enktesis* (1966) 60, n.2.

⁷⁰ See the commentary at RO 91, who refer to the abbreviated prescript and the absence of a publication clause in their suggestion that the decree was probably set up (in Piraeus near the site of the new shrine?) on the initiative and expense of the Citian requesters.

⁷¹ E.g. Simms (1988) 61-2.

⁷² Cf. A. Ruiz-Pérez, ‘Un oracle relatif à l’introduction du culte de Cybele à Athenes’, *Kernos* 7 (1994) 69-77 on the late fabrication of a Delphic advice concerning the acceptance of Kybele in Athens. In the Kitian decree it is emphasised that the grant had been awarded on the request of the Kitians (RO 91.33-8). We could similarly envisage the Thracian community in

the inventory of the Other Gods are thus inadequate indications for dating the Thracian grant of *enktesis*.

However, when we consider the Thracian grant against the background of other known grants of *enktesis* it becomes clear that we should probably see it as part of a larger Athenian scheme to woo the Odrysians from the late 430s until ca. 424. From the late fifth century onwards *enktesis* was regularly granted to foreign individuals who the *demos* wished to honour. The award included the right to own a house (οἰκίας ἔγκτησις) or, more often, a plot of land with a house on it (γῆς καὶ οἰκίας ἔγκτησις), or, as we saw above, the right to own property with the specific purpose of building a shrine, which is only attested three times.

Enktesis was mainly awarded to honour foreigners who had provided extraordinary services to the Athenians or who could be expected to do so in the future. For instance, in a decree of 338/7 (RO 77) we read that in addition to the honoured Akarnanians Phormio and Karphinas, who had come “in support with a force and were mustered together with the Athenians” (probably during the battle of Chaironeia in 338) the Athenians also honour “the other Akarnanians who have come in support with Phormio and Karphinas” *inter alia* with *enktesis* as long as they reside in Athens (22-25). Also, in the list of persons granted *enktesis* as provided by J. Peçirka most are *proxenoi*, citizens from other foreign *poleis* who defended Athenian rights abroad.⁷³ In other words, honorific grants of *enktesis* seem to have been instrumental in smoothing diplomatic relationships between important foreigners and the Athenian polis. This suggests that after the Thracians had requested an Athenian home for Bendis, they were granted this right in the context of foreign diplomacy. It seems that in this specific instance Nilsson was actually right. This also suggests we should date this grant between 429, when Bendis appeared to have still shared a sanctuary with an Athenian deity, and 424, when the warm ties between Athens and Thrace began to cool off under the new Odrysian king Seuthes.⁷⁴

Attica making a request. On the Delphic oracle during the Peloponnesian War: H. Bowden, *Classical Athens and the Delphic oracle: divination and democracy* (Cambridge 2005) 136-9.

⁷³ Peçirka, *Enktesis* (1966) 152-9. Of the fifty-nine attested grants, at least thirty-three were awarded to *proxenoi*.

⁷⁴ Is it conceivable that, similar to the decree of the Akarnanians (RO 77), the now lost decree which granted Sadokos citizenship also included the clause to grant “the other Thracians the right to build a shrine for Bendis”?

To grant the Thracians their request for *enktesis* was a truly revolutionary decision. It was probably the first time the Athenians decided to grant outsiders the right to own real property, a right that had always been an important attribute of those in charge of the community.⁷⁵ Since as long as the Athenians could remember, people who owned considerable real property had a say in the running of the community: the powerful men of the Dark Ages had belonged to a landed aristocracy; when in the beginning of the sixth century Solon wanted to create a larger citizen body on a timocratic basis he redistributed power over four new property-classes that were based on landed property; and when in 508, Kleisthenes gave power to the *demos* at large, he gave everybody who owned or could own any real property a say in the running of the polis.⁷⁶ Owning real property or having the right to acquire property was thus a significant attribute of Athenian citizens. And this was now granted to the Thracians.

We may take this line of thought even one step further. The rare occurrence of *enktesis* grants for the specific purpose of building a shrine for a foreign god should probably be explained against the background of the important implications of building a sanctuary on polis territory for the cohesion, the definition and perhaps even the complete existence of the polis community.⁷⁷ In other words, one can argue that whereas the right to privately own real property was an important denominator of being a member of a polis community, using property within polis territory to build a sanctuary was an important denominator of the polis community at large. It was probably one of the most significant acts a polis community as a whole could undertake through which it could define itself to both (human and divine) in- and outsiders. Not having the right to build a sanctuary for one's deities meant being an outsider to the polis community, which the Thracians obviously were. By granting them *enktesis* the Athenians did not grant them citizenship but they did open the door to the Thracians to become part of their community. This

⁷⁵ The next attested grant is dated to around 421 (*IG* I³ 81). The novelty of *enktesis* perhaps also explains the trip to Dodona to find divine support for this revolutionary request. At the time of the Kitian request there appears to be have been an elaborate procedure in place (RO 91).

⁷⁶ H. van Wees, 'Mass and elite in Solon's Athens: the property classes revisited' in: J.H. Blok and A.P.M.H. Lardinois (eds.), *Solon of Athens: new historical and philological approaches* (Leiden 2006) 351-89, argues convincingly against the notion that Solon's property classes reflected military divisions.

⁷⁷ Cf. F. de Polignac, *Cults, territory and the origin of the Greek city-state* (translated by J. Lloyd) (Chicago 1995) and F. van den Eijnde's forthcoming dissertation on Attica specifically.

door was not opened to foreigners many times; only the Kitians and Egyptians are known to have received the same right.

3 A public festival and a public cult for Bendis

So, after initial signs in the 440s-420s that worshipping Thracian Artemis was becoming customary (*themis*), the Athenians accepted Bendis and her Thracian worshippers in their midst as they gradually turned Bendis' cult into a polis cult: in 429 the Athenians controlled her treasury and with the grant of *enktesis* shortly after they allowed the Thracians to worship their goddess within the social and territorial parameters of the polis community. We will now look at how this polis cult on Mounychia Hill was further organised and what this tells us about the ways in which the Athenians tried to integrate Bendis' Thracian worshippers into their community. In other words, how was the identity of the Thracian community in Attica negotiated in the context of Bendis' polis cult? We will see that in addition to an extraordinary high level of integration, Thracians were also differentiated from the Athenian worshippers through (sometimes rigidly) demarcated participation. In this way the Thracians were firmly incorporated into the Athenian community while retaining, or rather expected by the Athenians to retain, their unique, Thracian identity.

3.1 The reception of Bendis and her worshippers in the Prytaneion

In the same inscription that contains the reference to the grant of *enktesis* (*IG II² 1283*), we also read that the Thracians were “to send the procession from the Hestia outside the Prytaneion” (6-7). At the time of the inscription, ca. 261, there were two groups of Thracian worshippers of Bendis, one in the city and one in Piraeus, each with its own shrine. It seems that one of the objectives of the decree was that

9. ὅπως ἄν οὖν φα-
ίνωνται και οἱ ὀργεῶνες τῶι τε τῆς πόλεως νόμωι πειθαρχ-
χοῦντες ὃς κελεύει⁷⁸ τοὺς Θραίκας πέμπειν τῆμ πομπήν εἰ-

⁷⁸ Garland, *Piraeus*² (2001) 120-21 suggested that κελεύει could mean both “orders” and “requests”. N.F. Jones, N.F., *The Associations of Classical Athens. The Response to Democracy* (New York and Oxford 1999) 258 has, however, correctly emphasised that πειθαρχοῦντες can only mean obeying and the “softer” requesting therefore seems no longer an option.

there has to be a good cooperation amongst each other; in such a way that the *orgeones* seem to obey to the law of the polis which orders the Thracians to send the procession to Piraeus.

It is set out that the more recently established group in the city is to arrange the procession in the same way as those in Piraeus do and on arrival in Piraeus they are to be welcomed in the Nymphaion, where the marchers will be provided with sponges, basins, water, wreaths and a lunch “just like they (i.e. those in Piraeus) provide for themselves” (13-20).

Since the main concern in 261 seems have been the integration of a new group of Thracian worshippers into an already existing ritual programme in order that “the whole (Thracian) *ethnos* will seem in harmony” (22-23), we can be certain that “the law of the polis which orders the Thracians to send the procession to Piraeus” was older than this decree. Although we cannot be certain how old the regulation was exactly, I suggest we date it either to the same time of the *enktesis* grant, ca. 429-424, with which it is linked in the beginning of the decree, or to 413/2 when, as we will soon see, the cult of Bendis was reorganised and her polis festival set in place. Either way, the *pompe* from the Prytaneion, located east of the Akropolis, to the Bendideion in Piraeus was one of the first aspects of Bendis’ cult to be regulated “by a law of the polis” ordering the “whole Thracian *ethnos*” to take care of these *hiera*, which now appear to have become a concern of the polis.

Mentioned in the same breath as the grant of *enktesis*, there apparently was something to boast about for the Thracians. And indeed there was, for this is the only Athenian procession we know for certain to have started from the Prytaneion, the symbolic heart of the polis where the eternal flame burnt in the common hearth as the ultimate symbol of community life and civilisation. Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood has suggested that the god-welcoming procession for Dionysos Eleuthereus during the City Dionysia also started from the Prytaneion. She considered the Prytaneion an appropriate beginning of the *pompe* because it was located along the Streets of the Tripods, which led to the theatre and sanctuary of Dionysos, and because it would be the ideal place to receive a new god with *xenismoi*, rites of guest entertainment, as it was the place where honoured citizens dined and foreign

guests were formally entertained.⁷⁹ Although Sourvinou-Inwood's designation of the City Dionysia as a god-welcoming festival is attractive, her suggestion of the Prytaneion as the starting point of the *pompe* must remain doubtful as she used late and ambiguous evidence from Plutarch (*Dem.* 12) and Apollodoros (3.14.7) to show that Dionysos was welcomed with *xenismoi*. Even so, her theory that the Prytaneion was the ideal place to welcome and honour a new god may very well explain the starting point of the *pompe* for Bendis.

In archaic times the Prytaneion in Athens had been the seat of the *prytaneis*, the executive board of the *Boule*. After this institution had moved to the Tholos in the Agora around 470, the main functions of the Prytaneion were the housing of the eternal flame in the common hearth, embodied by the Hestia, and the entertainment of Athenian benefactors and foreign guests.⁸⁰ Every foreign ambassador was in fact invited to dine in the Prytaneion, as Demosthenes (19.234) indicates. It seems, then, that by granting the Thracian worshippers the right to have the procession for Bendis start at the Prytaneion, the Athenians officially welcomed and honoured this foreign *ethnos* and their native goddess like they would other important foreign guests. The official reception of Bendis and her Thracians could not be made clearer while at the same time the foreign background of the goddess and her worshippers was still acknowledged.

Another motive for the Athenians to order the Thracians to send a procession from the heart of the polis to the Bendideion on Mounychia Hill in Piraeus might be that it was a perfect opportunity to connect the ancient city with the newly developed urban centre on the coast. Robert Garland already suggested that this new procession was perhaps instituted because the traditional centrifugal processions from Athens to outlying sanctuaries, like those to Eleusis or Brauron could not take place during the Peloponnesian War and the only safe route was along the road to Piraeus protected by the Great Walls.⁸¹ In addition, I would like to point out that all archaic processions that went from Athens to the sea appear to have ended at Phaleron, the ancient port of Attika, like the procession of initiates who were expected to wash a piglet in the sea on the second day of the Mysteries or

⁷⁹ C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Something to do with Athens: Tragedy and ritual' in: R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (eds.), *Ritual, finance, and politics: Athenian democratic accounts presented to David Lewis* (Oxford 1994) 277-81.

⁸⁰ S.G. Miller, *The Prytaneion. Its function and architectural form* (Berkeley 1978) 4-24; M.J. Osborne, 'Entertainment in the Prytaneion at Athens', *ZPE* 41 (1981) 153-70; Henry, *Honours* (1983) 262-90.

⁸¹ Garland, *Piraeus*² (2001) 121.

the bathing of the ancient wooden cult statue of Athena during the Plynteria. The Athenians perhaps felt a need to ritually connect the city with the new port and the procession for Bendis was a great opportunity to do so.⁸²

3.2 The Bendideia: *epichorioi* and youthful Thracians

3.2.1 Plato and the inauguration of the Bendideia in 413/2

Probably in conjunction with the procession from the Prytaneion, an elaborate polis festival was set in place for Bendis, the so-called Bendideia. This festival was celebrated in early summer, on the 19th of Thargelion.⁸³ In addition to the procession sent by the Thracians, it contained another procession, this one organised by the Athenians, a torch-race on horseback, public sacrifices, and a night-festival. Our main source is Plato who in the beginning of his *Republic* (327a) sketches the first celebration of this new festival as Sokrates tells the reader how

Κατέβην χθές εἰς Πειραιᾶ μετὰ Γλαύκωνος τοῦ Ἀρίστωνος προσευξόμενός τε τῇ θεῷ καὶ ἅμα τὴν ἑορτὴν βουλόμενος θεάσασθαι τίνα τρόπον ποιήσουσιν ἅτε νῦν πρῶτον ἄγοντες.

I went down to Piraeus yesterday with Glaukon, the son of Ariston, to pray to the goddess and also because I wanted to see how they would conduct the festival, since this was observed for the first time.⁸⁴

This passage implies that in Sokrates' lifetime it was fully accepted for an Athenian to worship Bendis on a personal initiative, just like they would pay their devotions to other Athenian deities. Later on in the *Republic* (328c), we also find the Syracusan metic Kephalos, the father of Lysias, who just performed a sacrifice in his courtyard probably also in honour of Bendis.

⁸² Assuming the procession during the festival of Artemis Mounychia did not start from the city. From Philochoros (*FGrH* 328F86) we know that during this festival roundly lit cakes, so-called ἀμφιφῶντες, were brought to Artemis. In Hellenistic times ephebes processed for Artemis Mounychia and competed in a regatta to commemorate the victory over the Persians at the Battle of Salamis in 480 (*IG* II² 1006.29; 1028.20; 1029.13), since, as Plutarch (*Mor.* 349f) informs us, “on that day the goddess shone with a full moon upon the Greeks as they were conquering Salamis”. We do not hear where the *pompe* started from.

⁸³ On the date: Proklos, in *Tim.* 9b and 27a. Cf. J.D. Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton 1975) 158.

⁸⁴ In an Athenian context “the goddess” normally refers to Athena but in this case it is Bendis, as becomes clear later on (*Rep.* 354a).

In addition to these personal devotions, Sokrates and Glaukon also witness the inauguration of the Bendideia, a new festival for an immigrant deity now “observed for the first time”. But when did this first celebration of the Bendideia take place? The dramatic date of the *Republic* is a true scholarly nightmare. Plato is not known for avoiding anachronism or being concerned with historical accuracy but to “date” Book 1 of the *Republic* has turned out to be especially tricky.⁸⁵ Traditionally, one of two dates is defended, either the summer of 421 or 411. Recently, however, Debra Nails convincingly argued and demonstrated that the *Republic* is a conflated work that was revised over many years, making it impossible to determine a single dramatic date.⁸⁶ Dating the inauguration of the Bendideia from Plato’s remarks is therefore equally impossible.

Help comes from a fragmentary decree dealing with Bendis’ festival and cult (*IG I³ 136*). The inscription consists of three fragments, one of which topped with part of a relief on which we see a man’s leg.⁸⁷ The fragments were found in the 1930s by Pappadakis on Mounychia Hill and they have been the subject of great controversy ever since.⁸⁸ Several scholars have described it as part of the treaty Athens concluded with the Odrysian king Sitalkes in 431 (Thuc. 2.29).⁸⁹ There is, however, nothing in the fragments of the decree that supports such an intricate reading.⁹⁰ What *is* certain is that the decree deals with Bendis’ cult and festival: the goddess is mentioned in line 13 and 35, while the date of her festival, the 19th of Thargelion, is referred to in line 28. It is also clear that the decree is concerned with an elaboration of the cult and not a completely new foundation: we come across a reference to “the cult statue” (τὸ ἄγαλμα – 8) and “the *stèle*” (τὸν στέλεν – 9) that

⁸⁵ K. Moors, ‘The argument against a dramatic date for Plato’s *Republic*’, *Polis* 7 (1987) 6-31, even suggested that Plato deliberately created a timeless dialogue.

⁸⁶ D. Nails, ‘The dramatic date of Plato’s *Republic*’, *CJ* 93 (1998) 383-96.

⁸⁷ Cf. M. Meyer, *Die griechischen Urkundenreliefs* (Berlin 1989) no. A12 and C.L. Lawton, *Attic document reliefs: art and politics in ancient Athens* (Oxford 1995) no. 70. Only one fragment is still preserved (Piraeus Museum inv. no. 1595).

⁸⁸ N.G. Pappadakis, ‘Ἱερός νόμος Βενδιδείων’, *Arch. Eph.* (1939) 808-23.

⁸⁹ Treaty with Sitalkes: Peek, *Ath. Mitt.* 66 (1941) 207-17; Nilsson (1942) 183-8; Ferguson (1949) 130-63. Most accepted are the interpretations and positioning of the fragments of P. Roussel, ‘A propos d’un décret attique (relatif à la déesse Bendis)’, *REA* 45 (1943) 177-82 and J. Bingen, ‘Le décret *SEG X 64* (La Pirée 413/2?)’, *RBPhH* 37 (1959) 31-44.

⁹⁰ Roussel (1943) 181, puts it best when he writes that “la mutilation du document ne permet pas – ou permet trop – de multiplier les hypotheses”.

were both apparently present in the already established Bendideion.⁹¹ The attention paid to several aspects of Bendis' festival further suggests that one of the main objectives of the decree was the inauguration of the Bendideia as described by Plato: we come across references to a *pompe* (3-4), sacrifices (6, 25 and 32), the distribution of meat (32-34), and a *pannychis* (27).

So, when was this decree issued? The preamble informs us that the *Boule* and the *demos* decided on matters pertaining to Bendis' cult and festival when Pasiphon Phrearrios was secretary. This is probably the same Pasiphon Phrearrios who was general in ca. 410 and who died in 409/8 (PA11668). A further indication is the occurrence of the *kolakretai* (36), a board of Athenian financial officials that was abolished in 411 when they were largely replaced by the so-called *hellenotamiai*. The decree therefore antedates 411, while a reference to a situation of war in line 6 (τῶν πολεμίῳν) suggests the decree postdates 431, when the Peloponnesian War broke out. Although earlier the secretary was commonly followed by the proposer of the decree, in the final quarter of the fifth century it became customary for the eponymous archon to be mentioned after the secretary. In that case the only eponymous archon that can be restored is Κλε[όκριτος ἔρχε], the eponymous archon of 413/2 and there is nothing in Plato that prevents us from dating the inauguration of the Bendideia to Kleokritos' year of office.⁹² So in 413/2 the Athenians decided to further regulate and elaborate the cult of Bendis. But what was decided?

3.2.2 Two processions for Bendis

Plato mentions two processions: in his *Republic* Sokrates comments that he “thought the procession of the citizens (τῶν ἐπιχωρίων) was very fine, but the one that was sent by the Thracians appeared not less conspicuous” (327a).⁹³ Thus, after

⁹¹ Also noted by Nilsson (1960) 78; Ferguson (1949) 132-3 (*agalma*); Roussel (1943) 179 (*stele*).

⁹² Cf. Bingen (1959) 31-7, who pointed out that the particular appearance of the *etta* and the non-stoichedon style suggest a date closer to 411 than to 431. He, moreover, positioned fragment B in between fragments A and C. Roussel (1943) had, however, already convincingly argued for placing A and C next to each and B below these fragments.

⁹³ The polis decree of 413/2 (*IG I³ 136*) might contain a reference to a *pompe*. After the preamble, the decree starts with a curious reference to ΔΙΑΠΟΜΠΙΑΙΟΝ ἀπο τῆς πόλε[ος] (3-4). These lines have puzzled many. Διαπομπάιον is not known in ancient Greek. Roussel (1943) 180-1, suggested it is a reference to an otherwise unknown Zeus Pompaïos. However, Pompaïos, supposedly derived from Zeus' festival the Pompaia, is not a known epithet of Zeus – although it is of Hermes – and Zeus should probably not be expected in a decree concerning the cult of Bendis. Is it a possibility that ΠΟΜΠΙΑΙΟΝ refers to a *pompe*? ἀπο τῆς πόλεος probably refers to moving away from the polis, most likely referring to a movement away

Bendis and her Thracian worshippers had been formally received at the Prytaneion two separate processions went on their way to the Bendideion; one sent by the Thracians and one sent by the Athenians. Apparently, although Athenians and Thracians now both shared in the *hiera* of Bendis they did so separately.

At other large polis festivals with different groups of participants we often find different contingents marching in procession, like at the Panathenaia or the City Dionysia. In the context of the Bendideia, however, each group of worshippers not only participated differentiated but completely separate from each other. Again, we can clearly see the parameters of the acceptance of Bendis and her Thracian worshippers in Athens. Although Bendis and her Thracian worshippers were gradually incorporated into the community their foreignness was never forgotten: Bendis was associated with Artemis but she never lost her foreign clothes, Bendis and her worshippers were officially received by the Athenians but this reception occurred at the Prytaneion, where foreign guests were commonly entertained, there was an official procession but the Thracians processed separately from the *epichorioi*, the native inhabitants of Attika.

3.2.3 A torch-race on horseback? “That’s a new idea!”

After the processions for Bendis, Sokrates wants to return to Athens. But before he can leave Polemarchos, the brother of the famous orator Lysias, and his friend Adeimantos stop him and force him to stay. Sokrates is curious why.

ἄρα γε, ἦ δ' ὅς, οὐδ' ἴστε ὅτι λαμπὰς ἔσται πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἀφ' ἵππων τῆθε ὦ; ἀφ' ἵππων; ἦν δ' ἐγὼ· καινόν γε τοῦτο. λαμπάδια ἔχοντες διαδώσουσιν ἀλλήλοις ἀμιλλώμενοι τοῖς ἵπποις; ἦ πῶς λέγεις; ἔφη ὁ Πολέμαρχος. καὶ πρὸς γε παννυχίδα ποιήσουσιν, ἦν ἄξιον θεάσασθαι· ἔξαναστησόμεθα γὰρ μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον καὶ τὴν παννυχίδα θεασόμεθα.

“Do you mean to say”, interposed Adeimantos, “that you have not heard that there is to be a torch-race this evening on horseback in honour of the goddess?” “On horseback?” said I (i.e. Sokrates). “That is a new idea. Will they carry torches and pass them along to one another as they race with the

from the (outer edges of) the Akropolis, where at the foot of the eastern slope the Prytaneion was located. Cf. Thucydides' remarks (2.15) on the habitation patterns of ancient Athens before Theseus' synoikism on the southern slope and south of the Akropolis: “from that old settlement, the Akropolis is still known among Athenians as the *polis*”.

horses, or how do you mean?” “That is the way of it”, said Polemarchos, “and, besides, there is to be a *pannychis* which will be worth seeing.” (*Rep.* 328a).⁹⁴

This torch-race on horseback in honour of Bendis was, as Sokrates’ amazement highlights, a novelty, something not seen before.⁹⁵ There were several torch-races in Athens, such as the ones at the Prometheia, the Hephaisteia and the Panathenaia, in which the youths of Athens competed on behalf of their *phylai*.⁹⁶ These were, however, all on foot. The peculiar version of the Bendideia should probably be attributed to the Thracians, who were famous for their horses. Already in Homer Thracians were renowned for their horsemanship.⁹⁷ It is likely, then, that during the Bendideia Thracian (and perhaps Athenian) youths competed in a typically Athenian and ephebic activity but with a twist that would emphasise the specifically Thracian background of the *agon*.

In the fourth century this torch-race, which was probably a costly affair in its hippic version, was still a popular event. On a relief of very fine workmanship in the British Museum in London (2155), found in Piraeus and dated to the fourth century, we see Bendis. She is holding two spears and is dressed in her familiar, exotic style with a short *chiton*, a *nebris*, a Phrygian cap, a long cloak and high *embades*. From the left we see ten men approaching. The first two men are bearded and dressed in *himations*; they are clearly older than the eight youths who follow, who are depicted beardless and naked. The first bearded man carries a torch. Bendis reaches out to him with a *patera*, a plate for making libations. What we see here is most likely Bendis honouring the victorious team in the torch-race of the Bendideia.

That these youths who competed in these torch-races in the fourth century probably still included Thracians, or at least non-Greeks, is nicely illustrated by a

⁹⁴ The translation is derived from: P. Shorey, *Plato, The Republic* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1963) *ad loc.*

⁹⁵ L. Beschi, ‘La prospettiva mitica della musica Greca’, *MEFRA* 103 (1991) 40-3 argues, not wholly convincingly, that a red-figure *kylix* in Ferrara (Mus. Arch. 2462) shows preparations for the torch-race of the Bendideia. The outfit of the deity inside the cup does not correspond with other Attic depictions of Bendis and the date of the vase, ca. 430, rules out a connection with the Bendideia, which were only instituted ca. 412.

⁹⁶ Torch-races: Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 254; idem, *Polytheism* (2005) 472; N.V. Sekunda, ‘IG II² 1250: a decree concerning the *lampadephoroi* of the tribe Aiantis’, *ZPE* 83 (1990) 149-56. (Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 463, accidentally refers to a “horse-race on torchback”.)

