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Foreword

In 1981 the J. Paul Getty Museum received as a gift a large lead tablet bearing a Greek inscription. The Curator of Antiquities asked the three scholars who are the authors of the present monograph to study and publish the inscription. They found the text difficult and in places impossible to read with certainty, but as they transcribed and interpreted the text they became aware of its critical importance for the history of Greek religion in the fifth century B.C.

The tablet has yielded specific information about its origins. The alphabet, dialect, the divinity Zeus Melilchos, and one of the two personal names mentioned (Myskos) all point to Selinous (modern Selinunte) in western Sicily. Just as there is no question about the significance of this tablet for Greek religion, there can be no doubt about its importance for further study and interpretation of the site of ancient Selinous. Recognizing this, and the fact that the Getty Museum does not exhibit material of primarily historical interest, we concluded that the piece would be better returned to Italy. The tablet was de-accessioned by the Museum in the fall of 1991, and on February 20, 1992, was donated to the Republic of Italy. After being exhibited in Rome, the piece will, we understand, be returned to Sicily.

J. Walsh, Director
J. Paul Getty Museum

June 29, 1992
Preface

THE TABLET from ancient Selinous (modern Selinunte) described in this monograph was first studied by Roy Kotansky while he was Research Fellow under Jiri Frel, at that time Curator of Antiquities at the J. Paul Getty Museum. David Jordan and, subsequently, Michael Jameson were invited to join in publishing the text. The task of transcribing and interpreting the inscription has required intensive effort and repeated examination of the tablet. Thanks to the skills of the conservation and photographic departments of the museum, the text has become much more legible than it was when we began our work. But we are very much aware that problems of reading and interpretation remain.

The tablet is the largest Greek text on lead known to us. The various reasons for attributing it to Selinous are set out in Chapter I.1. In fact it seems very likely that the text came from the area sacred to Zeus Meilichios adjacent to the larger sanctuary of the goddess Malophoros on the Gaggera hill outside the town of Selinous (see fig. 1 and Pl. 7a; for our use of the form "Meilichios" see the discussion in Chapter V.2). The date is approximately in the decade before 450 B.C.

The inscription will be of wide interest to students of ancient religion. It is exceptional in the detail it provides for rites of purification and the treatment of dangerous spirits. Except for incidental references in literature, it is the earliest evidence known on this subject. The tablet also provides evidence for a number of previously unattested words and linguistic forms (see Chapter II and the Commentary, Ch. I.4).

We offer a monograph rather than a bare text or an article because we have come to realize that an understanding of the tablet requires a considerable amount of information not easily available. For our interpretation of the text the reader may find it helpful to read Chapter III, "The Character of the Text," before consulting the detailed Commentary (Ch. I.4). A comprehensive discussion of the rituals (Ch. IV) and the supernatural figures (Ch. V) mentioned in the text seemed to us more useful than comments on them scattered throughout the detailed commentary. We also provide a survey of the history of Selinous (Ch. VI), with information about other lead tablets found there (Ch. VII) and the relevant archaeology (Ch. VIII). We have taken advantage of the presence of a number of small stone figures and other objects in the Getty Museum to publish examples of these in full for the first time in our discussion of "The Uninscribed Stones" (Ch. V.3).

From the end of the fifth century to its abandonment about a century and a half later, Selinous was mostly under the control of the Carthaginians. The Punic influence on the city and its cults both before and after
ca 430 is a complex matter that we examine in Ch. IX, together with a brief Punic inscription on a miniature stone altar in the Getty Museum, almost certainly from Selinous.

The expertise of the conservators and photographers of the J. Paul Getty Museum and the support and understanding of Dr Marion True, Curator of Antiquities, have been much appreciated. The editors of Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies have made it possible for our study to be published in an appropriate series. Amy Cohen and Susan Hirt of the Classics Department of Stanford University have helped us greatly in the preparation of the manuscript.

We have discussed the text and its problems with many scholars, both in seminars and through consultation with individuals. We are particularly grateful for the comments of Professors Jan Bremmer, Walter Burkert, Anna Morpurgo Davies, Laurent Dubois, Alan Henry, Henry Hoenigs- wald, Donald Laing, Robert Lambert, Olivier Masson, and Joseph Naveh. In the early stages of the study of the tablet, Dirk Obbink contributed significantly to the readings and interpretations. Professors Vincenzo Tusa and Margaret Miles have kindly shared their knowledge of the archaeology of Selinous with us. None of these scholars is, of course, accountable for what, in the end, we have included in or excluded from this study. That we do not attribute authorship to individual chapters indicates that the three of us have engaged in all aspects of the study.

Our citations of modern scholarship are by means of name and date, with full information given in the Bibliography at the end of the monograph, except for reference to a few standard corpora:

ICret  M. Guarducci, *Inscriptiones creticae* (Rome 1932–50)
IDél  *Inscriptions de Délos* (Paris 1926–72)
IG  *Inscriptiones graecae* (Berlin 1873–)
LSCG  ——, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris 1969)
LSSupp.  ——, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques, Supplément* (Paris 1962)
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A Lex Sacra from Selinous
I. The Tablet

1. Description and Provenance

The lead tablet carrying the inscription is the largest known to us: max. pr. H. 0.597 m., max. pr. W. 0.23 m., Th. 0.002 m. It is broken on all sides, with the result that for an estimate of its original size we must consider the text itself. The text is inscribed in two columns (A and B), written upside down to one another and separated by a bronze bar. Both columns have horizontal guide-lines, on average ca 0.008 m. apart, that were inscribed before the writing itself. For some reason, the guide-lines for Column A stop after eighteen lines of text, but there are six more lines of writing below, some of which stray considerably from the horizontal. Guide-lines, 22 in number, cover the full preserved height of Column B, but the text itself occupies only the upper 13. The rest of the column shows a few scattered and lightly incised, apparently casual, graffiti that run across guide-lines.

For neither column was there any attempt to keep a straight right-hand margin. It is likely that the piece of lead available for inscribing was irregular on the two short sides and that this accounts for the strange and, to the best of our knowledge, unparalleled procedure of writing the two adjacent columns upside down to each other (see frontispiece and Pl. 1a). In order to begin from a straight left-hand margin without sacrificing space on the right, two vertical lines were incised near the middle of the tablet to provide the left-hand margins for each of two columns, at the cost, to be sure, of having to turn the tablet 180° to read both columns. This explanation is supported by the following observations: no letters need to be supplied for the end of lines A10–16, but 10, and almost

1These are our own denominations, A being the column that we believe was inscribed first.
2The graffiti, which appear to have been made after the inscription of the guide-lines, are almost illegible, none consisting of more than a few letters. In all cases they run diagonally to the guide-lines:
   (a) at the left-hand end of space for B15–16, running diagonally upward: N (or H)N[N] (NAN);
   (b) beginning 0.03 m. from the bar, in the space for B17f, running diagonally upward: [IYCL]A (e.g. [IYCL])([/l]);
   (c) beginning 0.032 m. from the preserved right-hand edge of the tablet, in the space for B18–21, running diagonally upward, four irregularly spaced verticals (part of letters?) followed by A;
   (d) written upside down to Col. B, in the space for B22f, NAY[;]
   (e) 0.04 m. to the right of (d), a vertical followed at some distance by N if the lettering is in the same direction as Col. B; if it is upside down to B, then N followed by the vertical.
certainly 9, extend two letters to the right of the end of the writing in 11–16. Presumably the original margin of the lead was that much farther to the right at 9 and 10. By the time Column B was inscribed it was clear that the text would fit easily, and generous spaces were left at the ends of lines 5, 7, 9, and 12. We conclude that the original width of the inscribed part of the tablet was only slightly greater than that now preserved, and that the margins on the short sides were irregular.

As for the original height, a blank below A24 probably indicates the bottom of Column A. The sense of B1, which is adjacent to A24, is appropriate for the beginning of a set of instructions. We conclude that, unless there was an uninscribed margin, one of the two original horizontal edges would have been just slightly above B1 and below A24. Consideration of the bronze bar may help to estimate the location of the other horizontal edge, the one above Column A and below Column B (the frontispiece and Pt.). 1b show the bronze bar that once attached the tablet to a flat mount, perhaps a table or a board that could easily be turned. The bar has three nail-holes, one at its center and one at each end, spaced at equal intervals. The ends of the bar are not preserved well enough to show whether they are original. One end, however, is just below A24 and just above B1; because this is about where textual considerations would put the horizontal edge above Column B, we assume that this end of the bar is in fact original. If the other end is original, the original height of the tablet was only slightly greater than the preserved height, and Column A had no line of text above what is preserved. If, on the other hand, part of the bar has been lost at this end, if there was a nail-hole at its original (lost) end, and if the spacing of the nail-holes was regular, then there would have been room for at least twelve more lines at the top of Column A.

Each column has its own guide-lines, which must have been made before the bar (not shown in the folding plates 1 and 2) was attached, for they extend from beneath the bar. At the end of almost every line is a small, rather deeper mark, as if a pin had been held there, either for the attachment of a thread or for the positioning of a ruler that would have been used to make the lines straighter.

One can distinguish more than one hand. From the drawing it will be apparent that the letters of A1–3 have a more wayward look than those elsewhere on the tablet and in fact barely keep within the guide-lines. The writer corrects himself by inserting a C at the end of ἀρατὴνηςκόπια and in the next word, ἀρατὴνηςςέιν, he first omitted the aspirate but immediately corrected himself by superimposing an h over the second a and then proceeded correctly. The three lines that follow (4ff) are in rasura, and the few letters that are visible seem to be quite a bit smaller than those of 1ff and somewhat smaller than those of 7ff; but the appearance of smallness may be only a result of the erasure, which seems to have been made by smoothing the letters down into the lead. The letters are arguably also more orderly than those of 1–3, but in any case they do not occupy the whole space between the guide-lines as in 1–3, and in at least line 4 they are positioned somewhat like those of 7ff, closer to the upper than to the lower guide-line.

