

The Praxiergidae Decree (IG I³ 7) and the Dressing of Athena's Statue with the *Peplos*

Noel Robertson

THE ATHENIAN DECREE IG I³ 7, usually dated to 460–450 B.C., deals with the *genos* Praxiergidae.¹ It was set up on the Acropolis “[behind] or [south of] the Old Temple.” After the preamble there is a Delphic oracle with ritual prescriptions and then, in larger letters, a series of ritual prescriptions expressed by infinitives.

I. Introduction

This important document has resisted any satisfactory interpretation. Although the three non-joining fragments indicate its general form and scope, even the preamble presents difficulty, and it has proved quite impossible to restore or understand the ritual prescriptions at the point where the two lower fragments seem to match up, as the beginning and the end of about six successive lines, the conclusion of the series. Nor is it apparent why the duties of the *genos* require attention. It has mostly been supposed that traditional duties are re-affirmed, sometimes that new ones too are conceded or imposed.² If Attic *genê* were

¹L. Ziehen, *Leges Graecorum Sacrae* II 14; F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG I² 80*; D. M. Lewis, “Notes on Attic Inscriptions I: The Praxiergidai,” *BSA* 49 (1954) 17–21; A. M. Woodward, *BSA* 50 (1955) 271; *SEG* XIV 3; F. Sokolowski, *LSCG* 15; Lewis, *IG I³ 7*; J. M. Mansfield, *The Robe of Athena and the Panathenaic “Peplos”* (diss. U. California Berkeley 1985) 398–404. Lewis upholds “460–450” against suggestions of a later date; so too H. R. Immerwahr, *Attic Script. A Survey* (Oxford 1990) 95, 108, 167. But the lettering is unorthodox, and there can be no certainty.

²More recent treatments to this effect are J. K. Davies, *Democracy and Classical Greece*² (Cambridge [Mass.] 1993) 57–58, cf. Davies, “Religion and the

once the organs of aristocratic rule, the democracy might now wish to circumscribe such duties as remained to them. But this view of the *genê* no longer holds the field, and of the Praxiergidae in particular nothing is known but their ritual function.³

One prescription stands out, the only one that has been reliably read and restored. The Praxiergidae are to dress Athena's statue with the *peplos*. Hesychius defines the *genos* as doing just this: "those who dress the old statue of Athena" (Πραξιεργίδαι· οἱ τὸ ἔδος τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἀμφιεννύοντες). It has always been thought that the entry is based on a traditional duty, on the role they played at the festival Plynteria, washing the statue and the *peplos*.⁴ The decree would only re-affirm it. If however a new duty was conspicuous, there is no objection to supposing that the *genos* are thus defined. And despite the general opinion, there are strong objections to supposing that the definition could refer to a traditional duty.

In speaking of Athena's *peplos* and in evoking the festival Plynteria, the Praxiergidae decree summons us to consider evidence old and new, familiar or perplexed. It may be thought that there is nothing more to say. The *peplos* and Athena's festivals are topics often reviewed, and for the various problems various solutions have been tried.⁵ Relevant inscriptions—the civic calendar of sacrifice compiled by Nicomachus, calendars of Thoricus and Erchia, Hellenistic decrees for girls who work on the *peplos*—have been acutely edited and discussed in the past few years. Even so, even as new evidence is set beside the old, there is a tendency to repeat outworn assumptions. Assumptions about

State," in *CAH IV*² (1988) 370, and M. Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law* (Berkeley 1986) 145–148.

³Against this view, as it pertains to fifth-century developments like the Praxiergidae decree, see R. Parker, *Athenian Religion. A History* (Oxford 1996) 124–125, and M. H. Jameson in I. Morris and K. A. Raaflaub, edd., *Democracy 2500? Questions and Challenges* (Boston 1997) 174–175.

⁴So e.g. L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1932: hereafter "Deubner") 19; Ziehen, "Plynteria," *RE* 21 (1951) 1060; Parker (*supra* n.3) 307.

⁵The fullest and most rigorous accounts are the dissertations of Mansfield (*supra* n.1) and J. L. Shear, *Polis and Panathenaia. The History and Development of Athena's Festival* (diss. U. Pennsylvania 2001).

the Praxierygiae decree must be discarded, for a certainty; others may fall as well.

I shall argue that the text can be much improved, mainly through a slight adjustment of the two lower fragments (§§II–III). Since the text thus constituted gives us a festival date, the dates of both the Plynteria and its companion festival, the Calynteria, need to be established; it proves to be the latter that is envisaged by the decree (§IV). On this day, every four years, the decree calls for a new ceremony, the dressing of Athena's statue with the Panathenaic *peplos*; it was also dressed in a new mantle every two years (§V). The presentation of a new *peplos* and the dressing ceremony were familiar customs elsewhere, especially in Boeotia, and were adopted by Athens in the mid fifth century for their Panhellenic appeal (§VI).

II. Text and translation

(The text incorporates the adjustment and ensuing restorations as argued in the commentary.)⁶

fr. a

- I. [ἔδοχσεν τῇ]ι βο[λ]ῆ[ι καὶ τῷ δέμοι· . . . ⁶ . . . ἐπρυτάνε]- ΣΤ. 40
 [υε, . . . ⁶ . . .]ς ἐγραμμ[άτευε, . . . ⁷ . . . ἐπεστάτε, . . . ⁵ . . .]
 [. εἶπε· πε]ρὶ δὲν δέο[νται Πραχσιεργίδαι, τὲν μαντεῖ]-
 [αν τῷ θ]εῷ καὶ τὰ πρό[τερον αὐτοῖς ἐφσεφισμένα ἀνα]-
 5 [γράφ]αντας ἐν στέ[λει λιθίνει καταθέσθαι ἐμ πόλει]
 [ὄπισ]θεν τῷ νεῷ τῷ ἀρχ[αίῳ· ἡοι δὲ πολεταὶ ἀπομισθο]-
 [σάν]τον· ^v τὸ δὲ ἀργύριο[ν παρασχόντων οἱ ταμίαι ἀπ]-
 [ὸ τῷ] τῆς θεῷ κατὰ τὰ πάτρι[α· ὅταν δὲ ἡε ἡιέρεια θύει]
 [ἡοι] κολακρέται διδόντων [τὸ ἀργύριον. *vacat*]
 II. 10 [τά]δε ἡο Ἀπόλλων ἔχρεσεν· ἄ[μεινον Πραχσιεργίδαις]
 [ἀμ]φιεννύουσιν τὸν πέπλον τ[ὲν θεὸν καὶ προθύουσιν]
 [Μοί]ραις, Διὶ Μοιρ(α)γέτει, Γ[ῆι - - - - - - - - -]
vacat 0.035
 III. [τάδε] πάτρια Πραχ[σιεργίδαις ⁹] ΣΤ. 32–33

⁶I have not seen the stone and rely on the photograph published by Lewis, "Praxierygiae" (*supra* n.1).

- [...⁸⁻⁹ ...]ιτο[...²¹ ...]
lacuna
- 15 [...¹⁵⁻¹⁶ ... τὲν δὲ *ἱέρειαν* π]αρέ- fr. c
 [χεν δῖον κóιδιον Πραχσιεργί]δαῖς^{vvvv}
 [κρίον δὲ θῦσαι ἐμ πόλει·^{vv} τὸ] δὲ κóιδιον
 [τοῖς παρῶσιν *ἠυποστορενύ*]γαι κατὰ τὰ^v
 [πάτρια· *ἡότο* δὲ ἄλλο δέται π]αρέχεν·^{vvvv}
- 20 [τὸν δὲ *πέπλον* παραδιδόναι. τ]ῷ δὲ Θαργελι-
 fr. b [ὄνος μ]ε[νὸς φθίνοντος πρὸ τ]ρίτες διδόναι
 [μ]ῖς ἐμέ[ρας σῖτον πᾶσι τὸ]ν ἄρχοντα^{vvv}
 [^v] κατὰ τὰ πάτρ[ια. *vacat*] *vacat*
 [^v] Π[ρ]αχσιεργί[δας τὸν *πέπλον*] ἀμφιεννύ[ν]-
 25 [αι·^{vv}] Πραχσιερ[γί]δαῖς δὲ παρέ]χεν^{vvvvv}
 [^vμέ]διμνον χρ[ιθόν. *vacat*]
vacat

(In the translation supplements *exempli gratia* are indicated, but not those giving the necessary sense.)

I. It was resolved by the Council and the Assembly: the rotating tribe was [-], the secretary was [-], the presiding officer was [-], the mover was [-]. As to what the Praxiergidae are asking, inscribe the oracle of the god and the things previously voted for them on a marble stele and place it behind the Old Temple. Let the Poletae award the contract. Let the Tamiae provide the money from that of the goddess according to ancestral custom. But [?whenever the priestess sacrifices], let the Colacretae give the money.

II. Apollo answered thus. It is better for the Praxiergidae if they dress the goddess with the *peplos* and sacrifice beforehand to the Moirai, Zeus Moiragetes, Ge [- -]

III. This is ancestral custom for the Praxiergidae: [- -]

[?The priestess] is to provide [?a holy fleece for the Praxiergidae. ?She is to sacrifice a ram on the Acropolis. ?She is to spread] the fleece [?under those present] according to ancestral custom. Provide [?whatever else is needed. ?Hand over the *peplos*.]

Before 28th Thargelion, the archon is to give [?everyone grain] for one day according to ancestral custom. The Praxiergidae are to dress with the *peplos*. For the Praxiergidae provide a bushel of barley.

III. Commentary

Fr. a, running to 14 lines, contains the preamble, the oracle, and in larger letters the beginning of the series of ritual prescriptions. Though neither side is preserved, a combination of several likely restorations gives the length of the *stoichedon* lines for both the smaller and the larger letters. This has always been recognized, ever since Wilhelm *apud* Ziehen assembled the fragments.

Lines 1–6 med. Here I follow Lewis. Except for the names at the Assembly meeting, he was able to complete the restorations of earlier editors. As he remarked, [νοτό]θεν is equally possible in line 6. “The Old Temple,” a term subsequently used in the inventories of the *Tamiae* of Athena and in the Lycurgan law on the Lesser Panathenaea, contains the statue of Athena Polias with which the *Praxiergidae* are concerned, itself sometimes called “the old statue.” Later, it is the Caryatid temple, the “Erechtheium” of modern parlance.⁷ At this date, it is some vanished predecessor.⁸ The Caryatid temple, referred to after the fourth century as “the (old) temple of Athena Polias,” continues to be singled out in Athenian documents as a place for setting up *stelai*.⁹ We shall see that some of them return to the topic of Athena’s *peplos* (§V).

Lines 6 med.–9. These lines were quite differently restored by Ziehen in 1906 and by Lewis in 1954, and the two versions have successively prevailed as *IG* I² 80 and *IG* I³ 7. Neither seems accept-

⁷ Discussion of Athena’s temples will be much easier when it is recognized that the term “Erechtheium” and its associations belong to the two successive fifth-century shrines at the southeast corner of the Acropolis, “the *megaron* facing west” of Herodotus, “the double-chambered building” of Pausanias: see Robertson, “Athena’s Shrines and Festivals,” in J. Neils, ed., *Worshipping Athena. Panathenaia and Parthenon* (Madison 1996) 37–44. “Why Herodotus should not have simply called it the Erechtheion, if such it was, is unexplained”: so J. M. Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis* (Cambridge 1999) 346 n. 33. The explanation is that this quasi-technical word occurs nowhere but at Paus. 1.26.5 and [Plut.] *Vit. X Or.* 843E, and that ancient authors (poets, historians, even antiquarians) typically use descriptive phrases such as those quoted.

⁸ So Lewis, “*Praxiergidae*” (*supra* n.1) 20 (but he was wrong to restore [v]εώ in line 20 as the same building). For possible traces on the ground, see Robertson (*supra* n. 7) 36–37 and Hurwit (*supra* n.7) 145, 346 n.36. On a rival view, preferred by Hurwit 111, 121–124, “the Old Temple” of *IG* I³ 7 is identified with the late Archaic temple on the Dörpfeld foundations, wrecked by the Persians.

⁹ *IG* II² 687.44 (268/7 or 265/4 B.C.), treaty with Sparta, “beside the temple of Athena Polias”; 983.5–6 (*ca* 250), honours for Athena’s priestess, “beside the old temple of Athena Polias”; 1055.24–25 (perhaps distinctly earlier than *ca* 100; cf. SEG XXVI 118), citizenship decree, “beside the temple of Athena Polias”; 1036.25 (108/7), honours for girls working on the *peplos*, “beside the temple of Athena Polias”; 1035.15–16 (103/2), honours for the same, “beside Athena Polias.” Cf. P. Liddel, “The Places of Publication of Athenian State Decrees,” *ZPE* 143 (2003) 81.

able. I follow Lewis in lines 6–7 init. but venture a new restoration thereafter.

Ziehen restored only lines 7–9: τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον ἵνα ἀμφιέννυσθαι τὸ ἡέ/δος] τῆς θεῶ κατὰ τὰ πάτρι[α καὶ τὴν μαντείαν τῷ θεῷ / ἡο]ι κολακρέται διδόντων.¹⁰ The money, he thought, is for the dressing of Athena's statue, which will be mentioned again in the oracle and at the end of the ritual prescriptions. This was most unsatisfactory, leaving a gap in lines 6–7, distorting the language, and introducing "an irrelevance," as Lewis said.

Lewis restored lines 6–9 completely: ἡοι δὲ πολεταὶ ἀπομισθο/σάν]τον· ὃ τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον ἕξ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν εἶναι ἀπὸ / τῶν] τῆς θεῶ κατὰ τὰ πάτρι[α· ἡοι δὲ ταμίαι τῆς θεῶ καὶ / ἡοι] κολακρέται διδόντων [αὐτοῖς τὸ ἀργύριον *vacat*]. A contract for inscribing the stele is announced as usual, but the money is to come from Athena's funds, an arrangement described as κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, the first of several occurrences of the phrase. Accordingly, the Tamiae of Athena join in disbursing the money.

For the most part, this is an attractive restoration, with the procedure we expect after mention of inscribing the stele in lines 4–6. It founders on the present imperative διδόντων in 9, which denotes not a single payment, but a regular or repeated one.¹¹ The present tense is the main reason why Ziehen thought rather of a continuing ceremony, the dressing of the statue. Lewis suggested "dittography," but διδο- can hardly be so described, and there seems to be no parallel mistake among the countless epigraphic injunctions for officials to "give" money.

Yet we do expect the contract and payment procedure, and it will readily fit, together with something more. I restore accordingly.¹² The first stage, "let the Poetae award the contract," occupies lines 6–7, as before. The second stage, in 7–8, would normally be "let the Colacretae give the money." But "the money" comes from other hands, in charge of the fund, as it must be, "of the goddess." IG I³ 48 bis, "a. 440–430," has this injunction in lines 6–7: τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον διδο[ναι τὸς ταμίαις ἀπὸ τῷ] / τῆς θεῶ ἀργυρίο, "the Tamiae are to give

¹⁰Hiller von Gaertringen mistakenly puts θεῶ for θεῷ in line 8 *init.*

¹¹So A. S. Henry, "Provisions for the Payment of Athenian Decrees," *ZPE* 78 (1989) 250. P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford 1972) 102 n.5, cites IG I² 80, Ziehen's restoration instead of Lewis's, as indicating payment for a purpose other than inscribing a stele.

¹²I have not been consistent in the use of *h*, no more than the surviving text, which has ὅν in line 3 and ἡο in line 10. [μ]ῆς ἐμέ[ρας in line 22 may also be regarded as virtually certain, but for this word it is the regular spelling.

the money from that of the goddess." It is for the stipend of a rather puzzling priest or servitor of "the goddess," hereby appointed.¹³ Though the inscription was found on the Acropolis, it is uncertain whether the goddess is Athena, and whether the Tamiae are hers. It hardly matters; the Tamiae of some civic cult are told to pay for the stipend. In our decree, we may suppose that the Tamiae of Athena are told to pay for the inscribing of the stele: "let the Tamiae provide the money from that of the goddess according to ancestral custom." The phrase "according to ancestral custom" puts this stele in a special class, whether it has to do with the content, the duties of the Praxiergidae, or with the location, beside the Old Temple.