⁹⁷ E.g. Hom., *Il.* 13.4; 13.576; 23.808. Also see the Athenian epigram for the *proxenos* Pythagoras (*IG I³* 1154) who came from “horse breeding Selymbria”, as we saw earlier.

fourth-century dedication “to Bendis by Daos who had won in the torch-race” (*SEG* 39.210). The dedication was found near Laureion, where it was probably erected by the victor with the non-Greek name Daos, who possibly found a living in the mining-district.⁹⁸

3.2.4 Public sacrifices

That the Bendideia continued to be popular in the fourth-century with the Athenians as well is reflected by the number of animals sacrificed by the polis on the occasion of Bendis’ festival in the late fourth century: in the Lykourgan skin-sale records of 334/3 the Bendideia are accounted with 457 drachmas (*IG* II² 1496.86), indicating that between sixty-five and perhaps as much as one hundred animals, as W.S. Ferguson suggested, had been supplied by the *demos* for the Bendideia of that year.⁹⁹ In 334/3 only the Olympieia (671 Δ. – 82-83), the City-Dionysia (808 Δ. – 80-81), and the sacrifice to Zeus Soter (1005 Δ. – 88-89) produced more income. Although the size of the sacrifices in the Lykourgan period cannot be used as an indication for earlier periods, we can at least conclude that the Bendideia were still celebrated on a large scale in the late fourth century.

That the festival included public sacrifices from the beginning is moreover indicated by the decree regulating Bendis’ cult in which we find several references to sacrifices (*IG* I³ 136.6, 25, and 32). In the first instance the *phylai* (or probably men chosen from each *phyle*) are in some irretrievable way associated with a sacrifice ([---] τῆς φυλῆς ἐκάστος [θ]ύσειν – 6-7). The presence of the *phylai* shows that the Athenians were carefully integrating Bendis’ festival into the official structure of the polis. At other polis festivals, the *phyle*-structure was superimposed onto ancient ritual structures after 508, like at the City-Dionysia, where the dithyrambic *agones* were organized on a *phyle*-basis, and the Panathenaia, where the gymnastic *agones* were organized in the same manner. These were festivals where the unity of the Athenian polis was emphasized. At these polis-wide festivals the polis community was articulated in different ways by means of different marching contingents, differences in the portions of meat allotted to different social and administrative groups, and through the rituals performed by different groups in different ways. We already saw that in the Panathenaic procession focus lay on the

⁹⁸ Cf. Themelis (1989).

⁹⁹ Ferguson (1949) 144-5, believed a hecatomb was sacrificed on the occasion of the Bendideia in 334/3, i.e. one hide yielded 4.5 drachma. M.H. Jameson, ‘Sacrifice and animal husbandry in classical Greece’, *PCPhS Suppl.* 14 (1988) 107-12, suggested one hide yielded seven drachmas.

new demesmen of Attica and on transitional groups like *kanephoroi* and metic youths, while during the *agones* of the City Dionysia emphasis lay on native Athenian men. In the same line of thought one can argue that in the context of the sacrifices of the Bendideia the presence of the ten *phylai* highlighted the unity of the polis of which the Thracians had now become members while the separate processions and the unusual torch-race in turn articulated the differences between the Thracians and the Athenian *epichoroi*.

In the decree of 413/2 we also hear about the distribution of meat of the sacrificed animals (31-36): the ten *hieropoioi* are to distribute the meat of the communal sacrifices (δεμοσίαι θυο[μένον – 32). It is further stated that some group received ten hides (ἀπ]ὸ δέκα ἱερείων – 33), perhaps the priestess (and priest) of Bendis as they were common priestly perquisites. Of the other hides (τὰ δέ ἄλλα δέρματ[α – 33), some went to an unspecified party while others appear to have gone to the *hieropoioi* (34). The regulation of the distribution of meat ends with a reference to fifty, now lost, items and the mentioning of the *kolakretai* who are in charge of the money (35-36). With sacrifices provided for by the *demos*, a role of the *phylai* therein, and with the *hieropoioi* in charge of the *kreanomía*, there could be no mistake: the Bendideia were organised as a polis-wide festival that was controlled by the Athenian *demos*.

3.2.5 A nightly celebration by maidens

There is one last aspect of the Bendideia that has to be mentioned: the *pannychis*. After Polemarchos has mentioned the torch-race, he tries to convince Sokrates one more time to stay by saying that “there is to be a *pannychis* which will be worth seeing” (*Rep.* 328a). Unfortunately we know nothing about this *pannychis*, which, after the processions, the torch-race and the sacrifices probably made up the less formal part of the festival.¹⁰⁰ *Pannychides* were climactic night celebrations at which choruses of maidens and sometimes women danced in honour of a goddess.¹⁰¹ It appears from Plato that the *pannychis* of the Bendideia was watched by men, making it a more open and therefore probably a more charged occasion.

¹⁰⁰ The *pannychis* is also mentioned (without context) in *IG I³* 136.27.

¹⁰¹ W.K. Pritchett, ‘The Παννυχίς of the Panathenaia’, in: ΦΙΛΙΑ ΕΠΗ ΕΙΣ ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΝ Ε. ΜΥΛΩΝΑΝ Bd. 2 (1987) 179-87 and Parker, *Polytheism* (2005) 166, 182-3 and 257, who argues against Pritchett’s disconnection of the climactic aspects from the *pannychis* proper.

We can conclude that after its inauguration in 413/2, the Bendideia included two separate processions, a torch-race on horseback, sacrifices provided for by the polis through the *hieropoioi* and the *kolakretai* and perhaps performed by representatives of the *phylai*, and a *pannychis*. Both Athenian *epichorioi* and Thracians shared in these newly established *hiera* of Bendis; both belonged to the same Athenian community that looked after the obligations of the polis towards the gods.

Two of the events, the torch-race and the *pannychis*, were specifically associated with young men and women. Usually *Athenian* maidens and ephebic youths participated in these activities, now probably also performed by Thracian maidens and youths. Youths and maidens were Attica's future and perhaps the future role of the Thracians as new members of the Athenian community was thus given attention in the context of the Bendideia. The non-Athenian background of these worshippers was, however, not forgotten: the Thracians organised their own procession and competed in a particularly Thracian version of the typically Athenian torch-race.

3.3 Polis and cult, money and priesthood

There is more to a cult than a festival. In the same decree in which the Bendideia are set in place we read about significant changes concerning Bendis' finances and her priesthood. How the polis cult was organised before this decree, i.e. before 413/2, is largely a matter of speculation. Perhaps the Thracians managed Bendis' polis cult on their own from ca. 429, when Bendis' treasury became a concern of the polis, until the reorganisation of 413/2, providing a priestess and other cult personnel. A co-operation with an already established polis cult nearby cannot, however, be ruled out. We might, for instance, imagine the priestess of Artemis Mounychia attending to the rites in the Bendideion, or the cult personnel of Adrast[---] with whom Bendis shared a treasury, or perhaps even the personnel of the Nymphs whose cult was located nearby and who would at least in later times provide shelter to Thracian worshippers during the Bendideia.¹⁰² Unfortunately, we do not know much about this early phase of Bendis' cult as polis cult. What is certain is that some time in 413/2 the Athenians convened on the Pnyx not only to

¹⁰² A Nymphaion is mentioned as the location where the Thracian marchers from the city could find some relaxation after the procession in the decree dated to ca. 261 (*IG II² 1283.13-20*), which is our only evidence for a Nymphaion in Piraeus, most likely also located on Mounychia Hill.

discuss how the new Bendideia should be celebrated but also to set Bendis' income on a firmer footing and decide on the manner in which her priesthood should be filled.

3.3.1 Enhancing Bendis' treasury: the collection of *eparches*

In the decree dealing with Bendis' polis cult and festival (*IG I³ 136*) we come across references to the collection of ἐπαρχῶν (20-22). These *eparches* should probably be seen as an attempt by the *demos* to regulate financial matters of this relatively recent polis cult in order to safeguard its continued existence. With no regular, established means of income it is likely the *demos* imposed a fee upon a group of people connected with Bendis' cult (perhaps all people worshipping her and bringing her sacrifices) to guarantee an income for the goddess.

The term ἐπαρχή is rarely attested, though it is often associated with the term ἀπαρχή. In fifth-century decrees, however, the term ἀπαρχή appears to be exclusively associated with the collection of first-fruits as a thank-offering, like in the famous First-fruit decree (*M&L 73*), while an ἐπαρχη should probably be understood as some kind of tax to provide income for a recently established cult to pay for regular and irregular expenses, like sacrifices during a festival or repairs on a sanctuary.¹⁰³

The only other fifth-century epigraphic attestation of *eparches* is found in the fragmentary amendment to an equally fragmentary decree of the *demos* and the *Boule* dated to ca. 432 (*IG I³ 130.18*), which seems to deal with the use of *eparches* for repairs on a *hieron* of (Apollo) Delios. These *eparches* seem in some way associated with the one-drachma contribution, mentioned in the main decree, paid by each ship-owner who entered Phaleron to a god (τῷ θεῷ – 6) whose name is unfortunately now lost. I therefore think that Ferguson correctly placed the *eparches* of Bendis in line not with the Eleusinian first-fruit dedications but rather with the tax of one drachma for Asklepios, who had only arrived in Athens in 420, and with the τέλος of the πεντεδραχμίας for Theseus, whose cult experienced a great revival after Kimon had recovered the hero's bones from Skiros in 475, even though these taxes are only attested in a decree of the late 340s (*Hesp. 5* (1936) no.10.134-35 and 142-43). The *eparches* collected by the *demos* for Bendis should

¹⁰³ Later, in the fourth century, the term ἐπαρχή seems to have been used indifferently from ἀπαρχή, like in a late fourth-century decree concerning the Eleusinian cult of Demeter and Kore (*IG II² 1672. 288* (ἐπαρχή) and *297* (ἀπαρχή)).

then be similarly understood as a safety measure by the *demos* to cover some of the expenses of this recent polis cult.¹⁰⁴

Can we say anything else about Bendis' income in these early years? In the case of Theseus, Robert Schlaifer tentatively suggested that the income from the tax, a multiple of 1,000 drachmas annually, was perhaps additional to the income that came from the lease of space inside the Theseum and the rent of properties inside the Great Walls that was managed by the association traditionally in charge of the cult, perhaps to be identified with the family of the Philaidai to which Kimon belonged.¹⁰⁵ In the case of Asklepios, the income from the *telos* of one drachma, which also seems to have been a multiple of 1,000 drachmas per annum, was (eventually) supplemented by income that was derived from properties owned by the cult, like the house and garden donated to Asklepios by Demon of Paiania in the mid-fourth century (*IG II² 4969*).¹⁰⁶

Matters do not seem to have been significantly different in the case of Bendis' cult. In a mid-fourth-century decree of the Thracians in charge of the cult (*IG II² 1361*) we read that money was made from the rent of a house and the sale of water from which they paid for repairs on the Bendideion (8-11). In the same decree we also read that the *orgeones* decided that each worshipper should pay a contribution of two drachmas on the 16th of Thargelion (17-20), i.e. just three days before the Bendideia, presumably to cover some of the costs of that festival. It seems likely, then, that similar to the cult of Asklepios and Theseus, the *eparches* collected by the *demos* supplemented, or were later on supplemented by, income that derived from sources controlled by the smaller worshipping association that took care of the cult on a more daily basis, i.e. the Thracian worshippers known as *orgeones* rather than the *demos* at large.

Although there could be no mistake that Bendis' cult on Mounychia Hill was a cult of the polis, the Thracian worshippers of the goddess were thus allowed (or required) a continuing and influential involvement in the running of her cult. In the following centuries this co-operation between Athenian *demos* and Thracian

¹⁰⁴ Ferguson (1949) 142-44, who was heavily indebted to the important contribution made by R. Schlaifer, 'Notes on Athenian public cults', *HSCP* 51 (1940) 233-41.

¹⁰⁵ Schlaifer (1940) 238. Cf. Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 316-7 on the Philaidai.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. S.B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion. The people, their dedications and the inventories* (Amsterdam 1989) 96-9, who suggested the tax for Asklepios cannot have been instituted in the beginning of the cult in 420 since state intervention is only attested for ca. 350. I will argue elsewhere for a more gradual intervention of the polis with this cult, already starting in 420.

orgeones in the context of Bendis' polis cult only became more intertwined, as we will soon see. Let us first, however, consider the last, and certainly not the least, aspect of this cult the Athenians discussed in 413/2: the manner in which Bendis' priesthood should be filled.

3.3.2 Bendis' priesthood: Thracian or Athenian?

After the mention of *eparches* follow arguably the most interesting but also most puzzling lines of the decree of 413/2 (*IG I³ 136*). Lines 29-31 read:

[..... c.13.....] εἴτε χρὲ γυναῖκα hiereos[.....c.30.....]
 [...c.8....] Ἀθηναίῳ ἀπάντων πεμφσάντων [...c.32.....]
 [...c.13.....] ὅς τάχιστα·

These lines instantly bring to mind the decree regulating the appointment of a priestess for Athena Nike and the building of a new temple for her on the Akropolis (*IG I³ 35*), which has been variously dated to ca. 450-445 and to ca. 430-427.¹⁰⁷ Lines 2-5 of that decree read:

[.....c.15.....] Γλαῦκος εἶπε· [τῆι]
 [Ἀθηναία τῆι Νί]κει hierean he ἄγ [κλ]-
 [ερομένε λάχει] ἔχσ Ἀθηναίον haπα[σῶ]-
 [ν καθίστα]σθαι

Glaukos proposed that for
 Athena Nike a priestess,
 being chosen by lot from all Athenian women,
 is to be appointed.

It was a truly revolutionary and democratic decision to have the future priestess of Athena Nike appointed by lot from all Athenian women (ἐχσ Ἀθηναίον haπασῶν). Before the classical period, the priests and priestesses of polis cults were normally appointed by lot from specific *gene*, priestly “clans” like the Eteoboutadai, who held the priesthood for Athena Polias and Poseidon Erechtheus, or the Salaminioi, who filled the priesthoods of Athena Skiras, Herakles at Porthmos, Eurysakes and

¹⁰⁷ M&L no. 44 date the decree to (?) 450-445, while their main opponent, Harold Mattingly, has, ever since his initial publication in *Historia* 10 (1961) 169-71, always defended a later date based on more gradual adoption of the so-called three-bar sigma.

the probably joint priesthood of Aglauros, Pandrosos and Kourotrophos.¹⁰⁸ From the fifth century onwards we find besides these gentilician priesthoods what modern scholars have now commonly labelled “democratic priesthoods”: priesthoods that were filled by sortition from all Athenians, either from all Athenian men, all Athenian women or, in the case of a annually rotating priesthood that alternated between the different Attic tribes, from all Athenians belonging to a specific *phyle*. Two certain and one possible example are attested for the classical period: we just saw that Athena Nike’s priestess was appointed from all Athenian women; Asklepios’ annual priest came from all Athenian men belonging to one *phyle*; and there is a possibility, as we will see, that Bendis’ priestess was also chosen from all Athenians.¹⁰⁹

The decision to open up Athenian priesthoods to all Athenians should probably be explained as part of a larger development in which the Athenian *demos* gradually complemented most of the privileges that had traditionally belonged to the *gene* and other archaic institutions.¹¹⁰ It can even be argued that it was the icing on the cake of Athenian democracy: after the reforms of Kleisthenes, Perikles, and Ephialtes, the decision to appoint priests from all Athenians created a situation in which *all* important polis offices were now open to all Athenians, most notably not only to all Athenian men but, in the case of the priesthood of Athena Nike, also to all Athenian women.

Josine Blok has even associated Perikles’ Citizenship Law of 451 (PCL) with the opening up of priesthoods to all Athenians. She argues that PCL was not a

¹⁰⁸ On the method of selection: Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 56-66; S.B. Aleshire, ‘The *demos* and the priests: the selection of sacred officials at Athens from Cleisthenes to Augustus’ in: R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (eds.), *Ritual, finance, politics: Athenian democratic accounts presented to David Lewis* (Oxford 1994) 325-37; J.H. Blok and S.D. Lambert, ‘The appointment of priests in Attic *gene*’, *ZPE* 169 (2009) 95-121 with S.D. Lambert, ‘Aristocracy and the Attic *gene*: a mythological perspective’ 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)*, forthcoming.

¹⁰⁹ On Asklepios’ priesthood: D.D. Feaver, ‘The priesthoods of Athens’, *YCS* 15 (1957) 123-58 (arguing for an initial date in 420) and Aleshire, *Asklepieion* (1989) 72-85 (from the 350s onwards). Other religious offices could be filled in a similar manner. For instance, two of the four *epimeletai* of the Mysteries were appointed by the *demos* ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων ([Arist.] *Ath.Pol.* 57.1).

¹¹⁰ On this development: Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 122-9, who sees it as the control of the *demos* succeeding the control by previous organs of the polis *contra* R. Garland, ‘Religious authority in archaic and classical Athens’, *BSA* 79 (1984) 78-9 and idem, *Introducing* (1992) esp. 99-111, who characterises the development as a take-over by the *demos*, or triumph of the *demos* over the old archaic power structures.

closing of the ranks motivated by demography, civic protectionism, or even racism, but rather a guarantee that all candidates for a democratic priesthood, i.e. all Athenian men *and* women, answered to certain qualities of citizenship, which was ultimately based on descent. Thus, the endogamy traditionally required of gentilician priests was still guaranteed. Through PCL all Athenians constituted one big *genos*. From this newly created super *genos* the priests and priestesses of Athens' public cult could now be appointed by lot, just like they were appointed from the archaic Attic *gene*.¹¹¹ Was Bendis' priesthood to be filled in this new, democratic manner? Was Bendis' cult literally a cult of all Athenians? The Athenians were hesitant.

Compared to the decree that includes the regulation of the appointment Athena Nike's priestess, the inscription concerning Bendis' priestess shows some significant differences. Most importantly, in the decree concerning the cult of Bendis the decision on how to appoint the priestess has not yet been made. It actually states that an embassy has to be sent as quickly as possible (πεμφσάντων [...] ὅς τάχιστα – 30-31), to seek advice from an oracle, indicated by the beginning of the question (εἴτε χρεῖ), which was typical for consultations of an oracle. The question to be asked, as I read it, could be either:

Whether it is necessary (εἴτε χρεῖ) that a woman and a man who are to be priestess and priest (i.e. of Deloptes, a hero connected with Bendis' cult in later decrees¹¹²) should be appointed from the Thracians or from all Athenians (ἐχς ᾿Αθηναίων ἀπάντων in this case denoting both male and female Athenians¹¹³), or

¹¹¹ J.H. Blok, 'Oude en nieuwe burgers', *Lampas* 36 (2003) 21-3; idem. 'Perikles' citizenship law: a new perspective', *Historia* 58 (2009) 141-70.

¹¹² *IG* II² 1361.4-7 (post 350); 1324.15 (late 4th, early 3rd c.); 1283.21 (ca. 261); *Ag.*19, L16.3 (late 2nd, early 1st c.). See also the relief in Copenhagen (Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek 462) which belongs to the honorary decree of the *orgeones* for their *epimeletai* Euphyes and Dexios, dated to 329/8, on which we see Bendis and Deloptes. On an early third-century relief on Samos (cf. Th. Wiegand, *AM* 20 (1900) 172) we also find Bendis and Deloptes depicted together.

¹¹³ This was already suggested by Bingen (1959) 33: εἴτε χρεῖ γυναιῖκα ἱερεο[σύνην τῆς θεῶ ἱεραῖσθαι] Θραῖττα[ν εἴτε ᾿Αθηνα]ίων ἀπάντων; F. Sokolowski, *LSCG* (1962) no. 6.15-16: εἴτε χρεῖ γυναιῖκα ἱερεο[σθαι τῆι Βενδίδι διὰ γένος] Θραῖττα[ν ἢ ἄνδρα ἐχς ᾿Αθηνα]ίων ἀπάντων; Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 172 who writes "should she be Athenian or Thracian" was perhaps the question". However, all these scholars ignored the fact that a priest has to be included in the question as ᾿Αθηναίων ἀπάντων cannot refer to women only which would give ᾿Αθηναίων ἡπασῶν, as in the Athena Nike decree.

Whether it is necessary (ἐῴτε χρὲ) that a woman who is to be priestess is to answer to a now tragically lost qualification or not. In this case it seems likely that the embassy to be sent to the oracle will be selected from all Athenians (ἐξ Ἰσθμίου ἅπαντων in this case denoting only male Athenians).¹¹⁴

It can therefore not be said with certainty whether Bendis' priesthood was as democratic as the one of Athena Nike. What the decree *does* indicate is that the Athenians felt responsible for Bendis' priesthood and struggled with the question of how it should be organised. From the decree which refers to the grant of *enktesis* and the procession from the Prytaneion (*IG II² 1283*) it is clear that the Thracian community had quite a considerable say in the running of Bendis' polis cult on Mounychia Hill from the beginning. And in later decrees we come across Thracian *orgeones* managing Bendis' cult on a daily basis. It seems at least likely, then, that the Athenians had to carefully consider the possibility of a Thracian priestess for Bendis. Unlike the priestess of Athena Nike, who was to be appointed from all Athenian women, the priestess of Bendis could perhaps be a non-Athenian. A careful consideration was asked for and divine advice was sought; were the priests attending to the rites in the Bendideion to be Thracians or Athenians? Shortly after PCL had created a pool of potential priests out of all Athenians, the Athenian *demos* was now faced with the possibility that an outsider could intrude into this only recent democratic institution. Unfortunately we do not know what the gods answered; in later decrees we come across a priestess for Bendis and a priest for Deloptes but their background remains unclear.

4 The *orgeones* of Bendis

Let us now turn to the final attested phase in the gradual acceptance of Bendis and her Thracian worshippers as members of the Athenian community. Unlike most other foreign deities worshipped by non-Athenians in Attica, Bendis' cult was not taken care of by a group of so-called *thiasotai*. Instead, the Thracian worshippers who managed her cult on a daily basis went by the highly privileged name of

¹¹⁴ For the procedure of selecting an embassy to go to Delphi see especially *IG II² 204 (RO 58)* on the question whether the sacred *orgas* of Demeter and Kore currently cultivated should be rented out or should be left uncultivated for the goddess. Here “the people are to choose three men, one from the *Boule* and two from all Athenians (ἐξ Ἰσθμίου ἅπαντων), to go to Delphi to ask the god according to which of the two written messages the Athenians should act with regard to the sacred *orgas*, whether that from the gold *hydria* or that from the silver *hydria*” (42-47). Cf. Bowden, *Delphic oracle* (2005).

orgeones. This name seems to have been granted to them on account of their involvement in Bendis' polis cult and their management of the Bendideion on behalf of the polis. This probably even led to the acceptance of these Thracian cult managers in the Attic phratries, as I will argue shortly.

First a word on the relatively small size of the known groups of *orgeones*. As groups of *orgeones* were on average relatively small – where we have numbers they do not exceed sixteen *orgeones*¹¹⁵ – we have to envisage only a small delegation of Bendis' Thracian worshippers being called *orgeones* and thus being *de facto* accepted by a phratry. Still, the inscription regulating a good cooperation between the *orgeones* in Piraeus and the *orgeones* in the city in order that “the whole (Thracian) *ethnos* will seem in harmony” (*IG II² 1283.22-3*) demonstrates the representativeness of these *orgeones* for the Thracian community in Attica as a whole. So, though most Thracian worshippers were probably not enrolled in a phratry, that some of them probably were signals the exceptional position of all Thracians within the Athenian community.

4.1 The *orgeones* of Attica: Philochoros, *FGrH*328 F35 and the phratries

The subject of *orgeones* is a rather complex one.¹¹⁶ As with many of the associations of ancient Athens, it is not entirely clear what their origin, function and status was within the polis. The old view that they were the commoners of archaic Attica opposite a group of aristocratic *gennetai* was rejected long ago.¹¹⁷ However, recent attempts to describe them either in (modern) legalistic terms or as a reaction to the rigid egalitarianism of Athenian democracy are equally unconvincing.¹¹⁸ In

¹¹⁵ We have a third-century dedication naming sixteen *orgeones* of Asklepios from Prospalta (*IG II² 2355*). The unpublished *SEG* 41.84 presents a catalogue of *orgeones* of (Herakles) Pankrates: seven are from Phlya, two from Probalinthos. The *orgeones*-like Dionysiastai of the second century (*IG II² 1325* – ca.185/4) are fifteen in number. Ferguson (1944) 80 n. 27 furthermore suggested that the two *triclinia* cited as seating capacity for the *orgeones* of Egretes in *IG II² 2499.29-30* (306/5) imply a group of twelve to thirty diners.

¹¹⁶ Still most important is Ferguson (1944) and (1949). Also see Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 109-11 and 333-42. Cf. J.D. Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1998) 137-55, who offers a thorough discussion of the religious associations of Hellenistic Athens.

¹¹⁷ See, however, Y. Ustinova, ‘*Orgeones* in phratries: A mechanism of social integration in Attica’ *Kernos* 9 (1996) 227-42, who suggests that *orgeones* were immigrants in archaic times who could enrol in the phratries but not in the Attic *gene* and who were therefore unable to partake in the cults of the *gene*.

¹¹⁸ The old view was convincingly refuted by A. Andrewes, ‘Philochoros on phratries’, *JHS* 81 (1961) 1-15. For more recent approaches: Jones, *Associations* (1999) who, as his title already

the most general sense *orgeones* can be described as people who are organised to privately worship a hero or deity with rites (*orgia*) in a privately established shrine, while also performing some role in the religion of the polis at large. This role in polis religion seems to have led to the public recognition of these worshippers and their automatic acceptance by the phratries, of which they probably formed a sub-division.

Orgeones already existed in archaic times. Although it is uncertain whether the famous “Solonian law on associations” (*Digest* 47.22.4), which states that when certain associations, among them *orgeones*, “make arrangements among themselves these shall be binding unless forbidden by public law”, actually dates to ca. 594, the statement (in the *Suda s.v.* Ὀργεῶνες) that the historian Seleukos had reported that *orgeones* were mentioned on the *axones* of Solon indicates they were at least in existence in the legislator’s lifetime.¹¹⁹

A law mentioned by Philochoros (*FGrH* 328 F35) is especially interesting here as it is indicative of the privileged status of *orgeones* in Athenian society. It states:

περὶ δὲ τῶν ὀργεῶνων γέγραφε καὶ Φιλόχορος· τοὺς δὲ φρατόρας ἔπι
 ἀναγκῆς δέχεσθαι καὶ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας καὶ τοὺς ὁμογάλακτας, οὓς γένν
 ἦτας καλοῦμεν.