We assume provisionally two writers for A: Writer I for 1–3 and Writer II for 4–24, although it is not entirely clear, because of the erasure, whether 4–6 and 7–24 are both in fact Writer II's work. Writer II alone employs punctuation and he spells κατα(τ)ιτς (12) differently from Writer I (3). Column B, with rather larger and more confident letters, seems to be the work of still another writer, Writer III, whose spelling of words that contain a mute plus the semi-vowel r occasionally deviates from the normal (e.g. Β3 πορευθών for προ-, 5 περιτραγδόθον for περιστρ.). There is nothing to indicate how much time elapsed between the work of the three writers. In our interpretation of the text we have assumed that the subject matter of all three parts of the text is related. If they were intended to be read in a sequence, the reader would have begun at the top of Column A and continued through B13 after which there were at least nine lines left blank. Most probably this was also the order in which the two columns were written.

The unusual form of the inscription, a text in two columns that needed to be turned around for reading (unless the reader himself was expected to move around to the other side of, for instance, a table to which the tablet was affixed) distinguishes this tablet from most public inscriptions designed to be read by visitors to a sanctuary. It may have been kept in a closed structure and consulted only by those in need; the personal need of the performer of ritual is clear in Column B and may be inferred for Column A. Another possibility is that it was only a draft for a more monumental inscription for public display. Against this, however, is the absence of any laws or decrees on stone at Selinous (and their scarcity in Sicily in the Archaic and Classical periods). This form may have been the most permanent that local regulations ever received.

It is certain that the tablet originated in Selinous in southwestern Sicily. The alphabet used is that of Selinous, as shown by the distinctive, 'freak' beta in the form of a reversed Ν, which is known only from inscriptions of that city (cf. Jeffery 1961: 262). It can be seen at A14, B10, and possibly A3 and 24. The tablet also exhibits a unique form of S with

3 The tablet entered the Getty Museum glued to a wooden board, obviously not original, into which the nails of the bar had been driven.

4One will see the effect of this kind of erasure if one makes the experiment oneself with clay: inscribe a text, then smooth the clay out by rolling a bottle or some other cylinder over it, and the letters will appear smaller.

5One finds similar difficulties with γρ in a fifth-century lead curse tablet from Gela (A. P. Miller 1973: 189ff; Dubois 1989: no. 134; Β3 ἄποθεανος, 7 ἄποθεανος (but Β4, 10 ἄποθεανος, 14 γράϕαι).
the vertical hasta on the right rather than in the middle (e.g. the third letter of A16). The other letters are consistent with a Selinuntine origin as is the form of the West Greek dialect (see Ch. II).

The subject matter of the inscription also points to Selinous. Two of the sacrifices prescribed in Column A are to Zeus Meilichios, who is known to have had a cult at Selinous (Ch. V.2 and VIII). It seems likely that the tablet was found in the ruins of a structure in the part of the Gaggera hill that was sacred to Zeus Meilichios. The area included the Campo di Stele, where many uninscribed and a few inscribed stones of Zeus Meilichios were erected. The presence of a building of the Classical period or earlier is controversial (cf. Ch. VIII).

One of the sacrifices is to the Meilichios described as being ἐν Μῦσκῳ, "in the plot of Myskos" (A9). The name Myskos is attested only once, on an Archaic tombstone from Selinous (MP 76; Arena 1989: no. 16; Dubois 1989: no. 71; see the commentary on A9 in Ch. I.4). This early Myskos, we believe, is probably the man referred to on the tablet.
2. Diplomatic Transcript and Epigraphic Commentary

Column A

1: possibly the lower right-hand part of a loop open to the upper left: Θ or O.
2: a letter space with no visible trace, followed by a semicircle open on the left: Δ, Θ, O, or Φ.
3: lower left tip of A or N.
4: the vertical and perhaps the beginnings of the horizontals of E. Alternatively, O has been suggested, but the proposed traces seem too close to the preceding T.
5: after KA the top of the vertical, slanting to the left, is missing. The trace that follows is a vertical, curving slightly and continuing perhaps on the upper right, so that it could be interpreted as a relatively large O. An argument can also be made for Π, with the right-hand vertical unusually long.

The line is so damaged that we have not offered a restoration in the text. Reading Α after the H, Δε μαίνεσθαι τε δόθαι τε gives ingredients of a meal such as might be left behind—cf. κατάλεγοντος of the following line (for salt see also B4)—but the letters beginning with ΤΑ are unexplained and the lex sacra does not elsewhere use a series of objects or actions. Reading Ο after the H, we get δόθαι τε ἄλλα ἀλάτα ται which is written over a Π, the lower parts of which are still visible, while the angular upper part has been used for the top of the Τ. The last trace is a vertical, from whose top possibly the left end of a horizontal to the right, hence Π or E.

4: an isosceles: A, Α, M, or N.
6: a high brief diagonal descending to the right; from beneath its right-hand end a vertical descender, Π or T.
7: a semicircular letter opening to the right, Θ or O.
8: a vertical with an encrusted space at the right,
9: after the X here has, in addition to the usual vertical and the diagonal sloping to the right, another possible intersecting diagonal rising to the right. It is difficult to tell which strokes were inscribed first.
10: the spacing is wider than in the lines above and below.
11: the spacing is wider than in the lines above and below.
12: a single dot to the right of the Δ, but a second dot may have been lost in the crack below it.
13: traces of an earlier N beneath this N.
14: for discussion of the omitted A see Wachter 1991: 60, who includes this example.
15: trace of upper right, E.
1: O written twice, again as if a correction of a previous attempt.

16 1: Ξ here three diagonals sloping to the right, with possible traces of a vertical at the right-hand ends of the top and bottom diagonals (contrast full verticals in lines 19, 22).
3: 1 written twice.
3: a full vertical but for missing top: 1 or T.
4: upper part of letter slanting up to the right, For C.
17 1: the right-hand end of a high diagonal slanting down to the right, T, F, or E.
2: T written over E.
3: a semicircle open to the right: 0 or O.
18 1: OK written twice, each over another (cf. 13).
20 1: the single point may be accidental.
2, 3, 4: all these letters written twice.
21 1: I, seen before restoration of the tablet, is no longer visible.
2: the sequence KAOEMTEO yields no sense. Corrections or a second writing over a first draft, examples of which are found in both columns (e.g. at the beginning of A13), and insertions of letters have produced confusion. With no great confidence we suggest the following sequence: TONTE[ was written first. Then KA was written over the TO (but the O was not fully erased). Also the N was changed by adding a fourth stroke, which we at first took to be the creation of a Μ; but sense requires that it be read as IM, i.e., iota beta, the latter in the distinctive Selinuntine form of a reversed N. (Cf. the original writing of AI as one letter in B11, which was then corrected.) Finally O was added to follow the beta: KAI[O[...O], i.e., epsilon epsilon δε και βηλιν προς ιππαματον.
3: ΑΓΑΑΜΑΤΩΝ: first the writer wrote ΑΓΑΑΜ[Δ[ in. He corrected by writing the A over the T, a new A, and then over the N.
4: the right side of a delta (Δ), or possibly O or Θ.
5: possibly an upright stroke after the sigma.
Column B

1 [—2—]. ἈΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ[—α—].Π.Τ.[2–3 ἌΣΤΕΡΟΝΑΠΟΚΑ[ ]

1 Most of the top half is missing from this line which was probably the first line of this column and the beginning of a separate set of instructions. At the beginning of the line there is space for ατ’ κ’ or ατ’ τις, not ατ’ τις κας of B7. (Two slight traces would permit either Κ or ΙΩ.) The first, ατ’ κ’, fits more easily into the space, while Τις may be redundant with the following ἄνθρωπος.

1: the lower parts of all the letters of ἈΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ are clear.
2: trace of the upper right of a letter, perhaps of the short right vertical of a Π, followed by another, possibly circular letter, but now only a discoloration on the surface of the lead. The vertical whose top is lost that follows is most likely a Τ, to judge from its position. Finally, the left side of a letter, either circular or sloping left (e.g. Α). In the gap that follows, ΕΑ is a necessary restoration before which only a narrow letter such as τότα or σίγμα seems possible. In sum, the traces on either side of the probable Τ are very uncertain.
3: only the lower part of the verticals of Τ and Π are preserved.
4: a vertical, the left side of a Π, as the context shows.

It seems possible to end this line either with ἀπόκοιτος[θείρεσθαι], with [αι] at the beginning of the next line, or with all of ἀπόκοιτος[θείρεσθαι] on this line and [αι] beginning the next.

The restoration ατ’ τις ἄνθρωπος κας ιωτ’ ελήνου τούτου ἐλαστερίου (“If some man wishes to be purified from his elasteroi”) most easily suits the traces in the middle of the line, though not the beginning, but requires that the N of τοῦ be much compressed, perhaps impossibly so. Furthermore, from B9 no preposition is expected with ἀπόκοιτοςθείρεσθαι. Finally, the definite article in the plural is strange in view of what follows in Column B. It would be somewhat easier perhaps if modified, as in this alternative restoration: ατ’ κ’ ἄνθρωπος[θείρεσθαι] ατ’ τις [ἐλαστερίου ἀπόκοιτος[θείρεσθαι] ατ’ ιωτ’ (“If a man wishes to be purified from his elasteroi”), which also has the advantage of eliminating the N before ἐλαστερίου.

(A at the beginning ατ’ κ’ suits the space better, and τις, hardly necessary after ἄνθρωπος, is eliminated.)