The Colacretae finally appear in lines 8–9. Whereas they might have been expected to pay for inscribing the stele, it seems that they are told instead to pay for some continuing expense. "Whenever the priestess sacrifices," *i.e.* during the ceremony to be prescribed, is only *exempli gratia*. It could be any future item.¹⁴ Beside the cost of the stele, some other expense is mentioned, less immediate, perhaps even less certain. It was important that the stele should be paid for at once out of Athena's fund. To say that something else will be paid for in the future by the Colacretae is by way of apology.

Lines 10–12. Either ῥ[μεινον (Sokolowski) or ῥ[όμιμα (Lewis, after Ziehen's [νόμιμα) is a possible reading and restoration. Both occur in other Delphic oracles, and the meaning is the same. The rest goes back to Ziehen. Whether the preliminary sacrifice was part of the inquiry or was added by Delphi as a flourish does not appear. Probably the latter, since Delphi had a habit of foisting its favourite deities on inquirers.¹⁵

¹³Much else is puzzling about this decree for a person never named but twice referred to as τὸν ἄνδρα. L. Piccirilli, "A proposito di IG I³ 48 bis," *ZPE* 70 (1987) 167–170, seeks to identify the Athenians in question. The present point is not affected.

¹⁴As a rule, Athenian decrees are very specific about any payment to be made by the Colacretae. IG I³ 36, 424/3 B.C., the second decree for the priestess of Athena Nike, is solely concerned with ensuring that the salary previously voted shall be paid in the month Thargelion. However we restore line 8 med.–9, it will be the most perfunctory assignment on record for the Colacretae.

¹⁵These are all Delphic deities, expressive of Delphic theology. Statues of two Moirai and of Zeus Moiragetes (and also of Apollo Moiragetes) stood inside Apollo's temple (Plut. *De E apud Delphos* 2 [Mor. 385c], Paus. 10.24.4). Ge, reputedly the original incumbent of the oracle, had her shrine south of the temple. On the other hand, if the sacrifice was long perpetuated, the deities would take on an Athenian appearance. Hesych. s.v. Ἀγλαυρίδες says that these were "Moirai for the Athenians"; Aglauros the implied mother is a minor goddess proper to the Plynteria and the Callynteria. But whether the sacrifice was perpetuated must be left open. Perhaps it was meant to be preliminary to the first occasion only.

Lines 13–14. After a blank space the larger-letter lines begin. They are illegible except for the heading. After line 14 of fr. a and before line 15 of fr. c comes a lacuna of unknown length.

Thus far fr. a. The restoration of most of it is secure in outline; what does it securely tell us? The Praxiergidae are asking about something, and the answer is given by a Delphic oracle, obviously recent, and by things the Assembly has voted for them. Delphi sanctions something that was submitted as an official inquiry of the Athenians. It was something new, unless we suppose that the traditional duties of the Praxiergidae had suddenly become an issue. Delphi was commonly asked to sanction new departures in public worship, at Athens as elsewhere.¹⁶ In this case, the Praxiergidae are to dress Athena's statue with the *peplos* and to sacrifice beforehand to several deities as named.

The Assembly votes to the same effect, but much more fully, so that the details, in larger letters, occupy the rest of the inscription. To anticipate for a moment, the details still lead up to the same action, unmistakable in lines 24–25: "The Praxiergidae are to dress with the *peplos*" (or else "dress the goddess").

It is true that the Assembly begins its enactment with the heading, "This is ancestral custom for the Praxiergidae." There must have followed some mention of their traditional role at the two festivals addressed to Athena's statue, the Plynteria and the lesser Callynteria. But perhaps it was only a brief mention, before the details of their new assignment. It is also true that the phrase "according to ancestral custom" is used in line 8 of drawing money from Athena's fund and will be used again of certain details in 18–19 and 23. But to draw money for the inscribing of this inscription is not itself ancestral custom, and the details need not be either. The surest way to soften any innovation is to say that it shall conform to ancestral custom.

We turn to frs. b and c, lines 15–26, in which the details enacted by the Assembly are continued and concluded. I offer new restorations throughout. The first few lines are *exempli gratia*, but thereafter the ground is much firmer, a consequence of re-aligning frs. b and c. Let me explain this re-alignment before the commentary is resumed.

¹⁶J. Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle* (Berkeley 1978) 24–35, 438, 444, assembles the material (but lumping public and private worship together) so as to show that this is far and away the commonest subject of oracles known from inscriptions and contemporary authors. I do not see any clear instance of an oracle simply confirming a long existing practice.

Fr. b comes from the left side of the stone, fr. c from the right.¹⁷ Since we know the length of line, we see how nearly they approach each other. And since they both preserve a final line followed by a blank space, we see how the six lines of fr. b match up with the eleven lines of fr. c. Or rather, we thought we did.

In previous work the last line of fr. b has been placed on a level with the last line of fr. c, so that together they account for eleven lines, 15–25. But this produces an impossible result. Line 20 of fr. c ends]ω δὲ Θαργελι-, evidently the month Thargelion, almost certainly in the genitive case. Line 21 of fr. b begins [.]ασεμε[. And line 21 of fr. c ends]ρίτες διδόναι, demanding the restoration τ]ρίτες, the “third” day of a monthly decad.

Ziehen could not explain, much less restore, the sequence of letters.¹⁸ Lewis offered the following:]ι· [v]εὼ δὲ Θαργελι/[ὄν]α σεμε[νόμενον ἄχρι τῆς τ]ρίτες, “having sealed up (the) temple during Thargelion until *the* third (of the waning month).”¹⁹ The decisive objection is that νεώ would require the article.²⁰ Other objections are that “the third” by itself should mean “the third of the waxing month,” and that the article is unexpected with the count of days.²¹

¹⁷Lewis’s photograph, “Praxiēgidae” (*supra* n.1) pl. 3, shows the three fragments placed together as they should be (apart from the re-alignment). Frs. b and c, both with a blank space following the last line of text, appear to be, roughly, the bottom left and right corners. It is true that the bottom edge is not preserved on either fragment. It is also true that on fr. a the blank space of 3.5 cm. between the smaller-letter portions (I–II) and the larger-letter portion (III) exceeds the blank space at the bottom of frs. b and c. It is then theoretically possible that the larger-letter portion on frs. b and c was divided internally by a blank space, whether it is the one at the end of b or of c, so that b and c are opposite sides at quite different levels. This is Mansfield’s view (*supra* n.1). Frs. b and c, he says, “are wrongly arranged in relation to one another by D. Lewis” (he should have said, by A. Wilhelm and all subsequent editors), and he proceeds not only to separate the three fragments but to restore *in vacuo* the beginning of the larger-letter portion of fr. a as another decree, an extraordinary format for any inscription. It is entirely the “peculiarities” of language in lines 20–25 that lead him to this improbable surmise.

¹⁸“Relinquitur ut ... vox σημείον vel eiusdem stirpis vocabulum lateat; sed de quo signo sermo esse possit, nondum perspicio” (pp.61–62).

¹⁹Of the letters ι[.]εὼ first read by Lewis, ω is perfectly clear even on the photograph, but the rest not at all. Of ε Lewis says only “there seem to be traces,” and ι “seems too deep to be merely a scratch.”

²⁰So Sokolowski. Lewis himself felt uneasy about the accusative νεώ, thinking it a later form. It is however admitted by L. Threagles, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* (Berlin 1984–1996) II 39, 41, 687, 689.

²¹Inscriptions sometimes omit ἰσταμένο(ν), but not the words for the middle or the waning month. Lewis does not explain the omission, nor yet the article, but perhaps he thought that the article gave a needed emphasis, and that the passing of the first two decads was indicated by the accusative of duration Θαργελιῶνα. Yet this too is awk-

On the other hand, month-names usually take the article, and]ω is naturally understood as the genitive τ]ῶ. Yet Θαργελι/[. .]α can only be fitted in as accusative. Sokolowski sought to evade the month-name by reading] I [.]εω δὲ θαργέλ/[ι]α σεμε[. ἄχρη τῆς τ]ρίτης—and by suggesting at the same time τῶν χιτῶνα - - - θαργέλ[ι]α σεμῆον ἔχοντα, “the mantle [Sokolowski’s word] adorned with embroideries representing first fruits.” This does not fit the space, or respect the traces, or suit the context. Hiller von Gaertringen, proposing μενὸς] δὲ Θαργελι/ῶνος - -]ας ἔ μὲ ν?, was just as heedless of the space available.

Editors have been moved to desperation. The problem seems all the more intractable when we note that the successive lines in fr. c end with the month “Thargelion” and the “third” day, indicating that the whole line between must be filled out with a dating formula.

There is a simple solution. If the very last line of our inscription ended before it reached the right side, and there is every likelihood that it did, then fr. c will show not the last line, but the second last followed by a blank space. Fr. c must be placed one line higher in relation to fr. b. Overall, fr. c will give us lines 15–25, and fr. b lines 21–26. When the fragments are so placed, the dating formula is easily, almost inevitably completed. And so are the following lines. The running commentary now resumes.

Lines 15–20 fin. Down to the dating formula in line 20 fin., only the right side remains. Here the supplements are *exempli gratia*—they illustrate the possibilities.

There was a staccato series of prescriptions, five in all. (1) includes the infinitive π]αρέ/[χεν and ends with the dative]δαίς followed by a space. (2) occupies most of the next line. (3) begins τὸ] δὲ κίδιον and ends κατὰ τὰ [πάτρια, a phrase which in its many epigraphic instances always comes at the last. (4) ends with another π]αρέχεν followed by a space. (5) occupies the next line before the dating formula.

In all this the only distinctive item is τὸ] δὲ κίδιον. “The fleece” has been identified as a priestly perquisite after sacrifice.²² It would

ward if not impossible. Can the accusative of duration accompany an aorist participle denoting a single action?

²²So Ziehen and Sokolowski. P. Brulé, *La fille d'Athènes* (Paris 1987) 109, translates it as “little sheepskin,” but the diminutive form had lost its force entirely, as in many words; see E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik* I (Munich 1939) 471. M. Christopoulos, “Ἔργα ἀπόρρητα”. Quelques remarques sur les rites des Plyntéries,” *Kernos* 5 (1992) 35, explains this fleece, as also the sacrifice of sheep to Athena, by reference to the wool, ἔριον, with which, in the story of Ἐρι-χθόνιος, Athena wipes her leg after being molested by Hephaestus.

be surprising, however, if the prescriptions went so far into the modalities of a particular sacrifice. The fleece is more likely to be the purifying instrument otherwise called Διὸς κώιδιον or δῖον κώιδιον. Such a fleece was part of another Acropolis ceremony, the marshalling of the Scirophoria procession: χρῶνται δ' αὐτοῖς οἱ τε Σκιροφορίων τὴν πομπὴν στέλλοντες κτλ. (*Suda s.v.* Διὸς κώιδιον = Polemon Περὶ τοῦ δίου κωιδίου fr.87 Preller).

This festival of mid Scirophorion is not irrelevant. The festivals of Thargelion and Scirophorion go together to mark the culmination of the agricultural year, the ingathering of the grain and the recruitment of the community which precedes it. The festival Thargelia with its demonstrative scapegoat rite is a cleansing of the city, the Plynteria and Callynteria a cleansing of the citadel shrine of Athena, the Scirophoria a final threshing, the Dipolieia the sacrifice of a plough-ox as thanksgiving.²³ Furthermore, Athens created this festival sequence as a deliberate program.

Unlike most Athenian festivals, the Scirophoria procession from the Acropolis to the place Scirum beside the Cephissus is unique to Athens, as is the month-name Scirophorion.²⁴ It is deceptive that a standard festival of Demeter shares the name Scira, some harvest element, with the place and with the processional emblem.²⁵ As both C. Robert and Deubner saw, the Scirophoria procession was invented at a certain moment to advertise Athenian agriculture.²⁶ The

²³For these related purposes see Deubner 21 (Plynteria), 48 ("Scira"), 173 (Dipolieia), 192–193 (Thargelia). As against Deubner, R. Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford 1983) 29, remarks of the Thargelia and the Plynteria that the rites in question are not "agricultural magic" but an emotional release that accompanies the agrarian cycle. Yet their significance remains the same.

²⁴Scirophorion appears also among the thirteen strangely disparate month-names attested for Iasus, but was doubtless borrowed from Athens. See C. Trümper, *Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Monatsnamen und Monatsfolgen* (Heidelberg 1997) 114–116.

²⁵The festival name "Scira" is attested for Athens by literary sources, and for Peiraeus, Paeania, and Marathon by inscriptions, and in nearly every case it is plainly a festival of Demeter's agrarian cycle. On the other hand, the Athenian month-name shows that the procession from the Acropolis is properly called "Scirophoria." Predictably, some lexicographers confuse Scira and Scirophoria, and make it a question whether Demeter or Athena is being honoured. Whence the same confusion in modern works, including Deubner's. The words σκίρον, σκίρα are readily explained as "the white(s)," *scil.* the winnowed grain; see Robertson (*supra* n.7) 52–56 (but the terminological error of conflating "Scira" and "Scirophoria" is here perpetuated).

²⁶Deubner 47, citing Robert. It was not however "a compromise" between Eleusinian and Athenian agriculture, but a challenge or a riposte to a still independent Eleusis. The festival story is the battle between the respective kings, Erechtheus and Eumolpus. In Euripides' *Erechtheus* the royal family go out to the Cephissus and sacrifice as do the processioners of the Scirophoria; Erechtheus and Praxithea are professed ancestors and virtual prototypes of the officiating priest and priestess.

purifying fleece gave solemnity to the new occasion. Once purified, the procession was led out by the two priesthoods of the Eteobutadae, the priestess of Athena and the priest of Poseidon (Lysimachides *FGrHist* 366 F 3). The priestess of Athena was also engaged in the festivals of late Thargelion, the Plynteria and Callynteria. The purifying fleece was probably adopted in these prescriptions for the same reason, to give solemnity to a new occasion.

"The fleece" was mentioned before, if it is not a mere perquisite; it could be the object which someone is to "furnish" in lines 15–16. Perhaps the priestess of Athena is in charge. The fleece lends itself to the *ἵναι* verb in 18, for one "spreads it under" those in need: *χρῶνται αὐτοῖς ... πρὸς τοὺς καθαρμοὺς*, says the *Suda*, *ὑποστορνύντες αὐτὰ τοῖς ποσὶ τῶν ἐναγῶν*. And of course this would be done "according to ancestral custom." The patronymic dative plural in 16 can be no one but the Praxiergidae; the fleece is being deployed for them. Perhaps the purification takes place as the priestess hands over the *peplos* to the Praxiergidae.

In pressing these bits of text, what have we gained? The purifying fleece is certain, unless we fall back on a priestly perquisite. The rest is conjecture, ranging from probable to possible. But it is useful to see what is probable and what is possible among the prescriptions.

Finally, we should consider the temporal relationship between the business of lines 15–20 fin. and what follows. Our first response will be to say that lines 15–20 fin. refer to a ceremony earlier in the year than the date in lines 20 fin.–21. The ceremony might be any-time earlier; it need not be earlier than Thargelion, for in prescriptions which are novel and explicit the same month-name might be repeated with a different day. But there is another possibility. The next few lines, as we shall see, refer to an avowed preliminary of the main business; this mention of it may come halfway through the business of a single day.

Lines 20 fin.–23. The placement of frs. b and c explained above produces a single clause running through these lines: "[At a certain date in Thargelion] the archon is to give [something to someone] according to ancestral custom."

First the date. *τῷ δὲ Θαργελῖ/[ῶνος μ]ε[νὸς]* imposes itself. The "third" day will be specified as that of either the "waxing" or the "middle" or the "waning" month.²⁷ Any of these would fit, but it was precisely the waning month, *φθίνοντος*, when the Praxiergidae went into action, at the two festivals Plynteria and Callynteria. So the

²⁷ Only "waxing" could be omitted (*supra* n.21).

day is the third of the waning month, 28th Thargelion. The genitive τρίτες will be governed by a three-letter preposition, either ἀπό “after” or πρό “before” (ἐπί and διά give no acceptable meaning). πρό “before” is dictated by what the archon does.