On the *orgeones* Philochoros wrote: and it was compulsory for the *phratores* to admit both *orgeones* and *homogalaktēs* [i.e. those of the same milk], whom we call *gennetai*.¹²⁰

This suggests that associations of *orgeones* were, similar to *gene*, sub-divisions of the phratries of Attica, the archaic hereditary sub-divisions of the polis that controlled access to the citizen body by checking proper Athenian descent. After 508 this control on admission to the citizen body became a shared responsibility of the phratries with the Kleisthenic demes; broadly speaking, from 508 onwards the phratries remained the gatekeepers to the polis community by checking the pivotal

states, views associations as a response to democracy and I.N. Arnaoutoglou, *Thusias eneka kai sunousias: private religious associations in Hellenistic Athens* (Athens 2003), who struggles to get away from a legalistic perspective.

¹¹⁹ *Suda s.v.* Ὀργεῶνες: “Seleukos in his *Commentary on Solon’s Axones* says that those holding gatherings about certain heroes or gods are called *orgeones*”. On the Solonian law on associations: Jones, *Associations* (1999) 33-44.

¹²⁰ Cf. Andrewes (1961) and Lambert, *Phratries* (1998) 46-9.

qualification of citizenship, i.e. Athenian descent while enrolment in a deme enabled adult, Athenian men to enter the military and political bodies of Attica. Phratry membership thus remained the touchstone of proper Athenian descent and it is deployed as such in the orators, where rights based on descent are at issue, like inheritance, adoption and, essentially, Athenian citizenship.¹²¹ The law mentioned by Philochoros suggests that being a member of a group of *orgeones* was considered sufficient proof of one's qualification for acceptance by a phratry, leading to automatic access into a phratry, and therefore into the Athenian citizen body.¹²²

What does this tell us about the position of the Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis? Should we go as far as thinking these Thracian worshippers were accepted into a phratry and, if so, up to what degree? Most scholars fiercely object to this idea and suggest that the law mentioned by Philochoros was either no longer effective in the late fifth century or only applied to one particular group of *orgeones*.¹²³ However, nothing suggests that the law was no longer effective in the late fifth century or that we need to distinguish different types of *orgeones*. Rather, *all orgeones* appear to have been privately organised worshippers who were automatically enrolled in the phratries and we will see that this automatic acceptance of *orgeones* as members of the Athenian community was most likely derived from their management of their cult and shrine on behalf of the polis or at least a wider clientele.

The law on the automatic acceptance of *gennetai* and *orgeones* by the phratries is usually thought to be part of book 4 of Philochoros' *Atthis*, as we know

¹²¹ On *phratries*: Lambert, *Phratries* (1998), with 27-42 on the role of deme and phratry in relation to the access to the citizen body.

¹²² There is only one instance suggesting two separate enrolments among *orgeones* and *phrateres*: Isaeus 2.14. Already in the late nineteenth century Wilamowitz (via Andrewes (1961) 9) emphasised that the orator used different terms to describe the presentation of the defendant to a phratry (εἰσάγει) and the enrolment among his adoptive father's *orgeones* (ἐγγράφει), perhaps reflecting a difference between simple presentation and effective enrolment. Andrewes (1961) 9, further argued that the speaker was "not concerned to give a narrative of his admissions, only [...] to make the most of each distinguishable group that can attest to his adoption", while Arnaoutoglou, *Thusias* (2003) 35-6, suggests that the passage stressed the assured continuance of the *oikos* of the deceased.

¹²³ Philochoros on *orgeones* in book 4: Suda s.v. Ὀργεῶνες; Harpokration s.v. γεννήται. On *orgeones* most importantly: Ferguson (1944). Echoed, for instance, by Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 333-8, who writes that "clearly the old rule that anyone admitted to a group of *orgeones* must also be automatically admitted to an associated phratry did not apply in this case [i.e. of the Thracian *orgeones*]".

that Philochoros mentioned *orgeones* in that section.¹²⁴ Book 4 probably runs from Ephialtes' reforms in 462 to the end of the Peloponnesian War in 403 and the law would accordingly date to this period. William Scott Ferguson, however, argued that a date between 462 and 403 cannot be accepted for the law on *orgeones* as by that time Thracians were called *orgeones* and "aliens were debarred from being *phrateres*".¹²⁵ He therefore distinguished two classes of *orgeones*: class A consisting of groups of citizen *orgeones* worshipping a hero in the city with only a host (*hestiator*) as personnel and a more recent class B of foreign *orgeones* worshipping an imported deity in Piraeus with a larger staff, including *epimeletai* and treasurers. Ferguson further pointed out that the term *homogalaktes* appears to be archaic. He therefore suggested that the mention of the law was a digression in Philochoros and should rather be ascribed to the sixth century when there were no metic *orgeones* yet.¹²⁶ According to Ferguson then, the law only applied to the (archaic) *orgeones* of class A, who were clear-cut citizens. Most scholars still follow this scheme. But can we be so certain there were indeed two types of *orgeones*?

4.2 *Orgeones* and their role in polis religion

Probably in the late fifth and certainly in the fourth century *orgeones* were no longer solely Athenian citizens worshipping a hero as the Thracian worshippers running Bendis' cult were now also called *orgeones*. This may seem as an extraordinary departure from traditional usage of the term. Usually foreigners organised themselves in so-called *thiasoi* to privately worship their native deities. So, why not the Thracian worshippers of Bendis in Piraeus? One solution is to distinguish two classes of *orgeones*, as Ferguson has done. However, if we look at

¹²⁴ Recently C. Theodoridis, 'Ein unbeachtete Buchangabe zum Bruchstück des Philochoros über die attischen *Orgeonen*', *ZPE* 138 (2002) 40-2, argued that the attribution of the law to book 4 is tenuous as only the lexica connect the law with another reference to *orgeones* in book 4 of the *Atthis*. Theodoridis refers to an Alexandrian manuscript (Marcianus gr. 433 fol. 56^v) that states Philochoros also mentions *orgeones* in book 3, including the Solonian period, and he argues the law can therefore be expected to belong to this period. However, Phil. F35b, which gives the book 4 reference, links quite clearly in its detailed wording to F35a, which mentions the law on the automatic acceptance of *homogalaktes* and *orgeones*, on which see Lambert, *Phratries* (1998) 46 n.91. Either way, whether dated to the Solonian period or to the second half of the fifth century, the law is never said to have been repudiated and the use of the term *orgeones* to denote the Thracian worshippers of Bendis still needs explaining.

¹²⁵ Ferguson (1944) 68.

¹²⁶ *Ibidem*, 64-8.

the evidence there is nothing that necessitates a distinction between two classes of *orgeones*.¹²⁷ It even appears that Bendis' Thracian worshippers constitute the whole of Ferguson's class B as they seem to be the only certain case of foreigners being called *orgeones*.¹²⁸ If we moreover take a closer look at these Thracian *orgeones*, they turn out not so exceptional after all.

We have evidence for eighteen groups of *orgeones*, given in an appendix at the end of this chapter. Looking for common characteristics, it appears *orgeones* were privately organised groups who met once a month or once a year for religious purposes in a privately established shrine. They seem to have had full control of their shrine. This is indicated, for instance, by orgeonic decrees that record the renting of a *hieron* owned by *orgeones* to individuals who paid the *orgeones* for the use of the shrine and its land with the promise to keep it accessible to the *orgeones* on specific days of the years, on which the *orgeones* came together to worship their hero or god.¹²⁹ The *orgeones* also had their own personnel, varying from a single host (*hestiator*) to a staff including treasurers and *epimeletai*, whom they honoured with elaborate inscriptions and crowns.¹³⁰ In addition, as the law mentioned by Philochoros indicates, *orgeones* were in some way publicly acknowledged and automatically accepted by the phratries.

¹²⁷ So, the distinction between hero and "minor deity" is rather arbitrary. Robert Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 109 n. 29, already asked "whether the wall of division between the two classes is firm". See my appendix for a list of all known groups of *orgeones*.

¹²⁸ The other *orgeones* in class B are the *orgeones* of the Mother of the Gods (no. 14), the Dionysiastai (no. 15) and the *orgeones* of the Syrian Hagne Aphrodite (no. 16). It seems that Mother was initially worshipped by foreigners who were organised in a *thiasos* that was later taken over by a group of citizen *orgeones*; *IG II² 1316* is a decree by *orgeones* but also refers to *thiasostai*. Cf. Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 192-3 and Jones, *Associations* (1999) 262-4. The Dionysiastai seem to have consisted of a small club of relatively wealthy citizens resident in Piraeus. In the case of Hagne Aphrodite there is a chance of a foreign member: although it seems clear from *IG II² 1337 (97/6)* that the *orgeones* of Syrian Aphrodite were citizens, the priestess Nikasis is a Corinthian. In a second-century decree of *orgeones* of Aphrodite we further come across a Serapion from Herakleia (*MDAI (A) 66 (1941) 228, no.4*). The only other attested foreign *orgeon* seems to be Asklaon from Maroneia who was honoured by *orgeones* in ca. 200 (*IG II² 2947*).

¹²⁹ E.g. *IG II² 2501* (late 4th c.) records the lease of the *hieron* of the *orgeones* of Hypodektes for all time to Diopeithes and his descendants for 50 Δ a year on the promise that on the 14th of Boedromion they will open the shrine at daybreak, garland it and oil and unveil the cult statue so that the *orgeones* can receive the *hiera*. In *IG II² 2499 (306/5)* the *orgeones* of Egretes record the renting of their shrine to Diognetos for 200 Δ a year.

¹³⁰ E.g. *IG II² 2947* (Bendis? – 3rd c.); *IG II² 1316* (Mother – 272/1), *IG II² 1325*; (Dionysos – 185/4); *IG II² 1337* (Hagne Aphrodite – 95/4).

The public recognition of *orgeones* was most likely based on the role *orgeones* played in the religion of the polis in addition to their private rites, like the performance of a rite on behalf of the polis or the management of a shrine, making it accessible to outsiders. This was first tentatively suggested by Robert Parker. To illustrate the public aspects of *orgeones* he refers to the *orgeones* of Hypodektes (Receiver) who seem to have played some role in receiving the sacred objects from Eleusis on the day before the Mysteries. He also argues that the public shrines of the healing heroes Amynos and Heros Iatros (Hero Doctor), both managed by *orgeones*, must have attracted a wider clientele than only the *orgeones*. This can, for instance, be seen in the many dedications found in the sanctuary of Amynos that was located on the west slope of the Akropolis. Parker even suggests the dangerous hero Egretes was looked after by a group of *orgeones* for the public good. In these cases Parker finds “a little support” for a more public role of *orgeones*, which might have led to their acceptance by the phratries.¹³¹

I fully agree with Parker’s approach. We can even add several more examples to his list of *orgeones* with a public role, which would seem to make an even stronger case for *orgeones* as privately organised worshippers with a public aspect for which they were acknowledged and accepted by the phratries. To Parker’s list we can add: 1) the *orgeones* of Asklepios, that other famous healing deity, whose yet unlocated shrine in Prospalta was surely visited by more (sick) people besides the *orgeones*¹³²; 2) the *orgeones* of (Herakles) Pankrates, whose shrine on the banks of the Ilissos River also seems to have been used by a *thiasos* and a group *eranistai* and at which were found at least 53 dedications dating from the mid-fourth to the early third century¹³³; 3) the *orgeones* of the Mother of the Gods, who not only seem to have absorbed a foreign *thiasos* but also ran a shrine that was used by

¹³¹ Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 110-1. On Hypodektes also see E. Kearns, *The heroes of Attica* (London 1989) 74-5, who otherwise rejects any public aspect of the *orgeones*. On the Amyneion and the dedications: A. Körte, ‘Bezirk eines Heilgottes’, *MDAI (A)* 18 (1893) 231-56, idem, ‘Das Heiligtum des Amynos’, *MDAI (A)* 21 (1896) 287-332.

¹³² *IG II² 2355* (3rd c.?). Cf. Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 339 who wonders whether there is a functional difference between the *orgeones* of Asklepios administering their own local shrine and the Asklepiastai merely using the public Asklepieion on the Akropolis.

¹³³ E. Vikela, *Die Weihreliefs aus dem Pankrates-Heiligtum am Ilissos: religion-geschichtliche Bedeutung und Typologie* (Berlin 1994) and *SEG* 41.247 for a summary of the largely unpublished inscriptions of this shrine.

others to set up dedications¹³⁴; 4) the *orgeones* of Aphrodite, who in 138/7 performed a sacrifice “on behalf of the *koinon* of *orgeones*, their children, their wives and the Athenian *demos*” (*MDAI (A)* 66 (1941) 228, no.4. 5-6); and 5) the *orgeones* of Zeus Epakrios on Mt Hymettos, who, as Stephen Lambert cautiously suggested, might have been an Erchia based group in charge of a cult site that was being shared by more than one group.¹³⁵ Finally, we will soon see that the *orgeones* of Bendis also performed important public roles.

It thus appears that, similar to the *gene*, most *orgeones* also performed a more public role, taking care of several religious obligations on behalf of the polis at large or managing a shrine and making it accessible for outsiders in addition to their private rites: of the eighteen attested groups of *orgeones* at least ten can be demonstrated to have some sort of public aspect.¹³⁶ One could argue therefore that these groups of *gennetai* and *orgeones* functioned as an intermediary or facilitating level between the polis and those outside the formal structures of official worshipping communities, like individual worshippers or people organised in *thiasoi* etc.

Significantly, the Thracian *orgeones* were no different in that sense than, say, the *orgeones* of the god Hypodektes, who received the *hiera* during the Mysteries, or the *orgeones* of Pankrates, who seemed in control of a shrine that was also visited by a *thiasos*. The Thracians were deeply involved in the running of Bendis’ cult and in managing her shrine on Mounychia Hill. Rhonda Simms already

¹³⁴ Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 192-3 and M.J. Vermaseren, *Corpus cultus Cybelae Attidisque* (Leiden 1982) 68-97. Most important for the groups in charge of the Metroon in Piraeus is *IG II² 1316*: a decree by *orgeones* but also referring to *thiasotai*.

¹³⁵ S.D. Lambert, ‘Two notes on Attic *leges sacrae*’, *ZPE* 130 (2000b) 77-8. For the *orgeones* of Zeus Epakrios see the mid third-century inscription recording the transactions of the *orgeones* of Zeus Epakrios that was found in Plaka (*IG II² 1294*). In the sacrificial calendar from Erchia (*SEG* 21.541) we find a reference to a sacrifice by the Erchians on 16 Thargelion to Zeus Epakrios on Hymettos (E 59-64), which was not located within the deme Erchia. Perhaps the shrine of Zeus Epakrios on Hymettos can be identified with the summit sanctuary published by M.K. Langdon, *A sanctuary of Zeus on Mount Hymettos* (*Hesp. Suppl.* 16)(1976).

¹³⁶ One could compare this public role of *orgeones* to some of the responsibilities of *gene*. The Salaminioi, for instance, seem to have managed the shrine of Eurysakes on behalf of the *phyle* Aiantis; the *genos* set up decrees in the Eurysakeion (*IG II² 1232*) and provided a priest for his cult (*Hesp.* 7 (1938) 3, no. 1.11), while the *phyle* also used it to display its decrees (e.g. *Hesp.* 7 (1938) 94-5, no. 15), cf. Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 311. The Praxiergidai seem to have taken care of a shrine of Herakles in the Agora that was perhaps also used by a *thiasos* if an altar that was found in the Agora indeed reads “*hieron* of Herakles of the Praxiergidai and of the following *thiasotai* who share (in it)” (*Agora* I 1052), as S.D. Lambert, ‘Two documents of Attic *gene*’, *Horos* 14-16 (2000-2003) 79-82 proposes. Cf. S.D. Lambert, ‘*IG II² 2345*, *thiasoi* of Herakles and the Salaminioi again’, *ZPE* 125 (1999) 109 and 124.

suggested that the Thracian caretakers of Bendis' cult were granted the privileged name of *orgeones* because they were ordered by polis law to send a procession from the Hestia and therefore performed a sort of "state function".¹³⁷ The Thracians were, in addition, publicly and officially recognized by the Athenians as members of their community, not only by granting them certain privileges like *enktesis*, but also by the ritual language of the Bendideia. To call the Thracian worshippers *orgeones* is completely in line with this ritual language.

In sum, defining *orgeones* as privately organised *and* publicly recognised members of Athens' religious community, we no longer have to see the decision to call the Thracian worshippers of Bendis *orgeones* as an exceptional departure from traditional usage of the term and we no longer have to distinguish two classes of *orgeones*, a distinction the Athenians never made. I find it equally unnecessary to date the law mentioned by Philochoros to the sixth century. In fact, Andrewes already suggested the law was an amendment to Perikles' Citizenship Law of 451 and Lambert even argues it was part of it, as PCL regulated the admission to the citizen community and most likely called for further regulation on the level of the phratries as they played the major role in controlling the main qualification for Athenian citizenship, i.e. descent, which now had to be checked for both parents.¹³⁸ And even if the law mentioned in Philochoros was a sixth-century creation, there is nothing to suggest it was no longer valid in the fifth century; fifth-century *orgeones* were still privately organised worshippers who performed a public service and were publicly acknowledged for it. The only change that had occurred was that from the late fifth, early fourth century onwards *orgeones* could be (Thracian) metics.

The obvious conclusion therefore seems to be that the Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis were accepted into the Attic phratries on account of their management of Bendis' cult and shrine in Piraeus; an exceptional privilege granted to the representatives of an exceptional foreign community in Attica! However, be this as it may, it is difficult to imagine the phratries *fully* accepting a group of foreigners in their midst. Phratry membership was the touchstone of proper Athenian descent and it was intimately connected with Athenian citizenship as can be seen most clearly in the orators on cases like inheritance, adoption, or even citizenship.¹³⁹ The idea of the Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis automatically qualifying for full Athenian

¹³⁷ Simms (1988) 68-9.

¹³⁸ Andrewes (1961)13-4 and Lambert, *Phratries* (1998) 44-7.

¹³⁹ *Supra* n. 121.

citizenship through their acceptance into a phratry becomes even more difficult to accept when we read in a decree of the Thracian *orgeones* (*IG II² 1361*), dated post 350, that membership used to be hereditary but from then onwards became available upon the payment of a fee, with new members in addition subjected to a scrutiny (20-23). We have to assume that an institution as fussy about admissions as the Demotionidai/Dekeleis in their famous decree (*IG II² 1237*) was not going to let someone in on the payment of a fee.¹⁴⁰

I am not trying to deny the fact that the Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis were accepted by the phratries, but what then was their position in the phratries into which they were accepted on account of their role in Athenian polis religion? We should probably envisage some sort of partial membership; full phratry membership, as a qualification for Athenian citizenship, was not within the reach of these Thracians, but other (religious?) roles within a phratry probably were. It is interesting in this context to realise that in the course of the fifth century, differentiated membership, with differentiated roles for different groups of people in the community of which one was to be a member, had gradually become more extensive in both the polis and the demes, as we have just seen in the previous three chapters. In addition, it can be noted that, probably in conjunction with this trend, the second half of the fifth century witnessed a general tendency to distinguish status groups more precisely. Perhaps we can propose a similar process going on in the phratries, with Bendis' *orgeones* automatically accepted but only to certain parts of phratry community life in a certain way.

Whether the Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis were also accepted by the demes through which they could gain access to the political and juridical fields of the Athenian polis is highly unlikely. A similar situation seems to apply to the women who were acknowledged by the phratries of their husbands during the phratry-festival of the Apatouria at a rite called *gamelia*, but who were excluded from the deme registers and thus excluded from political and juridical participation in the community.¹⁴¹ The fact that the deme registers remained closed to the Thracian

¹⁴⁰ On this decree and the Demotionidai/Dekeleis see Lambert, *Phratries* (1998) 95-142 and T3.

¹⁴¹ Cf. P. Schmitt-Pantel, 'Athéna Apatouria et la ceinture: les aspects féminins de Apatouries à Athènes', *Annales (ESC)* 32 (1977 nov/dec) 1059-73; J. Gould, 'Law, custom and myth: aspects of the social position of women in classical Athens', *JHS* 100 (1980) 38-59 (who perhaps minimises the role of women in phratries); M Golden, 'Donatus and Athenian phratries', *CQ* 35 (1985) 9-13; O. Palagia, 'Akropolis Museum 581. A family at the Apatouria?', *Hesp.* 64 (1995) 493-505; Lambert, *Phratries* (1998) 178-88, on the position of women and girls in the phratries, who on p. 178 n. 193, emphasises that all depends on whether one sees the single known case of a woman being introduced into a phratry (Isaeus

orgeones should not, however, tempt us to see the privileged name as a hollow gesture: the phratries were the first gatekeepers to Athens' community of which the Thracian *orgeones* were now accepted members. In that sense they held quite a different and considerably higher status than the average metec destined to worship a foreign deity in a private *thiasos*.

4.3 The Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis (I)

Defining *orgeones* as a group of worshippers who were privately organised and in charge of their own shrine and who, in addition, performed a public duty, the Thracian worshippers of Bendis appear to be model *orgeones*, as we will see in the next section. But first I wish to argue that there was initially only one group of *orgeones* in charge of Bendis' cult and that this group consisted of Thracians. We have an impressive corpus of inscriptions, in fact the largest relating to a single group of *orgeones*. In chronological order they are:

IG II² 1361 (post 350, Piraeus): decree of the *orgeones* stipulating 1) the rules for sacrificing in the *hieron* by non-*orgeones*; 2) fines for sacrificing on the holy day (i.e. the Bendideia) and for proposing a change in the statute; 3) the rent of the *hieron*, house and water of which the money is to go to repairs on the *hieron*; 4) a meeting on the second of each month; 5) the bringing of wood by *hieropoioi* and *epimeletai* on the holy day; 6) a fee of two drachma to be paid by each *orgeon* three days before the Bendideia; and 7) a change in the criteria for membership from hereditary to payment.

IG II² 1255 (337/6, Piraeus): honorary decree of the *orgeones* of Bendis that was proposed by Olympiodoros for the *hieropoioi* [Antiphanes, son of Ant]isthenes of Ky[therios] (*PA1237*), [Nausophilos,] son of Nausinikos [of Kephaletes] (*PA10601*) and [Aristome]nos, son of Mosch[...], who are honoured with a golden crown of 300 drachma and a *stele* to be inscribed by the secretary, Thallos, and to be set up in the Bendideion for their care taken for the procession, the meat distribution and all other business.

IG II² 1256 (329/8, Piraeus): honorary inscription for the *epimeletai* Euphyes and Dexios, who are honoured by the *orgeones* with a golden crown of 100 drachma. The inscription is topped with a relief (Copenhagen Ny Carlsberg

3.73) as typical or exceptional. Isaeus cannot have simply invented the practice but how common it was is unknown.

Glyptothek 462) depicting the honorands with Bendis and Deloptes. In the corner we see Pan, Hermes and three nymphs.¹⁴²

IG II² 1324 (late fourth, early third century¹⁴³, Zanneion Hospital, Piraeus): honorary decree for the *epimeletes* Stephanos, who is honoured by the *orgeones* with a foliage crown and a *stèle* in the *hieron* to be set up by the treasurer for taking care of the *pompe* and being pious towards Bendis and Deloptes and the other gods.

IG II² 1283 (ca. 262, Zanneion Hospital, Piraeus): decree of the *orgeones* regulating a good co-operation between the *orgeones* in Piraeus and those in the city during the Bendideia.¹⁴⁴

IG II² 1284 (ca. 240¹⁴⁵, Piraeus): two honorary decrees for 1) Olympon son of Olympiodoros and 2) Sosias son of Hippokrates and Eukleides son of Antimachos, who are each honoured with a crown of oak leaves and a *stèle* in the *hieron*.

IG II² 2947 (late third, early second century, near the Academy, Athens): honorary decree by a group of *orgeones* for Asklaon, son of Asklaon of Maroneia.¹⁴⁶

Agora 19, L16 (late second, early first century, Athenian Agora): lease concerning the *orgeones* of Bendis and Deloptes from whom the Athenian *demos* is apparently leasing property.

It has been argued and is still commonly accepted that initially there were two groups of *orgeones* looking after the cult of Bendis in Piraeus: one consisting

¹⁴² Cf. M. Molteson, *Catalogue Greece in the classical period. Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek* (Copenhagen 1995) 138-40.

¹⁴³ S. Dow, 'The Egyptian cults in Athens', *HTHR* 30 (1937) 197 n. 54, pointed out that "the arrangement, which is non-stoichedon, with lines not divided according to syllables, would favor a date in the late fourth or early third, rather than in the second, century B.C."

¹⁴⁴ Cf. P. Gauthier, 'La réunification d'Athènes en 281 et les deux archontes Nicias', *REG* 92 (1979) 348-99.

¹⁴⁵ S.V. Tracy, *Athens and Macedon: Attic letter-cutters of 300-229* (Berkeley 2003) 125, identified the cutter of *IG II² 1284* with the one of *SEG 2.9*, which can be dated to 251/0. He subsequently dates our decree to ca. 240.