A more radical solution is to place less credence in the uncertain traces on either side of the sure vertical near the middle of the line, probably Τ, and read ΤΑ (rather than ΟΤΟ) and restore: ατ’ κ’ ἄνθρωπος[θείρεσθαι] ατ’ τις [ἐλαστερίου ἀπόκοιτος[θείρεσθαι] ατ’ ιωτ’ (“If a man (who is an) autorrektas wishes to be purified of elasteroi,. . .”). Physically, the narrow sigma is more easily accommodated than a νω before ἐλαστερίου. In sense this restoration provides the antecedent for ‘Let him be purified in the same way as when an autorrektas is purified of an elasteros.” Without autorrektas in line 1 the anthrapos, unmodified, in any case has to be understood as an autorrektas. It would be a good deal easier to suppose that he was in fact so described when first mentioned. The interpretation of these lines is discussed infra, Commentary on B1–7.
3. Transcription and Translation of the Text

Column A

1. [.. ~..].AN[:AI]..[-----------------------------..]
2. [.. ~..].ΔΕΜΑ[,.].,ΤΕ ΧΑΛΑΣΤΕΡΑI..ΚΑΙΟ[----------..]
3. [.. ~..].Β[).].ΚΑΤΑΛΕΞΕ[,.].ΠΟΝΤΑΣ, καταχώρησε δὲ τὸς θισμεσιός: νακτ

4-6  Ρασώρα

7. τὸν ἱμαρὸν ἵα τὸν θυσία πρὸ θυσίας καὶ τὰς ἑσσερίας πένθις
8. δέται βοῦπερ ἱοκά ἵα Ὅλυμπνας ποτείες. τοῖς διὰ τῷ Εὔμενει ἔθει
καὶ...[~]
9. ταῖς: Εὐμενίδες: τέλεον, καὶ τά δί: τοῖς Μυλίσιοι τοῖς ἔν Μύσοι: τέλεον: τοῖς Τρ-
10. ἵππατρεῖσι: τοῖς: μιαροῖς βόσκερ τοῖς κρόσεσι, βοίνους ἦπολει-καὶ...[~]
11. ψας: δὲ ὑρόφος: καὶ τῶν μορίων: τῶν ἐνάτον: καταρα-
12. λείπον: καὶ τραπεζεῖαν καὶ πλίνθου κάθαρον κενθαρὸν ἥμη: καὶ σπει-
13. νος: ἐλαίωας καὶ μελίκρατα ἐν κανισάς ποτερίδας: καὶ...[~]
14. αὐτάμανοι κατακαίατο καὶ καταλαίατο τῶν ποτερίας ἐνθέντες.
15. θυσίαν: βοῦπερ τοῖς θεοῖς τὰ πατρίδα: τοῖς ἐν Εὐθυδάμῳ: Μυλίσιοι: τοῖς ἴπποι-
17. νος: κρεθέμεν καὶ θολέας καὶ τάς τὰς τραπέζες: καὶ ἀπάργατα καὶ τότεία κατα-
18. νος: τὸν: καὶ τὰς μεθαρέας: καὶ τάς τὰς τραπέζες: καὶ...[~]
19. νος: κρεθέμεν καὶ θολέας καὶ τάς τὰς τραπέζες: καὶ ἀπάργατα καὶ τότεία κατα-
20. νος: τὸν καὶ τὰς μεθαρέας: καὶ τάς τὰς τραπέζες: καὶ...[~]
21. νος: κρεθέμεν καὶ θολέας καὶ τάς τὰς τραπέζες: καὶ...[~]
22. νος: κρεθέμεν καὶ θολέας καὶ τάς τὰς τραπέζες: καὶ...[~]
23. θυσίαν: βοῦπερ καὶ προσχωρεῖ τὰς πατρίδια: Εὐκλ..[~]
24. [.. ~..].ΕΥΣΥΝΗ[-----------------------------..]

νακτ...[~]
1 [If a man] wishes to be purified from elasteroi, having made a proclamation from wherever he wishes and whenever in the year he wishes and on whatever day he wishes, having made the proclamation whithersoever (i.e., to whatever directions) he wishes, let him purify himself. [And on] receiving (him, i.e., the elasteros), let him give (water) to wash with and a meal and salt to this same one, and let him sacrifice a piglet to Zeus, let him go out from it, and let him turn around; and let him be addressed, and take food for himself and sleep wherever he wishes. If anyone wishes to purify himself, with respect to a foreign or ancestral one (sc. elasteros), either one that has been heard or one that has been seen, or anyone at all, let him purify himself in the same way as the autorrektas (homicide?) does when he is purified of an elasteros. Having sacrificed a full-grown (sheep) on the public altar, let him be pure. Having marked a boundary with salt and having performed aspersion with a golden (vessel), let him go away. Whenever one needs to sacrifice to the elasteros, sacrifice as to the immortals. But let him slaughter (the victim so that the blood flows) into the earth.
4. Commentary

Column A

A3: The members of the household (?) of the person who is the subject of these regulations are to perform the actual burning of the parts of the sacrificial victim placed on the altar, whereas some other persons (mentioned earlier in the sentence) are perhaps required to withdraw, leaving behind (κατατελεστηκα) certain other elements of the sacrifice. In discussing the reading of line 2 (supra 8) we noted the possibility, but also the difficulty, of reading δὲ μα[τας]ν τε βίλα τε as elements of a meal to be left behind.

κατατελεστηκα: Cf. A12 κατατελεστηκα. We take these to be the same word, κατατελεστηκα in literary prose, denoting the act of consecration by means of the sacrificial fire. Here the writer evidently first wrote κατε and then corrected it by superimposing an h on the second a. (It is interesting that he did not correct the τ to a θ.) In its second occurrence, at A12 (by Writer II, supra 5), as κατατελεστηκα, the τ is not corrected and the stem of the verb is rendered as αγ-, not αγ-. κατατελεστηκα has been discussed fully by Casabona (1966: 200-04; cf. Chantraine and Masson 1954: 98f). In Attic sacrificial texts it means, in practical terms, “make disappear entirely,” primarily but not exclusively by fire; in Herodotus fire seems always to be implied.

A second word, κατατελεστηκα, in the sense of “tear into pieces,” with the skin of the sacrificial victim as the object, has been read in the fourth-century lex sacra from Erchia (LSCG 18 Γ 11f, Δ 11f; Daux 1963: 603-34, discussion at 630). κατατελεστηκα is glossed κατατελεστηκα by the lexicographers (Hesychius, Suda, Photius s.v.) with reference to the tearing up of clothes that are dedicated. At Erchia both instances are in the active, as opposed to the middle at Selinous; and in both there is a direct object, δέμα, the skin of a she-goat sacrificed to Artemis.

At Erchia the same vacillation between αγ- and αγ- is seen as at Selinous in the two occurrences of the word. Daux regarded καταγ- as an error for καταγ- because he expected the aspirated καταγ- for a compound of αγιο in Attic, and he therefore took the prescriptions to mean that the skin of the sacrificial animal was to be torn up and made unusable, not that it was to be destroyed by fire. Sokolowski (LSCG 18, p. 43) preferred κατατελεστηκα in both places, comparing LSCG 151 D 16f (SIG 1027), κατατελεστηκα δεμα (Kos, fourth century, the sacrifice of a she-goat, as at Erchia but in this case to the Charites, and with an oath ceremony). Presumably Sokolowski regarded destruction by fire rather than tearing up to be the meaning both at Erchia and Kos.
At Selinous, no object is specified at A12, nor, at least in the present state of the text, at A3. Strictly, καταγιζόμεν (or καθο-) need not imply destruction by fire, though in practice cutting up the skin would no doubt facilitate burning it up (cf. Plut. Mor. 694a–b). Both considerations have fostered confusion between the two words. When referring to skin, the distinction of meaning may not have been very significant. Another element of uncertainty, concerning the aspirate, may have arisen from the variation in words of this root, ἄγος and ἀγός (cf. Casabona 1966: 197f).

The more general sense of καταγιζόμεν—"destroy completely," presumably in the sacrificial fire—seems in any case more likely at A12 than καταγιζόμεν, "tear up completely," for the skin is not mentioned. Conceivably the other word was used at A3, with the aspirate inserted in error, but it is more economical to assume that the same sense was intended in both places and that at A3 the i was written in error or as an accepted variant spelling, while at A12 the aspirate, omitted initially at A3, was omitted once again and this time no correction was made. Again, a variant spelling may be indicated. It is conceivable that not all the terms found in the text were in local use. δανάτοις at B3 elsewhere is poetic.

In A12 the verb καταγιζόμεν is given no specified object; it is preceded by the very general θυόντω θύμα; it would seem that the point of the sentence is to indicate who are to perform the ritual acts, namely ἄγος, "those to whom it is ritually permitted" (see further 32 infra). At A3 the actors are also specified: they are the ἄγος, members of the household, i.e., those in closest contact with the implied subjects of these regulations.

We should understand as the unexpressed object of the verb those items that customarily went into the fire—certain parts of the victim, often referred to in leges sacrae as τὰ ἱερά, together with any additional offerings (e.g. LSCG 135.75f, 81f [IG XII.3 285], τὰ ... ἐκ τοῦ ἱερικοῦ νεκρομένων [82 νεκρομένων] ἱερά; cf. Stengel 1910: 8, Casabona 1966: 13). At times the privilege or duty of performing the act of consecration, of putting the items in the fire, is distinguished from the performance of the sacrifice as a whole. Thus, at the Olympic games, the Eleans performed the customary sacrifice (θυόντων ... ὅποιο νομίζομεν), and τὰ ἱερά were laid on the altar; but it was the victor of the stade race that set fire to them, ἐμφύρισε τὰ ἱερά (Philost. Gymn. 5; cf. LSSupp. 44.16 [SIG 3 671 A] for a comparable practice at Delphi; we owe these examples to David Briney).

The text uses a term for burning, καταχαίης, at A11f, 16, 19f. How does καταγιζόμεν differ? At A11 καταχαίης refers to the destruction by fire of the one-ninth of the flesh of one victim (see on A11f), while in the other two cases it refers to the destruction of elements of the theoxenia. By contrast, καταγιζόμεν may be taken to refer to the indispensable burning of the usual parts, the ἱερά, of normal animal sacrifice in the altar fire. Burning in the fire was usually the only treatment for these. The more...
specific verb for burning is applied to items that were not necessarily and regularly burned.1

[1] \[\text{[b]ομοκεύως:} \text{[b]ομοκεύως is cited by Aristotle, Pol. 1.1252b14, from Charondas (law-giver of Katane, late sixth century?), and the plural (codd. \[\text{[b]ομοκεύτες,} \text{[b]ομοκεύτες] is glossed \[\text{[b]ομοκεύτες by Hesychius. Literally it should mean "those who share the same breadbasket," from \text{κατά, a word thought to be of Semitic origin (cf. Chantraine 1968–1980 s.v.). LSJ (following Hesych.) translate "messmate," and Bourriot (1976: 674) takes it to refer to members of a local group. But the context in Aristotle indicates rather "members of an oikos." Aristotle pairs the word with \text{[b]ιμάκοπτες (Philochorus, FGrHist 328 F35) and \[\text{[b]ιμάκτης (LSG 77C 25f [Buck 1955; no. 52.44f], Delphi, ca. 400]. The form with \text{-κώς} for Charondas’ \text{-κώς is new. A. M. Davies points out that Mycenaean \[\text{[b]ίς, borrowed from Semitic \text{[b]ίς (Ventris and Chadwick 1973: 540); cf. also \text{κατά, P. Cair. Zen. 59014.14 (III B.C.).}}\]