After the date there follows a clause beginning with διδόναι at the end of 21 and ending with [v] κατὰ τὰ πάτρ[ια in 23, the rest of the line being left blank. The restorations that assume a different placement of frs. b and c were reviewed above insofar as they bear upon the date. After the date they too offer a phrase beginning with διδόναι at the end of 21 and ending with [v] Π[ρ]αχσιεργί[δαις in 23, the rest of the line being left blank.

Lewis restored διδόναι / [v] κατὰ τὰ πάτρ[ια κλειδας τὸν ἄρχοντα^{vuv} / [v] Π[ρ]αχσιεργί[δαις, “the archon is to give according to ancestral custom the keys to the Praxiergidae”—the archon had sealed up the temple until the 28th of the month. The word order is very awkward, with the phrase κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, which should come at the end as applying to the whole operation, intervening between verb and object. The blank space before the final word Πραχσιεργίδαις, the indirect object, is also very odd. Sokolowski restored διδόναι / κατὰ τὰ πάτρ[ια τὸν ἔναρχον ἄρχοντα^{vuv} / Π[ρ]αχσιεργί[δαις, “the archon in office is to give according to ancestral custom”—a chiton, it was, adorned with embroideries representing first fruits. Besides the same two objections to the word order and the blank space, ἔναρχον is otiose and unexampled, and since the chiton, etc., cannot be fitted in before this line, there is in effect no object for the verb.

The re-alignment largely dictates the restoration. [μι]ᾶς ἐμέ[ρας is inescapable (ἐμέρα is nearly always written without *h*).²⁸ The archon is to give something “of one day” for an event that will follow on the stated day, 28th Thargelion. He gives it “according to ancestral custom,” which need mean no more than that the city always pays for Acropolis ceremony. For what the archon gives, “of one day,” there are 9 letter spaces. We must supply something like σῖτον πᾶσι “grain for all” (who take part).

The blank space of 3 letters at the end of line 22, after ἄρχοντα, is understandable when it is the terminal phrase κατὰ τὰ πάτρια that is left over. And the longer blank space that follows is also understandable. Not much remains to be inscribed.

Lines 24–26. Since the Praxiergidae are named at the beginning of successive lines, now 24–25 instead of 23–24, line 24 presented much

²⁸For ἐμέρα see Threatte (*supra* n.20) I 500. The aspirate as we find it later is secondary; at the time of our inscription the word may still have been pronounced ἐμέρα.

the same appearance before the re-alignment: [ν τὸς] Πραχσιερ[γίδας] ἀμφιεννύ[ν/αι, “the Praxiergidae are to dress,” a clause lacking δέ or another connective, presumably as a new section. But in 25, formerly the last, editors had a wild ride. Lewis restored 24–25 as τὸ *hédos*] ἀμφιεννύ[ν/αι με]δίμνον χιλίον ἔ μνᾶν ἀπο]τίνεν, which he seems to have understood as “dress the statue up to the value of a thousand (cloth-)measures or pay as amends a mina.” The meaning and the construction of μεδίμνον χιλίον are improbable, and so is the notion that the Praxiergidae might be required to supply a new costume of a certain value.²⁹ Woodward substituted ἀμφιεννύ[ν/αι] δίμνον χι[τῶνα, “dress the statue with a two-mina chiton” etc.; Tod preferred the form ἀμφιεννύ[ν/εν. It is the same unlikely notion, and another unlikely word and meaning.³⁰ Sokolowski restored no more than τὸ *hédos*] ἀμφιεννύ[ν/αι] δίμνον χι[.]τίνεν. Mansfield, taking fr. c by itself, was free to venture details of the *peplos*: ἀμφιεννύ[ν/αι τὸν πέπλον τὴν θεὸν Ἔργασ]τίνεν or else τὴν θεὸν τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν ἐρε]νῆν. Neither Ἔργαστίνη nor ἐρεινοῦς (“i.e. ἐρεοῦς”) has any epigraphic parallel.

Frs. b and c are badly worn near the bottom, and there is uncertainty about the reading of letters at both the beginning and the end of the former line 25. As to the beginning, μέ]δίμνον has seemed obvious to most.³¹ Prott *apud* Ziehen next read χρ[, but Ziehen, relying on Prott's squeeze, printed only χ[,³² and so did Hiller von Gaertringen. Lewis read χι[, though doubtfully; he did not mention χρ[.³³ Mansfield proposes χρ[ιθῶν, without ado. Either this or χρ[ιθῶν seems inevitable.³⁴ κριθῶν (κριθῶν) μέδιμν- (or a lesser measure) is of com-

²⁹ Mansfield further objects that τὸ *hédos* is not used of Athena's old statue in other fifth- and fourth-century inscriptions, and that the punitive ἀποτίνεν requires a condition, “but if they fail to do so.” The price and the fine he brands as “absurd.”

³⁰ The word δίμνους has the expected sense “weighing two minas” in its three workaday occurrences: Philo *Belopoeica* 69.13 Wescher; *IG* II² 1013.55, a reform of weights and measures; *SEG* XXXIX 1752, a lead weight.

³¹ [μέ]δίμνον χ[Ziehen; μέ]δίμνον χ[Hiller von Gaertringen, doubtless by inadvertence.

³² “Deinde Pr. P scriptum fuisse consult, id quod tamen valde incertum videtur.”

³³ “The last *iota* on fragment b is not certain, but there is no room for any other letter in the space”: Lewis, “Praxiergidae” (*supra* n.1) 19. If the two statements are contradictory, the first must be preferred.

³⁴ The χ - spelling occurs in *IG* I³ 232 (ca 510–480), Eleusinium regulations, lines 15–16, 42, 59, cf. 120, and in *IG* I³ 250 (ca 450–430), Paeania calendar, A.21–22. The κ - spelling is first attested in *IG* I³ 78 (422?), the Eleusinian first-fruits decree, lines 38, 40, and is standard thereafter. Cf. Threatte (*supra* n.20) I 459. Except for *IG* I³ 232.15–16 = I² 839.2–3 (it is not in Prott-Ziehen), the stones with the χ - spelling were first published in 1941 and 1948. Earlier editors had less chance of guessing the restoration.

mon occurrence in ritual texts of the fifth century.³⁵

At the end of the line, Ziehen read]ίνεν. Lewis' reporting is inconsistent,]τίνεν or]τίνεν, the former perhaps by mistake. Even the latter is hardly justified by his comment, "Part of the *hasta* on tau appears to survive on fragment c, but it may well be just a scratch."³⁶ In any case Ziehen and subsequent editors have mostly restored the verb ἀποτίνεν "pay as amends" (only Hiller von Gaertingen refrained from restoration). This is indeed a favourite word of inscriptions, especially of ritual texts. As such it may have influenced the reading. The surface of the stone has plainly suffered before the last three letters. I, not to speak of T, seems altogether doubtful. If the third-last letter consists of three slanting strokes, it is N. But the left-hand stroke is faint and short, as if it were a scratch. The other two make the top half of X.³⁸]χεν seems equally possible, pointing to the verb παρέχεν "provide," as in 15 and 19. If the reading]νεν or even]ινεν is upheld, ἐκτί]νεν "pay in full" becomes a likely restoration.³⁹ In this context, "pay in full" may not differ greatly from "provide."

Let us try out the re-alignment. Line 24 is easily completed. The Praxiergidae at the beginning of the line are accusative subject of the infinitive at the end; they "are to dress." Either the object or the manner of their dressing was specified in the space between, for in the

³⁵IG I³ 231 (ca 510–500), Eleusinium regulations, lines 5–6 χρι]θὼν ηε/μέδιμν-. IG I³ 232 (ca 510–480), Eleusinium regulations, lines 15–16 (= IG I² 839.2–3) χρι]θ[ὼν, 42 χρι]θ[ν, 59 χρι]θὼν ηεμ]ιεκτέα, cf. 120 χρι]θὼν. IG I³ 250 (ca 450–430), Paeania calendar, A.21–22 πρεποσ/ιάδων χρι]θὼν. S. D. Lambert, "The Sacrificial Calendar of Athens," *BSA* 97 (2002) 353–399 (i.e. Nicomachus' calendar of 410–399: hereafter "Lambert"), fr. 3A.25–26 κρι]θὼν / [μέδι]μνος, 57–58 κρι]θὼν / μ[έδιμ]νο. Fr. B1.1 κ]ρι]θὼν μέδιμνος, 6 κρι]θὼν μέδιμνος.

³⁶In "Praxiergidae" (*supra* n.1) he gives]τίνεν, with comment as quoted; in IG I³ it is]τίνεν, without comment. Mansfield in proposing ἐρε]ινεν found the reading problematic.

³⁷Usage is constant over many instances, and Mansfield's objection to Lewis applies to any such restoration (cf. *supra* n.29). With ἀποτίνεν/ἀποτεισάτω the grounds are always made explicit: "whoever does/does not" or "if he/someone does/does not." And it is always a monetary sum that is paid as amends. Quite apart from the question of alignment, there is room for neither.

³⁸Other X's to be compared are in a.10, c.19, 22, b.24, 26 (those in a.6, 13 are vestigial). Other N's are frequent. Now it is true that the left stroke of other X's slants more widely. But so does the middle stroke of other N's. Whichever letter is read will be slightly unusual.

³⁹Its occurrences in fifth- and fourth-century Athenian inscriptions are all fragmentary and obscure: IG I³ 41 (446/5 vel paullo post), regulations for Hestiaea, line 116 ἐκτεισο[; 243 (ca 480–450), ritual text, line 99 με̐ ἐκτε[ῖσαι; IG II² 412 [SEG XXXII 81] (336/5–322/1), perhaps a law rather than a decree, line 6 ἐκτεῖσαι (here it is preceded by a condition).

next line the same Praxier[gidae lead off another clause. We have the choice of [v] Π[ρ]αχσιεργί[δας δὲ τὴν θεὸν] ἀμφιεννύ[ν/αι “the Praxiergidae are to dress the goddess” or [v] Π[ρ]αχσιεργί[δας τὸν πέπλον] ἀμφιεννύ[ν/αι “the Praxiergidae are to dress with the *peplos*.”⁴⁰ With the latter, there is asyndeton at the beginning of a new section. With either supplement, the prescription is just the same as in the oracle, except that the oracle said, “dress the goddess with the *peplos*” (11), direct object and adverbial accusative, and now one or other is left out, as understood.

If either παρέ]χεν or ἐκτί]νεν is read and restored at the end of 25, the space remaining requires Πραχσιεργί[δαίς δὲ, the dative as indirect object. The reiterated name in different cases is contrasting: the Praxiergidae are to dress the statue, and to the Praxiergidae payment or recompense is made. The same name could not be repeated as accusative subject in successive lines and clauses; it would be omitted in the second as understood. The subject of παρέχεν or ἐκτίνεν may be understood, being the city. Or it may have come in line 26, at the end. There is room for τὸν ἄρχοντα as in 22, where it also came at the end of its clause, or nearly so. The blank space of 5 letters at the end of 25 is perhaps in favour of the shorter restoration, without expressed subject. Having just two words left, the inscriber made free with space.

After the difficulties of earlier editors, it is a great relief to see these lines emerge so straightforwardly. The two clauses of lines 24–26 form the agenda for 28th Thargelion. Lines 20–23 outline the preparation for this day. Between the two sections there is the long blank space in line 23. Since the day was noted at the beginning of the first section (“before 28th Thargelion”), it need not be re-stated in the dative at the beginning of the second section (“on 28th Thargelion”). It is more important to re-affirm the preparation. “To give [?everyone grain] for one day” and “to provide / pay in full a bushel of barley for / to the Praxiergidae” are surely the same thing.

Lines 15–19, a seeming purification ceremony, will have been headed by a date. Quite possibly it was this very day, 28th Thargelion, so that the purification came just before the dressing of the statue. To mention, halfway through the day’s activity, that preparation must be made is indeed slightly inconsequent, but no more than usual in the drafting of decrees.

In sum, frs. b and c as re-aligned agree with the oracle from Delphi, which itself was prompted by an official inquiry. The

⁴⁰ δὲ τὸν ἑέδοος would also fit but seems less likely (cf. *supra* n.29).

oracle and the regulations of the Assembly are both in answer “to what the Praxiergidae are asking,” and are both to like effect. The *genos* are instructed to dress the statue of Athena with the *peplos*. The oracle adds a cautionary sacrifice; the regulations add a purification rite.

Is the dressing of the statue a new duty that is now first assigned? Or is it a traditional one that is re-affirmed? Or a duty more recently assumed and still uncertain? If it were an existing duty of some kind, the Assembly might be at pains simply to assert control over the *genos*, or to settle a disputed point as between the city and the *genos*, or between this *genos* and another. But on any such view it is hard to see why just the Praxiergidae are asking about it, and why the Delphic oracle is summoned to pronounce, and why a preliminary sacrifice and a purification are in order, and why of all the duties the Praxiergidae perform the dressing is singled out and set beside “ancestral custom” as mentioned at the beginning of the prescriptions. Surely it is a new duty.

If so, the Praxiergidae decree is only part of a larger innovation. The dressing of the statue will undoubtedly take place at a festival of Athena in late Thargelion, and even if the Praxiergidae are the chief officiants, the occasion is of general concern. The Assembly certainly took other steps besides obtaining this oracle and passing this decree. Let us consider the Plynteria and its companion festival, the Callynteria. First the calendar dates.

IV. *The calendar dates of the Plynteria and the Callynteria*

The two festivals occurred close together. The festival Bendideia was followed by festivals of Athena, said Aristocles of Rhodes (Proclus *In Pl. Tim.* 21A, p.85.28 Diehl), and these must be the “Callynteria and Plynteria” known to the lexica as related festivals, both being carried back by Photius to the princess Aglauros (Phot., *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Καλλυντήρια καὶ Πλυντήρια). If they are mentioned in the right order, the Callynteria came before the Plynteria, and indeed Photius dates the

Callynteria to 19th Thargelion, the Plynteria to 29th Thargelion. But as almost everyone allows, these dates are wrong.⁴¹

19th Thargelion belongs to the Bendideia.⁴² Plutarch, in such a matter an authority beyond appeal, dates the Plynteria to the 25th.⁴³ Furthermore, our record of Assembly meetings leaves just a few days of the last decad open for festivals, a criterion established by J. D. Mikalson. They run from the 24th to the 28th.⁴⁴ Photius' dates, at a schematic ten-day interval, are pure invention, and no doubt they were invented just because the entry gave the names in this order, Callynteria and Plynteria. The entry preserves no details of either festival, only their supposed origin in the life and death of Aglauros, expressed uncouthly. It is natural to suspect that the original entry concerned the Callynteria alone, a rare item, and that the much better known festival was only mentioned beside it, epexegetically.⁴⁵ If so, the

⁴¹Photius' date, the 29th, has always been dismissed in favour of Plutarch's, the 25th, except in the discussion of Nicomachus' calendar of sacrifice, where the "29th" of Thargelion is restored *in vacuo*, but according to the space available, as the heading for several offerings to Athena in fr. 3A.5—I follow the numbering of Lambert, the first comprehensive edition of the calendar. This occasion was identified as the Plynteria by Sokolowski, "New Fragments of the Fasti Sacri of Athens," *Eos* 37 (1936) 450–457 (in Polish, with English summary) and on *LSCG Suppl.* 10.A.5; by H. Hansen, *Aspects of the Athenian Law Code of 410/09–400/399 B.C.* (New York 1990) 96–98; and by W. Burkert, "Buzyge und Palladion," *ZRGG* 22 (1970) 358 n.9. But in the up-dating of his Harvard dissertation of 1969, Hansen (xxvii, xxix) now thinks instead of some lesser event; Lambert (374) regards it as a biennial one that somehow continues the Plynteria of the 25th. We shall see below that this entry for the "29th" is a biennial addition to the Callynteria.

⁴²On this there is solid evidence and general agreement. See e.g. M. H. Jameson, "Notes on the Sacrificial Calendar from Erchia," *BCH* 89 (1965) 158–159.

⁴³*Alc.* 34.1. The manuscript tradition is unvarying. Plutarch wrote technically on calendar questions and in his extant works records and discusses a great many historical and festival dates—they often coincide, as on this day of the Plynteria, when Alcibiades returned to Athens and Athena veiled her eyes.