¹⁴⁶ Ferguson (1949) 162-3, already pointed out that Maroneia is a Thracian city, making it likely Asklaon belonged to the Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis who were located in the city.

solely of citizens and one solely of Thracians. In addition, there are inscriptions from the early third century onwards that attest to another group of *orgeones* of Bendis located in the city (*IG II² 1283*; *IG II² 2947*; *Agora 19, L16*). The main basis for the notion that there were initially two groups of *orgeones* are the *hieropoioi* who are mentioned with their *demotika* in *IG II² 1255 (337/6)* and who are therefore certainly citizens, while *IG II² 1283* testifies to a group of Thracian *orgeones* in Piraeus. A. Wilhelm was the first to suggest a way to distinguish between the two groups. He reasoned that the Thracian *orgeones* held regular meetings on the 8th of each month and awarded their honorands with crowns of oak leaves (*IG II² 1283*; *1284*), while the Athenian *orgeones* apparently met on the 2nd of each month and awarded crowns of olive leaves or golden ones, while in one decree they used demotics (*IG II² 1255*; *1256*; *1324*; *1361*).¹⁴⁷

However, doubts have been raised about the initial existence of two groups of *orgeones* of Bendis. Cynthia Schwenk has emphasised that the *demotika* of the *hieropoioi* (the only people mentioned with *demotika* in the decrees of the *orgeones* of Bendis) are not sufficient proof for the existence of a separate group of citizen *orgeones* as these sacrificial officials need not necessarily belong to the *orgeones* but could equally well have belonged to the ten *hieropoioi* who were annually appointed by the *demos* to supervise sacrifices at several polis festivals (cf. [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 54.7).¹⁴⁸ Perhaps the fact that *hieropoioi* handled the sale of the skins of animals provided by the polis on the occasion of the Bendideia in 334/3 (*IG II² 1496.86-7*) lends some support to this idea. Then we should envisage the *orgeones* of Bendis managing the cult on a daily basis while the *hieropoioi* of the polis cooperated with them on the occasion of the Bendideia. Parker has moreover suggested that “the differences noted by Wilhelm can be explained chronologically” with a change, for instance, from meetings on the second of each month to the eighth of each month.¹⁴⁹

In addition, I would like to present two arguments that seem to substantiate the notion that the cult of Bendis in Piraeus was looked after by only one group of (Thracian) *orgeones*. First, although the honorary decree for the *epimeletai* Euphyes and Dexios (*IG II² 1256 – 329/8*) is commonly ascribed to the citizen *orgeones* on the account that the award consisted of a golden crown, the name of

¹⁴⁷ A. Wilhelm, ‘Inscription aus dem Peiraieus’, *JOAI* 5 (1902) 132-4.

¹⁴⁸ C.J. Schwenk, *Athens in the age of Alexander: the dated laws and decrees of the ‘Lykourgan era’, 338-322 B.C.* (Chicago 1985) 66-7.

¹⁴⁹ Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 171 n.65.

the first *epimeletes*, Euphyes, is certainly non-Attic and may be Thracian, while his companion, Dexios, may be a foreigner too.¹⁵⁰ We are thus faced with an orgeonic decree which honours one certain and one possible non-Athenian *orgeon* with golden crowns. This renders the crown criterion for distinguishing two distinct groups of *orgeones* useless. Secondly, in *IG II² 1284* (ca. 240) we come across one Olympon, the son of Olympiodoros, who is honoured by the *orgeones* with a crown of oak leaves. The decision to crown Olympon was made on the eighth of a now irretrievable month and this, together with the oak leaves, convinced Wilhelm that the decree was issued by Thracians. However, the proposer of the decree honouring three *hieropoioi* in 337/6 (*IG II² 1255*), which is commonly seen as a decree of the citizen *orgeones*, was one Olympiodoros. Since groups of *orgeones* are generally believed to be rather small, usually consisting of between ten to twenty members, and since membership of the *orgeones* of Bendis was hereditary up till shortly after 350, when membership became available upon payment of a lost amount to anyone who wanted (*IG II² 1361.20-3*), it seems reasonable to assume that this Olympiodoros in 337/6 was a relative of Olympon, son of Olympiodoros of *IG II² 1284*, thus intimately connecting two decrees that are commonly believed to belong to two distinct groups of *orgeones*.¹⁵¹ We should probably conclude, then, that there was most likely only one group of *orgeones* taking care of Bendis' cult in Piraeus.

From the decree that sets out to regulate a good co-operation between the Thracian *orgeones* in Piraeus and those in the city since the latter have decided to build a *hieron* (*IG II² 1283*) it is clear that around 262 a second group of *orgeones* of Bendis had come into existence, this time in the city, possibly as a result of the separation between the port and the city due to the presence of a Macedonian fortress in Piraeus, as was first suggested by Gauthier.¹⁵² Both these groups of *orgeones* consisted wholly of Thracians. This is not only clear from the decree referring to the whole Thracian *ethnos* living in harmony as a result of a good cooperation between the two groups (*IG II² 1283*) but also by the foreign name of the *epimeletes* Euphyes honoured by the *orgeones* in Piraeus, and from the fact that Asklaon who was honoured by the *orgeones* in the city came from the Greek-Thracian city of Maroneia. This further suggests that although many of the names

¹⁵⁰ Euphyes has no hits on the online *LGPN* (<http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/database/lgpn.php>) (01-11-2009), while Dexios has fifty hits in total, of which thirteen in Attica.

¹⁵¹ For the size of groups of *orgeones* see supra n. 115.

¹⁵² Gauthier (1979) 396-9. Perhaps the find spots of the two inscriptions relating to these *orgeones* suggests a location northwest of the Agora.

of the *orgeones* are indeed very Greek, like Olympiodoros, Stephanos, Sosias, and Eukleides, we should not, as Ferguson did, think of the Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis as Greek settlers in Thrace; at least some seem to have been native Thracians.¹⁵³ What the Hellenic names do signal, however, is that these Thracians conformed to their Athenian surroundings to a very high degree. And they did so not only in name: in the beginning of the chapter we already saw that many Thracians were living in Athens in the classical period and that many of them were highly regarded and held relatively good positions in many Athenian *oikoi* and in Athenian society at large as house slaves, wet-nurses, mourners, mining-contractors, soldiers, *proxenoi*, shoe-cobblers, worshippers, democratic supporters, and even as wives and mothers. Also in the way in which they took care of their native goddess Bendis both as *orgeones* and on behalf of the polis at large Thracians were indistinguishable from Athenian worshippers.¹⁵⁴

4.4 The Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis (II)

Let us now finally look at the kind of the activities these Thracian *orgeones* were involved in and how far they were in control of Bendis' polis cult and festival. Like other *orgeones*, the *orgeones* of Bendis seem to have possessed an impressive degree of autonomy in the running of Bendis' cult. The *orgeones* of Bendis appear to have had full control over the Bendideion in Piraeus built there after the Thracian request for *enktesis* was granted between 429 and 424: in the orgeonic decree shortly after 350 we read that the *orgeones* had rented the *hieron* of Bendis and a house and some source of water to an unidentified party (*IG* II² 1361.8-11). The lease of the late second, early first century (*Agora* 19, L16) indicates that the *orgeones* in the city were similarly in charge of their *hieron* that seems to have been established there shortly before 262 when we read in another decree that "they in the city have decide to build a *hieron*" (*IG* II² 1283.9-10). Also like other *orgeones*, the *orgeones* of Bendis manage their shrine not exclusively for themselves but also to some extent on behalf of the polis in the sense that they guaranteed that non-*orgeones* could make use of it. So, in the same decree

¹⁵³ Ferguson (1949) 162-3.

¹⁵⁴ Perhaps the unique material of oak leaves of some of the crowns bestowed by the Thracian *orgeones* can be seen as one of the few tiny differences that distinguished the Thracian from the Athenian *orgeones*, perhaps referring to the oracle of Dodona from which the Thracians obtained a positive answer concerning their request for *enktesis* that gave its answer through the rustling of oak leaves.

stipulating that the income from rent is to be used on repairs of the *hieron* (*IG II² 1361*) we read:

4. [ἐ]ὰν δὲ ἰδιώτης τις θύῃ τῆι θεῶι διδόναι τῆι ἱερέαι γαλαθνοῦ μὲν : IC
[κ]αὶ τὸ δέρμα καὶ κωλῆν διανε[κ]ῆ δεξιάν, τοῦ δὲ τελέου : III : καὶ δέρμα καὶ
[κ]ωλῆν κατὰ ταῦτά βοῶς δὲ : IC : καὶ τὸ δέρμα· διδόναι δὲ τὰ ἱερεώσυνα τῶ-
7. [ν μὲ]ν θηλ[ε]ῖων τῆι ἱερέαι, τῶν δὲ ἀρρένων τῶι ἱερεῖ.

When someone who is not an *orgeon* sacrifices to the goddess, that person has to give to the priestess the following: of an infant animal: the skin and the complete right hind leg; of an adult animal: the skin and the hind leg in the same manner; of an ox: also the skin. Give to the priestess her perquisite from the female animals and to the priest from the male animals.

It appears that the *orgeones* of Bendis were quite autonomous in running Bendis' polis cult. They also had their own cult officials: we come across *epimeletai*, a treasurer (*tamias*) and a secretary (*grammateus*). These officials ran the cult of Bendis on a more daily basis. The *epimeletai* were to make sure that anyone who owed money to the goddess due to a fine was inscribed on a *stèle*, for instance for sacrificing on the day of the Bendideia or for proposing something contrary to the statute of the *orgeones* (*IG II² 1361.13-15*). They also took care of the procession during the Bendideia and “welcome [the marchers] in the Nymphaion and provide them with sponges and basins and water and wreaths and, in the *hieron*, a lunch” (*IG II² 1283.16-20*).¹⁵⁵

It might seem that the *orgeones* ran the polis cult of Bendis completely on their own and had a considerable say in the organisation of the Bendideia but I already referred to the cooperation between the *orgeones* and the *hieropoioi*, polis officials in charge of many public sacrifices, who were honoured by the *orgeones* for the honourable way in which they had taken care of the (Athenian) procession and the meat distribution in 337/6 (*IG II² 1255*). These polis *hieropoioi*, together with the *epimeletai* of the *orgeones*, also provided the wood necessary for the sacrifices during the Bendideia (*IG II² 1361.15-16*). Also nicely illustrating the cooperation between *orgeones* and polis officials is the regulation that on the sixteenth of Thargelion, i.e. three days before the Bendideia, each *orgeon* had to give 2 drachma to the *hieropoioi* to go to the sacrifice (*IG II² 1361.17-19*). The

¹⁵⁵ Cf. *IG II² 1324.4-5* where the *epimeletes* Stephanos is honoured for “sending the procession of the goddess in an honourable manner”.

skin-sale records of 334/3 (*IG II² 1496.86-7*) demonstrate that, in addition to these contributions (probably barely enough to buy a single cow), the *demos* also provided sixty-five to one hundred animals to be sacrificed on the occasion of the Bendideia, to be handled by the *hieropoioi*.¹⁵⁶

This cooperation between Thracian *orgeones* and representatives of the Athenian *demos* perhaps also occurred in the case of the priestess of Bendis and the priest of Deloptes. The *orgeones* were responsible for the shares of the sacrifices offered in the Bendideion that went to the priestess and priest as part of their *hierosyna*, as we saw above. In the third-century decree recording the cooperation between port and city (*IG II² 1283*) we further read that:

20. ὅταν δὲ ὤσιν αἱ θυσίαι εὐ[χεσθαι]
τὸν ἱερέα καὶ τὴν ἱέρειαν πρὸς ταῖς εὐχαῖς ἄς ἔυ[χονται]
καὶ τοῖς ὀργεῶσι τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἄστει κατὰ ταῦτά, ὅ[πως ἂν τοῦ]-
23. τῶν γινομένων καὶ ὁμονοῦντος παντὸς τοῦ ἔθ[νους]

When the sacrifices take place the priest and the priestess, with the prayers that are spoken, will also pray for the *orgeones* in the city, in order that, when these things are performed, the whole [Thracian] *ethnos* will seem in harmony.

The priestess of Bendis and the priest of Deloptes and the *orgeones* were thus intimately working together. However, since we do not know how Bendis' priesthood was filled – either by a woman and a man selected from the Thracian *orgeones*, or selected from all Athenians – there is no way of telling how much the *orgeones* cooperated with the *demos* in this case.

Despite the great influence of the *hieropoioi* during the Bendideia – collecting contributions by the *orgeones*, probably sending the Athenian procession on its way, providing wood and animals, selling hides – and the possible role of Athenian priests in the cult, the *orgeones* seem to have had full control of their own affairs.

¹⁵⁶ Ferguson (1949) 155-6. F. van Straten, *Hiera Kala. Images of animal sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Leiden 1995) 176, suggests that the price of cattle in the fifth and fourth centuries lay somewhere between 40 and 90 drachmas, which roughly agrees with Ferguson's estimate. From *IG I³ 375.7-8* we know that 5114 drachmas was made available by the treasurers of Athena for the Panathenaic hecatomb of 410/9 = ca. 50 drachmas per cow. Also see ch.1, n. 16, on how many cows could be bought from the 41 minas made available for the Little Panathenaia in the 330s (*IG II² 334*), and ch. 2, 11, on calculating the numbers of cows sacrificed on different occasions from the Lykourgan skin-sale lists (*IG II² 1496*).

One of the most important indications for this is that the *orgeones* were apparently free to change the criteria for membership. In the decree that was published shortly after 350 (*IG II² 1361*), we read that the *orgeones* decreed a change in their basic criterion for membership. Membership appears to have been hereditary before: the fragmentary opening lines of the decree read “all who are inscribed on the *stele* and their descendants” ([---]ας ὀπόσοι ἐν τῆ[ι στήλ]η[ι ἐ]γ[γεγρα]μμένοι εἰσὶν ἢ το[ὺς τ]ούτων ἐκγόνους – 1-2). The last lines, however, stipulate that anyone who wishes can now become a member upon payment of a now lost number of drachmas “in order that the *orgeones* become as numerous as possible” (ὅπως δ’ ἂν ὡ[ς πλ]εῖστοι ὦσιν ὀργεῶνες τοῦ ἱερο[ῦ], ἐξεῖναι [τῶι] βουλομένωι εἰσεν[έ]γκαντι [---δ]ραχμὰς μετεῖναι αὐτῶι τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν στήλην ἐγγράφεισθαι – 20-21). The new *orgeones* were to be inscribed on a *stele* and subjected to a scrutiny (δο[κιμὰ]ζειν – 23). Apparently, the *orgeones* had relative autonomy and were in control of their own internal affairs in addition to their influence over the management of the Bendideion and the organisation of the Bendideia. In this way the Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis did not differ from any of the other attested groups of *orgeones*.

Conclusion

Considering the Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis, we can see that the incorporation of the Thracians into the Athenian community was extensive and twofold: the way in which the Athenians regulated the worshipping activities of the Thracians led to a thorough integration of this particular group of metics in the community, while the religious behaviour of the Thracians seems to have conformed to its Athenian context up to such a degree that they were hardly distinguishable from Athenians. With the typical orgeonic behaviour displayed by these Thracian *orgeones* we have almost reached the end of this chapter on the gradual acceptance of Bendis and her Thracian worshippers in Athens. We have seen how in the middle of the fifth century Bendis was slowly accepted by the Athenians as Thracian Artemis and how she received a sanctuary on Mounychia Hill in the late 420s. After this, around 412, Bendis became the focus of an elaborate polis festival, which contained a Thracian procession that started from the Prytaneion, thereby officially receiving Bendis and her Thracians as honoured foreign guests. The Athenians organised their own procession for Bendis, emphasising there were two different worshipping parties: the Thracians and the *epichorioi*, as Plato refers to them. After the processions, a

torch-race with a Thracian flavour took place and numerous sacrifices were performed by polis officials. In the decree regulating the Bendideia we also came across the *demos* interfering with Bendis' income and with the manner in which her priesthood should be filled; was this important position to be left to foreigners or should the Athenians have control?

From all this it becomes clear that although the Thracians were firmly incorporated into the Athenian community, the Athenian *demos* took care to differentiate the Thracian worshippers from the Athenian ones. The Thracians nevertheless held a special position within that community, probably most clearly illustrated in the fact that the Thracian worshippers who took care of Bendis' cult and sanctuary on a daily basis were allowed the privileged name of *orgeones*, suggesting they were enrolled in the phratries around Attica. This far-reaching integration and special position was probably the result of the great presence and influence of Thracians in Athens and not (exclusively) part of an Athenian policy to woo Thracian kings. This is not only borne out by the gradual acceptance of Bendis' cult, even continuing when Athenian-Thracian ties were severed, like in 412 when the inauguration of the Bendideia took place, but also by the continuing popularity of the cult. The opening up of the *orgeones* to anyone who wishes shortly after 350 attests to this, but also the late-third-century inscription honouring Asklaion of Maroneia and the late second, early first-century lease of the *orgeones* of Bendis and Deloptes recording the renting of land to the Athenian *demos*.

Appendix: attested *orgeones* in Attica

This list is in no way meant to be a comprehensive inventory of all known ancient documents and secondary literature relating to *orgeones*, it merely aims to list all attested groups of *orgeones* in Attica with its most important evidence and some suggested titles for further reading. I collected evidence dating from ca. 450 to 97/6 for eighteen groups of *orgeones* in Attica, which largely comes from Ferguson (1944), Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996), and Mikalson, *Hellenistic Athens* (1998).

1. ***Orgeones of the heroines and the hero Echelos*** (Ferguson's no.1). These are the earliest attested *orgeones*; two ancient (*ἀρχαίων*) *psephismata*, of which we find copies in an early third-century decree (*SEG* 21.530 = *LSS* 20), appear to date to the mid-fifth century. The ancient regulations include laws on sacrifices on the 17th and 18th of Hekatombaion and a *kreanomía* to “the *orgeones* who are present, and to their sons up to one half [viz. an *orgeon*'s share], and to the women of the *orgeones*, giving to the free ones the equivalent share and to their daughters up to one half and to one attendant up to one half” (12-23). Cf. Jones, *Associations* (1998) 251-4, who also provides a translation the text. Below the ancient decrees was inscribed a list of debtors that is now lost.
2. ***Orgeones of Bendis***. They are probably first mentioned in Plato (*Rep.* 327a) who refers to a procession sent by the Thracians on the occasion of the inauguration of the Bendideia in ca. 413/2. See main text.
3. In the accounts of the *poletai* for 367/6 (*Hesp.* 10 (1941) 14-27, no.1= *Agora* 19, *Poletai* P5), dated 367/6, we find among the creditors of a fugitive condemned for sacrilege: “Aeschines of Melite and **the *koinon* of *orgeones***” (30-31) (Ferguson's no.5). Nothing else is known about these *orgeones*.
4. ***Orgeones of Heros Iatros*** (?). (*Πραγματεία Ἀκαδ. Ἀθηνῶν* 13 (1948) no. 2 (333/2), with bibliography in Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 109 n.28).
5. ***Orgeones of Amynos, Asklepios and Dexion*** (Ferguson's no. 7). They owned two shrines (one for Amynos and Asklepios and one for Dexion), had two separate annual meetings (*IG* II² 1259; 1252+999; 1253; *SEG* 26.135; 39.149; 47.194 – all dated to the late fourth century) and two separate hosts, probably indicating two groups of *orgeones*. Several fourth-

century dedications found in the *hieron* of Amynos and Asklepios on the west slope of the Akropolis are listed in Körte (1893, 1896). Cf. Jones, *Associations* (1998) 254-6.

6. **Orgeones of the god Hypodektes** (Ferguson's no.3). *IG II² 2501* is a late fourth-century lease in which the *orgeones* of Hypodektes stipulate the terms under which Diopeithes and his descendants can rent the shrine for all time upon annual payment of 50 drachmas. One of the terms is that the shrine has to be open on the fourteenth of Boedromion, *inter alia* to receive the Sacred Things. On Hypdektes see: E. Kearns, *The heroes of Attica* (London 1989) 157.
7. **Orgeones of Egretes** (Ferguson's no. 2). *IG II² 2499 (306/5)* records that the *orgeones* rented out their wooded *hieron* to a Diognetos, son of Arkesilos, of Melite, for 10 years upon annual payment of 200 drachmas. The decree was found at the foot of the Hill of the Nymphs in Athens and also lists a banquet and sacrifice in Boedromion. Ferguson (1944) 80 n. 27, suggested that the two *triclinia* cited as seating capacity for the *orgeones* of Egretes in ll. 29-30 imply a group of twelve to thirty diners. Cf. Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 109-10.
8. Two fragmentary late fourth or early third-century texts on a cult table of *orgeones en toi thiasoi* (Ferguson's no. 10), found near the Acharnian Gate and first published and thoroughly discussed by S. Dow and D.H. Gill, 'The Greek cult table', *AJA* 69 (1965) 104, no. 1.
9. Fragmentary honorary decree for a [*hesitator*] of a *koinon of orgeones* (*Hesp.* 10 (1941) 56, no.2 = *Agora* 16, 130 – ca. 300) (Ferguson's no. 4).
10. **Orgeones of Zeus (Epakrios)** (Ferguson's no. 11). Financial transactions of these *orgeones* were found in Plaka (*IG II² 1294* – mid 3rd c.). Zeus Epakrios is also known from the Erchia calendar (*SEG* 21.541). A group which may be identified as these *orgeones* sold an *eschatia* in the great Lykourgan public land sale programme, on which see Lambert, *Rationes* (1997) F11A, 1-4, with 157-8 and 197, and idem, 'Two notes on Attic *leges sacrae*', *ZPE* 130 (2000b) 77-8. Perhaps the shrine of Zeus Epakrios on Mt. Hymettos can be identified with the summit sanctuary published by M.K. Langdon, *A sanctuary of Zeus on Mount Hymettos* (*Hesp. Suppl.* 16) (1976).

11. **Orgeones of Mother of the Gods** (Ferguson's no. 14). We have a late fourth-century dedication by (the foreigners) Mika and Manes to Mother (*IG II²* 4609). After these we find decrees of a body referring to itself as *thiasotai* (*IG II²* 1273 (281/0 or 265/4); *IG II²* 1246 (mid 3rd?); *IG II²* 1316 (late 3rd)). The first mention *orgeones* of Mother is found in a decree dated to ca. 272/1 (*IG II²* 1316). It seems that Mother was initially worshipped by foreigners who were organised in a *thiasos* that was later taken over by a group of citizen *orgeones*: *IG II²* 1316 is a decree by *orgeones* but also refers to *thiasostai*, on which see I. Arnaoutoglou, 'The date of *IG II²* 1273', *ZPE* 104 (1994) 103-6; Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 192-3; Jones, *Associations* (1999) 262-6. Later orgeonic decrees include *IG II²* 1327 (ca. 178/7) and 1328 (183/2). Cf. Vermaseren, *Corpus cultus Cybelae* (1982) 68-97 on the votives dedicated to Mother.
12. Crown for Asklaon of Maroneia (*IG II²* 2947 – 3rd/2nd c.) found in the region of the Academy. Ferguson (1944) 162-2, no. 12 suggested the decree probably belonged to **the *orgeones* of Bendis** who were located **in the city** at least in ca. 262 (*IG II²* 1283.9-10).
13. **Orgeones of Herakles Pankrates**. *SEG* 41.247 is a summary of unpublished inscriptions relating to this cult. Especially *SEG* 41.84 (early 3rd?) is interesting here as it discusses an unpublished list of *orgeones*, seven from Phlya, two from Probalinthos. Cf. Vikela *Weihreliefs Pankrates-Heiligtum* (1994), who lists 58 votives dating from mid 4th to mid 3rd century.
14. Trial between **2 groups of *orgeones* of an unknown goddess** (*IG II²* 1289 – early-mid 3rd) (Ferguson's no. 6). Cf. J.D. Sosin, 'Two Attic endowments', *ZPE* 138 (2002) 125-8, for a full discussion of this decree.
15. **Orgeones of Asklepios** (Ferguson's no. 8). In a third-century catalogue (*IG II²* 2355 – poss. 3rd c.) we find sixteen *orgeones* of Asklepios who apparently existed separately from the so-called Asklepiastai and seem to be based around Prospalta. They tended a local shrine.
16. **Orgeones of Dionysos** (Dionysiastai) (*IG II²* 1325, 1326, 4948 – 2nd/1st c.) (Ferguson's no. 15).

17. **Orgeones of Aphrodite** (*AM* 66 (1941) 228, no. 4 – 138/7). The only named member is the *epimeletes* from Herakleia who made a sacrifice on behalf of the Athenian people as well as on behalf of the society of *orgeones*. Cf. Ferguson, ‘Orgeonika’ (1949) 163 and Parker, *Athenian religion* (1996) 347.
18. **Orgeones of Syrian, Hagne Aphrodite** (*IG* II² 1337 – 97/6 found at Piraeus) (Ferguson’s no. 16). Although it is clear from *IG* II² 1337 that the *orgeones* of Syrian Aphrodite were citizens, the (expert?) priestess Nikasis is a Corinthian. In a second-century decree of *orgeones* of Aphrodite we further come across a Serapion from Herakleia (*MDAI* (A) 66 (1941) 228, no.4).

Conclusion

Concluding remarks μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως

Beyond religion, beyond the polis, beyond metics

1 μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως: **beyond religion**

I began this dissertation by emphasising that the Athenian polis was first and foremost a participatory community in which membership constituted of participating in the polis (μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως), most importantly in the ritual obligations, the *hiera*, of the Athenian polis. In what followed, we looked at the incorporation of foreign immigrants into the Athenian community in the fifth and fourth centuries BC by examining their participation as metics in several Athenian polis festivals. We have seen four large groups of metics participating in full splendour in the Panathenaic procession, symbolically presenting the Athenians with their future gifts of wealth and support to Athenian society; we have seen them at the intimate setting of the Lenaia where the ties between Athenians and foreign residents were strengthened after these had been put under stress by Perikles' Citizenship Law of 451/0; we have seen them in the cosmopolitan setting of the City Dionysia where the role of metics was by contrast rather restricted and where they were largely conceptualised as *xenoi*; we have seen them at the Hephaisteia where metics were invited to share in the sacrifices together with the young and strong Athenians with whom metics had increasingly cooperated in defending and rebuilding the polis; and we have seen them, or at least one of them, acting as gatekeeper of important Athenian *hiera* at the Eleusinian Mysteries. All these shares in the *hiera* of the Athenian polis led to the (further) incorporation of foreign immigrants into the Athenian community as metics and to the articulation of their polis membership by means of differentiated participation. In addition we

have seen how foreign immigrants were similarly integrated into the smaller communities of Attic society by granting them a share in the ancestral *hiera* of those communities. And finally we have looked at how the special position of Thracians within Athens was given shape by the careful and gradual acceptance of the Thracian cult of Bendis as a polis cult.