A7 \[\text{[b]αρόν \[b]α \[b]θυσία: As the text stands, the sentence (7f) beginning with these words has no main verb. We think of two possible explanations.}

(1) Lines 7f were inscribed after the erasure of lines 4ff, and what we read is exactly what was intended to be communicated. In this case we should think of the first four words as, in effect, a heading followed by two specifications as to the date. Both the phrase that constitutes the heading (\[b]αρόν \[b]α \[b]θυσία) and the attaching of dates to it in this fashion give us pause. While \[\text{[b]αρόν \[b]α \[b]θυσία is common enough in the sense of performing sacrifices (cf. Casabona 1966: 91), for \[b]αρόν \[b]α \[b]θυσία the only parallel we know is Plato, Resp. 394a, \[b]αρόν \[b]α \[b]θυσία, referring very generally to Chryses’ "performances of sacrifice" at IL 5.39f. A heading "The performances of sacrifices," referring to all the relevant sacrifices for the current year, suggests that they had been mentioned earlier and the time for them is now being prescribed. Some degree of

1In the \text{[b]ίς sacra more common than either of these words is \text{κατά, which also refers to destruction by fire of elements of the sacrifice: cf. LSG 525; 135.75f, 81f; 151 A 32f; 154 B 12; LSAM pp.49f. For further discussion of the rituals prescribed in the text, see Ch. IV infra.}

The \text{[b]αρόν \[b]α \[b]θυσία, "sacrifices of victims," would be a closer paraphrase of IL 1.40. Casabona’s view (1966: 15) that \[b]αρόν \[b]α in the plato refers to the parts burnt in the fire seems unlikely. For both Homer and Plato it is the pius act of sacrifice, not the burning of the particular parts, that is significant. To the best of our knowledge, only one example of \[b]αρόν \[b]α in the sense of "sacrificial victim" has been proposed, in a small fragment of the Athenian sacrificial calendar of ca 400 (LSL pp. 10 B 8, cf. 5). In the present inscription \text{[b]αρόν \[b]α \[b]θυσία is used for "victim" (B10).}

(2) An alternative explanation for the absence of a main verb would be that it was originally inscribed in lines 4ff, just possibly at the very end of line 6, where the lead is damaged, but more likely as part of the text that was rejected and erased. In this case we should suppose that the loss of the verb was overlooked, or that the sense was thought to be adequate, or that the inscriber of lines 7f had intended to re-inscribe the necessary words before line 7 but had failed to do so. It should be noted that erasure of three full lines would have been much easier than selective erasure made in order to preserve the syntax of the sentence. If the verb is supposed to have been erased, then other words in this sentence are also likely to be missing before line 7 (traces at line 4 in the rasura seem to show that \[b]αρόν \[b]α had been mentioned there, though quite possibly in another sentence). It would then no longer be necessary to take \[b]αρόν \[b]α \[b]θυσία directly with \[b]α \[b]θυσία. The original sentence might then have had the general sense: "Let the sacrifice [with regard to] the \[b]αρόν \[b]α be made before the Kotyta, etc." Furthermore, the \[b]αρόν \[b]α may well have been qualified by an adjective (e.g. "purificatory"), or the word itself may be adjectival, qualifying a noun ("the sacred X").

So far, we have assumed that some version of the phrase \[b]αρόν \[b]α \[b]θυσία is preserved here. But we should also consider A18, where, after a reference to sacrifice in the following year, \[b]αρόν \[b]α \[b]θυσία the only parallel we know is Plato, Resp. 394a, \[b]αρόν \[b]α \[b]θυσία, referring very generally to Chryses’ "performances of sacrifice" at IL 5.39f. A heading "The performances of sacrifices," referring to all the relevant sacrifices for the current year, suggests that they had been mentioned earlier and the time for them is now being prescribed. Some degree of
of the Chthonioi Theoi are in the possession of a private person, Telines the ancestor of Gelon. One can see how such objects were used in a number of instances where the term hiera does not in fact occur, though it would be thoroughly appropriate. Thus the xoana of the Twelve Gods are present at the theoxenia in the festival of Zeus at Magnesia on the Maiandros, where there is also the sacrifice of a bull (LSAM 32.41f [SIG 5 859]; on theoxenia, see IV.3 infra). On Chios the phratry of the Klytiada had ierain kovna or patera that they voted to remove from private houses and to keep in a communal oikos built for the purpose (LSAM 118 [SIG 5 987]). Because the Chian ierain are described as sitting (katheteta, line 26), it has been supposed reasonably that they are images. They are also clearly movable, for hitherto they have been kept in private houses and brought out as needed. At Chaironeia the scepter of Agamemnon, referred to as to dorn, "the spear," was honored with daily sacrifices in the house of a man serving as priest for the year, "and a table is set out beside it (paraxestat) full of all sorts of meats and cakes" (Paus. 9.40.1f). The panoply of Ajax was laid on a couch (klyndin) for the hero by the Athenians (the tribe Aiantis?). 

The sacrifices in the house of a man serving as priest for the year, "and a table is set out beside it (paraxestat) full of all sorts of meats and cakes" (Paus. 9.40.1f). The panoply of Ajax was laid on a couch (klyndin) for the hero by the Athenians (the tribe Aiantis?).

With reference to sacred objects or images, ierain kovna (ierain, "take out") or ierain tropo (ierain, "put forward") would refer to the placement of such objects as part of the ceremony. Images would be particularly appropriate to the entertaining of the gods in theoxenia, mentioned immediately thereafter (A18f; cf. 14–16). If this explanation is correct, the individual concerned is told that he may make use of the public images for his rites of theoxenia.

Can this same sense of ierain be attributed to the word in line 7? That would certainly be possible if a clause referring to them began in the erased lines and concluded with tov ierain at the beginning of 7, e.g. "[Let] the sacrifice [be performed ... with respect to] the sacred objects, before the Kottya, etc." If it is thought that lines 7f are complete, we have to posit "The sacrifice (or the ceremony) of the ierain (i.e., of the Images)," which is without parallel but understandable.

One might suppose that the Meilichios stones (discussed in 98–102 infra) were the ierain, and that up to A18 we have regulations for ritual concerning stones belonging to individuals or groups that was to be performed at various places, while in lines 18–20 the reference is to sacred stones belonging to the whole community. It is equally possible, however, that the public ierain are used throughout, until sacrifice is performed at home (A20f). But it must be admitted that the stones dated to the sixth and fifth centuries are not easily portable, unlike the small images of the fourth century and later (103–05 infra). Perhaps in the sixth and fifth centuries the objects used by the groups and by the state were made of wood, with stone versions only occasionally set up to stay permanently in the plots belonging to groups. In Athens, herms set up in front of private houses may have been more frequently of wood than of stone (Jameson 1990: 194).

The suggestions put forward above are offered with no great confidence. While it is attractive to suppose that ierain is used in the same sense at both points in the text, the word is protean, and it cannot be excluded that it is used in a different sense in the two passages.

Exechyssus s.v. Kottya mentions that Eupolis, through hatred of the Corinthians, represented Kottya as φυτοῦν τῶν δαιμονίων, from which it appears that she was also known at Corinth (cf. the Suda s.v. Kottyc, a daimon honored by the Corinthians who presides over shameful rites). There is, in fact, a separate group of references to Kottya or to her festival, which has no apparent connection with Thrace or the Thracian goddess aside from Eupolis’ purportedly malicious association of the two. Kotto (sic) and her sister Eurythems are daughters of Timandreus and honored by the Herakleidaei for helping them when they arrived in the Peloponnesos (Σ. θεοκ. 1d. 640); in Σ. Πινδ. Of. 12.56b Timandreus has four daughters: Hellotis, Eurytione, Chryse, and Kottya. This scholium and others on this line tell of Hellotis, sometimes with Eurytione, taking the youngest sister Chryse into the temple of Athena for refuge and being burned to death either by setting fire to the building themselves or because the Dorians did so. The conquerors, after suffering failure of crops, institute purificatory rites (κοιμήσεις), known as the Hellotia, for Athena Hellotis. Whether or not Kottya had a place in these rites, she was evidently included in the stories that provided their aition.3

That Kottya was known to Sicilian Dorians as well as to the Corinthians appears from a number of references. The scholiast b on Theoc. 6.40 gives the school of Hippocrates, a Sicilian historian of the fourth century (PGH 568 6), as his source. The knowledgeable rag Kottytarist in the Thrace connections.

3 Herbert (1986: 34f) identifies the god in whose honor torch races were run at Corinth with Artemis-Bendis, partly on the basis of Kottya’s presence and her supposed Thracian connections.
Theocritus’ poem has what is presumably a Sicilian name derived from Kotto/Kotyo (cf. Anth. Pal. 11.72).

Explicitly Sicilian is the following description of the festival in the paroemimetric corpus: ἄρσαγα Ὀκτυτίους. Οἴκητα ἐπὶ τὴν εἰς Σικελίαν, ἐν ἑνὶ περὶ τὸν κλάδου ἐξάπτωντες, πόρνας καὶ ψυκόδρια ἐπέτρεπτόν ἄρσαγας. ([Plut.] Proverb. Alex. 1.78–Leutsch and Schneidewin 1839–51: 1 333; the lemma only in the Athos codex, 3.112, Miller 1868: 86f; Crusiús 1892: 282). “Snatching at [?] the Kotyttia. Kotytta is a Sicilian festival in which they fastened cakes and nuts to branches and allowed people to grab them.” Two other Sicilian allusions may well relate in some way to this festival but the connections are not certain and they do not add anything of significance to our knowledge of the cult.