⁴⁴J. D. Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton 1975) 160–161, 163–164.

⁴⁵The tale of festival origins likewise suggests that the Callynteria formerly appeared alone. It is said that Aglauros as the first priestess of Athena was first to adorn the gods, i.e. their statues, whence the Callynteria "Adorning rites." We might expect to hear it said as well that she was first to wash statues or costumes, whence the Plynteria "Washing rites." Instead it is said that when Aglauros met her death—a celebrated story—people mourned for a year before

order of names need not be the calendar order.

Πλυντήρια < πλύνειν are “Washing rites,” and what we know of the festival agrees; statue and *peplos* were washed, and the statue while bare was anxiously veiled. Καλλυντήρια < καλλύνειν are “Adorning rites,” but of the festival business we know nothing, only that Aglauros was “first to adorn (κοσμήσαι) the gods,” which is to say their statues. Adorning will naturally follow washing.

Scholars who trust the order of names in the lexical entry (they cannot trust the concomitant dates) are bound to say that the apparent adorning was something else. A. Mommsen pointed to the meaning “sweep” for καλλύνειν, as also to the meaning “broom” for κάλλυντρον, and imagined that Athena’s temple was swept out once a year, before the washing of the statue; Deubner follows him.⁴⁶ Yet these meanings of the verb and its agent noun are obviously secondary, and no doubt colloquial to begin with, and quite unsuited to a festival name.⁴⁷ Mommsen and Deubner have met with objection in this matter of sweeping, but objectors do not explain how the Callynteria can otherwise be prior to the Plynteria.⁴⁸

We should also reflect that in the run of open days from the

washing their clothes, whence the Plynteria. This piece of silliness sounds more like a Byzantine copyist than an ancient *aition*.

⁴⁶A. Mommsen, *Feste der Stadt Athen* (Leipzig 1898) 487–488; Deubner 20. Deubner suggested with a fillip that it was also the time to replenish the oil in Athena’s ever-burning lamp. But as Mansfield remarks (*supra* n.1: 387–388), this would more naturally be done at the pressing of the first oil during the olive harvest, in late autumn.

⁴⁷An older word for “sweep,” κορεῖν, is thought by many to be the second element in νεωκόρος as in some other words; but a festival name formed from it would be just as surprising.

⁴⁸Note however the sequence that has been postulated, without evidence or argument, by B. S. Ridgway, “Images of Athena on the Akropolis,” in J. Neils, ed., *Goddess and Polis* (Princeton 1992) 124. On 20th–23rd Thargelion, the Callynteria, the statue was “adorned.” On the 25th, the Plynteria, it was “disrobed, probably sponged off ... and then wrapped in a shroud as a sign of mourning for Aglauros”; the Panathenaic *peplos*, being an elaborately decorated “tapestry,” may have served for shroud, as Penelope’s weaving was meant to do. On the 26th, the statue “was unveiled and dressed again with the cleaned garments.”

24th to the 28th Callynteria and Plynteria must be separated by an interval of at least a day. Successive days, however different their activities, would be counted as a single festival (like the successive days, each named for a distinctive activity, of the Anthesteria, the Thesmophoria, the Apaturia). Plutarch would not assign τὰ ὄργια "the rites" to the 25th alone (*Alc.* 34.1). In short, Plynteria and Callynteria must come in this order, and the latter must fall on either the 27th or the 28th. The 28th, the third day of the waning month, is an obvious choice. This is Athena's holy day, the principal day of her festival of games in Hecatombaeon, the Panathenaea.⁴⁹ The festival sequence in Thargelion culminates in the Callynteria.

Clinching evidence is supplied by the so-called calendar of Nicomachus, the elaborate and controversial record of ceremonies old and new that was set up somewhere in the Classical Agora at the very end of the fifth century. In its second, Ionic-letter version, Athena is honoured with several offerings late in the month Thargelion. The passage comes on the left side of the most extensive fragment where the edge is worn, so that the date in line 5, itself projecting into the left margin as a heading, is partly lost.⁵⁰ It was restored long ago by J. H. Oliver as [δευτέραι] φθίνοντος "on the 29th," 8 letters to fit the space, and everyone since has concurred.⁵¹ By Mikalson's criterion,

⁴⁹See e.g. Mikalson (*supra* n.44) 16, 34.

⁵⁰Lambert fr. 3A.5–17.

⁵¹Hansen (*supra* n.41) 85 and Lambert 374 both describe this restoration as "certain." The headings in Nicomachus' calendar have a spacing of their own, and the only question is whether the general rule was here applied. They mostly consist of two or more lines projecting into the left margin, of which the first line gives the date, the next line or lines the source of authority. In the three instances that are well preserved, two on this fragment and one on another, the date-line projects a little further than the source-line(s), a clear and pleasing format: fr. 1A.3–4; fr. 3A.32–34, 44–46. In all other instances (six, including ours), the date-line must be restored by rule. One of them, if it is indeed a two-part heading, defies the rule. The source-line [ἐκ τῶν] νέων "from the new (items)" in fr. 2A.3 will project further than the date-line (this restoration has not even been mooted, but no other seems feasible). A heading in an unpublished fragment is said to contain a striking irregularity of a different kind: Lambert 372. Some parts of the calendar were not so tidy. But it is reasonable to insist on the rule in fr. 3A.

established more recently, this is an impossible date for a festival. 29th Thargelion, like the 29th of most months, was particularly favoured for Assembly meetings.⁵²

It is likely, however, that the offerings in the left-hand column are only of biennial occurrence. Nicomachus' calendar contained two lists of biennial observances for any two successive years, and one of them began in the next column to the right.⁵³ The left-hand column is probably the end of the other list, which seems to refer to odd-numbered Athenian years (*e.g.* 451/50 B.C.).⁵⁴ It happens that the five Assembly meetings attested for 29th Thargelion are, or may be, assignable to even-numbered years (as 450/49 would be).⁵⁵ This biennial observance was therefore respected by the Assembly. It is the last observance of the month. The remnants of the second-last observance in the preceding lines contain nothing distinctive (fr. 3A.1–4). We are free to suppose that the observance of the 29th is the second day of a festival that was celebrated principally on the 28th.⁵⁶ In the other biennial list, in the column adjacent to this one, a festival that was celebrated principally on 16th Hecatombaeon, the

⁵²Mikalson (*supra* n.44) 161–162, 182–186.

⁵³Fr. 3A.30, τῶδε τὸ ἕτερον ἔτος θύεται α[, "these are biennial ceremonies ..." The heading of the other cycle was described in fr. 2A.1 by S. Dow, "The Athenian Calendar of Sacrifices," *Historia* 9 (1960) 281–283, 285–287; see further Lambert 371, 376. The two headings can be restored to say that they belong to a first and second cycle, *e.g.* to a προτέρα and ὑστέρα δρασμωσύνη as in the calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis (now re-edited by Lambert, *ZPE* 130 [2000] 43–70).

⁵⁴So Lambert 372–373, and again "Parerga II: The Date of the Nemean Games," *ZPE* 139 (2002) 72–74. He restores "Nemean Zeus" in fr. 2A.10 and something similar in 13; the Nemean Games are a biennial observance of an odd-numbered Athenian year.

⁵⁵So Lambert 374. One case is doubtful, as Lambert concedes, but a single exceptional meeting can be entertained; it happens on several festival days.

⁵⁶Lambert (355) expressly refrains from "a full interpretation" of the calendar entries, and his view of this biennial observance does not emerge very clearly. He suggests (374) that the Plynteria, while falling on 25th Thargelion, "extended over more than one day," and again that "when [the biennial observance] did not take place, 29 Thargelion was the day on which normal business resumed after the Plynteria." He does not mention the Callynteria. If the suggestion is of a unitary four- or five-day festival, it is very much against the evidence.

Synoecia, begins a day earlier, on the 15th.⁵⁷ Biennial celebrations, it appears, could be extended, as quadrennial celebrations quite generally were. Our observance is undoubtedly a festival of Athena, since the offerings are to her alone and include "a *pharos* [of wool]." In sum, the calendar entry is best interpreted as a biennial addition to the Callynteria of 28th Thargelion. The previous argument is confirmed.

Thus the Plynteria fell on 25th Thargelion (so Plutarch), and the Callynteria on the 28th, and every second year the Callynteria continued through the 29th. The Praxiergidae decree calls for the dressing of Athena's statue on 28th Thargelion. We would like to know how this enactment of the mid fifth century consorts with other custom, with the festival Callynteria and with the extended biennial celebration. For each observance Nicomachus' calendar, at least the Ionic-letter version, specifies the source of authority, and in our case it is ἐκ τῶν κατὰ μῆνα (fr. 3A.6), *i.e.* from the list of ceremonies "occurring each month." A standard list, obviously; it is the commonest of several sources cited in the fragments; it is usually thought to have originated with the reputed laws of Solon from which the calendar was in part compiled.⁵⁸ Besides regular lists like this one, the calendar avowedly drew on supplementary sources of recent origin, inscriptions or other records, though we cannot be sure just how they were identified. It would be wishful, however, to suppose that the ceremonies "occurring each month" are uniformly of early origin; such a list was likely to be up-dated from time to time, apart from the separate records. We cannot tell whether the biennial observance antedates the Praxiergidae decree.

In asking how the ritual may have changed during the fifth

⁵⁷Fr. 3A.30–58, the first observance in the second biennial list.

⁵⁸Other lists are of ceremonies "of the Phylobasileis" and of those "on no fixed day," and there are also citations of either *s[telai]*, actual inscriptions, or *s[yngraphai]* "programs," and perhaps of "new" items. See Robertson, "The Laws of Athens, 410–399 BC," *JHS* 110 (1990) 67–71; Lambert 356–357, 371–372, 378; and *supra* n.51.

century, we should be aware that the dates in late Thargelion are not age-old. Athens shares the Plynteria, like most of her festivals throughout the year, with the rest of Ionia, but there it was celebrated in the following month of June, sometimes called Plynterion after the festival.⁵⁹ Attic demes celebrate the Plynteria in the same month, showing that it is precisely Athens which has departed from the original Ionian pattern. At both Erchia and Thoricus, sacrificial calendars prescribe offerings to Athena and Aglauros early in Scirophorion. At Thoricus the day is not given, only the rubric “at the Plynteria.”⁶⁰ At Erchia the festival as usual is not named, and the date is 3rd Scirophorion.⁶¹ But during this one day offerings were made on the local acropolis to five deities who are not otherwise conjoined in a single festival: besides Athena and Aglauros, we have Zeus Polieus and Poseidon and one whose name is lost.⁶² It is almost the only occasion in the month, and must have been a compendious effort, a way of dispatching all the acropolis business of the season.⁶³ Accordingly, we cannot infer that 3rd Scirophorion

⁵⁹Plynterion = June on Paros and Thasos, and probably on Chios and Ios: see Trümper (*supra* n.24) 294 *s.v.*

⁶⁰G. Daux, “Le calendrier de Thorikos au Musée J. Paul Getty,” *AntCl* 52 (1983) 150–174, lines 52–54. G. Dunst, “Der Opferkalender des attischen Demos Thorikos,” *ZPE* 25 (1977) 260, cut the knot with one tremendous stroke. The Thoricus calendar, he said, proved absolutely that the Plynteria fell in Scirophorion, and any date in Thargelion was a confusion with the Callynteria.

⁶¹G. Daux, “La grande démarche: un nouveau calendrier sacrificiel d’Attique (Erchia),” *BCH* 87 (1963) 603–634, A.57–65, B.55–59.

⁶²Daux (*supra* n.61) Γ.59–64, Δ.56–60, E.65–66. Previous comment on Erchia’s entries for 3rd Scirophorion assumes that they pertain to a single festival, whether it is the Plynteria or the basket-bearing mission of the Arrhephori, associated with Aglauros as one of three mythical “dew-sisters.” See Robertson, “The Riddle of the Arrhephoria at Athens,” *HSCP* 87 (1983) 281–283 (Plynteria); Jameson (*supra* n.42) 156–158 (Arrhephoria). But in either case Zeus Polieus, Poseidon, and another deity will all be out of place.

⁶³These five offerings appear at or near the bottom of the five columns, where the stone is broken off. But Γ.65–67 prescribes yet another offering on 16th Scirophorion, and there was probably another after the presumed entry for [3rd] Scirophorion beginning at E.65–66. See Lambert, “Two Notes on Attic Leges Sacrae,” *ZPE* 130 (2000) 75. Even so, between the 3rd and the 16th Erchians will be free to attend the Acropolis festivals in Athens.

is the date proper to Athena.⁶⁴

This evidence—the Ionian month-name, the calendar entries at Erchia and Thoricus—shows that early June, not late May (I speak of notional lunar months), is the time fixed by ancient custom for the washing rites, Plynteria, addressed to the goddess of the citadel. The calendar entries also show that the minor goddess Aglauros is part of it. The name "Ἀγλαυρος" is reliably interpreted by linguists as meaning "Bright-water" (ἀγλαός + the second element of ἄναυρος "waterless," a term for seasonal streams).⁶⁵ She personifies the washing.⁶⁶ But the evidence fails to show whether the pattern included the other festival, Callynteria. At Erchia it may or may not be subsumed in the compendious effort. At Thoricus other sacrifices follow in the month Scirophorion, assignable to other occasions which are not named—the rubric "at the Plynteria" is exceptional.⁶⁷ There

⁶⁴It is true that "the third" is spoken of as Athena's birthday, just as the 4th is the birthday of both Hermes and Aphrodite, the 6th of Artemis, the 7th of Apollo, and the 8th of Poseidon. The mythical birthdays are real-life festival dates, which in the other cases make a graduated series in the first quarter of the moon (Apollo as a late-comer is inserted between the even days): see Robertson, "The Religious Criterion in Greek Ethnicity," *AJAH* N.S. 2 (2002) 28–36. Athena's birthday and festival date are the third of the waning month, the 28th. "The third" *simpliciter* was bandied by way of explaining τριτογένεια, which has a different origin, in a word for "water": see H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1960–1979) s.v. Τρίτων, though he takes a different view. Despite Mikalson (*supra* n.44) 16 and the opinion cited there (Schmidt, Jacoby), it is unreasonable to say either that Athena has two birthdays or that the third of the waxing month is the only one.

⁶⁵Frisk (*supra* n.64) s.v. "Ἀγλαυρος."

⁶⁶Aglauros also has a shrine below the east face of the Acropolis, with its own ceremony and priesthood. According to S. Aleshire, "The Demos and the Priests," in R. Osborne and S. Hornblower, edd., *Ritual, Finance, Politics. Athenian Accounts presented to David Lewis* (Oxford 1994) 328 n.14 (admittedly a provisional statement), the ceremony and the priesthood are not those of the Salaminian *genos*, in which case she enjoys a still wider currency. The shrine below the Acropolis must have been installed about the same time as the "old agora" beside it. Aglauros was once a popular figure, and underwent a long development at Athens: see in brief compass Jacoby on Philochorus *FGrHist* 328 F 105, and E. Kearns, *The Heroes of Attica* (*BICS* Suppl. 57 [1989]) 24–27, 139–140. Yet the evidence from Erchia and Thoricus and (to be mentioned *infra*) the calendar of Nicomachus show that the Acropolis worship of Athena was the starting point.

⁶⁷The sacrifices of Scirophorion have often been discussed, most recently by S. Scullion, *ZPE* 121 (1998) 119–121. I shall attempt to articulate the series, as

is indeed a second sacrifice to Athena, immediately after the sacrifices to Athena and Aglauros. It could be at the Callynteria. But it is just as likely to be another at the Plynteria, later in the day.