The main aim of this dissertation has been to show how the development of a separate metic status for immigrant *xenoi* was greatly informed by the participation of these immigrants as metics in the often ignored but essentially formative context of polis religion. It is in that way not aimed to replace any previous views on the development of Athenian metic status in the classical period – it is rather meant to complement them. I am not saying that Perikles' Citizenship Law of 451/0, the institution of a special metic tax in the late fifth, early fourth century, the fact that metics had to register on separate lists in demes, and the fact they had to go to the Polemarchos' for their legal disputes did not matter for the position of metics in Athens and the way in which they were conceptualised by the Athenians. Rather, based on the ancient notion that membership of the Athenian polis community consisted of sharing in the polis, most of all in the *hiera* of the polis, I have argued that the differentiated participation of foreign immigrants as metics in several polis festivals *also* played a pivotal role in the conceptualisation of metic status throughout the fifth and fourth centuries.

In addition to their role in polis religion, we should consider the role of foreign immigrants as metics in other polis activities. There was a sliding scale of membership on which metics held a specific position on account of their differentiated sharing/participating in the public affairs of the polis. We have just seen how this polis membership of metics was given shape in polis religion, a much ignored area in which metics played sometimes important and always informative roles. To arrive at an even fuller understanding of the position of metics in Athenian society we should, however, also look at the ways in which the Athenian *demos* regulated how metics were expected to participate in other public arenas of Athenian polis life. How was metic status translated in fiscal terms or economic terms? How were metics expected to participate in the legal arenas of Athens? The same questions can again be asked for the smaller communities of Attica. In short, how were foreign immigrants expected to participate in the polis (μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως) and what does this tell us about their position or status within Athenian society? With this dissertation I hope to have made a first and important contribution to a better understanding of the development of metic status

from a participatory perspective. And even though the participation of metics in activities that were not predominantly religious in nature needs more research beyond the scope of this dissertation, an “updated” sketch of the general lines of the development of metic status, as based on a combination of David Whitehead’s essential work and my own findings as explored in this thesis, might be cautiously be presented.

The earliest sign of a separate status for the foreign immigrants living in Athens comes from the late sixth-century epigram for the Naxian Anaxilas in which he is lauded for his services for the Athenian community and in which he is referred to as a *μετάοικον* (*SEG* 22.79). This epigram signals an early notion of a special group of *xenoi* who were apparently first and foremost characterised by the fact that they literally had moved *oikos*, i.e. had immigrated. Whitehead connected this epigram with Kleisthenes’ reforms of 508/7 as he thought it very likely that the latter had not only resulted in a new self-awareness among Athenian citizens but also in a first neutral recognition of a special group of free inhabitants in Attica who were not Athenians by descent and who required some sort of recognition of their position within the Athenian polis.¹

After this first “act of recognition” of a separate group of *xenoi*, which, as I agree with Whitehead, should probably be situated in the context of Kleisthenes’ reforms, there is a slight chance that metics played a role in Themistokles’ naval reforms in the 480s, although the sources on which this is based are either late (Diodorus Siculus 11.43.3) or not entirely trustworthy (the so-called Themistokles Decree (M&L 23)).² More secure is the incorporation of four groups of metics into

¹ D. Whitehead, *The ideology of the Athenian metic* (Cambridge 1977) 145-7.

² Diodorus Siculus 11.43.3: “Themistokles persuaded the *demos* to make the metics and the artisans exempt from tax, so that a great multitude would come”. As Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 148 emphasises, “the problems here are manifold”. Basically they come down to two things: that a metic tax is not attested before the late fifth century and that, even if so, Themistokles’ decree would only come down to a temporary exemption as part of a temporary incentive to attract more foreigners for the building of a fleet. The Themistokles Decree (M&L 23) has given rise to much debate, especially concerning questions of authenticity. Cf. M.H. Jameson, ‘A decree of Themistokles from Troizen’, *Hesp.* 29 (1960) 198-223; idem, ‘A revised text of the decree of Themistokles from Troizen’, *Hesp.* 31 (1962) 310-15 on the decree itself and C. Habicht, ‘Falsche Urkunden zur Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter der Perserkriege’, *Hermes* 89 (1961) 1-35; J.K. Davies, ‘Documents and ‘documents’ in fourth century historiography’ in: P. Carlier (ed.), *Le IV e Siècle av. J-C: Approches historiographiques* (Paris 1996) 29-40, on the fourth-century trend to “re-invent” fifth-century decrees, among which most famously the Themistokles’ decree. I find it very difficult to see

the Panathenaic procession which can now be dated to the 470s. During this procession, four groups of youthful metic youths and girls marched up to the Akropolis in the company of *kanephoroi* and *thallophoroi* and in the fourth century also ephebes. These were all groups that, one way or the other, represented transitional groups, groups that were about to move from one phase in life to another, either from youth to adulthood, or from adulthood to old age. In the context of the Panathenaic procession – carrying objects in honour of Athena and dressed in the finest-looking clothes, in their full beauty and splendour – these groups were presented as about to contribute greatly to the well being of the Athenian community. Each would contribute in their own way: *kanephoroi* would soon get married and hopefully bear legitimate children, *thallophoroi* would put their wisdom and experience to good use in guiding the *demos*, and ephebes were in training to defend the polis with their lives. I argued that the four groups of metics should be understood in similar terms as about to contribute to the well being of the polis, in their case in terms of wealth, as symbolised in the expensive crimson cloaks the *skaphephoroi* wore, and in terms of future supportive roles they would perform, as reflected in the stools and the parasols the *diphrophoroi* and *skiadephoroi* were carrying in procession.

Usually, this phase in the conceptualisation of a separate metic status is relegated to the sidelines as a minor concession for the exclusion of metics from most aspects of Athenian public life. I argued that the incorporation of metics in the Panathenaia should instead be understood as a highly significant step as the Panathenaic *pompe* appears to have constituted the first arena in which metics were publicly presented as a coherent and clearly definable group of people. It was furthermore the first context in which metics were associated with the typical “metic” attributes of wealth and support, an idea found in literary sources only much later, for instance in Xenophon’s *Ways and Means* (2.1) written in the early fourth century. Finally, it seems likely that in case of wrongful participation there was a means to decide who was a metic and who not and perhaps even a rudimentary way to keep track of Athens’ metic population, perhaps at the Polemarchos’, who treated *dikai* involving metics ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 58.3), or perhaps already in the demes, for which we have evidence that they kept registers of their metic population by 414 at the latest (*IG I³ 421.33*), while the Skambonidai already in the

the reference to τοὺς ξένους τοὺς οἰκοῦντας Ἰ Αθήνησι (7) in this complex decree as genuine. On metics in the navy also see Whitehead (1977) 84-6.

460s recognised the metics living in their deme community by granting *metoikoi* a share of their sacrifices to Leos (*IG I³ 244.4-10*).

In any case, it seems likely that metics were by this time, or shortly after, also formally recognised under the laws of Athens. This legal recognition eventually included the regulation that metics should go to the Polemarchos' office for their legal disputes ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 58.3) and perhaps had to present a legal guardian, a *prostates*, in court (cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1275a), although, as Whitehead states, "to say what form it took at this early stage would need an equation with fewer unknowns".³

All these early "metic" labels of the Panathenaia and (crude) recognition mechanisms were already in place when Perikles formulated his famous Citizenship Law in 451/0 (PCL) in which it was stipulated that from then onwards an Athenian citizen could only be born of an Athenian *astos* and an Athenian *aste* ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 26.4; 42.1; Plut. *Per.* 37.3). Although the reasons behind this legislation remain a matter of debate, it is certain that PCL constitutes an important watershed in the development of metic status, eventually, with its re-enactment in 403, explicitly forbidding Athenians to marry a non-Athenian.⁴ By this law metics thus became *de facto* excluded from marrying into the Athenian descent group of citizens.

Significantly, the period after PCL witnessed the inclusion of metics in several important polis festivals. Josine Blok recently stated that in a time when Athenians and metics were increasingly separated from each other through several political, juridical and fiscal measures, the incorporation of metics into more *hiera* was crucial in preventing the disintegration of the Athenian community. She argues that, since sharing in the *hiera* of the Athenian polis was a qualifying mark of the members of the community, the incorporation of metics in more polis festivals could secure the cohesion of the group at large.⁵ We should therefore probably associate the incorporation of metics into the Lenaia and possibly the Eleusinian Mysteries in the second half of the fifth century as an attempt to secure the

³ Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 146.

⁴ On PCL see most importantly: C. Patterson, *Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451/0 BC* (Ann Arbor 1976); A. Boegehold, 'Perikles' Citizenship Law of 451/0', in: A.L. Boegehold and A.C. Scafuro (eds.), *Athenian identity and civic ideology* (Baltimore and London 1994) 57-66; J.H. Blok, 'Oude en nieuwe burgers', *Lampas* 36 (2003) 21-3 and idem, 'Perikles' citizenship law: a new perspective', *Historia* (2010), forthcoming.

⁵ J.H. Blok, 'Fremde, Bürger und Baupolitik im klassischen Athen', *Historische Anthropologie* 15 (2007) 309-26.

cohesion of the polis after PCL had put this cohesion under stress.⁶ It was especially in the intimate context of the Lenaia that metics and Athenians were conceptualised as a homogenous worshipping community. From around 440 onwards metics and Athenians jointly shared in the *hiera* of Dionysos Lenaios as a coherent group consisting of the free male population of Attica. On those winter days in Gamelion, in the theatre of Dionysos on the slope of the Akropolis, Athenians and metics were “by themselves”, as Aristophanes (*Ach.* 497-508) claims, as associations between them were emphasised and strengthened, by being together and probably also by the abusive behaviour in the *pompe*, while differences were temporarily ignored.

The role of metics as sponsors for *xenoi* who wished to participate in the Mysteries of Eleusis should be interpreted along similar lines. By allowing metics to act as sponsors for visiting or enslaved *xenoi* on the occasion of the Mysteries they were conceptualised as different from these *xenoi*; slaves and visiting *xenoi* were on the outside, while metics were apparently on the inside together with the other members in charge of the *hiera* of the Athenian community.

Cohesion was, however, not all that was established, for, in conjunction with the tendency in the second half of the fifth century to distinguish status groups more precisely, the separate and specific membership of metics was also displayed and negotiated on more occasions by means of differentiated participation. By decreeing the differentiated participation of metics in several of their *hiera* the Athenians could both highlight the membership of metics to the community and negotiate a separate status for them. A clear instance of this differentiation was seen in the context of the City Dionysia. In the procession of this polis-wide festival a single group of metic *skaphephoroi* marched alongside *kanephoroi*, Athenian *astoi* carrying wineskins, people carrying loaves of bread, *choregoi* with their choruses, prisoners set free, and representatives of Athenian allies and colonists. Many groups associated with the Athenians were thus represented in the *pompe*. In the subsequent ceremonies and dithyrambic and dramatic *agones* in the theatre, however, most attention went to the Athenian citizens among the spectators and competitors, leading to the unmarked inclusion of foreign immigrants among the Greek *xenoi* in the theatre. It was thus in this cosmopolitan context that metics

⁶ Cf. P. Wilson, *The Athenian institution of the khoregia: the chorus, the city and the stage* (Cambridge 2000) 28, who also interprets the inclusion of metics in the Lenaia as a compensation “at a time when their inferior status had recently been given sharper focus by Perikles’ citizenship laws”.

were demarcated as a coherent group of people associated with the Athenian polis, their crimson cloaks probably again signalling the wealth they were expected to bring in the future, while integrative connotations and aspects were largely absent.

Perhaps the inclusion of metics in the reorganised version of the Hephaisteia in 421 can be similarly seen as an attempt to maintain cohesion in Athenian society after PCL had closed the ranks of Athenian citizens, though I hope to have argued conclusively that this instance of metic participation should rather be associated with the increasing involvement of metics both in the large building programmes that had begun under Perikles and in the Athenian army and fleet which was fighting off the Peloponnesians in 431-404. The Hephaisteia had always been an agonistic festival of the strong youths and men of Attica. To grant metics a share of the sacrifices to Hephaistos from 421 onwards should therefore be understood as acknowledging the increased involvement of young and strong metics in rebuilding and defending the city. Besides the “metic” attributes of wealth and support displayed and negotiated in Panathenaic *pompe*, (male and perhaps including non-Greek) metics were from 421 onwards also seen as contributing to Athenian society as workmen and soldiers.

Again, cohesion and integration was not all that was achieved. We have seen that metics did not share in the *hiera* of Hephaistos in the same way the Athenians did; metics *only* sacrificed three cows of which they were to receive the meat raw, indicating metics consumed their shares away from the site. Significantly, it was in the same period as the incorporation of metics in the Hephaisteia that the “metic” *demotikon* in the “οἴκειν ἐν”-formula is first attested (*IG I³ 421.33 – 414/3*), which made it easier to distinguish between Athenians and metics living in the same deme, perhaps indicating some form of registration in the demes. From then onwards this separate “metic” *demotikon* quickly gained ground as can be seen for instance in the many occurrences in the Erechtheion accounts of the final decade of the fifth century. It furthermore seems that the special tax metics had to pay to the polis a short time after their arrival, the so-called *metoikion*, was also instituted in this period: in Harpokration’s gloss on the metic tax (*s.v. μετοικίον*) the comic poet Aristomenes is cited, whose career ran from ca. 439 to 388, which could mean that this tax was already paid by metics in the late fifth century.⁷ I proposed that, analogue to these fiscal and administrative measures, the differentiated participation of metics in the Hephaisteia should similarly be understood as

⁷ On the carving out of metic status in this period: Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 151-4.

facilitating the differentiation between metics and Athenians that was desired in the second half of the fifth century after metics had become more involved in Athenian society.

After this period and throughout the fourth century we hear nothing about demarcating measures concerning metic status. Whitehead stated that “the *metoikia*, seemingly, was now fully developed – at least, no substantive *metabolai* are henceforward attested or need to be postulated”.⁸ Significantly, we also hear nothing about the incorporation of metics in more polis *hiera* after their inclusion in the Hephaisiteia in 421. Evidently, the Athenians did no longer feel a need to further carve out the membership of metics of their community. The participation of metics in all essential polis affairs was now regulated in detail. From the late fifth century onwards metics were foreigners who had immigrated to Athens to find a living, who were excluded from political deliberation and who had their own court at the Polemarchos’, who paid a specific metic tax, were excluded from marrying a native Athenian, were liable to several liturgies and participated in several religious rites; it is almost as Pollux (3.57) wrote many centuries later when he illustrated the term ἀδιάτακτοι (“out of rank”) by referring to “the metics who are not enrolled with the metics, or who have not paid the metic tax, or have not carried the *skaphe*.”

2 μετέχειν: beyond the polis

In chapter three we saw how membership of the subdivisions of the polis also consisted of active participation in the community and how religion again formed a central platform for expressing and articulating this membership. Similar to Herodotus’ claims for a shared Greek identity based on shared religion (8.144.2) and the desperate attempts of the Eleusinian herald to reunite Athenians by referring to the common ancestral rites they share in (Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.20), as we saw in the introduction, the members of a deme were those people who had a share in the rites of that community by descent. And similar to what happened on polis level, the subdivisions could also accommodate new residents in their deme by granting them a share of their *hiera*. But we also saw that the ways in which the original deme members articulated the membership of these newcomers differed significantly from one deme to the other, informed by the specific circumstances in the deme and the historical context. So, the Skambonidai were probably from an

⁸ Whitehead, *Ideology* (1977) 160.

early phase faced with a significant presence of foreign residents in their community, located as it was in the heart of Athens and we have seen that it was already around 460, in a period when immigrants in the polis became a hot topic, that the Skambonidai decided to include “*metoikoi*” in their sacrifice to the hero Leos, thus acknowledging the new presence of these “*metoikoi*” in their community.

However, the Skambonidai were the only ones who, in a rare instance of a deme community mimicking the polis, included immigrants as *metoikoi*. In Ikarion, on the other hand, the Ur Ort of Athenian drama and therefore probably attracting many foreigners to the Ikarian Dionysia, it was decided that not only wealthy Ikarians should be liable for *choregia* but also “those living in Ikarion”, who probably included not only other Athenians but also metics. This was a truly revolutionary decision as the *choregia* at rural Dionysia was usually reserved for the demesmen of the organising deme. We saw a similarly broad and inclusive notion in the deme Phrearrhioi from which comes a decree (*SEG* 35.113) dated to ca. 300 stipulating that *demotai* and “the others” are to share together in an Eleusinian rite (8). It was probably in this period in which demes were increasingly faced with more and more outsiders living in their community (not only with metics or other *demotai* but also with soldiers on garrison duty) and in imitation of inclusive policy of the Eleusinian Mysteries, that Phrearrhioi accepted outsiders who were merely resident in their deme by allowing them a share in their *hiera* for several Eleusinian deities.

Finally, we looked at the honours bestowed on the Theban Damasias by the Eleusinians after he had performed all duties normally performed by a *choregos* in the context of the Eleusinian Dionysia in the mid fourth century. One of the most remarkable honours he received was “to give Damasias one hundred drachma for a sacrifice from the common fund” (*IG* II² 1186.34-35), which I compared to grants by which Athenian *demotai* from other demes than the honouring parties were given a share in the *hiera* of the honouring deme. I suggested that the latter grants should probably be understood as grants of citizenship to powerful individuals on deme level. Damasias was not, however, given the right to share permanently in the *hiera* of Eleusis but he was nevertheless integrated in the community of the deme up to a very high degree.

I argued, in sum, that similar to the members of the polis at large, the members of these smaller communities were also defined by participation in the public life of that community, by *μετέχειν τοῦ δήμου*, be they demesmen,

demeswomen, other Athenians living in the deme, or foreign immigrants. This participation in the community consisted most of all of participation in communal rites. But here as well we should also consider what the demarcated and differentiated participation of a particular group in other fields in the community can tell us about how the deme members articulated the membership of that group. Although these other defining activities go beyond the scope of this dissertation, we have already seen, for instance, how deme membership was also informed by communal military participation of the *demotai* in Athenian campaigns or how in some demes special taxes were instituted, some of which paid by non-*demotai* living in the deme, others paid by *demotai* only.⁹ We saw in the section on the honours bestowed on the Theban Damasias by the Eleusinians how not only the grant of one hundred drachma from the communal fund to make a sacrifice but also the grant of *ateleia* from “those taxes over which the Eleusinians have authority to both him and his descendants” (*IG II² 1186.25-26*) should both be understood as similarly integrative measures. Different demes thus conceptualised different integrative and defining measures. These were not only construed in religious terms but in other (fiscal) terms as well. To fully understand the position of non-*demotai* in these communities – of Athenians and metics alike – we should therefore focus on the differentiated participation of these people in the rites of the community and in other defining communal areas, while it remains of the highest importance to never lose sight of the diversity in these semi-autonomous communities.

To go even one step further: it might be feasible to widen our scope to other *poleis*, in which religion indisputably played a similarly prominent, formative and defining role. However, as so often, the scarcity of sources from other *poleis* seems to stand in the way of any thorough investigation across the boundaries of Attica.¹⁰ Still, it is important to acknowledge the socially formative and defining role of religion in these communities and sometimes precious and highly informative glimpses can be caught. Concerning resident foreigners in other *poleis*, for

⁹ Cf. D. Whitehead, *The demes of Attica, 508/7 - ca. 250 BC. A political and social study* (Princeton 1986) 75-7 and 150-2 and above, 227-8 with n. 133.

¹⁰ This especially concerns a lack in literary and epigraphic sources, while important contributions mostly come from archaeological data, for which see, e.g., F. de Polignac, *Cults, territory and the origin of the Greek city-state* (translated by J. Lloyd) (Chicago 1995); C. Morgan, ‘Ritual and society in Early Iron Age Corinthia’ in: R. Hägg (ed.) *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical* (Stockholm 1994) 73-90; idem, ‘The Evolution of a Sacral “Landscape”: Isthmia, Perachora and the early Corinthian state’ in: S.E. Alcock and R. Osborne (eds.), *Placing the Gods, Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece* (Oxford 1996) 105-42.

instance, we have a late fifth, early fourth-century decree from Iasos (*SEG* 36.981), a polis in Asia Minor, in which it is stated that the priest of Zeus Megistos shall take his sacrificial cakes, one each from the baskets of the *astoi* and the *metoikoi* (3-5). In this polis and on Delos we also find metic *choregoi*.¹¹ In an Eretrian decree dated to ca. 308 (*IG* XII 9.192 = *LSCGS* 46), we read that in commemoration of Eretria's liberation from Macedonian rule and the reintroduction of democracy (3-5) both the Eretrians and the *livers-in* (ἐνοικουντες) are to wear an ivy crown in the Dionysiac procession (6-8).¹² Very interesting, as Whitehead already observed, is the (convincing) supplement provided by Boeckh according to which the decree further prescribed that the citizens can finance these crowns with money from the *demosion* fund (8-10) implying that the "livers-in" were to pay their crowns themselves.¹³ In an early third-century inscription from Keresia (*IG* XII 5, 647) it is further stipulated that *metoikoi* and freedmen are to join the Koresean citizens and their official guests in the Prytaneion for public feasts (9-11). Apparently, foreign immigrants in other *poleis* could be included in the *hiera* of these communities in a similarly differentiated and telling way as metics were in the *hiera* of the Athenian community. We will never, however, get such a clear picture of the development and conceptualisation of a separate metic status as we have in the case of Athens.

3 μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως: **beyond metics**

Of course foreign immigrants were not the only people whose polis or deme membership was negotiated by their differentiated participation in the *hiera* and the *hosia* of the community in question. In the introduction I already referred to the different memberships Athenian men and women held on account of their specific roles in Athenian polis religion. In the chapter on the incorporation of Bendis and her Thracian worshippers in the Athenian community we furthermore saw how the special membership of these esteemed Thracians was given shape by gradually giving shape to the cult of Bendis as a polis cult and to the role of Thracians therein; after sharing a treasure, and therefore probably a shrine, with an Athenian

¹¹ For references see: P.M. Fraser, 'Citizens, demesmen and metics in Athens and elsewhere' in: M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the ancient Greek city-state* (Copenhagen 1995) 73.

¹² Cf. A.-F. Jaccottet, 'Le lierre de la liberté', *ZPE* 80 (1990) 150-6.

¹³ D. Whitehead, 'Immigrant communities in the classical polis: some principles for a synoptic treatment', *AC* 53 (1984) 58.

hero, Bendis received her own sanctuary on Mounychia Hill in Piraeus, her own polis cult, run by Thracian *orgeones*, and her own festival in which Thracian and Athenian worshippers each played their own part. In that way, the Thracians living in Attica were acknowledged and displayed as a significant constituent part of the polis community up to a very high degree, while their specific membership of the community was communicated in terms of the specific participation of Thracian worshippers, for instance in the torch-race on horseback and the reception of the Thracians in the Prytaneion, and the differences between Thracian and Athenian participants, for instance in the two separate processions.

One of the main underlying arguments of this thesis, then, is that any group that mattered to a community – whether polis, deme or other community – could and was almost always negotiated and expressed in a cultic or religious context, while the group’s relationship with the community was expressed in differentiated participation in cult. All these groups accordingly held their own specific position on an enormous scale of community membership. To understand the position not only of metics but also of Athenian women, most obviously, or of ephebes, girls, children in general, Kitian merchants, metics from Herakleia, or even slaves, we should first and foremost investigate the ways in which these groups shared in the *hiera* of the communities they lived in.¹⁴ The possibilities are many and only few have been investigated in this dissertation. In the end I hope to have shown the

¹⁴ A good starting point for the study of ephebes in religion would be the numerous (Hellenistic) decrees honouring the services of ephebes, among them many in the religious field (e.g. *IG II² 1006-1111*). The role of girls in Athenian (or Greek) religion is not a spectacularly new subject (see e.g. the work of Sourvinou-Inwood, Dillon, Cole etc) though a fresh emphasis on the socially defining aspects of these roles and taking them together as constituting the polis membership of these girls could be highly informative. On children in polis religion: M. Golden, *Children and childhood in classical Athens* (Baltimore 1990) 38-50, 65-72, 75-79 and J. Neils, ‘Children and Greek religion’ in: J. Neils and J.H. Oakley (eds.), *Coming of age in ancient Greece: images of childhood from the classical past* (New Haven 2004) 139-62. In 333/2 Kitian merchants received a grant of *enktesis* from the Athenian *demos* with the specific purpose to build a shrine for Aphrodite (Ourania) (*IG II² 337 = RO91*). Although only snippets of information concerning Aphrodite Ourania and Kitians in Athens have come down to us, it might be interesting to see this grant, similar to the one the Thracians received, as a way to integrate an important group of people in the polis community. On metics from Herakleia: J.D. Mikalson, ‘The Heracleotai of Athens’ in: G. Schmeling and J.D. Mikalson (eds.), *Qui miscuit utile dulci. Festschrift essays for Paul Lachlan MacKendrick* (Wauconda 1998) 253-63, of which Jon Mikalson kindly provided me with an offprint. The “religious presence” of these metics is particularly striking. Although the participation of slaves in Athenian polis religion was unsurprisingly small (they probably accompanied their masters to the City Dionysia, carried *phalloi* during several rural Dionysia, and seem to participate in the Zeus festival the Kronia), in the rites of several “oikos-communities” they nevertheless performed highly significant roles.

ways in which membership of the Athenian community was shaped, articulated and demonstrated through differentiated participation in the religious activities of the polis and, more specifically, how this was done in the case of one vital group of polis inhabitants.