Scholars have generally tried to reconstruct a single cult of Kotyo, originating in Thrace and spreading to Athens, Corinth, and Sicily. (Srebny 1836: 424 tried to exclude Athens but the presence of Alkibiades in Eupolis’ Baptist makes that improbable: cf. Kassel-Austin 1986: V 331f). It has long been realized that the transmission to the Peloponnesos must have been early if it was carried as an agrarian cult by Dorian settlers to Sicily (Müller 1825: 427; Crusiús 1892: 284). The present inscription shows that by the mid-fifth century the Kotyttia was a major

4(a) Lobeck (1829: 1031f) and Crusiús (1892: 282ff), followed by Nilsson (1906: 432) and Srebny (1936: 434), attached a gloss in Hesychius to the same festival: δραχμά̔ς ἐν Σικελίαν (θῆ) ἔργον ... εἰς οἱ γενετοὶ εὐθές ξηρανοῦν 86th καὶ δραχμὰς ἐκδίπλωμεν (cf. the less obviously relevant gloss in Étym. Mag. s.v. Δραχμάς [286.33 Gaisford]: ἡ λέξις Σικελία, εμπήκον ἐς τοὺς κατ' ἄρσαγας τῶν ὄφελίμων τῆς ἔλας τῶν ἁγιασμένων καὶ ἀρσαγότων ... ἕκτος Ερωτεύσθης κυβάδαν) [κυβάδας οὖσαν]. (Srebny) καλεῖ, παρὰ ὅν τὸ δραχμαῖον. εἰς τὸ διογενενὸν ἑρων ἐς δραχμὰς ερμηνεύει κυβάδας. There seems to be a reference here to farmers offering first-fruits (ἐφήδας) and other such gifts as they are brought in. But the festival was the Kotyttia. Rites in which offerings were snatched or stolen were widespread (e.g. Nilsson 1906: 197). The cakes and nuts of the Kotyytia are not necessarily nor most basically offered with the offerings vowed by farmers.

(b) A phrase used by Callimachus (fr. 201 Pfeiffer), ἄρσαγα Κοννίδα, probably derives from a comedy of the Syracusan Epicharmos, the Harpagai (fr. 81 Austin 1973:52), via the Sicilian historian Timaeus (FGrHist 566–148). An explanation of the phrase is given by Zenobius, following Timaeus (Leutsch and Schneidewin 1839–51: 1.31, 2.77 in the Athos codex, Miller 1868) and the Dieresi to Callimachus (9.12–24, Pfeiffer 1949: 1 94f), which explicitly corrects the name Κοννίδα (Κινν. in Zenobius) to Κοννίδα (which happens to be the name of Theseus’ παράγωγος, who was honored by the Athenians with a ram on the day before the Theseia: see Plut. Thes. 4). A metric pindy, by name Κοννίδας, grew wealthy at Selinous and declared that his property would go to Aphrodite and to his friends (Zen.: to Aphrodite only). On his death his will was found to say ἄρσαγα Κοννίδα, “grab the (goods) of Κοννίδας.” The people grabbed his goods and his girls (or, “coming out of the theater, they grabbed to Κοννίδα,” according to the Dieresi). An allusion to the practice at the Kotyttia, and perhaps specifically the Selinuntine festival in view of the pindy’s place of business, seems likely. Were girls, as well as cakes and nuts, at risk in this festival? Before the discovery of the Dieresi the phrase had been discussed by Lobeck (1829: 1031f), among others, but most fully by Crusiús (1892: 284f), who offered an Epicharmian trimeter: ἄρσαγα Κοννίτιος, ἄρσαγα τό Κυννίδον (or rather Κοννίδος). Cf. also Kabel 1899: I.1 131 no. 231.

and no doubt complex festival in Selinous. This can hardly be the result of the rapid spread of the cult ridiculed in Athens later in the century by Eupolis. Schwenk (1922) suggested that a Greek cult was identified with the Thracian, once the latter had become popular. We would go further and say that there is nothing to link the Sicilian with the Thracian cult other than the polymorphous name of a goddess, and that probably only Eupolis identified the Corinthian with the Thracian figure. We should associate with the Selinuntine cult only the elements specifically attributed to Sicily—the carrying of branches laden with cakes and nuts and the snatching at them—and possibly some of the elements indicated for Corinth, such as the purificatory rites for Athena Hellotis. Orgiastic or indecent performances, transvestism, or immersion in water (this last unlikely also for the Athenian version of the Thracian cult; cf. Parker 1983: 306 n. 125) have no evident place in the Peloponnesian and Sicilian cults, although none of them are inconceivable in Greek rural cults. There was no doubt, a connection between the Corinthian daimon and the figure that lies behind the Selinuntine festival, but there is little that we can say about it.

If it is granted that the Sicilian and Peloponnesian cult need not have a Thracian origin, other possible connections can be explored. For Archaic Corinth a Near Eastern source is not out of the question (cf. Maass 1903, who stresses oriental influence; Will 1955, skeptical; and Williams 1986, with a balanced view on the cult of Aphrodite). The branch seems to be an essential feature of the Sicilian festival. The basic Semitic triconsonantal roots QṬ and QṬ mean “to cut, pluck; harvest” in Aramaic and post-Biblical Hebrew (Jastrow 1967: 1345, 1351, s.v.). The Biblical Hebrew equivalent is QṬ, “to cut off, break off, pluck off (twigs, etc.).” (Brown et al. 1952: 882 s.v., with cognates in other Semitic languages).

The Selinuntine custom of decking out a branch with cakes and nuts has been compared to the Attic eiresione and the korythale, also known elsewhere in Greece, and to the German Malbaun, which are regarded as conveying fertility and bringing good luck (Deubner 1932: 198–201; Blech 1982: 278–81). In Athens the branch was fastened annually to the doors of private houses, a practice that Deubner took to be more fundamental than the attachment to the doors of the temple of Apollo. The eiresione has also been seen as an instrument of purification. We do not know what was done with the branches at Selinous but it is plausible that they too were taken to private houses and renewed annually. If there was also an element of purification in the practice, as is suggested by the Corinthian Hellotia, we can interpret the Kotyttia as an annual rite that addressed the community’s concern for purification and fertility before which the more specific purifications of the present text were to be performed by individual families and other gentilitial groups. For common purifications for women before the Thesmophoria, τοὺς ἀναμνηὼς τοὺς πρὸ τῶν Θεοπο- ρούν, cf. LSAM 16.19f, Gambreion, third century, concerned mostly with the engagement of women in funerary rites.
The use of πρὸ to indicate the date of a sacrifice is seen in the calendar of the deme of Marathon, part of that of the Marathonian Tetrapolis (LSG 20 [IG II 2 1358]). Every year sacrifices of an ox or cow to a deity whose name is lost, perhaps Demeter, and a ewe to Kourotrophos are to be made before the Mysteries, presumably the Great Mysteries at Eleusis (B 20). Two other ceremonies are dated as πρὸ Κισιποῦ, that is before the Skira on the twelfth of the month Skirophorion (Deubner 1932: 40–50); annually a male sheep is to be sacrificed to the local hero Hyttenios and a piglet to Kourotrophos (B 30); and every other year the hero Galios (otherwise unknown) receives a ram, and the Tritopatres are honored with a τραπέζα (cf. IV.3 infra). Prott (1896: 50) understood the first example at least to mean “on the day before the Mysteries,” for some sacrifices are explicitly dated as coming on the day before a larger festival (cf. Plut. Ther. 4). In the present text, however, πρὸ applies not only to the Kotytia but also to the Olympic truce (ἐξερησία), which is not likely to have begun on the day of the Kotytia and occurs, in any case, only every fourth year. Here πρὸ must refer to a period “some time before the Kotytia and the Olympic truce.” Such leeway in the timing of a ritual is consistent with the private initiative that the groups and individuals concerned would have been expected to take. The community’s interest is presumably in having the rituals completed before major events in its religious calendar.

As for the time of year at which the Kotytia festival was celebrated, the eiresione in Athens was used in the Pyanopsia festival in the autumn, and, though sometimes described as a harvest festival, it comes well after most Athenian crops other than olives would have been harvested. It may also have been used at the Thargelia, another festival of Apollo, in early summer close in time to harvest and with a strong purificatory element (cf. Deubner 1932: 179–98, who, however, rejects the use of the eiresione claimed by Σ Ar. Plut. 1064; Apollo Pythios was the god of both festivals: cf. Stanley 1961). If the Kotytia were held at roughly the same time of year as the Olympic truce (see below), i.e., in mid-summer, the grain harvest would already have been over. Nor do cakes and nuts point unequivocally to harvest time. It may be that rather than coinciding with a significant moment in the agricultural year the ceremony is to be seen as an annual renewal before which the μισσαματα of the present text are to be cleared away.5

5 It may be more than a coincidence that the three Marathonian sacrifices mentioned above were to take place before the Mysteries and before the Skira. The Suda, s.v. ἄρκα σπαθοῦ, says that the fleeces of victims sacrificed to Zeus Meilichios and Zeus Ktesios were kept, addressed as Zeus, and used by the dispatchers of the procession of the Skirophorion, by the Daidouchos at Eleusis, and by certain others who for purifications laid the fleeces under the feet of the polluted persons (cf. IV.2 infra, Attica s.v.). Thus there seems to have been a concern for purification at the Skira as well as at the Great Mysteries, some time before which the sacrifices to Zeus Meilichios and Zeus Ktesios would have been performed and fleeces produced for use in the later festivals. A mutilated scholium to Ar.
should not be ruled out (cf. Ch. VI). If the Myskos of the gravestone is the same as the man whose "plot" is implied in the lex sacra, his cult of Melichios had a long history. Even if our Myskos is only a descendant of the seventh-century person, his line has clearly maintained its prominence for almost two centuries.

A9f: On the Tritopatores, see V.4 infra.

A10 τοῖς μιαροῖς: The first reference to the Tritopatores is followed by the qualification "the polluted"; they are to receive ritual "as to the heroes." After that ritual has been prescribed, they are referred to as "the pure" (A13 καθαροῖς) and are to receive sacrifice "as to the gods" (A17).

How are we to understand the distinction, and how can supernatural figures, classed to some degree with gods, be polluted? Sacrilege and especially contact with death was thought to pollute the sanctuaries and images of the gods, although in Classical Athens there was some reluctance to suppose that the gods could be affected in this way by the actions of humans (Parker 1983: 144-49). For less serious violations purification was possible, and failure to purify was dangerous for those who had brought the pollution upon the gods. The persons engaged in the rites prescribed in this text are likely, therefore, to have been the very ones who have caused the pollution. The first set of rites effect the necessary purification and thereafter the Tritopatores are deemed pure and receive sacrifice and theoxenia as gods.