Returning now to Athens, we see that the festival calendar has been adjusted. It was remarked before that Scirophorion = June is an unwonted month-name matching an unwonted festival, the Scirophoria. A traditional month-name like Plynterion has been supplanted, and the festival Plynteria has been moved back to late Thargelion. But old ritual must not be allowed to lapse entirely, and the punctilious calendar of Nicomachus prescribes offerings in early Scirophorion which are unmistakably the Plynteria. In the same biennial column, right after the entry for 29th Thargelion, comes an entry for early Scirophorion with offerings to Athena and Aglauros (fr. 3A.19–27).⁶⁸ Athena re-

follows. Lines 52–54: “At the Plynteria,” a sheep for Athena, another for Aglauros, a choice lamb for Athena—or is this last at the Callynteria? Lines 54–57: (At a harvest festival corresponding to Athens’ Dipolieia), an ox for Cephalus and a sheep for Π[—the several possibilities are reviewed by Sculion. Lines 57–65, the major entry, already announced in line 52, and expanded further by a sacrifice on the left side at the level of line 58: (At the ceremonial swearing of oaths of office), a sheep for “[her]oinēs of Corone or Coroneia”—this is the left-side sacrifice, in which the name was truncated deliberately. The oath-taking probably occurred on 30th Scirophorion, like the corresponding *eisitêtêria* of magistrates in the city, on which see Deubner 175–176. The civic ceremony as we know it takes place in the Classical Agora at the Stoa of Zeus (quarters of the board of archons) and its somewhat earlier congener, the Stoa Basileios (quarters of the Basileus). In front of the latter lies a slab of stone, doubtless for the oath-taking. The ceremony at Thoricus—and there was another in Metageitnion (lines 10–12)—takes place at the Delphinium, an original seat of government among the Ionians, still discernible in legend at Athens city; see Robertson, *Festivals and Legends. The Formation of Greek Cities in the Light of Public Ritual* (Toronto 1992) 4–11. At Athens’ Delphinium mothers swore an oath attesting the legitimacy of children, and at Erchia’s Delphinium Kourotrophos is worshipped beside Apollo; see Lambert (*supra* n.63) 76. At Thoricus the oath was sworn in the neighbouring enclosure of Zeus *kataibatês* (mentioned under Metageitnion), probably on another slab of stone, inviting a lightning strike for perjury; cf. the separate enclosure of Athens’ Delphinium, with its forbidding memories (Plut. *Thes.* 12.6). The “[her]oinēs Κορωνέων”—the place denoted by the ethnic Κορωνεύς, whether “Corone” or “Coroneia,” is named for crows—will be avengers of perjury like the Erinyes or the Praxidikai.

⁶⁸The restoration Ἀγλαύ]ρωι in Nicomachus’ calendar was first proposed in 1969 by Hansen (*supra* n.41) 105, and independently, since Hansen’s dissertation was published later, by W. Burkert *apud* Dunst (*supra* n.60) 258, this in

ceives βῶς κριτή "a choice ox," whereas at Erchia she receives οἷς ἀν/[τ]ίβους "a sheep instead of an ox," a unique provision.⁶⁹ The day of the "waxing" month is lost, and so is the day of the "waxing" month that begins the next entry, just as the stone breaks off. For both dates there is a wide range of possibilities; the two days could even be successive.⁷⁰ As to whether the second festival was a primordial Callynteria, we cannot even make a guess.

It is possible then that the original Ionian pattern, as we see it in the demes Erchia and Thoricus and as imprinted in the month Plynterion, consisted solely of the festival Plynteria, named for the cleansing which, in the context of the agricultural year, was after all the main purpose. We may wonder if the verb καλλύνω was early enough to produce a standard festival name.⁷¹ At all events, when Athens shifted the ritual to late Thargelion, the Callynteria stood out, falling on Athena's holy day, the 28th. Let us consider how the dressing of Athena's statue comes into it.

V. The dressing of Athena's statue at the Callynteria

At the Plynteria of 25th Thargelion the Praxiergidae remove Athena's costume and veil the statue (Plut. *Alc.* 34.1, cf. Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.12). Both the statue and, among the elements of the

the full light of the parallels at Erchia and Thoricus. It deserves to be accepted, all the more since the only conceivable alternative, μαγεῖ[ρ]ωι (Sokolowski), turns the barley offering into a perquisite, without the usual heading *hierosyna*, and for a butcher, an unlikely person. I was wrong to question Ἀγλαύ[ρ]ωι in "Arrhephoria" (*supra* n.62) 281, and Lambert 376 is wrong to reject it outright.

⁶⁹Jameson (*supra* n.42) 157–158 adduces the Athenian ritual term θῦμα ἐπίβοιον as mentioned by Philochorus *FGrHist* 328 F 10 and others, and also the story in Philochorus F 169 that the Athenians once ran short of sacrificial oxen, possibly an *aition* of such ritual practices.

⁷⁰Lambert 375–376 sets forth the possibilities. In line 20, the first entry, it might be the 2nd, 4th, 5th, or 7th of the waxing month (either 7 or 8 letters can be accommodated according as successive iotas occupied one space or two). In line 28, the second entry, it might be the 3rd, 6th, 8th, or 9th (either 5 or 6 letters).

⁷¹The only demonstrably early verbs of this type, "instrumentatives" based on -ος neuters, are αἰσχύνω and ἀλεγύνω. But later instances include another ritual term, φαιδύνω (assimilated to the common adjective as φαιδρύνω). And καλλύνω is Ionic as well as Attic on the evidence of καλλύσματα "sweepings" in *IG* XII.5 593.A.22 (Ceos, 5th cent.). Cf. Schwyzler (*supra* n.22) 733.

costume, the *peplos* are washed, for the two kinds of washing are reflected in the two names λουτρίδες and πλυντρίδες for the girls who minister.⁷² The two kinds of washing, with the same two girls, are successive. The veiling comes after the washing of the statue and conceals the bare form until it can be dressed again. The woollen *peplos* would take a while to dry. On the assumption that the Praxiergidae “dress” the statue once more at a later hour on the same day, they would have scrambled.⁷³ It is understandable that the statue stood veiled for two days, between this festival and the next. The atmosphere of ill omen which fell over Athens when the statue was veiled (and when Alcibiades sailed into Peiraeus) must have continued for this time. The Assembly, we recall, appears not to meet at all until the day after the Callynteria.

The dressing with the *peplos* takes place at the “adorning

⁷²Phot. *s.v.* λουτρίδες = Ar. fr.849 K.-A. There is also the gloss κατανίπτης, “one who washes off ?the bottom of Athena’s *peplos* as it gets soiled” (Phot. *s.v.*, *Anecd.Bekker* I 261: the reading is not certain), but as Ziehen (*supra* n.4) 1062 remarks, this is more likely to be an occasional task than a festival routine.

⁷³Phot. *s.v.* ἡγητηρία further describes “a procession of the Plynteria” in which a fig cake of this name, “leader” of the procession, is proudly carried, doubtless to the Acropolis, doubtless to sustain Athena. The Praxiergidae must have been concerned in this too. Other business of the Plynteria is not to our purpose here, but note that the separation of washing and dressing should finally give the death blow to the notion that Athena’s statue was carried in procession from the Acropolis to the Phalerum shore for the washing procedures and was carried back again in procession on the same night. Ever since Athenian festivals began to be studied in the light of inscriptions in the mid-nineteenth century, it has been debated whether it was during the Plynteria that ephebes of the Hellenistic period paraded twice on one day with a statue of “Pallas.” A survey of opinion would show many authoritative names on both sides, and both sides can even boast the same name: Parker (*supra* n.23) 27 says that the ephebic event “almost certainly formed part of a different festival,” and Parker (*supra* n.3: 307) says that it was “probably” at the Plynteria. A closer reading of the ephebic inscriptions reveals, however, that the first procession was a local one at Phalerum, like the local processions at Athens and Peiraeus with a statue of Dionysus, and that only the second went all the way from Phalerum to Athens. Athena’s statue was brought to Phalerum at an earlier juncture, in the procession described by Philochorus *FGrHist* 328 F 64. Such a sequence points to the “Palladium” statue of southeast Athens; we know from reports elsewhere and from both Athenian and other legends that Palladium statues were typically removed and sequestered and restored. See Robertson, “Athena as Weather Goddess,” in S. Deacy and A. Villing, edd., *Athena in the Classical World* (Leiden 2002) 38–41, 47–53.

[rites],” Καλλυντήρια, of 28th Thargelion. We should have expected it. Dressing and adorning are, for a woman, either synonymous or concurrent. ζῶσε δὲ καὶ κόσμησε “she cinched her (in the *peplos*) and adorned her,” says Hesiod of Athena’s attentions to Pandora (*Theog.* 573, *Op.* 72). Though Athena’s statue was also adorned with aegis and helmet and, as we shall see, a mantle, and though the whole costume might be given further attention (polishing the metal, anointing the cloth with fragrant oil), it was all included in the gracious ceremony of a woman’s dressing.⁷⁴

Inscriptions give us more details of the Callynteria ritual, first at the end of the fifth century, and then in the later Hellenistic period. For the biennial observance of 29th Thargelion, Nicomachus’ calendar mentions, ahead of all the other offerings, φάρος / [ἐρίων] καθαῶν “a *pharos* of pure [wool]” (fr. 3A.7–8).⁷⁵ The word φάρος is remarkable, for it does not occur in surviving Attic prose, only in Ionic (Pherecydes of Syros, Herodotus). It is an archaism preserved by the calendar, like the sacrificial victim ἄρνειος “young wether” (fr. 1A.5).⁷⁶ As an Attic word φάρος once denoted either “robe” or “mantle,” the two senses it has elsewhere—but which? For Athena’s robe the term πέπλος is common and unvarying, in both prose and poetry, throughout the history of Athens; φάρος can hardly be an early synonym. It must mean “mantle.”⁷⁷

⁷⁴The east frieze of the Parthenon shows Athena sitting in a *peplos* with the aegis on her lap and without her helmet, and the real-life *peplos* is being folded up behind her. Hurwit (*supra* n.7) 227 suggests, as others have, that “she is getting ready for a change of costume.” More likely, she has removed these trappings to be comfortably seated with the other gods. It is not a stage in Athena’s ritual.

⁷⁵[ἐρίων] Sokolowski, [λίνων] Dow. The latter seems very unlikely, since Athena, and especially Athena Ergane in line 13, points to wool.

⁷⁶In the form ἄρνειός it was included in Ister’s *Attic Glossary*, *FGrHist* 334 F 23, with other age designations for sacrificial victims.

⁷⁷Sokolowski (*supra* n.41) 456–457 identifies it as Athena’s “*peplos*,” on *LSCG Suppl.* 10 as her “mantle”; but he still means her *peplos*, since the festival Plynteria is said to involve its “changing” (of course it does not). We have seen apropos of line 21 of the Praxiergidae decree that Sokolowski thinks of a chiton as a “mantle.” Some scholars are careless of attire. Hansen (*supra* n.41)

When Athena was dressed again each year at the Callynteria of 28th Thargelion, it had always been with the old *peplos* newly washed. That was the point of the age-old “washing rites.” But every second year, it now appears, she was dressed as well in a newly woven mantle. We are reminded of the newly woven *peplos* that was presented at the Great Panathenaea every fourth year. To say of the mantle that the wool is “pure” is to insist on its preparation, on carding and spinning by dedicated hands. Such preparation was important also to the new *peplos*. The Birds in Aristophanes propose to “card” the *peplos* for their own tutelary deity (*Av.* 827).⁷⁸ The mantle was produced with similar care and presented at the biennial Callynteria, as the dressing and adorning continued on the second day.

The biennial Callynteria, as we saw, belong to odd-numbered years, and come round in the month Thargelion = May near the end of the year, *e.g.* in 451/50. The Great Panathenaea belong to even-numbered years and come round in the month Hecatombaeon = July at the beginning of the year, *e.g.* in 450/49. It is noteworthy that the biennial presentation of a mantle follows the quadrennial presentation of a *peplos* at the two furthest intervals, so to speak. For example, the Great Panathenaea of July 450/49 would be followed by the biennial Callynteria of May 449/48 and May 447/46. The next cycle would begin at once, in July 446/45. At the Callynteria each new mantle was used to dress the statue, so as to amplify the washing of the *peplos*. We must wonder what was done with each new *peplos* of the Great Panathenaea.

A Hellenistic inscription juxtaposes the *peplos* and mantle of Athena’s statue and points to a relationship between the Great Panathenaea and the Callynteria. The Callynteria can be recognized as the occasion described by a decree of 108/7 B.C.—the

89–94 argues against “*peplos*” in favour of the improbable view that this was a “cloak” or “wrap” used to veil the statue. Lambert (374) speaks of a “cloak.”

⁷⁸It has indeed been questioned whether carding and other preliminary steps were important to the manufacture of Athena’s *peplos*. We shall come back to this below.

date appears in a second decree on the same stone (*IG* II² 1060 + 1036).⁷⁹ The 13 badly broken lines preserved on two fragments speak of the "Praxiergi]dae," "the *peplos*," and a "mantle," *himation*, and in its second mention the *peplos* is qualified as "the annual" one. But before taking up these indications, let us be apprised of the business of the second decree, which is rather well preserved.

The business is the same as in another decree of 103/2, also well preserved (*IG* II² 1034 + 1943, *cf.* *SEG* XL 122), and in a third, a mere fragment, assigned only to *ca* 100 B.C. (*IG* II² 1942). All three are in honour of an annual contingent of, on average, *ca* 120 "*parthenoi* who have worked the wool for the *peplos* for Athena," τῶν παρθένων τῶν ἡργασμένων τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ τὰ ἔρια τὰ εἰς τὸν πέπλον, and who also parade as *Canephoroi*. These inscriptions were set up beside the Caryatid temple (*supra* n.9), where too the Praxiergidae decree was presumably still standing.

The girls, listed under their twelve tribes, are from well-to-do families. A few serve more than once; a few are otherwise known for serving as *Arrhephoroi*; some are sisters of known ephebes. The series of three decrees has therefore been compared with the much larger series of ephebic inscriptions in the same period.⁸⁰ Whereas the ephebes parade and show off in other ways at festivals throughout the year, a certain kind of distinction in worshipping Athena was devised for the girls. The devising was the subject of the first, very fragmentary, decree.

What does it mean to "work the wool for the *peplos* for Athena"? "The *peplos*," we may be sure, is for presentation to Athena, the famous custom of the Great Panathenaea. Yet 108/7 and 103/2 are not Panathenaic years; in this period they

⁷⁹S. B. Aleshire† and S. D. Lambert, "Making the *Peplos* for Athena: A New Edition of *IG* II² 1060 + *IG* II² 1036," *ZPE* 142 (2003) 65–86 (hereafter "Aleshire and Lambert"). They evoke the possibility (70) that the first decree has been copied from an original of the Lycurgan period, but think it unlikely.

⁸⁰So, as the latest, Aleshire and Lambert 85–86.

are 110/9, 106/4, and 102/1.⁸¹ In a recent authoritative re-edition of *IG II²* 1060 + 1036, it has been argued that these and the other decrees of the series are evidence, uniquely, for a change of custom, for the presentation of a *peplos* every year, and so at the Lesser Panathenaea too.⁸² The argument rests in part on the phrase quoted. It is held that the girls, *ca* 120 each year, are weaving a *peplos* each year.

“Working wool” can refer to any of the stages in the manufacture of woollen clothing: carding, spinning, weaving. This is granted, and it should be granted too that each is essential. Spinning like weaving is both tricky and prolonged. An ideal woman, such as the tall and slender blondes of Thrace, will be spinning all the time (*Hdt.* 5.12.2, 4, though here it is flax). Athena’s title ἐργάνη, used on the Acropolis as at many other places, is expressive of wool-working in general; more specific titles refer to the woof on the loom and to the pensum of wool for spinning.⁸³ The first woman, like the first man, was created, obviously, by the moulding of clay; but woman’s nature, unlike man’s, was not complete until Athena dressed her attractively in a woollen *peplos*. The story of the first woman, subsequently called Pandora, is an *aition* both of woman’s nature (and her work) and of Athena’s worship—which Hesiod turned to his own grim purpose. Athena then presides over wool-working in general, a large part of life in Greek households. The several tasks were doubtless performed in her ritual as they are by ordinary women.

The *peplos* for which the *parthenoi* “work the wool” is

⁸¹ There was a time when these inscriptions were conjecturally assigned to Panathenaic years, as in *IG II²*, and when festival notions followed suit, as in Deubner 30–31.

⁸² Aleshire and Lambert 72, 75–77. They acknowledge that these three inscriptions would be the sole evidence for the change. Error and impudence give us the manuscript reading of *Diod.* 20.46.2, an annual celebration at the end of the fourth century, and the scholium on *Pl. Resp.* 327A, an annual celebration in the Peiraeus, after the Bendideia, with a different *peplos* depicting the war against Atlantis.