Samenvatting

Dit proefschrift gaat over de rol van immigranten, zogenaamde metoiken (*metoikoi*), in de religieuze activiteiten van klassiek Athene. Daarbij is gekeken naar wat deze deelname zegt over de officiële status van metoiken in de Atheense samenleving in de vijfde en vierde eeuw voor Christus. Er zijn twee belangrijke inzichten, één nieuw en één oud, waar dit onderzoek uit voortvloeit. Ten eerste is er sinds kort een nieuw begrip van het wat het betekende om Atheens burger te zijn, waarbij het zwaartepunt ligt bij actieve deelname in de polisgemeente, bovenal in de religieuze activiteiten van de polis, en Atheens burgerschap niet langer gezien wordt als een nauw omschreven juridische status die volwassen Atheense mannen het recht gaf deel te nemen in de politiek en verdediging van de polis; in veel bronnen uit de klassieke periode vinden we de omschrijving dat je lid van de polis was als je deelde in de polis (μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως) of, specifieker, in de zaken van de (polis)goden (μετέχειν τῶν ἱερῶν). Deze hypothese is de basis van het VICI-project van professor Josine Blok over Atheens burgerschap aan de Universiteit van Utrecht waar mijn dissertatie deel van uitmaakt.

Het tweede inzicht waar deze dissertatie uit voort vloeit is het oude inzicht dat metoiken zich buiten de Atheense polisgemeente bevonden door hun uitsluiting van de meeste politieke en juridische activiteiten in de polis. Metoiken werden volgens velen slechts getolereerd door de Atheners vanwege de financiële en economische bijdragen die zij leverden aan de Atheense polis. In deze dissertatie beargumenteer ik echter dat door de actieve deelname van metoiken in de religieuze activiteiten van de Atheense polis zij door bijna iedereen ten onrechte buiten de Atheense gemeente geplaatst worden. Door hun deelname in Atheense festivals, zoals de Panathenaia, de Lenaia, en de Hephaisteia, zullen wij metoiken moeten zien als leden van de Atheense polissamenleving – ook al zouden ze nooit volwaardige leden kunnen worden, zoals de Atheense burgers waren op basis van hun afkomst. Deze stelling heb ik uitgewerkt door uitgebreid naar alle geattesteerde vormen van deelname te kijken. Daarbij lag de nadruk op de wijze waarop

metoiken deelnamen in de polisreligie; waar liepen de metoiken in de optocht voor Athena Polias en mochten zij net zoveel delen in de offers aan Hephaistos als de Atheners? Door te kijken naar de gedifferentieerde deelname van metoiken in verschillende polisfestivals, heb ik getracht de wijzen te belichten waarop de Atheense demos het polislidmaatschap van metoiken vormgaf; door metoiken op een bepaalde manier te laten deelnemen in hun rites konden de Atheners enerzijds deze belangrijke groep buitenlanders incorporeren in hun gemeenschap, terwijl de wijze waarop ze deelnamen veelzeggend is over de wijze waarop de Atheners het polislidmaatschap van deze nieuwkomers vormgaven.

In hoofdstuk één hebben we gekeken naar de deelname van metoiken in de processie ter ere van Athena Polias tijdens de Panathenaia, het polisfestival waar we de meeste informatie over bezitten, ook betreffende de rol van metoiken daarin. We zagen dat vier groepen metoiken meeliepen in de *pompe*: een groep jongemannen in purperen gewaden met grote schalen vol offerandes, een tweede groep jongemannen met waterkruiken, een groep pubermeisjes met parasols om de Atheense meisjes die meeliepen van schaduw te voorzien, en een groep pubermeisjes met krukjes. In totaal liepen meer dan tweehonderd metoiken mee.

Ik heb beargumenteerd dat deze deelname niet louter in termen van eervol of smadelijk gezien moet worden, zoals de meeste geleerden doen. We moeten zowel kijken naar de wijze waarop deze metoiken geïntegreerd werden in de Atheense gemeenschap als naar de wijze waarop ze gedifferentieerd werden van de andere deelnemers. Dan zien we dat deze vier groepen van metoiken voorop in de processie liepen vergezeld door Atheense efeben, i.e. jonge mannen in militaire training, zogenaamde *kanephoroi*, i.e. Atheense pubermeisjes met offermandjes, en zogenaamde *thallophoroi*, oude mannen met olijftakken. Deze groepen kunnen gezien worden als zijnde in een overgangsfase: de efeben zouden binnenkort de polis gaan verdedigen met hun leven, de *kanephoroi* stonden op het punt te trouwen en legitieme kinderen te baren, en de oude mannen kwamen net van het slagveld en zouden in het vervolg een belangrijke rol spelen in het adviseren van de demos. Hun toekomstige bijdrages zouden weergegeven kunnen zijn in de giften die zij meedroegen voor Athena. Ik heb gesteld dat de vier groepen van metoiken op zelfde manier bekeken kunnen worden; de jonge metoiken zouden binnenkort een eigen bijdrage gaan leveren aan de Atheense samenleving. Wellicht dat de extreem dure purperen gewaden van de jongemannen de financiële bijdragen van de

mannelijke metoiken in Athene onderstreepten, terwijl de parasols en krukjes van de metoiken meisjes hun toekomstige rol in de dienstensector weerspiegelden.

In het tweede hoofdstuk is gekeken naar de rol van metoiken in de Lenaia, de Stedelijke Dionysia, de Hephaisteia en de Eleusinische Mysteriën, vier festivals waaraan metoiken mochten deelnemen vanaf de tweede helft van de vijfde eeuw, nadat de Burgerschapswetten van Perikles van 451/0 Atheense burgers en metoiken strenger had gescheiden. De incorporatie van metoiken in deze *hiera* kan gezien worden als een cruciaal middel om de desintegratie van de Atheense polisgemeenschap te voorkomen nadat Perikles de lijnen tussen Atheense burgers en andere polisbewoners dikker had getrokken. Vooral in de intieme context van de Lenaia, een festival voor Dionysos Lenaios gevierd in de winter, werden vanaf ca. 440 de Atheense en metoiken aanbidders geconceptualiseerd als een homogene groep bestaande uit de gehele mannelijke vrije bevolking van Attika. Tijdens dit festival waren metoiken en Atheners “onder elkaar”, zoals Aristophanes (*Ach.* 497-508) beweert, in een context waarin de banden tussen beide groepen werden benadrukt en verschillen genegeerd.

De rol van metoiken als sponsors voor vreemdelingen (*xenoi*) die aan de Mysteriën van Eleusis wilden deelnemen, kan op eenzelfde wijze geïnterpreteerd worden. Door metoiken als sponsors te laten optreden voor buitenlandse gasten en slaven werden metoiken geconceptualiseerd en gepresenteerd als een aparte groep afzonderlijk van deze *xenoi*; terwijl slaven en buitenlandse gasten als *xenoi* aan de buitenkant stonden, bevonden metoiken zich blijkbaar met de Atheners aan de binnenkant van de Atheense polisgemeenschap.

Cohesie was echter niet het enige dat werd bereikt. Analooq aan de trend in de tweede helft van de vijfde eeuw om sociale groepen scherper te onderscheiden, werd de aparte status van metoiken ook benadrukt op meer religieuze gelegenheden door middel van gedifferentieerde participatie. Door te bepalen dat metoiken op een bepaalde manier moesten deelnemen aan een festival, konden de Atheners zowel het polislidmaatschap van metoiken benadrukken als een aparte status voor hen vormgeven. Een duidelijk voorbeeld hiervan was te zien in de context van de Stedelijke Dionysia. In de processie van dit grote festival liep een groep metoiken jongemannen met schalen mee naast *kanephoroi*, Atheners die wijnvellen droegen, mensen met broden, koorleiders met hun koren, gevangenen, en vertegenwoordigers van de Atheense bondgenoten en kolonisten. Op deze wijze waren vele groepen die met de Atheners verbonden waren vertegenwoordigd in de

pompe. In de daaropvolgende dithyrambische en dramatische wedstrijden in het theater ging de meeste aandacht, echter, naar de Atheense burgers in het publiek. Dit leidde tot de ongemarkeerde opneming van metoiken bij de andere *xenoi* in het theater. Het was dus in deze kosmopolitische context dat metoiken in de processie werden gepresenteerd als een duidelijk aparte groep, terwijl integrerende elementen grotendeels afwezig waren

De deelname van metoiken in het festival voor Hephaistos vanaf 421 bevatte tot slot zowel incorporerende als differentiërende elementen. Ik heb beargumenteerd dat deze deelname gezien kan worden als een reactie op de toenemende betrokkenheid van (mannelijke) metoiken bij de Atheense samenleving, vooral op het gebied van het herbouwen van de stad Athene vanaf ca. 450 en oorlogsvoering tijdens de Peloponnesische Oorlog (431-404). De Hephaisteia waren altijd al een competitief festival geweest waarin de sterke en jonge mannen van Attika streden om eer. Om de metoiken vanaf 421 een deel van de offers aan Hephaistos te schenken kan daarom gezien worden als een bekrachtiging van de toegenomen rol die jonge en sterke metoiken speelden in de Atheense bouw en het leger.

Maar ook in dit geval was cohesie niet het enige dat werd bereikt. Metoiken deelden niet op dezelfde wijze als Atheners in de *hiera* van Hephaistos; metoiken ontvingen “slechts” drie ossen van welke ze het vlees rauw ontvingen, wat erop wijst dat ze hun porties elders consumeerden terwijl de Atheners het offervlees waarschijnlijk gezamenlijk tijdens een groot banket opaten. Het is interessant op te merken dat in deze zelfde periode ook verschillende administratieve en fiscale maatregelen werden ingesteld die speciaal gericht waren op metoiken; het “metoiken” demotikon in de vorm van de “οἰκεῖν ἐν”-formule is voor het eerst geattesteerd in 414/3 (*IG I³ 421.33*), terwijl de metoiken belasting, de *metoikion*, waarschijnlijk rond de eeuwwisseling werd ingesteld.

In hoofdstuk drie zagen we hoe lidmaatschap van de demen eveneens bestond uit actieve deelname in de demegemeenschap en hoe religie wederom een belangrijk platform was voor het uiten en articuleren van dit lidmaatschap; de leden van een deme waren die mensen die deelden in de rituelen van die gemeenschap op basis van hun afkomst. Op dezelfde wijze als op polisniveau konden nieuwkomers geïncorporeerd worden in deze gemeenten door hen te laten delen in de *hiera* van de deme. We zagen echter ook dat de wijzen waarop de oorspronkelijke demeleden het lidmaatschap van deze nieuwkomers vormgaven verschilden van deme tot

deme, mede afhankelijk van lokale omstandigheden en historische context. Zo werden de Skambonidai waarschijnlijk vanaf een vroege periode geconfronteerd met de aanwezigheid van een grote groep buitenlandse inwoners daar deze deme in het hart van Athene lag. We hebben gezien dat reeds rond 460, in een periode waarin immigranten in de polis een “hot topic” werden, de Skambonidai besloten om “*metoikoi*” te laten delen in hun offer aan de *heros* Leos, daarmee de nieuw aanwezigheid van deze *metoikoi* in de deme erkennend.

De Skambonidai waren echter de enigen die, in een zeldzaam geval van een deme die de polis nadoet, immigranten integreerden als *metoikoi*. In Ikarion, het *Ur Ort* van het Attische drama en daardoor waarschijnlijk vele buitenstaanders aantrekkelijk, werd besloten dat niet alleen rijke Ikarieis verantwoordelijk konden worden gesteld voor het betalen van *choregia*, maar ook “zij die in Ikarion leven”, een groep die waarschijnlijk niet alleen Atheners uit andere demen maar ook metoiken omvatte. Dit was werkelijk een revolutionaire beslissing aangezien de *choregia* van de Plattelands Dionysia doorgaans uitsluitend een zaak van de demeleden van de organiserende deme was. We kwamen een soortgelijke inclusiviteit tegen in een decreet uit de deme Phrearrhioi, gedateerd rond 300, dat stelt dat de *demotai* en “de anderen” zullen delen in een Eleusinische rite (*SEG* 35.113.8). Het was waarschijnlijk in deze periode waarin demen in toenemende mate werden geconfronteerd met grote groepen buitenstaanders die voor langere tijd in een deme kwamen leven en in navolging van het inclusieve beleid van de Eleusinische Mysteriën dat de Phrearrhioi de buitenstaanders in hun gemeenschap accepteerden door hen te laten delen in hun *hiera* voor verscheidene Eleusinische goden.

Uiteindelijk hebben we gekeken naar de eerbewijzen die de Thebaan Damasias in het midden van de vierde eeuw van de Eleusiniërs ontving, nadat hij de taken van een *choregos* had uitgevoerd tijdens de Eleusinische Dionysia. Eén van de meest opvallende eerbewijzen die hij ontving was de beslissing “te geven aan Damasias honderd drachmas uit het gemeenschappelijke fonds voor een offer” (*IG* II² 1186.34-35), wat ik vergeleken heb met eredecreten die een Athener uit een andere deme laten delen in de *hiera* van de erende deme. Ik heb voorgesteld dat deze beslissingen gezien kunnen worden als schenkingen van burgerschap aan belangrijke individuen op het niveau van de deme.

Het laatste hoofdstuk van dit proefschrift gaat over de stapsgewijze integratie van de Thracische godin Bendis, en daarmee van de Thraciërs die haar aanbaden en

haar cultus verzorgden, in de Atheense samenleving. We zagen hoe het speciale polislidmaatschap van deze zeer gewaardeerde groep metoiken werd vormgegeven door de cultus van Bendis en de rol van Thraciërs daarin vorm te geven. Nadat zij een schat (en waarschijnlijk een heiligdom) met een Attische godheid had gedeeld, kreeg Bendis haar eigen heiligdom, het Bendideion, in Piraeus, haar eigen officiële poliscultus die werd geleid door Thraciërs met de officiële betiteling *orgeones*, en haar eigen officiële polisfestival, de Bendideia, waarin Thracische en Atheense aanbidders elk een eigen rol speelden. Op die wijze werd de Thracische gemeente die in Attika leefde geaccepteerd en gepresenteerd als een belangrijk component van de polisdemeenschap. Hun specifieke polislidmaatschap werd daarnaast geuit door de gedifferentieerde deelname van de Thracische aanbidders, bijvoorbeeld in de fakkelrace die op paarden werd afgelegd en de aparte optocht die de Thraciërs vanaf het Prytaneion organiseerden los van een Atheense processie.

Natuurlijk zijn buitenlandse immigranten niet de enige mensen die in de Atheense polis of een deme werden geïntegreerd door ze te laten deelnemen in de *hiera* van de gemeenschap en wier polislidmaatschap werd vormgegeven door hen op een gedifferentieerde manier te laten deelnemen in gemeenschappelijk rituelen. In de introductie van deze dissertatie wees ik al op de verschillende polislidmaatschappen die Atheense mannen en vrouwen hadden op basis van hun verschillende rollen in de Atheense polisreligie. Eén van de voornaamste argumenten van deze thesis is dan ook dat elke groep die op enige wijze van belang was voor een gemeenschap – polis, deme, of andere gemeenschap – bijna altijd werd gedefinieerd en gearticuleerd in een cultische of religieuze context, terwijl de relatie van die groep met de gemeenschap werd geuit in gedifferentieerde participatie in culten. Al deze groepen hadden dienovereenkomstig een eigen specifieke positie in de Atheense polisdemeenschap. Om de positie van niet alleen metoiken, maar ook van Atheense mannen en vrouwen, van efeben, meisjes, kinderen, Kitische handelaren, metoiken uit Herakleia, of zelfs van slaven te begrijpen, moeten we allereerst de wijzen waarop deze groepen deelnamen in de Atheense polisreligie onderzoeken. De mogelijkheden zijn talrijk en slechts een paar zijn onderzocht in deze dissertatie. Toch hoop ik aangetoond te hebben op welke wijzen lidmaatschap van de Atheense polis werd gevormd, gearticuleerd en geuit door middel van gedifferentieerde participatie in de religieuze activiteiten van de polis en, meer in het bijzonder, hoe dit werd gedaan voor één belangrijke groep van polisbewoners.

Polisreligie was echter niet het enige gebied waarop polislidmaatschap vormgegeven werd. Naast religie moet ook gekeken worden naar de gedifferentieerde participatie van metoiken (of vrouwen, efeben, kinderen, meisjes, slaven etc.) op het economische, fiscale en zelfs politieke vlak om een vollediger begrip te krijgen van de ontwikkeling van een aparte metoiken status. Polisreligie was echter wel een belangrijke en nog steeds vaak genegeerde context waarin deze ontwikkeling plaatsvond. Ik hoop met deze dissertatie die lacune in ons begrip van de ontwikkeling van een aparte metoiken status in de vijfde en vierde eeuw v. Chr. enigszins opgevuld te hebben.

Sara Wijma

Bibliography

- ALCOCK, S.E., *Graecia Capta: the landscape of Roman Greece* (Cambridge 1993).
- ALESHIRE, S.B., *The Athenian Asklepieion: the people, their dedications, and the inventories* (Amsterdam 1989).
- _____, *Asklepios at Athens: epigraphic and prosopographic essays on the Athenian healing cults* (Amsterdam 1991).
- _____, 'Towards a definition of 'state cult' for ancient Athens' in: R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Stockholm 1994) 9-16.
- _____, 'The *demos* and the priests: the selection of sacred officials at Athens from Cleisthenes to Augustus' in: R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (eds.), *Ritual, finance, politics. Athenian democratic accounts presented to David Lewis* (Oxford 1994) 325-37.
- ALESHIRE, S.B. and S.D. LAMBERT, 'Making the Peplos for Athena: a new edition of *IG II² 1060+1036*', *ZPE* 142 (2003) 65-86.
- AMANDRY, P., 'Trépièds d'Athènes', *BCH* 101 (1977) 163-202.
- ANDERSON, G., *The Athenian experiment: building an imagined political community in ancient Attica, 508-490 B.C.* (Ann Arbor 2003).
- ANDREWES, A., 'Philochoros on phratries', *JHS* 81 (1961) 1-15.
- ARCHIBALD, Z.H., 'Thracian cult - from practice to belief' in: G.R. Tsetschkladze (ed.), *Ancient Greeks, West and East* (Leiden 1999) 456-61.
- ARNAOUTOGLU, I.N., 'The date of *IG II² 1273*', *ZPE* 104 (1994) 103-6.
- _____, *Thusias eneka kai sunousias: private religious associations in Hellenistic Athens* (Athens 2003).
- BABA, K., 'On Kerameikos inv. I 388 (*SEG* xxii, 79). A note on the formation of the Athenian metic-status', *BSA* 79 (1984) 1-5.
- BÄBLER, B., *Fleissige Thrakerinnen und wehrhafte Skythen: Nichtgriechen im klassischen Athen und ihre archäologische Hinterlassenschaft* (Stuttgart 1998).

- BACON, H.H., 'The Furies' homecoming', *CP* 96 (2001) 48-59.
- BAKEWELL, G.W., Μετοίκια in the *Supplices* of Aeschylus', *CA* 16 (1997) 209-28.
- _____, 'Lysias 12 and Lysias 31: Metics and Athenian citizenship in the aftermath of the Thirty', *GRBS* 40 (1999) 5-22.
- BARBER, E.J.W., 'The peplos of Athena', in: Neils, J. (ed.), *Goddess and Polis; the Panathenaic festival in ancient Athens* (Princeton 1992) 103-17.
- BASLEZ, M.-F., *L'étranger dans la Grèce antique* (Paris 1984).
- BATINO, S., 'Il Leokorion. Appunti per la storia di un angolo dell' Agora', *ASAA* 79 (2001) 55-82.
- BEAZLEY, J.D., 'The master of the Boston Pan-Krater', *JHS* 32 (1912) 354-69.
- BESCHI, L., 'Il monumento di Telemachos, fondatore dell' Asklepion Ateniese', *ASAtene* 29/30 (1967-1968) 381-436.
- _____, 'Il rilievo di Telemachos ricompletato', *AAA* 15 (1982) 31-43.
- _____, 'La prospettiva mitica della musica greca', *MEFRA* 103 (1991) 35-50.
- BEST, J.G., 'Bendis', *Hermeneus* 35 (1964) 122-8.
- _____, *Thracian peltasts and their influence on Greek warfare* (Groningen 1969).
- BIERS, W.R. and T.D. BOYD, 'Ikarion in Attica: 1888-1981', *Hesp.* 51 (1982) 1-18.
- BINDER, J., 'The early history of the Demeter and Kore sanctuary at Eleusis' in: R. Hägg. (ed.), *Ancient Greek cult practice from the archaeological evidence* (Stockholm 1998) 131-39.
- BINGEN, J., 'Le décret SEG X 64 (La Pirée 413/2?)', *RBPhH* 37 (1959) 31-44.
- BLOK, J.H., 'Phye's procession: culture, politics and Peisistratid rule', in: H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), *Peisistratos and the tyranny: a reappraisal of the evidence* (Amsterdam 2000) 17-48.
- _____, 'Virtual voices: towards a choreography of women's speech in classical Athens', in: A. Lardinois and L. McClure (eds.), *Making silence speak: women's voices in Greek literature and society* (Princeton 2001) 95-116.
- _____, 'Oude en nieuwe burgers', *Lampas* 36 (2003) 5-26.
- _____, 'Recht und Ritus der Polis. Zu Bürgerstatus und Geschlechterverhältnissen im klassischen Athen', *Historische Zeitschrift* 278 (2004) 1-24.
- _____, 'Becoming citizens. Some notes on the semantics of "citizen" in archaic Greece and classical Athens', *Klio* 87 (2005) 7-40.
- _____, 'Fremde, Bürger und Baupolitik im klassischen Athen', *Historische Anthropologie* 15 (2007) 309-26.
- _____, 'Deme accounts and the meaning of *hosios* money in fifth-century

- Athens', *Mnemosyne* (2009), forthcoming.
- _____, 'Citizenship in action: "reading" sacrifice in classical Athens' in: C. Mann and R. von den Hoff (eds.) *Rollenbilder und Bürger im demokratischen Athen* (2009), forthcoming.
- _____, 'A covenant between gods and men: *hiera kai hestia* and the Greek *polis*' in: C. Rapp (ed.) *City - Empire - Christendom: changing context of power and identity in antiquity* (Cambridge and New York 2010), forthcoming.
- _____, 'Perikles' citizenship law: a new perspective', *Historia* 58 (2009) 141-70.
- _____, *Citizenship, cult and community in classical Athens* (Cambridge 2011), forthcoming.
- J.H. BLOK and S.D. LAMBERT, 'The appointment of priests in Attic *gene*', *ZPE* 169 (2009) 95-121.
- BOARDMAN, J., 'Herakles, Peisistratos and Eleusis', *JHS* 95 (1975) 1-12.
- _____, *Athenian red figure vases: the archaic period* (London 1975).
- _____, 'The Parthenon Frieze, a closer look', *RA* 99 (1999) 305-30.
- BÖCKH, A., *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener* I (3rd ed.) (Berlin 1886).
- BOEDEKER, D., 'The view from Eleusis: Demeter in the Persian Wars' in: E. Bridges, E. Hall, and P.J. Rhodes (eds.), *Cultural responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium* (Oxford 2007) 65-82.
- BOEGEHOLD, A., 'Perikles' Citizenship Law of 451/0' in: A.L. Boegehold and A.C. Scafuro (eds.), *Athenian identity and civic ideology* (Baltimore and London 1994) 57-66.
- BOWDEN, H., *Classical Athens and the Delphic oracle: divination and democracy* (Cambridge 2005).
- BOWIE, A.M., *Aristophanes: myth, ritual and comedy* (Cambridge 1993).
- BRADEEN, D.W., 'Athenian casualty lists', *Hesp.* 33 (1964) 6-62.
- _____. 'New fragments of casualty lists', *Hesp.* 37 (1968) 237-40.
- _____, 'The Athenian casualty lists', *CQ* 19 (1969) 145-59.
- BREMMER, J.N., 'Scapegoat rituals in ancient Greece', *HSCP* 87 (1983) 299-320.
- _____, *Greek religion* (Oxford 1994).
- BROMMER, F., *Hephaistos: der Schmiedegott in der antiken Kunst* (Mainz 1978).
- BRONEER, O., 'The Thesmophorion in Athens', *Hesp.* 11 (1942) 250-74.
- BRUIT ZAIDMAN, L and P. SCHMITT PANTEL, *Religion in the ancient Greek city* (transl. by P.A. Cartledge from: *La religion grecque* (Paris 1989)) (Cambridge 1992).
- BRULÉ, P., *La fille d'Athènes; la religion des filles à Athènes à l'époque classique:*

- mythes, cultes et société* (Paris 1987).
- _____, 'La cité en ses composantes: remarques sur les sacrifices et la procession des Panathénées', *Kernos* 9 (1996) 37-63.
- BRUN, P., *L'orateur Démade. Essai d'histoire et d'historiographie* (Bordeaux 2000).
- BUCK, C.D., 'Discoveries in the Attic deme Ikaria, 1888. VII. Inscriptions from Ikaria. No. 8-17' *AJA* 5 (1889) 304-19.
- BURKERT, W., *Homo Necans: Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen* (Berlin 1972).
- _____, *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Stuttgart 1977).
- _____, 'Greek *poleis* and civic cults: some further thoughts' in: M.H. Hansen and K.A. Raaflaub (eds.), *Studies in the ancient Greek polis (Historia Einzelschriften 95)* (Stuttgart 1995) 201-10.
- BUTZ, P.A., 'Prohibitory inscriptions, *Ξένοι*, and the influence of the early Greek polis' in: R. Hägg (ed.), *The role of religion in the early Greek polis* (Stockholm 1996) 75-95.
- BYRNE, S.G., 'Some People in Third Century Athenian Decrees' in: *Festschrift Elaine Matthews*, forthcoming.
- CADOUX, T.J., 'The Athenian archons from Kreon to Hypsichides', *JHS* 68 (1948) 70-123.
- CAMP, J.M., 'Notes on two towers and borders of classical Boiotia', *AJA* 95 (1991) 193-202.
- _____, *The Athenian Agora: excavations in the heart of classical Athens* (2nd ed.) (London 1992).
- _____, *The Archaeology of Athens* (New Haven and London 2001).
- CARTER, D.M., 'Citizen attribute, negative right: a conceptual difference between ancient and modern ideas of freedom of speech' in: I. Sluiter and R.M. Rosen (eds.), *Free speech in classical antiquity* (Leiden 2004) 197-220.
- CARTLEDGE, P.A., *The Greeks* (Oxford 1993).
- CAVANAUGH, M.B., *Eleusis and Athens: documents in finance, religion and politics in the fifth century B.C.* (Atlanta 1996).
- CHRIST, M., 'Liturgy avoidance and *antidosis* in classical Athens', *TAPA* 120 (1990) 147-69.
- CLERC, M., *Les métèques athéniens: étude sur la condition légale, la situation*

- morale et le rôle social et économique des étrangers domiciliés à Athènes* (Paris 1893).
- CLINTON, K., *The sacred officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Philadelphia 1974).
- _____, 'A law in the City Eleusinion concerning the Mysteries', *Hesp.* 49 (1980) 258-88.
- _____, 'Sacrifice at the Eleusinian Mysteries' in: R. Hägg, N. Marinatos and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), *Early Greek cult practice* (Stockholm 1988) 69-80.
- _____, 'The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman initiates and benefactors, second century BC to AD 267', *ANRW II* 18 (1989) 1499-1539.
- _____, 'The sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis' in: N. Marinatos and R. Hägg (eds.), *Greek sanctuaries. New approaches* (London 1993) 110-24.
- _____, 'The Epidauria and the arrival of Asclepius in Athens' in: R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Stockholm 1994) 17-34.
- _____, 'The Eleusinian Mysteries and Panhellenism in democratic Athens' in: W.D.E. Coulson et al. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the democracy* (Oxford 1994) 161-72.
- _____, 'Stages of initiation in the Eleusinian and Samothracian Mysteries' in: M.B. Cosmopoulos (ed.), *Greek Mysteries: the archaeology and ritual of ancient Greek secret cults* (London 2003) 50-78.
- _____, *Eleusis. The inscriptions on stone: documents of the sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and the public documents of the deme* (2 vols.)(Athens 2005).
- COHEN, E.E., *The Athenian Nation* (Princeton 2000).
- COLE, S.G., 'The social function of rituals of maturation: the *Koureion* and the *Arkteia*', *ZPE* 55 (1984) 233-44.
- _____, 'The uses of water in Greek sanctuaries' in: R. Hägg, N. Marinatos and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), *Early Greek cult practice* (Stockholm 1988) 161-5.
- _____, 'Procession and celebration at the Dionysia' in: R. Scodel (ed.), *Theater and society in the classical world* (Ann Arbor 1993) 25-38.
- _____, 'Civic cult and civic identity' in: M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium August, 24-27 1994. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre vol. 2* (Copenhagen 1995) 292-325.
- _____, *Landscape, gender and ritual space. The ancient Greek experience* (Berkeley 2004).
- CONNELLY, J.B., *Portrait of a priestess: women and ritual in ancient Greece* (Princeton 2007).