What actions might have produced a state of impurity for the Tritopatores? Since the procedures described in this text may apparently begin in any year, the polluting actions may also occur at any time. Conceivably impermissible entrance into the precinct of the Tritopatores could cause pollution requiring purification (cf. the case of Oidipous and the sanctuary of the Eumenides at Kolonos, Soph. OC 466-92; a small precinct in the Kerameikos of Athens was declared abaton, 107 infra). So too might the presence of a dead body in their precinct (cf. Parker 1983: 32ff), or the performance of an impermissible sacrifice (cf. LSSupp. 115 A.26-31). But here there is no reference to the purification of a precinct or shrine, unless the libation of wine through the roof (A11) has this function. A more serious objection to such an explanation is that the rites for the Tritopatores are here embedded in a series involving other figures and possibly continuing for a second year (and even perhaps a third), when some of the rites were performed "at home" (A26).

An alternative interpretation would be that there were two types of Tritopatores, those who were permanently miasmai and dangerous and those who, by contrast, were always katharoi. Both the language of the text and the lack of good parallels for such a situation lead us to favor the view offered in the Commentary. However, we note that a permanent state of religious danger is perhaps to be seen in the lex sacra of Kyrene (LSSupp. 115 §6; the passage is discussed at 100 n.35 infra).
The most probable source of the pollution, in our view, would have been contact with death for those attached to the cult of the Tritopatores. We know that the closer kin of the deceased were more affected by the pollution of death than the more distantly related or the unrelated (cf. LSCG 97 A.25-29 [STG 387]; Parker 1983: 39ff). It is conceivable, therefore, that such ancestral spirits as the Tritopatores could have been contaminated by a death involving members of that group. Natural death within the kin group to which they are attached might of itself have this effect, but it seems more likely that a violent death, especially homicide between group members, would require sacrifices to the Eumenides and to Zeus, in three guises, as well as to the Tritopatores. It is only the Tritopatores who must be converted from a polluted to a pure state, perhaps because they are, so to speak, members of the family of the individuals engaged in the violence. (The uncertainty whether the Tritopatores referred to here are of the community as a whole or of particular gentilitial groups, though we incline to the latter, is discussed in Ch. V.4).

Homicide, we believe, is also what stirs the elasteros of Column B, but in this case the spirit is associated with the victim, not the killer (cf. Ch. IV).

A11: Libations of wine were to be poured δι’ ὀρφον, “through the roof,” for the impure Tritopatores, and subsequently the pure Tritopatores were to be libated through honey mixture. The use of the same unusual verb ἴναλβία for b, i.e., kinds of libation suggests that the same process occurred in the same place (see 70ff infra).

What was the structure through whose roof the libations were poured? One would suppose that it was low enough for easy access to the roof. A likely parallel may be seen at Paestum—Posidonia in Italy in the sunken late Archaic structure that has become known as the Hypoagonia (Pt. 18a). It is small (3.85 m. by 3.55 m.), built of limestone blocks, and has a low-pitched tiled roof that rises from ground level. It has no entrance. When excavated, it was found to contain the remains of a bed, eight bronze vessels filled with honey, and an Attic black-figure amphora of ca. 510. A potsherds bore a dedication “To the Nymph,” which may be translated rather as “The Bride,” referring to Hera. The chamber is thought to have been covered with a mound of earth, and there is no indication of an opening in the roof (Kron 1971: 117-48 at 147f; compare it with abata such as the grove of the Eumenides at Kolonos [Soph. OC 37, etc.] and the precinct of the Tritopatores in the Kerameikos at Athens [167 infra]: Sæflund 1981, however, sees the chamber at Paestum as a thalamos for a hieros game). A structure of similar type, however, that was meant to receive regular tendance might well have had one tile in the roofing system covering an opening or skylight (cf. Wikander 1983, who lists four such tiles from three Sicilian sites, nos. 15ff). Unfortunately, little or nothing is known of the architecture of the Melichios precinct at Selinous in the late Archaic and early Classical periods.

As for the practice, Pausanias (10.4.10) describes how the Phokians poured the blood of victims through a hole into the grave of a hero archegetes at Tronis (τοῦ μὲν αἵματος διὰ ὅσις ἐκκεκίνησαν ἐκ τοῦ τάφου). The pouring of liquid offerings at the grave of either heroic or ordinary mortals is widely attested (cf. Frazer 1898: V 227ff; for the Near East cf. Pope 1977, 1981). Passages or tubes and vessels broken at the bottom are found set over graves of Protogeometric through Sub-geometric date in Attica and a few other areas (Andronikos 1968: 94-97). Thereafter the examples are isolated, and a clear picture does not emerge. The practice has not been reported from Selinous. In the case of the Tritopatores at Selinous the model is more likely to have been the cult of Tritopatores than ritual for the ordinary dead.7

A11f τῶν μοῦρον τῶν ἐνάκτων κατακάλυψιν μίαν, “of the ninth parts burn one”; Two other possible interpretations would be τῶν μοῦρον τῶν ἐνάκτων, “burn the ninth part, (just) one” (cf. LSCG 51.113-15, the Iobakchoi inscription from Athens, second century AD: τίθετο τῶν τῶν Καταγοιγών σκινδήν στιβάδι πίνων), and τῶν μοῦρον τῶν ἐνάκτων, “of the parts, burn the ninth part, (just) one.” The interpretation we have adopted seems the most likely: the impure Tritopatores do not receive a victim of their own. Any sacrificial parts must come from the two preceding sacrifices, at which each victim could have provided a ninth part. One ninth part of the two possible ninth parts is specified for the Tritopatores.

μοῦρα and μηῖς are the standard terms for portions of the meat distributed to the worshippers at a sacrifice (e.g. Arist. Or. 48.27; Pollux 6.55; LSSupp. 129.6, where, as often, the reference is to double portions, since it is the exceptional, larger, share that is cause for mention in the inscriptions). The procedure of offering ninth parts, for which the verb is ἐνακτεῖν, is known from Mykonos and Thasos. On Mykonos it is prescribed for a yearling victim to Semele (τῶν ἐνακτεῖται, LSCG 96.23f [STG 1024]), On Thasos it is prohibited in the cult of Herakles Thasios (οἰὸς ἐνακτεῖται, LSSupp. 63.4f [SEG 2.505, IG XII Suppl. 414]; Picard 1923: 243) but is apparently prescribed for a different cult of Herakles (ἐνακτεῖται, IG XII Suppl. 353; Launey 1937: 398, 406 and 1944: 94, 127). Stengel (1910: 132) explained the practice as the offering of a ninth part of

7 Cf. Oeconomus 1921; Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 206, 241. Garland (1985: 114) writes of clay piping inserted into the ground as feeding-tubes “in some cases” and goes on to say that they are “comparatively rare in Athenian graves of the Classical period.” But at 169 he notes only a single example of clay piping, whose purpose is not clear, out of 150 Attic periodoi. Coersen 1991: 94ff gives examples of funnels bored into funery niches of Roman date in Byzania, with discussion of earlier material.
the flesh of the victim and compared the verb δεκατέυεται, the “chthonic” associations of the number nine, and the giving of a seventh part (of the cooked food, however) to Hermes and the Nymphs at Od. 14.434ff.18

The present passage shows that the ninth part was burnt in the sacrificial fire, not set on the sacred table as a perquisite for religious officials, as had seemed possible (LSSupp. p. 121). Even if one does not endorse fully Stengel’s category of the chthonic, it is fair to say that this burning of a sizeable fraction of the victim, in contrast to the trivial destruction in normal sacrifice, shifts the sacrifice towards holocaust and other powerful and expressive rituals. The clearest examples we have of this practice are from the cult of Herakles, as were the Thasian uses of ἐναπατεύειν cited above; his ambivalent status as both hero and god was noted in antiquity (e.g. Hdt. 2.44.5). At Sikyon, the thigh bones were burnt on the altar some of the meat was eaten and some burnt as to a hero, ὥσ ήρω ... ἐναπατεύειν, Paus. 2.10.1; cf. LSAM 42 B 2f.

It is noteworthy that the practice of ἐναπατεύειν, known from the Kyklades (Mykonos and presumably Paros, the mother city of Thasos) and the northern Aegean (Thasos), is found in Dorian Selinous. The Parian cult of Zeus Elasteros is another possible link with the Kyklades (cf. 116 infra). These connections suggest either that people from the Kyklades joined the original Megarian settlers of Megara Hyblaea who founded Selinous, or that the Megarians shared in a religious κοινε of the central and western Aegean, as could be argued from the presence of the Tritopatares in Attica, Troizen, and presumably Thera (because of their place in Kyrene).

A12 θύμα: Discussed by Casabona 1966: 146–54. Here and in A18, 22 it must refer to the sacrifice of an animal. The word is common in Doric inscriptions but found only in verse in Attic.

καταγιζόντα ὅσιο ὡσιοία: κατα(γ)ίζεται has been discussed above on A3, where we also suggested that ὅσιο ὡσιοία, “those to whom it is permitted by religion” or “to whom there is no religious obstacle,” refers to the persons who place the parts to be burnt on the fire. The alternative, “consecrate to those to whom it is permitted” (cf. ὡς ὁμοίον διὰ τῆς ἡμέρας, Kleidemos FGrHist 323 F14), is to be rejected because the figures who receive the ritual (the pure Tritopatares) have been specified and also because A3 shows that it is the subject of the verb κατα(γ)ίζεται that is significant. For the noun ὅσιο cf. LSSupp. 115 A 21–25; Jeannaire 1945; Parker 1983: 336–39. For the more common neuter adjective ὅσιον referring to persons who may or may not sacrifice, cf. e.g. Hdt. 6.81 and LSAM 16.25f.

A12f περιράποντες: Aspersion, i.e., sprinkling with a liquid, usually water, is a common purificatory act in Greek ritual, often embedded routinely in complex ceremonies. At B11 aspersion with gold, i.e., sprinkling water from a golden vessel, is prescribed. At A12f we take the unexpressed object of the active verb to be either the place or the images or symbols of the Tritopatares: “having sprinkled (them) anoint (them).”