⁸³ Athena πηνίτις: *Leon. Anth. Pal.* 6.289 = *Gow-Page, HE* 42; *Ael. NA* 6.57. Athena σταθμία: *Hesych. s.v.*; cf. *e.g. Il.* 12.433–434, γυνή ... σταθμὸν ἔχουσα.

naturally taken as the famous *peplos*, the one presented to Athena at the Great Panathenaea. Let us recall the salient details about this quadrennial *peplos*, leaving aside the tergiversations of late commentators that have been exposed over and over again.⁸⁴ The Council, later it is a law-court, ἔκρινεν ... τὰ παραδείγματα καὶ τὸν πέπλον “judged the—?designs ?samples—and the *peplos*” (Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 49.3), a cryptic statement that leaves us guessing whether the first item has to do with the *peplos* or with building projects and the like. The *peplos* contains inwoven scenes of the Gigantomachy and exceptionally, in 302 B.C., portraits of Antigonus and Demetrius (Plut. *Dem.* 12.3). Two Arrhephori help “the priestesses” set up the loom at the festival Chalceia of 30th Pyanopsion (*Et.Gen.* p.306 Miller, *Suda* s.v. Χαλκεῖα 2, cf. Harp. s.v. ἀρρηφορεῖν), which could be the celebration nine months before the Great Panathenaea, or one before this, up to three years and nine months before. Hesychius has the gloss ἐργαστῖναι· αἱ τὸν πέπλον ὑφαίνουσai, “Workers (female): those who weave the *peplos*.” In both tragedy and comedy we hear how mature women, rather than girls, weave the *peplos*.⁸⁵ In the Panathenaic procession from the Dipylon to the Acropolis the *peplos* is carried high on the mast of a

⁸⁴The *peplos* is treated at length by Mansfield (*supra* n.1) and by Shear (*supra* n.5). Both subject a mass of evidence to searching criticism, but Mansfield spares the scholastic comment of late antiquity which describes the *peplos* as a large decorative hanging or tapestry; he concludes, or rather postulates from the outset, that there were two kinds of *peplos*, this and Athena's robe. As for our three inscriptions, Shear (97–103) infers an annual *peplos*, as do Aleshire and Lambert. Mansfield (284–290, 338–343, 358–360) does so too, and also interpolates the Arrhephori as weavers in one of the inscriptions. He identifies Arrhephori and Ergastinae; one of the latter he inserted in the Praxiergidae decree (see *supra* 124).

⁸⁵Eur. *IT* 222–224, *Hec.* 466–474; Pherecrates fr.51 K.-A. Iphigeneia is indeed a *parthenos*, but also a mature woman. Aleshire and Lambert 76–77 remark that the chorus of Eur. *Hec.* should recall to us Homer's Trojan women who present a *peplos* to Athena; but their words must also be appropriate to Athens. A scholium on the passage (citing Pherecrates) says that girls instead of women were alleged as *peplos* weavers by Apollodorus of Athens, not a negligible source (*FGrHist* 244 F 105); but his meaning was perhaps distorted for the sake of controversy.

ship-wagon, a virtual sail.⁸⁶ On the Parthenon frieze we see it being folded up; its size can be closely estimated, about six feet square.

These sources mention only weaving and, as allusions on the stage, only mature women. Skilled hands were needed for inwoven scenes, and for a strong consistent effect many hands were not wanted, and they would hardly be at work for as long as four years.⁸⁷ *Ergastinae* is reasonably taken as a title of honour going back to the Classical period and reserved for a few women. On the other hand, there is the “carding” attributed to the whole community of Birds (Ar. *Av.* 827, cited above), and during the quadrennium there was time for any number of girls and women to join in. And even weaving need not have been restricted to the loom with the *peplos*. The role of the Arrhephori, seven- to eleven-year-old girls, was purely ceremonial. We might expect the same of older girls as well; we might expect them to act in parallel with well-practiced women, as the Arrhephori did in their own small way. Did older girls produce the two mantles that were offered to Athena during the subsequent quadrennium? Were “the *paradeigmata*” for them, and “the *peplos*” for the women?

As for the practice round 100 B.C., 120 girls cannot be engaged each year in weaving a single *peplos* for the Great Panathenaea.

⁸⁶The mast and rigging, rather than the whole conveyance, are the exclusive subject of remark down to the Roman period, when it is likely that a much grander ship-wagon was constructed, and in more than one version, and propelled with the *peplos* only to a point below the Eleusinium. See Shear (*supra* n. 5) 143–155, 641, 646, 654–655. The earliest references are in Strattis’ *Macedonnes* (fr.31 K.-A.) and on the Attic-letter side of Nicomachus’ calendar (fr. 9B.11–12), where Lambert’s *hóπ*/[*λα*---], coming right after a “hecatomb,” is a convincing restoration. Apropos of Strattis, Shear (152, 557) suggests that the mast, etc., was first introduced at the Great Panathenaea of 402; but the calendar entry cannot be so explained. In any case, this is a feasible means of displaying a *peplos* like the one on the Parthenon frieze, about six feet square. It is however quite understandable that Strattis should hyperbolize about “innumerable hands” tugging at the ropes, and late commentators likewise about a giant tapestry.

⁸⁷E. Barber, “The *Peplos* of Athena,” in Neils (*supra* n.48) 115–116, describes the technique that might be used in weaving a *peplos* of five feet by six feet (her estimate) with an elaborate inwoven design.

It does not help in the least to conjecture that they are now weaving a *peplos* for presentation each year. They are still mere girls, and still too numerous. They could however be engaged in preliminary or parallel tasks that are ceremonial and redundant, and it might only be a revival or exaggeration of earlier custom. The decree of 103/2 B.C., *IG II² 1034* etc., is surmounted by a relief depicting, "under a roundel, two objects which appear to represent pieces of woven cloth with holes at the edges, ready to be stitched together to make the *peplos* (?)." ⁸⁸ If the *peplos* then was of the same size as on the Parthenon frieze, it could hardly be stitched together from separate pieces. The pieces may be other handiwork by the girls; they may even be the two mantles of the biennial Callynteria.

We come back to the programmatic decree that is so fragmentary, and to the first of its two fragments. There is mention of the board of Athlothetae (fr. a.2), of a single Agon]othetes, as it must be (fr. a.6, *cf.* 2), of a "procession" (fr. a.6) in which they are concerned (fr. a.6). The occasion is plainly the Great Panathenaea. Apropos of this festival, something is done for] καλῶς ποιησαμέναις τὸν πέπλον, (those) "who have finely wrought the *peplos*" (fr. a.3). This is not the phrase used of the girls. ⁸⁹ It is apt for those who weave the *peplos* of the Great Panathenaea; it reinforces the argument that has just been made for distinguishing the many girls from a few women. For these persons a standard honour is prescribed in the next line:] τοῦ δήμου θαλλοῦ στεφάνῳ, (by action) "of the Demos with a crown of green-shoot" (fr. a.4). It need not signify that the standard honour is awarded also to the girls of 108/7 B.C. (fr. b.20–21). Finally, it must be the same persons who yet again in the next

⁸⁸ Aleshire and Lambert 65 n.1, with pl. I.

⁸⁹ According to Aleshire and Lambert (71), these are girls "who had been *adjudged* (my italics) to have 'made the *peplos* well'" and are awarded crowns for that reason. In the next decree, however, all the girls who have "worked the wool for the *peplos*" in 108/7 are awarded the same crowns. Furthermore, if "make the *peplos*" and "work the wool for the *peplos*" are the same, except that some do it "well," the alternative phrases are unlike the formulaic language of decrees.

line “(?wear) white clothing (?during the conveyance or presentation) of the *peplos*”: πέ]πλου λευκὴν ἐσθῆτα Η[(fr. a.5).⁹⁰

Between this fragment and the other, on the stone that continues with a decree for the girls, much or little may be lost.⁹¹ If πομπε.[in the first line of fr. b is still the grand procession of the Great Panathenaea, the business of fr. a is being rounded off. Otherwise it will refer to the annual Panathenaic procession, in which the girls also joined, as we see from the honorific decrees. Thereafter a different festival is in view, with the Praxiergidae officiating: it must be the Callynteria. They are the subject of two injunctions (fr. b.1–4): [- - - ὅταν - - - Πραξιεργί]/δαι παραλάβωσιν τὸν ἐφέτειον πέπλ[ο]ν [- - - ὅταν δὲ - - - τὸ] / ἰμάτιον ἐξάγωσιν, παραδιδότωσαν ταῖ[ς - - -], “[- - - whenever - - - the Praxiergi]dae receive the annual *peplos* [- - - and whenever - - -] they remove the mantle, let them hand it over to the (?girls).” Πραξιεργί]/δαι was read and restored by B. Nagy.⁹² ταῖ[ς is read and restored by Aleshire and Lambert. I insert ὅταν before the two subjunctives, which must belong to temporal clauses, and also the article τὸ] ἰμάτιον. The two injunctions, following two successive temporal clauses, pertain to different occasions, probably different celebrations of the festival Callynteria.

“The annual *peplos*” can only be the *peplos* with which the Praxiergidae have always been concerned, every year.⁹³ It is the

⁹⁰B. Nagy, “The Ritual in Slab V-East on the Parthenon Frieze,” *CP* 73 (1978) 140–141, thought that “white clothing” was a third element of the statue costume, beside *peplos* and mantle; but the absence of the article, as well as the likely construction of the sentence, are much against this. Aleshire and Lambert 71 rightly discount a reference to the Arrhephori, who are elsewhere said to wear white clothing. Their own preference is for the girls.

⁹¹The bottom of fr. a and the top of fr. b are both sawn straight across, and it is possible that the fragments are adjacent. But so little remains of the bottom and top lines that no connected sense can be suggested. See Aleshire and Lambert 70.

⁹²Nagy (*supra* n.90) 140.

⁹³Though “annual” is the common meaning, ἐφέτειος / ἐπέτειος can perhaps also mean “this year’s,” “each year’s,” “year-long,” “year-old”; it is often hard to be sure. There is no reason but special pleading to look for some nuance here.

peplos that is taken off Athena's statue, and washed, and put back on the statue once more. In this context, as in no other, it is distinguished from the *peplos* presented at the Great Panathenaea, every four years. The distinction proves again that the *peplos* in the other decrees, the *peplos* for which the girls work the wool, is that of the Great Panathenaea. If the *peplos* in all these decrees was to be distinguished, as a new *peplos* woven each year, from the *peplos* of the Great Panathenaea, we would hear of "the annual *peplos*" repeatedly.

Whereas the Praxiergidae wash the annual *peplos* at the Plynteria and place it on the statue at the Callynteria, they now "receive" it. As between the two festivals, it was surely the Callynteria that saw them "receive" the *peplos*. They have access to the statue throughout, for the purposes of undressing and bathing and veiling and dressing again. But they will withdraw from the Acropolis during the two days between the festivals, and on returning will receive the *peplos*, clean and dry, from the hands of the priestess. The temporal clause was followed by an imperative, directing the Praxiergidae to do something with the *peplos*. Did they surrender it because its place was taken by the contrasting Panathenaic *peplos*? If so, it is the Callynteria of a Panathenaic year.

In the next step the subject will be the Praxiergidae again. This time they "remove" the mantle, but not in the sense of undressing the statue, which they did at the Plynteria. They remove it from the temple or the precinct because it is finished with. This is a common meaning of ἐξάγω, illustrated by inscriptions better than by literature.⁹⁴ The *himation* of the decree is doubtless the *pharos* of Nicomachus' calendar, the mantle that is presented every second year. With each new

⁹⁴Inscriptions often use ἐξάγω in the sense of "remove," "take away" from the wonted place: earth and stones from the Pelargicum (IG I³ 78.57), obnoxious statues from the temple at Delphi (Syll.³ 244.E.41–42), flawed building blocks from a construction site (IG VII 3073.35–36). The meaning is not recognized by LSJ, and Aleshire and Lambert (73) find it awkward to construe ἐξάγωσιν with "this type of inanimate object" and suggest that it either governs some other accusative or is intransitive, "march out."

mantle there is an old one to remove. The Praxierygiae are now to hand it over to a female group, perhaps the women or the girls who of course wove it two years before, perhaps so that it can now be dedicated as a permanent offering to be laid up. Here the festival is surely the biennial Callynteria, when a new mantle is presented (on the evidence of Nicomachus' calendar), so that the old one must be disposed of.

Let us fill out the first step on the analogy of the second. The Praxierygiae, having received the annual *peplos*, hand it over because it is finished with. They hand it over to a female group, again perhaps those who wove it, women rather than girls. The scene comes into focus all at once if we suppose that the annual *peplos* of the previous four years originated as a Panathenaic *peplos* that was turned to use in dressing Athena's statue. It seems that the age-old washing rites had been modified to this extent, that a new Panathenaic *peplos* was admitted every four years. Nicomachus' calendar showed us that it was modified to the extent of admitting a new mantle every two years, but the mantle is only an accessory.

It appears then that both women and girls are to attend at the Callynteria so that the Praxierygiae may return to them the *peplos* and the mantle of recent use. But for such a ceremony all the girls who have worked the wool year by year are far too many: it would be necessary to choose a few of them to represent the rest, by some unimpeachable procedure. The next two lines, which are at the end of this programmatic decree of 108/7 B.C. (fr. b.4–5), speak of "distinguishing" or "dividing" as an important matter: συνεπιμελο(υ)μένου τῆς διαιρεσεως [and ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνωνται διαί[ροῦντες or -[ροῦμενοι.⁹⁵ Perhaps the girls who will attend are being distinguished from those who will not.

We can trace the progression of thought in the decree with

⁹⁵ Aleshire and Lambert 73 have improved the readings in these lines so as to give the words for "distinguishing" or "dividing" in place of an unseemly hapax. They think rather of a division of the wool or of "some other aspect of the work."

some likelihood. Before we pick it up in fr. a and b, the main part of it undoubtedly arranged for a large contingent of girls to "work the wool" year by year for the Panathenaic *peplos*, the arrangement that leads to the series of honorific decrees. In fr. a, however, the decree turns to the women "who have finely wrought the *peplos*." They have always done so, but they must not be forgotten now, vis-à-vis the girls. They too will be honoured in the context of the Great Panathenaea. In fr. b both women and girls are directed to attend at the Callynteria, at the respective celebrations which make use of either a new *peplos* or a new mantle, so that the previous exemplars may be returned for their final destination as *anathêmata*. This business at the Callynteria is dispatched in brief compass, in little more than four lines of which half is the "distinguishing," the reason being that it is only a new version of a familiar procedure for replacing *peplos* and mantle.

It is time to draw it all together. The ancient Ionian custom of the Plynteria "Washing rites" was to wash the citadel statue of Athena and its *peplos* in early summer, as part of the general cleansing of the community before the ingathering. At Athens the custom was placed in the hands of the *genos* Praxiergidae. Down to the fifth century Athens followed the custom faithfully except for adjusting the calendar date from Scirophorion to Thargelion and also adding, if it was not part of the Ionian custom, the Callynteria "Adorning rites." When Hesychius defines the *genos* as precisely "those who dress the old statue of Athena," it is not with reference to the ancient custom. Dressing the statue once again, after it and the *peplos* have been washed, is a small part of the custom; it does not even occur on the principal day that is named for the washing. When the Praxiergidae decree calls upon the *genos* to "dress the statue with the *peplos*," while a special sacrifice and purification or the like are performed, it is not to re-affirm the custom. Hesychius and the decree both refer to a striking innovation.

About the same time as the Praxiergidae decree, Athens is

seen to celebrate a custom that she never had before. A newly woven *peplos* is presented to Athena every fourth year at the Great Panathenaea, the widely attended festival of games in mid-summer, near the end of July. The two customs, old and new, can be reconciled if, every fourth year at the Callynteria, near the end of the following May, the Panathenaic *peplos*—which has been folded up and laid away in the interval—is now ceremonially draped on the statue, taking the place of the one that has been washed. Hesychius refers to this replacement, and it is prescribed for the first time by the Praxiargidae decree. At the Plynteria and Callynteria of the next three years it is washed and placed again on the statue in the good old way. In the fourth year, however, which is another Panathenaic year, it is washed and removed and laid away permanently, and the new *peplos* of the past July is placed on the statue.