- CONNOR, W.R., 'Tribes, festivals, and processions. Civic ceremonial and political manipulation in archaic Greece', *JHS* 107 (1987) 40-50.
- _____, 'Seized by the Nymphs: nympholepsy and symbolic expression in classical Greece', *CA* 7 (1988) 155-89.
- _____, "'Sacred" and "secular": *Hiera kai hosia* and the classical Athenian concept of the State', *Ancient Society* 19 (1988) 161-88.
- _____, 'City Dionysia and Athenian democracy' in: W.R. Connor et al. (eds.), *Aspects of Athenian democracy* (Copenhagen 1990) 7-32 = *C&M* 40 (1989) 7-32.
- _____, 'The problem of Athenian civic identity' in: A.L. Boegehold and A.C. Scafuro (eds.), *Athenian identity and civic ideology* (Baltimore and London 1994) 34-44.
- CSAPO, E. and W.J. SLATER, *The context of ancient drama* (Ann Arbor 1995).
- CULHAM, P., 'Again, what meaning lies in colour!', *ZPE* 64 (1986) 235-45.
- DAMSGAARD-MADSEN, A., 'Attic funeral inscriptions: their use as historical sources and some preliminary results' in: E. Christiansen, A. Damsgaard-Madsen and E. Hallager (eds.), *Studies in ancient history and numismatics presented to Rudi Thomsen* (Aarhus 1988) 55-68.
- DARCQUE, P., 'Les vestiges mycéniens découverts sous le Téléstérion d'Éleusis', *BCH* 105 (1981) 593-605
- DARWIN ADAMS, C., *The speeches of Aeschines* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1988).
- DAVIES, J.K., 'Demosthenes on liturgies: a note', *JHS* 87 (1967) 33-40.
- _____, *Athenian propertied families, 600-300 B.C.* (Oxford 1971).
- _____, 'Documents and 'documents' in fourth century historiography' in: P. Carlier (ed.), *Le IV e Siècle av. J-C: Approches historiographiques* (Paris 1996) 29-40.
- DETIENNE, M., 'The violence of wellborn ladies: women in the Thesmophoria' in: M. Detienne and J.-P. Vernant (eds.), *The cuisine of sacrifice among the Greeks* (transl. by P. Wissing) (Chicago 1989) 129-47.
- DEUBNER, L.A., *Attische Festen* (Berlin 1932).
- DEVRIES, K., 'The *diphrophoroi* on the Parthenon Frieze', *AJA* 98 (1994) 323.
- DEWITT, N.W. and Norman J. DEWITT, *Demosthenes vol. VI* (Cambridge [MA] London 1949).
- DILLER, A., *Race mixture among the Greeks before Alexander* (Urbana 1937).
- DILLON, M.P.J., *Girls and women in classical Greek religion* (London 2002).

- DINSMOOR, W.B., 'The burning of the opisthodomos in Athens. I: the date', *AJA* 36 (1932) 143-72.
- DOW, S., 'The Egyptian cults in Athens', *HThR* 30 (1937) 183-232.
- _____, 'The Greater Demarkhia of Erkhia', *BCH* 89 (1965) 180-213.
- _____, 'Six Athenian sacrificial calendars', *BCH* 92 (1968) 170-86.
- DOW, S. and D.H. GILL, 'The Greek cult table', *AJA* 69 (1965) 103-14.
- DOWDEN, K., 'Grades in the Eleusinian Mysteries', *RHR* 197 (1980) 409-27.
- DUNBAR, N., *Aristophanes, Birds* (Oxford 1995).
- DUNCAN-JONES, R.P., 'Metic numbers in Periclean Athens', *Chiron* 10 (1980) 101-9.
- DUNST, G., 'Die Siegerliste der samischen Heraia', *ZPE* 1 (1967) 225-39.
- EDMONSON, C.N., 'Onesippos' Herm', *Hesp. Suppl.* 19 (1982) 48-50, 212.
- EDMONDS, J.M., *The fragments of Attic comedy* vol.1 (Leiden 1957).
- EIJNDE, F. van den, 'Salaminian gods in Athens. The creation of a common past', http://www.archaeologie-online.de/de/bibliothek/tagungsberichte/2007/introducing_new_gods/salaminian_gods_in_athens
- EVANS, N., 'Feasts, citizens, and cultic democracy in classical Athens', *Ancient Society* 34 (2004) 1-25.
- FARAGUNA, M., *Atene nell' età di Alessandro: problemi politici, economici, finanziari* (Rome 1992).
- FEAVER, D.D., 'Historical development in the priesthoods of Athens', *YCS* 15 (1957) 123-58.
- FERGUSON, W.S., 'The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion', *Hesp.* 7 (1938) 1-74.
- _____, 'The Attic *orgeones* and the cult of heroes', *HThR* 37 (1944) 62-140.
- _____, 'Orgeonika', *Hesp. Suppl.* 8 (1949) 130-63, 453.
- FEYEL, C., *Les artisans dans les sanctuaires grecs aux époques classique et hellénistique à travers la documentation financière en Grèce* (Athens 2006).
- FINLEY, M.I., *Studies in land and credit in ancient Athens, 500-200 B.C.; the "horos" inscriptions* (New Jersey 1951).
- FISHER, N.R.E., 'How to be an alien', *CR* 29 (1979) 266-8.
- _____, *Aeschines, Against Timarchos* (Oxford 2001).
- _____, 'The bad boyfriend, the flatterer and the sykophant: related forms of the "kakos" in democratic Athens' in: I. Sluiter and R. Rosen (eds.), *KAKOS. Badness and anti value in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden 2008) 185-231.
- FLUCK, H., *Skurrile Riten in griechischen Kulte* (Endingen 1931).

- FRAGIADAKIS, C., *Die attischen Sklavennamen von der spätarchaischen Epoche bis in die römische Kaiserzeit, eine historische und soziologische Untersuchung* (Mannheim 1986).
- FRASER, P.M., 'Citizens, demesmen and metics in Athens and elsewhere' in: M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the ancient Greek city-state* (Copenhagen 1995) 64-90.
- _____, 'Ethnics as personal names' in: S. Hornblower and E. Matthews (eds.), *Greek personal names. Their value as evidence* (Oxford 2000) 149-57.
- FRÖNING, H., *Dithyrambos und Vasenmalerei in Athen* (Würzburg 1971).
- FUNKE, P., 'Fremde und nicht-Bürger in den griechischen Heiligtümern der antiken Mittelmeerwelt. Ein historische Einführung' in: A. Naso (ed.), *Stranieri e non cittadini nei santuari Greci* (Firenze 2006) 1-12.
- FURTWÄNGLER, A., *Meisterwerke der griechischen Plastik: kunstgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Leipzig and Berlin 1893).
- GABRIELSEN, V., 'The *antidosis*-procedure in classical Athens', *C&M* 38 (1987) 7-38.
- GARLAND, R., 'Religious authority in archaic and classical Athens', *BSA* 79 (1984) 75-123.
- _____, *Introducing new gods: the politics of Athenian religion* (New York 1992).
- _____, *The Piraeus from the fifth to the first century BC* (2nd ed.) (London 2001).
- GAUTHIER, Ph., 'La réunification d'Athènes en 281 et les deux archontes Nicias', *REG* 92 (1979) 348-99.
- GEORGOUDI, S., 'Sacrifices dans le monde grec: de la cité aux particuliers. Quelques remarques', *Ktéma* 23 (1998) 325-34.
- GOETTE, H.R., 'Athena Pallenis und ihre Beziehungen zur Akropolis von Athen' in: W. Hoepfner (ed.), *Kult and Kultbauten auf der Akropolis* (Berlin 1997) 116-31.
- _____, *Ho axiologos demos Sounion. Landeskundliche Studien in Südost Attika* (Rahden 2000).
- GOLDEN, M., 'Donatus and Athenian phratries', *CQ* 35 (1985) 9-13.
- _____, *Children and childhood in classical Athens* (Baltimore 1990).
- GOLDHILL, S., 'Representing democracy: women at the Great Dionysia' in R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (eds.), *Ritual, finance, politics: Athenian democratic accounts presented to David Lewis* (Oxford 1994) 347-70.
- _____, 'The audience of Athenian tragedy' in P.E. Easterling (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Greek tragedy* (Cambridge 1997) 54-68.

- _____, 'The Great Dionysia and civic ideology', *JHS* 107 (1987) 58-76.
- _____, 'Civic ideology and the problem of difference. The politics of Aeschylean tragedy, once again', *JHS* 120 (2000) 34-56.
- GOULD, J., 'Law, custom and myth: aspects of the social position of women in classical Athens', *JHS* 100 (1980) 38-59.
- HABICHT, Ch., 'Falsche Urkunden zur Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter der Perserkriege', *Hermes* 89 (1961) 1-35.
- _____, 'Foreign names in Athenian nomenclature' in: S. Hornblower and E. Matthews (eds.), *Greek personal names. Their value as evidence* (Oxford 2000) 120-7.
- _____, *Athens from Alexander to Anthony* (Cambridge [MA] 1997).
- HANSEN, M.H., *Three studies in Athenian demography* (Copenhagen 1988).
- HARRIS, D., *The treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion* (Oxford 1995).
- HARTMANN, E. and C. SCHAEFFER, 'Preisrichter oder Publikum? Zur Urteilsfindung in den dramatischen Wettkämpfen des klassischen Athen', *Klio* 88 (2006) 96-116.
- HARTWIG, P., *Bendis. Eine archaologische Untersuchung* (Leipzig and Berlin 1897).
- HEADLAM, W., 'The last scene of the Eumenides', *JHS* 26 (1906) 268-77.
- HENDERSON, J., 'Women and the Athenian dramatic festivals', *TAPA* 121 (1991) 133-47.
- HENNIG, D., 'Staatliche Ansprüche an privaten Immobilienbesitz in der klassischen und hellenistischen Polis', *Chiron* 25 (1995) 235-82.
- HENRY, A.S., *Honours and privileges in Athenian decrees: the principal formulae of Athenian honorary decrees* (Hildesheim et al. 1983).
- HINTZEN-BOHLEN, B., *Kulturpolitik des Eubolos und des Lykurgs: die Denkmäler und Bauprojecten in Athen zwischen 355 und 322 v. Chr.* (Berlin 1997).
- HUMPHREYS, S.C., 'Family tombs and tomb cult in ancient Athens: tradition or traditionalism?', *JHS* 100 (1980) 96-126.
- _____, *The strangeness of gods: historical perspectives on the interpretation of Athenian religion* (Oxford 2004).
- HURWIT, J.M., *The Athenian Acropolis: history, mythology and archaeology from the Neolithic era to the present* (Cambridge 1999).
- ISAAC, B.H., *The Greek settlements in Thrace until the Macedonian conquest* (Leiden 1986).
- ISAGER, S. and M.H. HANSEN, *Aspects of Athenian society in the fourth century*

B.C.: A historical introduction to and commentary on paragraphe-speeches and the speech against Dionysodoros in the corpus Demosthenicum (Odense 1975).

JACCOTTET, A.-F., 'Le lierre de la liberté', *ZPE* 80 (1990) 150-6.

JAMESON, M.H., 'A decree of Themistokles from Troizen', *Hesp.* 29 (1960) 198-223.

_____, 'A revised text of the decree of Themistokles from Troizen', *Hesp.* 31 (1962) 310-15.

_____, 'Notes on the sacrificial calendar from Erchia', *BCH* 89 (1965) 154-72.

_____, 'Agriculture and slavery in classical Athens', *CJ* (1977-78) 122-45.

_____, 'Sacrifice and animal husbandry in classical Greece' in: C.R. Witthaker (ed.), *Pastoral economies in classical antiquity (PCPhS Suppl. 14)* (Cambridge 1988) 87-119.

_____, 'Theoxenia' in R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Copenhagen 1994) 35-57.

_____, 'Religion and Athenian democracy' in: I. Morris and K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Democracy 2500? Questions and challenges (AIA Colloquia and conference papers 2)* (1997) 171-95.

_____, 'The spectacular and the obscure in Athenian religion' in: S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance culture and Athenian democracy* (Cambridge 1999) 321-40.

JENKINS, I., *The Parthenon Frieze* (London 1994).

JEPPESEN, K., *The theory of the alternative Erechtheion: premises, definition, and implications* (Aarhus 1987).

JONES, H.S., 'Two vases by Phintias', *JHS* 12 (1891) 366-80.

JONES, N.F., *Public organization in ancient Greece: a documentary study* (Philadelphia 1987).

_____, *The associations of classical Athens. The response to democracy* (New York and Oxford 1999).

_____, *Rural Athens under the democracy* (Philadelphia 2004).

KAHIL, L., 'Autour de l'Artémis attique', *AntK* 8 (1965) 20-33.

_____, 'L'Artémis de Brauron: rites et mystère', *AntK* 20 (1977) 86-98.

KALLET-MARX, L., 'The Kallias decree, Thucydides, and the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War', *CQ* 39 (1989) 94-113.

KAPPARIS, K., 'The Athenian decree for the naturalisation of the Plataeans', *GRBS* 36 (1995) 359-81.

- KARDARA, C., 'Glaukopis – Ho archaios Naos kai to Thema tes Zophorou tou Parthenos', *Arch. Eph.* (1961) 62-158.
- KASSEL, R. and C. AUSTIN (eds.), *Poetae Comici Graeci* vol IV (Berlin and New York 1983).
- KATAYAMA, Y., 'The social significance of liturgies from the viewpoint of the participation of metics', *JCS* 18 (1970) 40-51.
- KEARNS, E., 'Change and continuity in religious structures after Cleisthenes' in: P.A. Cartledge and F.D. Harvey (eds.), *Crux. Essays in Greek history presented to G.E.M. de Ste Croix on his 75th birthday* (Exeter 1985) 189-207.
- _____, *The heroes of Attica* (London 1989).
- _____, 'Cakes in Greek sacrifice regulations' in: R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Stockholm 1994) 65-70.
- KEESLING, C.M., *The votive statues of the Athenian Acropolis* (Cambridge 2003).
- KENDRICK-PRITCHETT, W.K., 'The Attic Stelai. Part I', *Hesp.* 22 (1953) 225-99.
- _____, 'The Attic Stelai. Part II', *Hesp.* 25 (1956) 178-281.
- KNIGGE, U., *The Athenian Kerameikos. History-Monuments-Excavations* (Athens 1991).
- KNOEPFLER, D., 'Adolf Wilhelm et la *pentétèris* des Amphiaraiia d'Oropos' in: M. Piérart (ed.), *Aristote e Athènes* (Paris 1993) 279-302.
- _____, *Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté (Érétria. Fouilles et recherches XI)* (Lausanne 2001).
- KOLB, F., *Agora und Theater, Volks- und Festversammlung* (Berlin 1981).
- KÖRTE, A., 'Bezirk eines Heilgottes', *MDAI (A)* 18 (1893) 231-56.
- _____, 'Das Heiligtum des Amynos', *MDAI (A)* 21 (1896) 287-332.
- KOSMOPOULOU, A., *The iconography of sculptured statue bases in the archaic and classical periods* (Wisconsin 2002).
- KOTSIDU, H., *Die musischen Agone der Panathenäen in archaischer und klassischer Zeit (Quellen und Forschungen zur Antiken Welt 8)* (Munich 1991).
- KRENTZ, P., 'Foreigners against the Thirty: IG II² 10 again', *Phoenix* 34 (1980) 298-306.
- _____, *The Thirty at Athens* (New York and London 1982).
- _____. 'Athens' allies and the *phallophoria*', *AHB* 7 (1993) 12-6.
- KRITZAS, C., Πρακτικά τοῦ Ε' Διεθνoῦς Συνεδρίου Πελοποννησιακῶν Σπουδῶν, Ἔργον-Ναύπλιον, 6-10 Σεπτεμβρίου 1995, vol. 2 (Athens 1996/1997) 33-

42.

- KRON, U., *Die zehn attischen phylenheroen: Geschichte, Mythos, Kult und Darstellungen* (Berlin 1976).
- _____, 'Priesthoods, dedications and euergetism: what part did religion play in the political and social status of women?' in: P. Hellström and B. Alroth (eds.), *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World* (Uppsala 1996) 139-82.
- LALONDE, G.V., *Horos Dios: an Athenian shrine and cult of Zeus* (Leiden 2006a).
- _____, 'IG I³ 1055 B and the boundary of Melite and Kollytos', *Hesp.* 75 (2006b) 83-119.
- LAMBERT, S.D., 'The Attic *genos* Salaminioi and the island of Salamis,' *ZPE* 119 (1997) 85-106.
- _____, *Rationes Centesimarum: sales of public land in Lykourgan Athens* (Amsterdam 1997).
- _____, *The Phratries of Attica* (2nd ed.) (Ann Arbor 1998a).
- _____, 'The Attic *genos* Bakchiadai and the City Dionysia', *Historia* 47 (1998b) 394-403
- _____, 'IG II² 2345, *thiasoi* of Herakles and the Salaminioi again', *ZPE* 125 (1999) 93-130.
- _____, 'The sacrificial calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis', *ZPE* 130 (2000a) 43-70.
- _____, 'Two notes on Attic *leges sacrae*', *ZPE* 130 (2000b) 71-80.
- _____, 'The Erechtheum workers of IG II²1654', *ZPE* 132 (2000c) 157-60.
- _____, 'Parerga III: the Genesis, Basile and Epops again', *ZPE* 139 (2002a) 75-82.
- _____, 'Two documents of Attic *gene*', *Horos* 14-16 (2000-2003) 77-82.
- _____, 'The sacrificial calendar of Athens', *BSA* 97 (2002b) 353-99.
- _____, 'A house of the Piraeans?', *ZPE* 146 (2004a) 91-2.
- _____, 'Athenian state laws and decrees, 352/1–322/1: I Decrees honouring Athenians', *ZPE* 150 (2004b) 85-120
- _____, 'Athenian state laws and decrees 352/1–322/1: II. Religious regulations', *ZPE* 154 (2005) 125-59.
- _____, 'Athenian state laws and decrees, 352/1-322/1: III Decrees honouring foreigners. A. Citizenship, proxeny and euergey', *ZPE* 158 (2006) 115-58
- _____, 'Athenian state laws and decrees, 352/1-322/1: III Decrees honouring foreigners. B. Other awards', *ZPE* 159 (2007) 101-54.

- _____, 'Polis and theatre in Lykourgan Athens: the honorific decrees' in: A.P. Matthaiou and I. Polinskaya (eds.), *Mikros Hieromnemon. Meletes eis mnemen Michael H. Jameson* (Athens 2008) 53-85.
- _____, 'Aristocracy and the Attic *gene*: a mythological perspective' 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)*, forthcoming.
- LANGDON, M.K., *A sanctuary of Zeus on Mount Hymettos (Hesp. Suppl. 16)* (1976).
- _____, 'The territorial basis of the Attic demes', *SO* 60 (1985) 5-15.
- _____, 'An Attic decree concerning Oropos', *Hesp.* 56 (1987) 47-58.
- LAUFFER, S., *Die Bergwerksklaven von Laureion* (Mainz 1956).
- LAUTER, H., *Attische Landgemeinden* (Marburg 1993).
- LAWTON, C.L., *Attic document reliefs: art and politics in ancient Athens* (Oxford 1995).
- LEVY, Ed., 'Métèques et droit de résidence' in: R. Lonis (ed.), *L'étranger dans le monde grec* (Nancy 1988) 47-67.
- LEWIS, D.M., 'Attic manumissions', *Hesp.* 28 (1959) 208-38.
- _____, 'Law on the Lesser Panathenaia', *Hesp.* 28 (1959) 239-47.
- _____, 'Cleisthenes and Attica', *Historia* 12 (1963) 22-40.
- _____, 'Dedications of *phialai* at Athens', *Hesp.* 37 (1968) 368-80.
- LINDERS, T., *The treasurers of the Other Gods in Athens and their functions* (Meisenheim 1975).
- LOHMANN, H., *Atene: Forschungen zu Siedlungs- und Wirtschaftsstruktur des klassischen Attika*, vol. 1 (Cologne 1993).
- LORAUX, N., *The invention of Athens: the funeral oration in the classical city* (transl. by A. Sheridan) (Cambridge [MA] 1986).
- LLOYD-JONES, P.H., *The Eumenides* (Oxford 1970).
- LUPPE, W., 'Ein weiteres Zeugnis für fünf Konkurrenten and den Komödien-Agonen während des Peloponnesischen Krieges', *ZPE* 129 (2000) 19-20.
- LUPPE, W., 'Nochmals zum Einführungstermin der Komödien-Agone an den Lenäen', *ZPE* 159 (2007) 25-7.
- LUPU, E., 'A note on *SEG XXXV 113*' in: D. Jordan and J. Traill (eds.), *Lettered Attica. A Day of Attic Epigraphy. Proceedings of the Athens Symposium, 8 March 2000* (Toronto 2003) 69-77.
- _____, *Greek sacred law. A collection of new documents* (Leiden 2005).