Various compounds of the verb ἐπικάλεσθαι are used in cult regulations. περιράποντες here suggests sprinkling around in a circle so as to purify all that is enclosed, or sprinkling all around the person who is performing the rite. περιράποντα, sometimes used in conjunction with καταθήκη and the phrase ἅπα χρυσήν μακρῶς προσπεράτως, occurs repeatedly in regulations for purification of cult personnel and cult places on Kos (LSGC 154 B 15, etc.). There the sprinkling is to be of water from a golden vessel and of seeds. τιθηράπονται is used for aspersion of a house with saltwater (θάλασσα) after a death, LSC 97 A 14–18 (SIG1 1218, Keos). The force of διακόνω is evidently that the sprinkling should be done throughout the house.

ἀπορραπονομαται is used of sprinkling saltwater by a priest who sacrifices to Athena Machan on Kos (LSGC 151 B 23f [SIG1 1026]). The middle voice probably indicates that he purifies himself, but it is not clear precisely at what point and from what. ἀπορραπονομαται is used of the final act of the series in Column B of the present inscription, where it certainly seems to refer to the individual concerned to purify himself. The dative χρυσοί at B11 has the same sense as the Koan phrase with the genitive: he is to use a golden vessel. For this last cf. Eur. I 1216, Ion 146; the Pythagorean rule, ἐν λεγρ ἐν τί ἄκουσέν αύτι γένηται, δὴ χρυσόν ἄκουσέν καταθήκη περιράπονται, lambi. Vit. Pyth. 153; and the fragmentary lines from Menander, Theophoroumene, ἴπτα το χρυσίῳ [...] ἀκουστῇ ἐπέει (p.146 Sandbach).

A13 καταλείποντα, also at A16: Cf. Hesychius ἔλεγεν, ἔλεγεν η ἔλεγεν καταλείποντα. The verb ἔλεγεν is also attested for Cyprus and Epidauros (Chantraine 1968–80: s.v.). For the compound, Photius gives καταλείποντα: καταλείπω (without accents) which editors have emended to κατα- λειπόντα: καταλείπω, and the MSS of Hesychius give καταλείποντα καταλείποντα, glossed καταλείπω, Dubs and Masson refer us to Cypriot ἐναλαλωμένος from *ἐνάλωο (Masson 1983: no. 217.26 and p.243). The word appears to be equivalent to καταλείπω, with the sense of “smear, daub, or anoint.” Most of the uses of ἔλεγεν and its compounds refer to anointing the body with oil or daubing an altar or a roof with plaster or pitch (e.g. LSCG 39.24f [IG II1 659, SIG1 375]; see LSJ s.v.).

18In a detailed discussion, however, Bergquist 1973: 70–80 denies that the verb has any reference to the flesh of sacrifice.
To arrive at the meaning of the word in a ritual context we should consider the object that might be daubed or anointed. (Despite the δρόμος of A11, the non-ritual καταταλάκτη of maintenance work on an αυτό ον Delos, IDelos 290.27, is clearly irrelevant.) In the first use of καταταλάκτη in this text it is joined with aspersion (A121 περιπλάναντες) after a sacrifice and the burning of parts (καταταλάκτη). In the second it is to be performed after the burning up of "first-fruits" and "putting the seats," perhaps on the altar (A15f). In both cases the object of the anointing could be the altar on which the burning has taken place.

Oil for the altar is referred to in LSCG 55.10f (SIG 1042, Attica, second century A.D.), and Lucian (Conc. Deor. 12) speaks of the oracular use of "every stone and every altar that has oil poured over it, a crown of statues with the anointing of oil and purifying of what lies before the statues (τα προ των αγαλμάτων) and with the aspersion (παίνης) of the temples' surroundings. This suggests that anointing could be seen as a purificatory action. In Athens in the early third century B.C. preparations for the procession of Aphrodithe Pandemos required the provision of a dove for the purification, κάθωροι, of her shrine, the περιπλάνα των αυτών, the application of pitch (probably to the doors, cf. IG II' 1672.17f), the washing of "the seats," ἐν, presumably the seats of the statues (LSCG 39. 24f). The anointing of the altars in this case is very likely purificatory. In the fifth-century Attic lex sacra from Paiania anointing (καταταλάκτη) is probably required of a sanctuary official, but the lines are damaged and we do not know what the object of the anointing was (IG I' 250 B.36 [LSsupp. 18A]).

The meaning of "anointing of sacred stones, some of which were conceived of as representations of the supernatural, and of other aniconic sacred objects is mentioned more often than the anointing of altars (e.g. Mayer 1917: 35ff, 48). Theophrastus's Superstitious Man poured oil on the smooth stones at crossroads and knelt down to worship them (Char. 16.5). There are also Herstia (Hom. Hymn. 24.3) and the jar representing Zeus Ktesios in the household (Antilcides ap. Ath. 473C). Perhaps the most famous stone was that at Delphi, said to have been the stone that Kronos swallowed when it was substituted for the infant Zeus: Paus. 10.24.6, "a stone of no great size. They pour oil upon it every day and at every festival they put white wool on it" (cf. the discussion by Frazer 1898: V 354).

The aniconic or partly iconic objects were important for the cults associated with Zeus Meilichios at Selinous (with supra on A13 cf. 98-102 infra). Two references in our text has to anointing might well apply to these sacred objects, symbols perhaps of the Tritopatore, rather than to the altar on which their sacrifices were made, although the immediate context in A13 and 16 would seem to favor the altar.

Other common ritual type of anointing should be mentioned: the anointing of the worshipper before he engages in ritual (cf. Mayer 1917: 50-54). This might be suggested here by the use of the middle voice, but nothing else in these lines points to an act that bears primarily on the actors.


A 13, 15, μελάρτα: See 72 infra.

A14ff: The rite of the theoxenia prescribed in these lines is discussed in Ch. IV.3.


The requirement that fresh cups should be furnished for a rite occurs three times in the mid-fourth-century cult calendar of Kos (LSCG 151 A-C [SIG 1025-27]). In the first instance (A.60f) τοις κύλεκες χυτίνοις are to be given on the occasion of a sacrifice of two sheep (one a full-grown male, the other a pregnant ewe) to Demeter, after which there is to be no carrying away of meat. In the second instance (B.25f) the occasion is the sacrifice of a heifer or a full-grown ewe (in alternate years) to Athena Machanis. The priest sacrifices and sprinkles (ἐπορευέται) with sea water. No meat is to be carried away. The goddess is to be given four measures (κύλεκες) of oil, a measure (τετράτομα) of wine, two new jugs (πρόχοτα) and three kylikes (κύλικες). (It is possible that these are described as ὀφθαλμού, "unburnt," i.e., not deposited in the sacrificial fire, but the reading is not certain; see Sokolowski, LSCG p.259). In the last instance (C.6), accompanying the sacrifice of a full-grown sheep by each of the three tribes of Kos (the names of the recipients are not preserved), there are to be given a measure (ὀφθαλμού) of barley groats, a measure (μῆλον) of each of two grains (wheat and barley), and three kylikes and a tray (κυλίκας). These are provided by the officials known as Πρωτοκολοῦ, who perform the sacrifices.

In the last example, and possibly in the second, the offerings in addition to the sacrifice referred to as τετράτομα, a common term for the extra offerings that are sometimes specifically required to be supplied by the priest (e.g. LSCG 151 A 45ff; 136.73f, 81ff; cf. Dow and Hesley 1965: 24).
Since the other items listed (grain, oil, and wine) were perishable and were presumably consumed in the sacrificial fire (or, less probably, by the participants), it seems that the new vessels specified were also ephemeral, not permanent additions to the equipment of a sanctuary. Unlike the cups at Selinous there is no indication in any of the three instances on Kos that they were used in a rite of theoxenia (cf. 67-70 infra). It is possible, however, that the common practice of offering food (grain, oil, or wine) in addition to sacrificing an animal was equivalent to setting food out on tables in theoxenia.

A similar concern for fresh vessels may be alluded to in the description of the offering of sacred cakes and milk in pottery vessels (ἐγκυρείς κηρύμελα) for the Eumenides (Σ. Aeschin. 1.188). Cf. if the θηλυκοῦσαι on the last day of the Eleusinian Mysteries when the contents of a κρεβός κηρύμελον were emptied into a chasm (Ath. 496a-b, quoting Eur. fr. 592 Nauck). By contrast, metal vessels, being the costliest available, would presumably be used repeatedly. The requirement that the vessels used for the Eumenides be of pottery may imply that they are new, but there may be other symbolic connotations for the use of ceramic containers.10

κρατεῖν τις κρατικοῦ is unparalleled and unexpected. Elsewhere in Doric ἀριστ the aorist is used, and it remains uncontracted or goes to ἐκτείνεσκον, ἐκτείνομαι (falysoς), κρατεῖ in Sophron fr. 25 Kaibel and Theoc. 1.6. In Megarian, from which Selinuntine derives, κρατεῖ is attested at Ar. Ach. 795. See Buck 1955: 39.

A16, 19f, κατακατακατοντο, κατακακάκατον: The aorist in κατακακάκατον has been found only in epic, as H. M. Hoenigswald points out.

A16f: ὡοντο πόλεις τοὺς θεοὺς τὸ πάτρια τα we take to be a new sentence that refers back to the ὡοντο of A13 and defines the mode of sacrifice. πάτρια ἐνθέντος then goes with the preceding sentence. It seems improbable that ὡοντο, etc., at the beginning of A17 refers forward to the sacrifice to Meilichios ἐν Εὐθυδώμῳ. "As to the gods" is in contrast to the "as to the heroes" of A10, of the rites for the impure Tritopatores, whereas "as to the gods" is the obvious mode for Zeus Meilichios.

A17: πάτρια here and in A22 corresponds to the much more common πάτρια in the phrase κατ' τὰ πάτρια referring to the traditional, ancestral manner in which cult matters, especially sacrifice, were conducted, e.g. Ath. 659f, τὰ λαόν κατ' τὰ πάτρια κα' τά τρόπον θεοῦ, but the connotation of specific ancestors that has been detected in πατρία in contrast to the more general πάτρια (Benveniste 1973: 220f) may be intended here.

10For pottery vessels probably made in the sanctuary of Hera on Samos and designed for use solely in cult meals there, see Κρον 1988: 144-47.
That the sacrificer is not required but given the right to sacrifice the following year may be connected with whether or not he enters into the procedure "this year." If he does so he must perform the ritual described in A7–18. His need may be such that he wishes to continue in the following year and perhaps even in a third year (A23), though that might be a required rather than an optional action. It seems that the need or desire to enter into these procedures is something the individual or the individual and his group determine. The authorizing the rules shows what must be done if they choose to do so and grants the right to continue in the following year.