Twice in the same cycle—in the year following the Panathenaic year and again in the second year after that—a new mantle is both presented and placed on the statue at the Callynteria, and at the same time the previous mantle is removed and laid away permanently. Very likely this is meant to reinforce the twining of the two customs. Possibly, however, the mantle as a secondary garment is an earlier addition to the sombre custom of washing and replacing the *peplos*: a compensating gesture of munificence.

Near the end of the second century it is decided that the many marriageable maidens of well-to-do families shall all be associated with the famous Panathenaic *peplos*. They are to “work the wool” year by year, and are honoured for the task; the women who weave the *peplos*, the original and famous task, are honoured in the same way. Girls and women go in procession at the Panathenaea; girls and women attend on the Acropolis at the Callynteria, on the days when the mantle and the *peplos* respectively are replaced on the statue.

Such are the conclusions to be drawn from the evidence in hand. Of course they immediately raise a larger question: the

origin of the custom of presenting a *peplos* at the Great Panathenaea, a custom that is so strikingly at variance with the Athenian and Ionian custom of the Plynteria. Where did it come from? When and why did Athens adopt it? The answer depends on a different range of evidence.

VI. *The origin of the custom of presenting a new peplos to Athena*

Central Greece, especially Boeotia, is the place of origin. It is Halae in East Locris that has yielded the only evidence outside Athens for the weaving of a new *peplos* in the service of Athena.⁹⁶ An inscription from the acropolis sanctuary names three πεταμνυφάντειραι, "weavers of the spread [cloth]" (*πέταμνον < πετάννυμι).⁹⁷ Like πέπλος (perhaps "folded [cloth]"), the new word denotes a squarish woollen cloth serving as a woman's robe.⁹⁸

At Delphi, where Athena's worship on the terrace of Marmariá is generally thought to be the earliest on the site, probably going back to the Late Bronze Age as Apollo's certainly does not, she has a festival Λῶτις (= λοῦσις) in mid-summer.⁹⁹ The festival name points to the washing of the statue. Our information, however, is restricted to the quadrennial celebration, coinciding with the Pythian Games. An Amphictyonic law of 380 B.C. provides for an impressive new costume, most of it

⁹⁶Various gods receive new vestments on festival occasions. A woman's robe, *pátos* or *peplos*, is presented to Hera at Argos and Olympia, a man's robe, *chiton*, to Apollo at Amyclae—other instances are mostly of lesser elements of the costume. The presentation goes with the rest of the worship and illustrates the god's function in Greek society. Hera is a bride being robed for the wedding, Apollo is a citizen just come of age. These are not comparanda for the weaving and presentation of Athena's *peplos*.

⁹⁷H. Goldman, "Inscriptions from the Acropolis of Halae," *AJA* 19 (1915) 444–451 no. 3.12–13. Goldman immediately thought of "a garment woven for the Athena of Halae." In a later report, "The Acropolis of Halae," *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 399, she mentions Athena *erganê* as a possible candidate for a "herm-like" statue.

⁹⁸See Frisk (*supra* n.64) s.v. πέπλος.

⁹⁹For Mycenaean "goddess" figurines at Marmariá, see R. Hope Simpson, *Mycenaean Greece* (Park Ridge 1981) 78. For the festival, G. Roux, "Lôti: le bain rituel d'Athéna à Delphes," in *Hommages à C. Delvoye* (Brussels 1982) 232–235.

costly articles of metal, but including a costly mantle—and omitting a *peplos*.¹⁰⁰ Two questions are forced upon us. Why is the *peplos* omitted? To what extent did the ordinary celebration each year correspond to this one?

Whatever is done with the *peplos*, it is surely a custom of the local women with which the Amphictyons do not venture to interfere. It will be the *peplos*, and little more, that constitutes the statue costume as a traditional concern, year by year. The festival name “Lotis,” contrasting with the Ionian “Plynteria,” is in favour of a contrasting custom for the *peplos*, not a washing but a replacement. So is the analogy with the nomenclature of Athena’s festival at Argos, λωτρά and λωτροχόοι, for at Argos the statue was transported bare to the washing; the *peplos* was not washed at the same time, and must have been replaced instead.¹⁰¹ Metal articles would not be replaced each year, but the Amphictyons in doing so at the quadrennial celebration take their cue from the *peplos*. Surely then a new *peplos* was woven and presented each year.

It is likewise in East Locris and at Delphi, and also in Boeotia, at Tanagra and Thebes, that we hear much—in literature, lexica, and inscriptions—of a distinctive cult of Athena ζωστηρία “cincher.”¹⁰² A cippus naming both Athena ζοστερία

¹⁰⁰ *CIDelph* I 10.26–31. The metal articles are each worth from 100 to 200 Aeginetan staters. The ἀμπέχονον “mantle” is worth 150, and comes first. Without remarking on the omitted *peplos* here, commentators adduce the Panathenaic *peplos*, and even suggest that the Amphictyons are inspired by Athenian practice. This reverses the flow of ideas. The festival Lotis is focussed on Athena’s statue and hence its costume. The Panathenaic festival has little or nothing to do with Athena’s statue, and the *peplos* has been adopted as a mere emblem.

¹⁰¹ At Argos Athena’s statue is transported in haste from the citadel to the Inachus at the moment when this so-called river is in spate, rushing from the hills full of mud and foliage (Callim. *Hymn.* 5.49–51). It is a bath suited only to Athena, accustomed to the sweat and grime of combat (5–12). The statue is bare-naked, for any man who sees it in the street will go blind, like Teiresias (51–54). It was of course in Boeotia that Teiresias intruded on Athena’s bath, and Callimachus enumerates several Boeotian cult-sites (60–64), doubtless evoking our custom of Central Greece.

¹⁰² Ernst Meyer, “Zosteria,” *RE* 10A (1972) 852–853, gives the evidence for Tanagra, Thebes, East Locris, and Delphi—and also for Cape Zoster in Attica. But here the place-name is primary, for this is a belt-shaped spit of land, and the principal cult and festival, Apollo *zôstêr* and his Zosteria, are heard of no-

and Athena *φαργάνε*, i.e. *erganê* "worker," comes from the sanctuary at Marmariá where the festival *Lotis* was conducted (at least this is the provenance which the French excavators retrospectively assign to it).¹⁰³ The cult epithet in the usual style describes the goddess as performing an action that typifies her worshippers: cinching the *peplos*.¹⁰⁴ The worshippers do so above all when they dress the cult statue with its *peplos*.

It was remarked above that the story of the first woman is an *aition* of Athena's worship. More exactly, it is an *aition* of these cults of Central Greece. Hesiod of Ascra made the story into literature, rehearsing it twice, at length, in his two great works.¹⁰⁵

where else. At some juncture, perhaps the one we are about to see, Athens was emboldened by the coincidence of names and laid hands on Athena *zôstêria* of Central Greece. *Contra*, Meyer 848–852.

¹⁰³ Another cippus from Athena's sanctuary is inscribed for Zeus *machaneus*, and at Tanagra he and Athena *zôstêria* are named together in a dedication. Elsewhere too this avatar of Zeus is found beside Athena, who has the like epithet *machanitis*. The festival **Μαχάνεια* falls in late autumn, as we see from the derivative month-names *Machaneios*, *Machaneus*; so the *μηχανή* for which the deities and the ritual are named is no doubt the olive-press. Olive oil as a domestic and personal commodity belongs to the same sphere as wool and weaving.

¹⁰⁴ Athena *zôstêria* is most often associated with the cinching or girding up of warriors, as by Meyer (*supra* n.102). So is Apollo *zôstêr*, a patent misconception. Pausanias is responsible, in his excursus on the cult of Athena *zôstêria* at Thebes (9.17.3). It evidently lay on the road to Chalcis, being attributed to Amphitryon when he made war on "Chalcodon and the Euboeans" in a campaign otherwise unknown. "So *zôsasthai* was how the ancients spoke of putting on armour," says Pausanias, and refers us to Homer, who uses this expression twice and also compares Agamemnon to Ares in respect of his *zônê* (apparently "waist"). Here is a Homeric *zêtêma*; a girding up of warriors is never actually described in Greek epic. Since Athena is above all a warrior goddess and patron of warriors, and since moreover the misinterpretation of epithets is a special branch of Greek theology, *zôstêria* could not be omitted from the discussion. As if Athena was worshipped for long ages because of a practice which had disappeared before Homer! As for Amphitryon, he is best known for his ideal bride, Alcmena (the bride also of another paragon, Rhadamanthys), ample reason for him to honour the goddess who "cinches" yet another bride, Pandora.

¹⁰⁵ *Theog.* 570–584, *Op.* 60–82. Hesiod in the *Theogony* tells us no more of man's origins than serves his purpose, to justify the rule of Zeus. He does not mention that man was moulded by Prometheus and so enjoyed at first the Golden Age under Cronus (in place of the Golden Age Hesiod gives us a catalogue of human ills as children of Night). When Zeus came to power, he spared Prometheus and called on him to regulate anew the intercourse between man and gods. On being flouted, Zeus arranged for the creation of woman, for the

Between the two versions almost the only line unchanged is ζῶσε δὲ καὶ κόσμησε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη. To be sure, Hesiod says much more about the adorning (with what and by whom); the details vary from one version to the other. Yet dressing with the *peplos* is foremost. The first time, the line quoted is extended by ἀργυρέῃ ἐσθῆτι—Athena both “cinched and adorned with white clothing.” The second time, he says that Zeus, in authorizing the creation of woman, told Athena ἔργα διδασκῆσαι, πολυδαίδαλον ἱστὸν ὑφαίνειν, “to teach her works, to weave the patterned web.” Both ἔργα and ζῶσε are key words, leading off their respective lines. The story looks to the cults of Athena ἐργάνη and ζωστηρία.

The traditional story which Hesiod inherited spoke only of Athena’s dressing the first woman with the *peplos*, and this cult myth was not discreditable but inspiring. As the women at the festival dressed Athena’s statue with the *peplos*, they remembered with a thrill woman’s first day on earth, when she was dressed by Athena. Hesiod while constructing a succession of divine regimes was bound to represent woman as a degradation of man’s lot, for man was happy under Cronus, as he is not under Zeus.¹⁰⁶

From the creation story the first woman passes into heroic genealogy, but still belongs to Central Greece. Pandora is mother of one or other of the flood survivors, Deucalion or Pyrrha, and hence the *capostipite* of all genealogy. The flood story, the casting of stones, the fire-bringing are all located on Parnassus or in the district of Opus in East Locris. The upper reaches of Greek

moulding by Hephaestus, and for the dressing and adorning by Athena. But whereas Prometheus was a god of potters, Hephaestus was a god of smiths, not quite suited to the role. Hesiod describes his moulding of woman in the language Homer uses for his fashioning of metal maidservants. By this means the cult myth of the first woman was adapted to Hesiod’s succession of regimes.

¹⁰⁶ That Hesiod invented the succession of regimes is plain from epic usage, in which Zeus alone is Κρονίων or Κρονίδης. And since Cronus is eponym of the festival Κρόνια, probably “*kernos* rites,” a byword for joyous revelry, his character in Hesiod is paradoxical. Cronus and Zeus as father and son represent not different regimes but rather the transition from the happy days of summer to the laborious agrarian cycle which occupies the rest of the year.

genealogy were extended as the Greek horizon widened, but in its original form Aeolus and Ion and Dorus as the principal eponyms were three sons of Deucalion (like the three sons of Noah), and the family was at home in Central Greece, the only area where the three great races live side by side.¹⁰⁷

The ceremony of presenting a new *peplos* and using it to dress Athena's statue was therefore common and conspicuous in Central Greece. It may well have occurred elsewhere. It did not stand out, however, so as to be remarked in literature. Much less was it made into a famous story. Another famous story, of how the priestess Auge was taken by Heracles as she washed the old *peplos*, shows that the custom of Arcadia was similar to Ionia's.¹⁰⁸ At Argos, as we saw, a new *peplos* was probably made available each time Athena's statue was bathed so drastically in the Inachus, for the old *peplos* was not washed as

¹⁰⁷ After the three races discovered their common identity through epic poetry, and the epic name Hellen was inserted between Deucalion and his sons, the homeland was shifted to Thessaly, which became a swarming hive of folk migrations.

¹⁰⁸ In Euripides' *Auge* Heracles took her "near a fountain" as she was "washing Athena's clothing": see L. Koenen, "Eine Hypothese zur Auge des Euripides und die tegeatische Plynterien," *ZPE* 4 (1969) 10–11, and W. Luppe, "Die Hypothese zu Euripides' 'Auge'," *ArchPF* 29 (1983) 22. The scene in Euripides is depicted in the Pompeian wall-paintings adduced by Koenen (12–14); cf. C. Bauchhenss-Thürdiedl, *LIMC* III (1986) s.v. "Auge" nos. 12–15. The story envisages the actual fountain near the excavated temple, shown on fig. 4 of M. E. Voyatzis, *The Early Sanctuary of Athena Alea at Tegea* (Göteborg 1990), at the end. In the paintings Auge has two companions, girls who help in the washing, perhaps in drawing water. The setting is similar in many respects to Athens' Plynteria, in which water was fetched from the fountain Clepsydra to the Caryatid temple, as indicated by discarded jars and both the Caryatids and an equivalent scene on an earlier temple: see Robertson (*supra* n.7) 33–36. Koenen and Luppe restore the festival in Euripides as πα[ννυχίδος, an all-night celebration which could be riotous; Koenen adds χο[ρῶν "choral dances," where Luppe does not intervene—he thinks of a tragic chorus or choruses, but they do not suit the context. Moses of Choren in his *Progymnasmata*, cited by Koenen (10), gives us both *pannychis* and dances, and also a ring for *anagnorisis*. Yet all these items surely come from some comic treatment of the story, though Moses is not mentioned by Kassel and Austin, *PCG* V 197–199 (Eubulus) or VII 376–377 (Philyllus), presumably because they trace the passage to Euripides (note however that they cite Luppe for the Hypothesis, and he dissociated Moses and Euripides). A feasible restoration of the Hypothesis might be ἡ δὲ τῆς πα[τρίας ἐορτῆς ἐν τῇ / 'Αλέαι παρα]στάσης χο[ρηγοῦσα, "as she ministers at the celebration of the customary festival in Alea."

well. But since the bathing was sudden and unpredictable, depending on a rain-storm, there cannot have been at the same time a stately presentation and a dressing ceremony.¹⁰⁹ If other Dorian custom differed from that of Argos, we do not hear of it. In any case, Boeotia is closest to Athens, and these neighbours were always aware of each other.

When and why did Athens adopt the custom? The earliest signs are the Praxiargidae decree as interpreted above—though the epigraphic date of 460–450 is only tentative—and the east frieze of the Parthenon, a building constructed in the years after 447, but conceived and planned before this. Among authorities on Athenian festivals, E. Pfuhl maintained that the offering of a *peplos* every fourth year was age-old. Deubner more reasonably linked it with the institution of the Great Panathenaea in the mid sixth century, and this is now the usual view.¹¹⁰ It is certainly possible that the custom was introduced in 566 B.C. or at any time in the next hundred years. In *ca* 506, for example, Athens inflicted a crushing defeat on Boeotia and set up a victory monument on the Acropolis; she could have adopted the *peplos* custom at the same time, invidiously. But there is no particular reason to suppose that Athens' custom is any earlier than the first, and striking, evidence. The Great Panathenaea as another venue for Panhellenic games did not straightway require any elaboration of Athena's worship.

The central scene on the Parthenon east frieze is more than a glancing allusion. It is the culminating ceremony, which doubtless took place nearby, whether in front of the temple or within.

¹⁰⁹The Argive festival is highly unusual in occurring not on an appointed day, but according to a weather change, rainfall that causes the Inachus to flow (Callim. *Hymn.* 5, as cited *supra* n.101). See Robertson, "Athena and Early Greek Society," in M. Dillon, ed., *Religion in the Ancient World: New Themes and Approaches* (Amsterdam 1996) 411, and (*supra* n.7) 50–51, erring however as to the season. The first such heavy rain could be expected only in late autumn, the time when the Palladium statue was tended; Callimachus consistently refers to "Pallas."