- MAAB, M., *Die Prohedrie des Dionysostheaters in Athen* (München 1972).
- MACDOWELL, D.M., *Demosthenes against Meidias* (Bristol 1990).
- _____, *Aristophanes and Athens; an introduction to the plays* (Oxford 1995).
- MAKRES, A.K., 'The rediscovery of IG I³ 253-4' in: A.P. Mattaiou (ed.), *Attikai epigraphai. Praktika symposiou eis mnemen A. Wilhelm* (Athens 2004) 123-40.
- MANVILLE, P.B., *The origins of citizenship in ancient Athens* (Princeton 1990).
- _____, 'Toward a new paradigm of Athenian citizenship' in: A.L. Boegehold and A.C. Scafuro (eds.), *Athenian identity and civic ideology* (Baltimore and London 1994) 21-33.
- MARCHANT, E.C., *Xenophon VII Scripta Minora* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1984).
- MARSHALL, C.W. and S. VAN WILLIGENBURG, 'Judging Athenian dramatic competitions', *JHS* 124 (2004) 90-107.
- MATTINGLY, H.B., 'The Athenian coinage decree', *Historia* 10 (1961) 148-88.
- _____, 'New light on the Athenian standards decree', *Klio* 75 (1993) 98-102.
- _____, *The Athenian Empire restored. Epigraphic and historical studies* (Michigan 1996).
- MAURIZIO, L., 'The Panathenaic procession: Athens' participatory democracy on display?' in: D. Boedeker and K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Democracy, Empire and the Arts in fifth-century Athens* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1998) 297-317.
- MAXWELL-STUART, P.G., 'Remarks on the black cloaks of the ephebes', *PCPS* 16 (1970) 113-6.
- MCCULLOCH, H.Y., and H.D. Cameron, 'Septem 12-13 and the Athenian ephebia', *ICS* 5 (1980) 1-14.
- MEIGGS, R., *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972).
- MERRITT, B.D., *Athenian financial documents of the fifth century* (Ann Arbor 1932).
- MEYER, M., *Die griechischen Urkundenreliefs* (Berlin 1989).
- MIDDLETON, D.F., 'Thrasyboulos' Thracian support', *CQ* 32 (1982) 298-303.
- MIKALSON, J.D., *The sacred and civil calendar of the Athenian year* (Princeton 1975).
- _____, 'Religion in the Attic demes', *AJP* 98 (1977) 424-35.
- _____, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (Berkeley 1998).
- _____, 'The Heracleotai of Athens' in: G. Schmeling and J.D. Mikalson (eds.),

- Qui miscuit utile dulci. Festschrift essays for Paul Lachlan MacKendrick* (Wauconda 1998) 253-63.
- MILES, M.M., *The City Eleusinion (The Athenian Agora 31)* (New Jersey 1998).
- MILLER, M.C., 'The parasol: an oriental status-symbol in late archaic and classical Athens', *JHS* 112 (1992) 91-105.
- _____, *Athens and Persia in the fifth century BC: a study in cultural receptivity* (Cambridge 1997).
- MILLER, S.G., *The Prytaneion: its function and architectural form* (Berkeley 1978).
- MILLET, P., 'The rhetoric of reciprocity in classical Athens' in: C. Gill, R. Seaford and N. Postlethwaite (eds.), *Reciprocity in ancient Greece* (Oxford 1998) 227-53.
- MILLS, H., 'Greek clothing regulations: sacred and profane', *ZPE* 55 (1984) 255-65.
- MITCHEL, F.W., 'Derkylos of Hagnous and the date of *IG II² 1187*', *Hesp.* 33 (1964) 337-51.
- MOLTESON, M., *Catalogue Greece in the classical period. Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek* (Copenhagen 1995).
- MOMMSEN, A., *Heortologie: antiquarische Untersuchungen über die städtischen Feste der Athener* (Leipzig 1864).
- MOORS, K., 'The argument against a dramatic date for Plato's *Republic*', *Polis* 7 (1987) 6-31.
- MORETTI, J.-C., 'The theatre of the sanctuary of Dionysos Eleuthereus in late fifth-century Athens', *ICS* 24-25 (1999-2000) 377-98.
- MORGAN, C., 'Ritual and society in Early Iron Age Corinthia' in: R. Hägg (ed.) *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Stockholm 1994) 73-90.
- _____, 'The evolution of a sacral "Landscape": Isthmia, Perachora and the early Corinthian state' in S.E. Alcock and R. Osborne (eds.), *Placing the Gods, Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece* (Oxford 1996) 105-42.
- _____, *Early Greek states beyond the polis* (London 2003).
- MORROW, K.D., *Greek footwear and the dating of sculpture* (Madison 1985).
- MYLONAS, G.E., *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton 1961).
- NAGY, B., 'Athenian officials on the Parthenon Frieze', *AJA* 96 (1992) 55-69.
- NAILS, D., 'The dramatic date of Plato's *Republic*', *CJ* 93 (1998) 383-96.
- NEILS, J., 'Pride, pomp, and circumstance: the iconography of procession' in: idem

- (ed.), *Goddess and polis: the Panathenaic festival in ancient Athens* (Hanover and Princeton 1992) 177-97.
- _____, (ed.), *Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon* (Madison 1996).
- _____, *The Parthenon Frieze* (Cambridge 2001).
- _____, 'Children and Greek religion' in: J. Neils and J.H. Oakley (eds.), *Coming of age in ancient Greece: images of childhood from the classical past* (New Haven 2004) 139-62
- NILSSON, M.P., 'Bendis in Athens', *From the collections of Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek* 3 (1942) 169-88.
- _____, *Opuscula Selecta* vol. 3 (Lund 1960).
- NOACK, F., *Eleusis: die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Heiligtumes* (Berlin 1927).
- NORDQUIST, G.C., 'Some notes on musicians in Greek cult' in: R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence* (Stockholm 1994) 81-93.
- OAKLEY, J.H., *The Phiale Painter* (Mainz am Rhein 1990).
- OBER, J., *Mass and elite in democratic Athens: rhetoric, ideology, and the power of the people* (Princeton 1989).
- _____, 'The polis as a society: Aristotle, John Rawl, and the Athenian social contract' in: idem (ed.), *The Athenian revolution. Essays on ancient Greek democracy and political theory* (Princeton 1996) 107-22.
- OSBORNE, M.J., 'Entertainment in the Prytaneion at Athens', *ZPE* 41 (1981) 153-70.
- _____, *Naturalization in Athens* 4 vols. (Brussels 1981-1983)
- OSBORNE, M.J and S.G. BYRNE, *The foreign residents of Athens: an annex to the "Lexicon of Greek personal names: Attica"* (Leuven 1996).
- OSBORNE, R., *Demos: the discovery of classical Attika* (Cambridge 1985).
- _____, 'The demos and its subdivisions in classical Athens' in: O. Murray and S., Price (eds.), *The Greek city form Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990) 265-93.
- _____, 'The potential mobility of human populations', *OJA* 10 (1991) 231-52.
- _____, 'Women and sacrifice in classical Greece', *CQ* 43 (1993) 392-405 (reprinted in: R. Buxton (ed.), *Oxford readings in Greek religion* (Oxford 2000) 294-313.
- _____, 'Archaeology, the Salaminioi, and the politics of sacred space in archaic

- Attica' in: S.E. Alcock and R. Osborne (eds.), *Placing the gods. Sanctuaries and sacred space in ancient Greece* (Oxford 1994) 143-60.
- _____, 'Inscribing performance' in: S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.) *Performance culture and Athenian democracy* (Cambridge 1999) 341-58.
- OSTWALD, M., *Nomos and the beginnings of the Athenian democracy* (Oxford 1969).
- PACHE, C.O., 'Barbarian bond: Thracian Bendis among the Athenians' in: S.R. Asirvatham, C.O. Pache and J. Watrous (eds.), *Between magic and religion. Interdisciplinary studies in ancient Mediterranean religion and society* (Lanham 2001) 3-11.
- PALAGIA, O., 'The ephebes of Erechtheis 333/2 BC and their dedication (with David Lewis)', *BSA* 84 (1989) 333-44.
- _____, 'Akropolis Museum 581. A family at the Apatouria?', *Hesp.* 64 (1995) 493-505.
- PAPPADAKIS, N.G., 'Ἱερός νόμος Βενδιδείων', *Arch. Eph.* (1939) 808-23.
- PARKE, H.W., *Festivals of the Athenians* (New York 1977).
- PARKER, R., 'Greek religion' in: Boardman, J., J. Griffin and O. Murray (eds.), *The Oxford history of the classical world* (Oxford and New York 1986) 254-75.
- _____, *Athenian religion: a history* (Oxford 1996).
- _____, 'What are sacred laws?' in: E.M. Harris and L. Rubinstein (eds.), *The law and the courts in ancient Athens* (London 2004) 57-70.
- _____, *Polytheism and society at Athens* (Oxford 2005).
- PATTERSON, C.B., *Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451/0 BC* (Ann Arbor 1976).
- PEÇIRKA, J., *The formula for the grant of enktesis in Attic inscriptions* (Prague 1966).
- PEEK, W., *Attische Grabschriften* (Berlin 1954-1957).
- PÉLÈKIDIS, C., *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ* (Paris 1962).
- PETRAKOS, B.C., Ο Δῆμος του Ραμνοῦντος II. Οἱ Ἐπιγραφές (*BAAH* 181/182) (Athens 1999).
- PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, A., *The dramatic festivals of Athens* (2nd ed. revised by J.P.A. Gould and D.M. Lewis) (Oxford 1991).
- PLANEAUX, Ch., 'The date of Bendis' entry into Attica', *CJ* 96 (2000) 165-92
- POLIGNAC, F. DE, *Cults, territory, and the origins of the Greek state* (translated by J. Lloyd) (Chicago 1995).

- _____, ‘Sanctuaires et société en Attique géométrique et archaïque: réflexions sur les critères d’analyse’ in: A. Verbanck-Piérard and D. Viviers (eds.), *Culture et société: l’avènement d’Athènes à l’époques archaïques* (Brussels 1995) 73-101.
- _____, ‘Repenser la “cite”? Rituels et société en Grèce archaïque’ in: M.H. Hansen and K. A. Raaflaub (eds.), *Studies in the ancient Greek polis (Historia Einzelschriften 95)* (Stuttgart 1995) 7-19.
- PRITCHARD, D., ‘Kleisthenes, participation, and the dithyrambic contests of late archaic and classical Athens’, *Phoenix* 58 (2004) 208-28.
- PRITCHETT, W.K., ‘The Παννυχίς of the Panathenaia’, in: ΦΙΛΙΑ ΕΠΗ ΕΙΣ ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΝ Ε. ΜΥΛΩΝΑΝ ii (1987) 179-88.
- RACKHAM, H., *Aristotle, The Athenian constitution; The Eudemian ethics; On virtues and vices* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1961).
- _____, *Aristotle XXI Politics* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1982).
- RAECK, W., *Zum Barbarenbild in der Kunst Athens im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Bonn 1981).
- RANDALL, R.H. Jr., ‘The Erechtheum workmen’, *AJA* 57 (1953) 199-210
- RAUBITSCHKE, A.E., *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: a catalogue of the inscriptions of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.* (Cambridge [MA] 1949)
- REBER, K., ‘Das Hephaisteion in Athen – ein Monument für die Demokratie’, *JdI* 113 (1998) 31-48.
- REINHOLD, M., *History of purple as a status symbol in antiquity (Collection Latomus 116)* (Brussels 1970).
- REINMUTH, O.W., *The ephebic inscriptions of the fourth century B.C.* (Leiden 1971).
- RHODES, P.J., *A commentary on the Aristotelian ‘Athenaion Politeia’* (2nd ed.) (Oxford 1993).
- _____, ‘Nothing to do with democracy: Athenian drama and the polis’, *JHS* 123 (2003) 104-19.
- RICHTER, G.M.A., ‘Red-figured Athenian vases recently acquired by the Metropolitan Museum of Art’, *AJA* 27 (1923) 265-85.
- ROBERSTON, C.M. and A. FRANTZ, *The Parthenon Frieze* (London 1975).
- _____, ‘The South Metopes: Theseus and Daidalos’, in: E. Berger (ed.), *Der Parthenon-Kongreß Basel* (Mainz 1984) 206-9.
- ROBERTSON, N., ‘New light on Demeter’s festival: the festival Proerosia’, *GRBS* 37 (1996) 319-79.

- _____, *Festivals and legends: the formation of Greek cities in the light of public ritual* (Toronto 1992).
- _____, 'The two processions to Eleusis and the program of the Mysteries', *AJP* 119 (1998) 547-75
- ROBINSON, D.M., 'Three new inscriptions from the deme of Ikaria', *Hesp.* 17 (1948) 141-3.
- ROCCOS, L. J., 'The *kanephoros* and her festival mantle in Greek art', *AJA* 99 (1995) 641-66.
- ROMANO, I.B., 'The archaic statue of Dionysos from Ikarion', *Hesp.* 51 (1982) 389-409.
- ROSEN, R.M., 'Trouble in the early career of Plato Comicus: another look at *P.Oxy.* 2737.44-51', *ZPE* 76 (1989) 223-8.
- ROSIVACH, V.J., '*Talasiourgoi* and *Paidia* in *IG* 2² 1553-78: a note on Athenian social history', *Historia* 38 (1989) 365-70.
- _____, '*IG* II² 334 and the Panathenaic hekatomb', *PP* 46 (1991) 430-42.
- _____, *The system of public sacrifice in fourth-century Athens* (Atlanta 1994).
- _____, 'The Thracians of *IG* II² 1956', *KLIO* 83 (2000) 379-81.
- ROTROFF, S.I., 'The Parthenon frieze and the sacrifice to Athena', *AJA* 81 (1977) 379-82.
- _____, 'An anonymous hero in the Athenian agora', *Hesp.* 47 (1978) 196-209.
- ROTROFF, S.I. and J.H. OAKLEY, *Debris from a public dining place in the Athenian Agora* (*Hesp. Suppl* 25) (1992)
- ROUSSEL, P., 'L'initiation préalable et le symbole Eleusien', *BCH* 54 (1930) 51-74
- _____, 'A propos d'un décret attique (relatif à la déesse Bendis)', *REA* 45 (1943) 177-82.
- RUBINSTEIN, L., *Adoption in fourth-century Athens* (Copenhagen 1993).
- RUIZ-PÉREZ, A., 'Un oracle relatif à l'introduction du culte de Cybele à Athènes', *Kernos* 7 (1994) 169-77.
- RUSTEN, J., 'The four "new Lenaeon victors" of 428-5 B.C. (and the date of the first Lenaeon comedy) reconsidered', *ZPE* 157 (2006) 22-6.
- SAMONS L.J. II, *Empire of the owl: Athenian imperial finances* (Stuttgart 2000).
- SCAFURO, A.C., 'Witnessing and false witnessing: proving citizenship and kin identity in fourth-century Athens' in: A.L. Boegehold and A.C. Scafuro (eds.), *Athenian identity and civic ideology* (Baltimore and London 1994) 156-98.
- SCHLAIFER, R., 'Notes on Athenian public cults', *HSCP* 51 (1940) 233-60.

- _____, 'The cult of Athena Pallenis (Athenaeus VI 234-235)', *HSCP* 54 (1943) 35-67.
- SCHMITT-PANTEL, P., 'Athéna Apatouria et la ceinture: les aspects féminins de Apatouries à Athènes', *Annales (ESC)* 32 (1977) 1059-73
- _____, *La cité au banquet: histoire des repas publics dans les cités grecques* (Rome 1992).
- SCHNURR, Ch., 'Zur Topographie der Theaterstätten und der Tripodenstrasse in Athen', *ZPE* 105 (1995) 139-53.
- SCHOLFIELD, A.F., *Aelian. On the characteristics of animals*, vol. 2 (Cambridge [MA] and London 1958).
- SCHWENK, C.J., *Athens in the age of Alexander: the dated laws and decrees of the Lykourgan era*, 338-322 B.C. (Chicago 1985).
- SCULLION, S., 'Tragic dates', *CQ* 52 (2002) 81-101.
- SEKUNDA, N.V., 'IG II² 1250: a decree concerning the *lampadephoroi* of the tribe Aiantis', *ZPE* 83 (1990) 149-82.
- SHAPIRO, H.A., *Art and cult under the tyrants in Athens* (Mainz am Rhein 1989).
- _____, 'Mousikoi agones: music and poetry at the Panathenaia' in: J. Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis. The Panathenaic festival in ancient Athens* (Princeton 1992) 53-76.
- SHEAR, J., 'Prizes from Athens: the list of Panathenaic prizes and the sacred oil', *ZPE* 142 (2003) 87-108.
- SHEAR, T.L. Jr., 'The Athenian Agora: excavations of 1970', *Hesp.* 40 (1971) 241-79.
- _____, 'The Athenian Agora: excavations of 1972', *Hesp.* 42 (1973) 359-407.
- _____, 'The demolished temple at Eleusis', *Hesp. Suppl.* 20 (1982) 128-212.
- SHOREY, P., *Plato, The Republic* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1963).
- SIEWERT, P., 'The ephebic oath in fifth-century Athens', *JHS* 97 (1977) 102-111.
- SIMMS, R.R., 'The cult of the Thracian goddess Bendis in Athens and Attica', *Ancient World* 18 (1988) 59-76
- _____, 'Isis in classical Athens', *CJ* 84 (1988/9) 216-21.
- SIMMS, R.M., 'Myesis, Telete, and Mysteria', *GRBS* 31 (1990) 183-95.
- _____, 'The Phrearrhian *lex sacra*. An interpretation', *Hesp.* 67 (1998) 91-107.
- SIMON, E., *Festivals of Attica. An archaeological commentary* (Wisconsin 1983).
- SLATER, N.W., 'The Lenaeon theatre', *ZPE* 66 (1986) 255-64.
- SMYTH, H.W., *Aeschylus II Agamemnon, Eumenides, fragments* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1981).

- SOMMERSTEIN, A.H., *Acharnians* (Warminster 1980)
- _____, 'The theatre audience, the *demos*, and the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus' in: C. Pelling (ed.), *Greek tragedy and the historian* (Oxford 1997) 63-79.
- _____, *Ecclesiazusae* (Warminster 1998).
- SOSIN, J.D., 'Two Attic endowments', *ZPE* 138 (2002) 123-8.
- SOURVINOU-INWOOD, C., *Studies in girls' transitions: aspects of the arkteia and the age representations in Attic iconography* (Athens 1988).
- _____, 'Male and female, public and private, ancient and modern' in: E. D. Reeder and S.C. Humphreys (eds.), *Pandora. Women in Classical Greece* (Baltimore 1995) 111-22.
- _____, 'What is polis religion?' in: O. Murray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek city from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990) 295-322, reprinted in: R. Buxton (ed.), *Oxford readings in Greek religion* (Oxford 2000) 13-37.
- _____, 'Something to do with Athens: tragedy and ritual' in: R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (eds.), *Ritual, finance, politics. Athenian democratic accounts presented to David Lewis* (Oxford 1994) 269-90.
- _____, 'Reconstructing change: ideology and the Eleusinian mysteries' in: M. Golden and P. Toohey (eds.), *Inventing ancient culture: historicism, periodization and the ancient world* (London and New York 1997) 132-64.
- _____, 'Festival and Mysteries. Aspects of Eleusinian cult' in: M.B. Cosmopoulos (ed.), *Greek Mysteries. The archaeology and ritual of ancient Greek secret cults* (London and New York 2003) 25-49.
- SPAHN, P., 'Fremde und Metöken in der athenischen Demokratie' in: A. Demandt (ed.), *Mit Fremde leben: ein Kulturgeschichte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (München 1995) 37-56.
- STAVRIANOPOULOU, E., 'Gemeinsam feiern, getrennt verehren: zum Kult der thrakischen Göttin Bendis in Attika' in: C. Ambos et al. (eds.), *Die Welt der Rituale. Von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Darmstadt 2005) 144-55.
- STANTON, G.R., 'Some Attic inscriptions', *BSA* 79 (1984) 289-306.
- STEINHOWER, G., 'Παρατηρήσεις στην οικιστική μορφή των αττικών δήμων' in: W.D.E. Coulson et al. (eds.), *The archaeology of Athens and Attica under the democracy* (Oxford 1994) 175-89.
- STRATEN, F. VAN, 'Heracles and the uninitiated' in: A.N.Z.J. Jitta and J.S. Boersma (eds.), *Festoen. Opgedragen aan A.N. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta bij haar zeventigste verjaardag* (Groningen 1975) 563-72.
- _____, 'Assimilatie van vreemde goden: archeologisch bronnenmateriaal',

- Lampas* 9 (1976) 42-50.
- _____, *Hiera Kala. Images of animal sacrifice in archaic and classical Greece* (Leiden 1995).
- STULZ, H., *Die Farbe Purpur in frühen Griechentum beobachtet in der Literatur und in der bildenden Kunst* (Stuttgart 1990).
- SUMMA, D., 'Una iscrizione coregica di Thorikos?', *ZPE* 136 (2001) 71-6.
- _____, 'Una dedica coregica inedita', *ZPE* 150 (2004) 147-8.
- _____, 'Attori e coreghi in Attica: iscrizioni dal teatro di Thorikos', *ZPE* 157 (2006) 77-86.
- TAYLOR, C., 'A new political world' in: R. Osborne (ed.), *Debating the Athenian cultural revolution. Art, literature, and politics, 430-380 BC* (Cambridge 2007) 72-90.
- TAYLOR, M.C., 'One hundred heroes of Phyle', *Hesp.* 71 (2002) 377-97.
- THEMELIS, P.G., *Horos* 7 (1989) 23-9
- THEODORIDIS, Ch., 'Eine unbeachtete Buchangabe zum Bruchstück des Philochoros über die attischen Orgeonen', *ZPE* 138 (2002) 40-2.
- THOMPSON, D.B., 'The Persian spoils in Athens' in: S.S. Weinberg (ed.), *The Aegean and the Near East. Studies presented to Hetty Goldman* (New York 1956) 281-91.
- THOMPSON, H.A. and R.E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens: the history, shape, and uses of an ancient city center (The Athenian Agora 14)*(Princeton 1972).
- THOMPSON, W.E., 'The deme in Kleisthenes' reforms', *SO* 46 (1971) 72-9.
- THOMSON, G.D., *The Oresteia of Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1938).
- TODD, S.C., 'Status and gender in Athenian public records' in: *Symposium 1995: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (Cologne 1997) 113-24.
- TRACY, S.V. and C. HABICHT, 'New and old Panathenaic victor lists', *Hesp.* 60 (1991) 187-236.
- _____, 'The Panathenaic festival and games: an epigraphical enquiry', *Nikephoros* 4 (1991) 133-53.
- _____, *Athens and Macedon: Attic letter-cutters of 300 to 229* (Berkeley 2003).
- TRAILL, J.S., *The political organization of Attica. A study of the demes, trittyes, and phylai, and their representation in the Athenian council (Hesp. Suppl. 14)* (Princeton 1975).
- _____, *Demos and trittys: epigraphical and topographical studies in the organization of Attica* (Toronto 1986).

- _____, *Persons of ancient Athens* (Toronto 1994).
- TRAVLOS, J., *Bildlexicon zur Topographie des antiken Attika* (Tübingen 1988).
- _____, *Pictorial dictionary of ancient Athens* (New York 1971).
- TSIAFAKIS, D., 'The allure and repulsion of Thracians in the art of classical Athens' in: B. Cohen (ed.), *Not the classical ideal: Athens and the construction of the Other in Greek art* (Leiden 2000) 364-89.
- USTINOVA, Y., 'Orgeones in phratries: A mechanism of social integration in Attica', *Kernos* 9 (1996) 227-42.
- VANDERPOOL, E., 'A *lex sacra* of the Attic deme Phrearrhioi', *Hesp.* 39 (1970) 47-53.
- VELIGIANNI, C., 'Belobigung und Bekränzung von Rat und Magistraten in Zusammenhang mit der Rechenschaftsablegung', *Hellenika* 40 (1989) 239-56.
- VERMASEREN, M.J., *Corpus cultus Cybelae Attidisque* (Leiden 1982).
- VERSNEL, H.S., *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman religion* (Leiden 1990).
- _____, 'Religion and democracy' in: W. Eder (ed.), *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?* (Stuttgart 1995) 367-87.
- VIDAL-NAQUET, P., 'The Black Hunter and the origin of the Athenian ephebia' in: idem, *The Black Hunter. Forms of thought and forms of society in the Greek world* (transl. by A. Szegedy-Maszak) (Baltimore 1986) 106-128.
- VIKELA, E., *Die Weihreliefs aus dem Athener Pankrates-Heiligtum am Ilissos: religion-geschichtliche Bedeutung und Typologie* (Berlin 1994).
- VINCE, J.H., *Demosthenes III* (Cambridge [MA] and London 1935)
- VLASSOPOULOS, K., 'Free spaces: identity, experience and democracy in classical Athens', *CQ* 57 (2007) 33-52.
- VOS, M.F., *Scythian archers in archaic attic vase-painting* (Groningen 1963).
- WALDSTEIN, C., 'Τραπέζω and Κοσμώ in the Frieze of the Parthenon', *JHS* 11 (1890) 143-5
- WEAVER, B.H., 'A further allusion in the *Eumenides* to the Panathenaia', *CQ* 46 (1996) 559-61
- WEES, H. VAN, *Greek warfare. Myths and realities* (London 2004).
- _____, 'Mass and elite in Solon's Athens: the property classes revisited' in: J.H. Blok and A.P.M.H. Lardinois (eds.), *Solon of Athens: new historical and philological approaches* (Leiden 2006) 351-89.
- WESENBERG, B., 'Panathenäische Peplosdedikation und Arrephorie. Zur

- Themaktik des Parthenonfrieses', *JdI* 110 (1995) 149-78.
- WEST, M.L., 'The early chronology of Attic tragedy', *CQ* 39 (1989) 251-4
- WHITEHEAD, D., *The ideology of the Athenian metic* (Cambridge 1977).
- _____, 'Competitive outlay and community profit: *philotimia* in democratic Athens,' *Classica et Mediaevalia* 34 (1983) 55-74.
- _____, 'Immigrant communities in the classical polis: some principles for a synoptic treatment', *AC* 53 (1984) 47-59.
- _____, *The demes of Attica, 508/7 - ca. 250 BC. A political and social study* (Princeton 1986).
- _____, 'The ideology of the Athenian metic: some pendants and a reappraisal', *PCPS* 212 (1986) 145-58.
- _____, 'Athenian demes as *poleis* (Thuc. 2.16.2)', *CQ* 51 (2001) 604-7.
- WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORF, U. VON, 'Demotika der attischen Metoeken', *Hermes* 22 (1887) 107-28 and 211-59
- WILHELM, A., 'Inscription aus dem Peiraieus', *JOAI* 5 (1902) 132-4.
- WILSON, P., *The Athenian institution of the khoregia: the chorus, the city and the stage* (Cambridge 2000).
- _____, 'Tragic honours and democracy: neglected evidence for the politics of the Athenian Dionysia', forthcoming.
- WINKLER, J.J., 'The ephebes' song; tragôidia and polis', *Representations* 11 (1985) 26-62
- WYCHERLEY, R.E., *Literary and epigraphical testimonia (Agora 3)* (London 1973).
- ZANDEN, J.L. VAN, and M. PRAK, 'Towards an economic interpretation of citizenship: the Dutch republic between medieval communes and modern nationstates', *European Review of Economic History* 10 (2006) 111-45.
- ZIEHEN, L., 'Panathenaia', *RE* 18 (1949) 457-93.
- ZIMMERMANN, K., 'Tätowierte Thrakerinnen auf griechischen Vasenbildern', *JdI* 95 (1980) 163-96.