¹¹⁰E. Pfuhl, *De Atheniensium pompis sacris* (Berlin 1900) 8–9, 32; Deubner 30. Cf. e.g. Robertson, "The Origin of the Panathenaea," *RhM* N.S. 128 (1985) 288–290.

Throughout most of the frieze we see processioners bound for the Acropolis; they would have seen themselves as they approached the ceremony east of the temple or within. Within the temple, through the open door, they saw a *peplos* in use, or rather two of them, each a splendid prototype. The great statue of Athena Parthenos was dressed in a *peplos* all of gold, the costliest garment in the world. At the centre of the relief scene on the base, symmetrical with both the statue and the folding of the *peplos* on the frieze, was the figure of the first woman being dressed by Athena in a *peplos* which Athena herself had woven.¹¹¹

It is a question how many of the human figures on the east frieze are involved in the *peplos* ceremony. A man and a boy are

¹¹¹Plin. *HN* 36.19, Paus. 1.24.7. Pliny and Pausanias see the sculpture in the light of Hesiod, both calling it Πανδώρας γένεσις. But the "twenty" gods attending (so Pliny) show that the sculpture departed from Hesiod's authority; he reaches a maximum of eleven in his fuller account (*Op.* 60–82). The copy from the Library at Pergamum is faithful in all respects except in being reduced to one-third scale and truncated on either side, since the flanking elements of the statue (shield and column) were omitted: see F. Winter, *Altertümer von Pergamon* VII *Die Skulpturen* (Berlin 1908) I 38–46, and also "Zur Parthenonbasis," *Jdl* 22 (1907) 55–70. Both the original and the ten figures at Pergamum (only six survive) included a festive Apollo with his lyre, known from yet another copy, a Hellenistic relief on Rhodes: see W.-H. Schuchhardt, "Zur Basis der Athena Parthenos," in *Wandlungen. Studien zur antiken und neueren Kunst* E. Homann-Wedeking gewidmet (Waldsassen 1975) 125–126. This is much against the spirit of Hesiod's story. The first woman was shown as a smaller stiffly-standing figure, a virtual statue, receiving the attentions of Athena on one side and of a Charis or Hora on the other. Athenian vases that are closely contemporary (cited below) depict the same figure. The base and the vases are fully treated by Robertson, "Pandora and the Panathenaic *Peplos*," in M. B. Cosmopoulos, ed., *The Parthenon and Its Sculptures* (Cambridge 2004) 86–113. Two points should be mentioned here. First, the supposed Roman copies that are behind current notions of the scene, as in the models of the Royal Ontario Museum and the Nashville Parthenon, have been discredited, mainly by Schuchhardt. Second, the scene as reconstructed from the Pergamum copy does not lend itself to a purely symbolic interpretation of "Pandora" as either an inspiring or a monitory figure. O. Palagia, "Meaning and Narrative Techniques in Statue Bases of the Pheidian Circle," in N. K. Rutter and B. A. Sparkes, edd., *Word and Image in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh 2000) 60–62, thinks of the figure as "a benign goddess," citing *inter alia* the supposed worship of Pandora beside Athena; but there can be no real doubt that the correct reading in Philochorus *FGrHist* 328 F 10 is "Pandrosos" (Palagia mistakenly calls it an emendation).

folding up the *peplos*.¹¹² Next to them on the left is a woman receiving two girls with stools on their heads: by general consent the priestess of Athena and two servitors.¹¹³ On either side of these central figures the gods are seated, but who are the men

¹¹²The man is often identified as the Basileus, but for no good reason, as B. Nagy, "Athenian Officials on the Parthenon Frieze," *AJA* 96 (1992) 62, points out. For both man and boy M. Steinhart, "Die Darstellung der Praxiergidae im Ostfries des Parthenon," *AA* 1997, 475–478, thinks of the Praxiergidae, as indeed others have done, but here the objection is the same as with the Arrhephori (n.113 *infra*), i.e. that a *genos* seen or stated to be active in various ways is never associated with the Great Panathenaea. This is not an argument *e silentio*, but one squarely based on the obvious sources. Of the boy we know nothing. Perhaps the officiating magistrate was allowed to choose a young relative, a *pais amphithalês*, to help with just this task of folding the *peplos*, and perhaps to carry it and place it somewhere on the Acropolis. A boy ostentatiously assisting the effective action of an older man, his relative, has a parallel in the carrying of the *eirêsionê* at the Pyanopsia as documented by Hellenistic inscriptions: see Robertson, "The Ritual Background of the Erysichthon Story," *AJP* 105 (1984) 388–393. F. Brommer, *Der Parthenonfries* (Mainz 1977) 269–270, cites the *Confession* of St Cyprian (the magician of Antioch, not the bishop of Carthage) as showing that Athena's snake was fed by a ten-year-old boy, and others since have fastened on this rare testimony. Now the *Confession* assembles a dozen or so lurid pagan cults in which Cyprian, at certain stages from infancy to the age of fifteen, was supposedly "dedicated" or "initiated," so that he can now expose and denounce them. Two of these cults concern snakes, the creatures of Satan: there is the snake at Delphi, the subject of "dramaturgy" (cf. Plutarch on the festival Septeria), and Athena's snake on the Acropolis (cf. Herodotus). He comes to the one as an infant, to the other at the age of ten. Does this elucidate the Parthenon frieze?

¹¹³The only likely suggestion for the use of these stools is A. Furtwängler's, often echoed since, that goddesses will be invited to sit and dine at a table (already in place), just as gods at many festivals are invited to recline. See Deubner 31 n.14, though he appears to follow Matz instead in supposing that the *peplos* was somehow spread out on the stools. One stool is foremost, being Athena's; the other is for a companion goddess who was obvious at the time, either Aglauros as emblematic of the *peplos* or Pandrosos, well attested at the Panathenaea. The duties for which a priestess of Athena Polias is honoured *ca* 250 B.C. include τῆς τε κοσμήσεως τῆς τραπέζης, "the adorning of the table," a sure restoration (*IG* II² 776.12). Of the Acropolis festivals at which the priestess might adorn a table, none is likelier than the Panathenaea (she is praised for her performance throughout the year, including a subvention at either the Plynteria or the Callynteria in lines 18–20). Lycurgus in his speech *On the Priestess* mentioned ἡ τραπέζοφος (VI fr.20 Conomis), and the lexica, citing Ister *FGrHist* 334 F 9, explain that two "priestesses" called τραπέζω and κοσμή help the priestess of Athena in adorning a table. Since the priestess of Athena is spoken of in the inscription as acting alone, *trapezô* and *kosmô* are probably mere girls, to be equated with those of the frieze. Commentators on the frieze mostly speak of the two Arrhephori who with the priestess warp the *peplos*, but there is no reason why they should be asked to carry stools, and such references as we have to their ceremonial duties say nothing of the famous Panathenaic procession.

who stand on either side of the gods? They form a separate group between the gods and the processioners further out on either side, two files of girls headed by marshals. It has been argued lately that these are Athenian magistrates in charge of the Great Panathenaea and especially of the *peplos* ceremony—not the archons, as was first said, but rather the board of ten *Athlothetae*.¹¹⁴ When marshals and magistrates are rightly distinguished, there seem to be five magistrates to the left of the gods, and four to the right of them. The man folding the *peplos*, nearer to the four, is therefore another *Athlothetes*, perhaps more eminent than the others, as Pericles himself once was. If the argument is accepted, the *peplos* ceremony is emphasized more than ever.

Athena *erganê* was very likely adopted at the same time. She is first attested at Athens towards the end of the fifth century, and may be represented by a terracotta type of Athena wearing helmet and aegis, and holding distaff and spindle.¹¹⁵ Pausanias came to her on the north side of the Parthenon (1.24.3).¹¹⁶ Amid the forest of statues two fixed points which he mentions soon after Athena *erganê* are the monument of Conon and the cult-site of Ge, both to the north of the middle columns of the north colonnade. Though Pausanias' text is defective, Athena *erganê* appears to be "in the temple" together with a herm and a companion deity representing a worker's "zeal." In any case, she is

¹¹⁴I. D. Jenkins, "The Composition of the So-called Eponymous Heroes on the East Frieze of the Parthenon," *AJA* 89 (1985) 121–127, distinguishes the ten figures so as to include the man folding the *peplos* (slabs E 19–23, 34, 43–46), and makes them archons and secretary. Nagy (*supra* n.112: 55–69) argues convincingly for *Athlothetae*. J. Neils, *The Parthenon Frieze* (Cambridge 2001) 158–161, favours the more usual identification of slabs E 18–23 and 43–46 as Eponymous Heroes.

¹¹⁵Syracuse, Mus. Naz. = P. Demargne, *LIMC* II (1984) s.v. "Athena" 54. See A. Di Vita, "Atena Ergane in una terracotta dalla Sicilia ed il culto della dea in Atene," *ASAtene* 30–32 (1952–1954) 141–154.

¹¹⁶Ridgway (*supra* n.48) 138 correctly says of Pausanias, "as he moves along the north side of the Parthenon." But thereafter she seems to favour G. P. Stevens' location for Athena *erganê*, on the square foundation at the north end of the western steps. Any site west of the Parthenon was properly discounted by W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen*² (Munich 1931) 241–242 (and by Frazer before him).

the prime candidate for the *naiskos* and statue and altar recently detected in the middle of the north side of the Parthenon, between the colonnade and the cella wall.¹¹⁷ This small shrine was installed before the Parthenon itself was built, and has been taken as a pre-existing cult which the Parthenon was bound to respect.¹¹⁸ It would be extraordinary luck if a pre-existing cult were sited so conveniently for the plan of this great building. Surely it was part of the plan, and was set down in the years just before.

About the same time as the construction of the Parthenon, the Panathenaic program of events and the facilities were being enlarged. Plutarch says of Pericles that he supervised the building of the Odeium, and quotes Cratinus as mocking him for this, and tells how he passed a decree establishing the musical contests, and on being elected Athlothetes set the rules for competitors (*Per.* 13.9–11, with Cratinus fr.73 K.–A.). Pericles' innovations cannot be the whole story, since the musical contests are carried much further back by other evidence. Yet the Odeium itself, a remarkable building, sufficiently indicates an upsurge of interest. "Then and thereafter," says Plutarch, "they came to the Odeium to watch the musical contests."¹¹⁹ Pericles is associated too with the Parthenon and Athena Parthenos. His name is a rubric for all the intense sustained activity that transformed Athena's festival. It is natural to think that the *peplos* custom originates at this time.

¹¹⁷M. Korres, "The History of the Acropolis Monuments," in R. Economakis, ed., *Acropolis Restoration: The CCAM Interventions* (London 1994) 46, and "Die Athena-Tempel auf der Akropolis," in W. Hoepfner, ed., *Kult und Kultbauten auf der Akropolis* (Berlin 1997) 229–230.

¹¹⁸So Korres (*supra* n.117); Ridgway (*supra* n.48) 125, 136; Hurwit (*supra* n.7) 27, 142.

¹¹⁹M. C. Miller, *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century B.C.* (Cambridge 1997) 218–242, shows how remarkable the Odeium was. She argues further that it was built solely for display, without any function but to rival the grandeur of a Persian hypostyle hall, and that the very name "Odeium" is secondary, prompted perhaps by the acoustic properties of the pyramidal roof. It is true that other sources attest a variety of other uses, sometimes incidental. But Plutarch would not be so confident of its original use without some warrant in the contemporary sources on which he principally draws.

There is another reason to think so. The cult myth of Athena's dressing the first woman appears not only on the base of Athena Parthenos but on three Athenian vases that are just a little earlier, being dated stylistically to 470–460 or simply 460 B.C.¹²⁰ The first woman is the same iconic figure as on the base, smaller than Athena and other gods nearby, standing stiffly at the centre. Athena pins the shoulder of the woman's *peplos*, or holds up a wreath as further adornment. The vases like the base are meant to depict a dressing ceremony. The cult myth had suddenly caught the attention of Athenians.

Just as remarkably, the cult myth disappears forever from Athenian vase-painting after this brief series. And it is at once replaced by an equivalent cult myth, a local one. On a vase of *ca* 450, and on a later one from South Italy imitating an Athenian original, the first woman rises from the earth to greet her first male admirer, standing by with a mallet in his hand.¹²¹ He has broken up the clods in the field, like a farmer, and the object of his desire has emerged from the ground, like the grain. The first woman now conforms to Athenian ritual and belief.¹²² Not a

¹²⁰London, BM D 4 = *LIMC* I (1981) "Anesidora" 1 (E. Simon), a white-ground kylix by the Tarquinia Painter, 470–460 B.C., tondo, with captions Athena, "Anesidora," Hephaestus. London, BM E 789 = *LIMC* "Anesidora" 3, a fragment of a red-figure crocodile rhyton by the Sotades Painter, 460 B.C., showing the legs of Athena, Hephaestus, Pandora. London, BM E 467 = *LIMC* "Anesidora" 2, a red-figure kalix krater by the Niobid Painter, 460 B.C., showing Athena, Pandora, and other gods attending. Before this series, there is quite a different rendering on Berlin F 1837 = *LIMC* "Artemis" 1264 (L. Kahil), a black-figure neck-amphora by the Diosphos Painter, 520 B.C.: Zeus holds a small stiffly standing figure as Aphrodite and Hermes look on. The subject was identified as the creation of Pandora by T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth* (Baltimore 1993) 157–158; there is nothing to be said for earlier suggestions of the birth of Athena or of Artemis. The black-figure vase, unlike the later series, may be inspired solely by the Hesiodic story.

¹²¹Oxford, Ashm. Mus. G 275 = *LIMC* "Pandora" 4 (M. Oppermann), a volute krater related to the Group of Polygnotus, side A, 450 B.C. London, BM F 147 = *LIMC* "Pandora" 5, a South Italian amphora, Owl Pillar Group, 450–425 B.C.

¹²²The transformation of the story was certainly assisted, and probably suggested, by the Attic use of "Pandora" and "Anesidora" as cult titles of the goddess of the grain at harvest time. The use is illustrated, though without being expressly distinguished as Attic, by M. P. Nilsson, "Die eleusinischen Gottheiten," *ArchRW* 32 (1935) 138–139 = *Opuscula Selecta* II (Lund 1952) 620. Hipponax fr.104.47–49 West shows that it is Ionic too. Even in the original

few Athenian vases show an undoubted goddess, Ge or Persephone she might be, emerging from the earth with or without the help of mallets, a so-called *anodos*.¹²³

Thus the vase-paintings register two sharp changes of belief or attitude, *ca* 460 and *ca* 450 B.C., to adopt the schematic dates assigned to the vases. In *ca* 460 the cult myth of Central Greece was suddenly adopted and promoted. In *ca* 450 it was just as suddenly rejected. All the evidence we have examined—the Praxiergidae decree, the *naiskos* of Athena *erganê*, the Parthenon frieze, the base of Athena Parthenos, the vase-paintings—probably falls within a decade or two, close to the mid century.

The Athenians of the day were bent on empire, campaigning in Cyprus and Egypt, ready for Sicily and South Italy. At home, Central Greece was the target. From the battle of Oenophyta in 458 or 457 to the battle of Coroneia in 447 or 446 Athens controlled Boeotia, and set up governments of her choosing in each Boeotian city. In the early 440's she intervened at Delphi to support the Phocians. It is the very period and the very region that we have just marked off. After this Boeotia was lost, and Athens sought rather to dominate Ionia. Just as the Ionians were summoned to the Panathenaea, so the Boeotians must have been. The *peplos* custom and its charter story were meant for them. They were meant to show that Athens' worship of Athena was on behalf of Greeks at large.¹²⁴

February, 2004

1101-139 Clarence St.
Victoria, B.C.
Canada V8V 2J1
noelrobertson@shaw.ca

story, and even on perhaps the earliest of the vases, the white-ground kylix, the first woman is labelled "Anesidora" (*supra* n.120). Conversely, when the first woman rises from the earth, her admirer is Epimetheus.

¹²³R. Krumeich, N. Pechstein, and B. Seidensticker, *Das griechische Satyrspiel* (Darmstadt 1999) 378–380, give a brief account of these vases with an up-to-date bibliography.

¹²⁴I am grateful to the reader and to Kent Rigsby for comments and suggestions which have improved the paper.