The language of Column B is different. There too it is up to the individual to decide whether he wants to engage in the ritual (B1, 7), but once he does, all the instructions are delivered by means of imperatives. The implications of these optional provisions will be considered in Ch. III. By analogy with rules for commemorative rites for the dead elsewhere, it may be that the possibility of performing certain sacrifices under certain circumstances is being guaranteed because others have been explicitly prohibited by the city.

καλέω [διόνυσιν λέει: The control of the privilege of participating in sacrifices was an important social instrument. There could be exclusion of foreigners (cf. LSCG 96.26 [SIG3 1024]) and of males (as at the Thesmophoria) or females (e.g. LSSupp. 88). The effect was to demonstrate and underline the particular character of the group performing the sacrifice—thus the exclusion of foreigners just cited is from a sacrifice on Mykonos to Zeus Chthonios and Demeter Chthonia "on behalf of the crops." It was evidently important to identify the worshippers as the local people of Mykonos. The head of a family sacrificing to Zeus Ktesios in his own courtyard excluded slaves and free persons who were not kin (Isaeus 8.16; cf. Antiph. 1.16ff, where the invitation is a mark of esteem for a good friend). Seen in this light the explicit permission to invite "whomever he wishes" may indicate that the ceremony is to provide an opportunity for the sacrificer to re-integrate himself and his gentilitial group into the community by securing the participation of people outside his own group. Had outsiders been prohibited up to this time?

καλέω [διόνυσιν λέει: The control of the privilege of participating in sacrifices was an important social instrument. There could be exclusion of foreigners (cf. LSCG 96.26 [SIG3 1024]) and of males (as at the Thesmophoria) or females (e.g. LSSupp. 88). The effect was to demonstrate and underline the particular character of the group performing the sacrifice—thus the exclusion of foreigners just cited is from a sacrifice on Mykonos to Zeus Chthonios and Demeter Chthonia "on behalf of the crops." It was evidently important to identify the worshippers as the local people of Mykonos. The head of a family sacrificing to Zeus Ktesios in his own courtyard excluded slaves and free persons who were not kin (Isaeus 8.16; cf. Antiph. 1.16ff, where the invitation is a mark of esteem for a good friend). Seen in this light the explicit permission to invite "whomever he wishes" may indicate that the ceremony is to provide an opportunity for the sacrificer to re-integrate himself and his gentilitial group into the community by securing the participation of people outside his own group. Had outsiders been prohibited up to this time?

καλέω [διόνυσιν λέει: The control of the privilege of participating in sacrifices was an important social instrument. There could be exclusion of foreigners (cf. LSCG 96.26 [SIG3 1024]) and of males (as at the Thesmophoria) or females (e.g. LSSupp. 88). The effect was to demonstrate and underline the particular character of the group performing the sacrifice—thus the exclusion of foreigners just cited is from a sacrifice on Mykonos to Zeus Chthonios and Demeter Chthonia "on behalf of the crops." It was evidently important to identify the worshippers as the local people of Mykonos. The head of a family sacrificing to Zeus Ktesios in his own courtyard excluded slaves and free persons who were not kin (Isaeus 8.16; cf. Antiph. 1.16ff, where the invitation is a mark of esteem for a good friend). Seen in this light the explicit permission to invite "whomever he wishes" may indicate that the ceremony is to provide an opportunity for the sacrificer to re-integrate himself and his gentilitial group into the community by securing the participation of people outside his own group. Had outsiders been prohibited up to this time?
home." Before Solon's legislation, oxen were at least sometimes sacrificed at funerals, for he is said to have prohibited the practice (Plut. Sol. 21.5, ἐναπέλτην ... βοῦν).

The restoration πρὸδεύεται seems inescapable; the omikron is not elided, and in prepositional phrases with an adversative force articles are omitted more often than usual. Cf. Smyth 1920: §1128, Kühner and Gerth 1898: I 605. In the present text there is no article with ὅπως (though one appears with the following ἐξεχείρησα, A7) or in the phrase δι' ὅροφο (A11).

For the requirement that the victim be slaughtered near the statue of the figure being honored, cf. LSSupp. 61.75f (IG XII.7 515): εφασάτωσαν ... πρὸς [τῷ] ἠνάλυτητα.

A21f: The beginning of the sentence can be restored in several ways, e.g. τούτου ὁ θύμα or τῷ θύμα. Perhaps an alternative is offered to the expressional οὐ, e.g. ἐ σφαίρα ὀλλο ὁ θύμα, but the slight traces on the lead by no means guarantee the verb.

A22 προχόρης: We take the word to be equivalent to ἐγχωρῆσα and ἐπιχωρήσα, "allow, permit."

A23: The problems of the reading are discussed supra 11.

Column B

B1-7: A comparison is made in B8f with another procedure, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ... ἄδεινε... That other procedure we take to be the one described in B2-7. It is identified at B9 as the one used by ὁ αὐτορρέκτος (κεφαλαρέκτας) when he is purified from an elasteros, ἐλαστέρον ἀποκοθάρεται. A version of this same phrase is seen in the second half of B1, ἐλαστέρον ἀποκοθάρεται but this first time with the elasteroi in the plural.

The subject of the sentence should be an autorektas, whether or not explicitly so described. The possible restorations are discussed supra 12 and in the general interpretation in Ch. III.

On the distinctive figure of the elasteros, first seen in this inscription, see the discussion in Ch. V.6. We understand it to be the angry spirit that haunts the killer on behalf of the victim, not the ghost of the victim himself. The αὐτορρέκτας we take to be the killer (see on B9).

B2f describe the circumstances of a public pronouncement made by the subject; i.e., the killer, after which he proceeds to purification.

προσεκύνων and B3 ποιεῖται: The word is used for the proclamation made by the kin of a murdered man in the Agora of Athens ([Dem.] 43.57), from which it is restored to the text of the late fifth-century republication of Drakon's homicide law (IG Π 104 [Meiggs and Lewis 1988: no. 86.20]; cf. Ath. Pol. 57.2); for public declarations at Gortyn see I Cret IV 72 (Buck 1955: no. 117 II 28 and XI 506). But it is also used of the proclamation made to the avenging spirit (the ἱερέως ἑαυτός) in the Kyrene lex sacra (LSSupp. 115 B 31 and 33 [SEG 9.72, Buck 1955: no. 115]). The explicit freedom of time, place, and even direction in the Selinean notice suggests that it is intended not for a human but for a supernatural auditor.

The freedom of time of year is in sharp contrast to A7f, where it is said that the ritual must be performed before the Kotyria and the Olympic truce. The rites in A concern the community as a whole and must be completed before the time of a communal or Panhellenic festival. Column B is evidently solely the concern of the individual (all finite verbs are in the singular). Whether he undertakes the purification and when are entirely up to him.

B3: ὅπως is found twice in this line and in both instances can be understood as ὅπως, "where" or "wherever." This may be supported by the fact that the writer first omitted the final N of the first προσέκυνων and wrote ὅπως (= ὅπωςι), but in rewriting this part of the line changed to ὅπως, which suggests that the two words had roughly the same meaning. But the coexistence of West Greek ὅπως (B6) with Attic-Ionic ὅπως is surprising. The first ὅπως should perhaps be understood as ὅπως-ὁπόθεν, (cf. Megarian ἅπαθεν, Ar. Ach. 754; Buck 1955: 103), which would refer then to the source of the proclamation, while the last phrase in this series, repeating προσεκύνων near the end of B3, refers to the direction in which the proclamation is made (ὅπως). Although the ὅπως that follows τὸ ἔκτος cannot have the sense of ὅπως ἑαυτός, the alternative ὅπως, sc. "wherever in the year," is redundant with "whatever month." This ὅπως may therefore be a mistake for ὅπως ἑαυτό, as in the phrase that follows. If so, the translation would be "in whatever year he wishes." If no error is assumed, the coexistence of ὅπως and ὅπως may indicate that the sources of these instructions are not entirely local, a possibility on which we comment in Ch. III.

B3f: The practice of this inscription is to employ asyndeton at the beginning of a set of prescriptions (cf. A7f, A8, A17, A20bis, B7, B9, B11, and B12). If the subject of δοτό at B4 is the same as that of καθαρέσθω at B3, the text should continue without a connective, although there may have been room for a κατ. On the identity of the subject of ἦν ὁ ἁπάθεως see 56 n.2 infra.

ἀποδέχεσαι (as well as the simplex ἀποδέχαται) is a common term for receiving and providing hospitality to a ξένος. The ξένος may be a suppliant seeking protection or purification (e.g. Apollod. Bibl. 1.9.1). The word is used at Kyrene of entertaining a ἱερέως ἑαυτός, a spirit sent against the person who protects himself by performing the appropriate ritual (LSSupp. 115 B 36f, ὅπως ἐδέχεσαν πορτιθεὶς τοῦ μέρους πάντων).
The hospitality consists of providing three items: water with which to wash, a meal, and salt. The verb ἀνουσίον, in the middle, is washing to be done by the guest. In the Odyssey, water with which to wash precedes setting out food for the entertainment of a visitor (cf. Od. 4.52-59, 17.91-95, and Aren 1933: 68-72, 124 on the relevant Homeric type-scenes). Cf. the washing of themselves by the purifiers in the Exegetikon, as opposed to the washing, in the active, of the polluted man done by their leader: FGrHist 352 F 1 (quoted 74 n.12 infra); cf. also LSSupp. 115 A 30 (Kyrene): the man who has removed all trace of inappropriate animals sacrificed on an altar must wash himself.

B4: ἀνουσίον is defined in the lexica as "to take breakfast"; cf. Ath. 11C on the dipping of bread into unmixed wine as the origin of the word. But here it would seem to refer simply to a meal, perhaps consisting of bread and wine rather than the meat that follows sacrifice. The offering of a meal is a familiar means of exorcising a bewitchment. The best-known examples are the meals for Hekate (cf. Ar. Plut. 594-97 with Σ), Sophron of Syracuse, possibly in a mime entitled "The women who claim that they are driving out the goddess," described a meal for the goddess and preparations involving salt, laurel, a puppy, asphalt, and a torch (Page 1940: 328; Gow 1952: I1 34; Parker 1983: 222f; for the offering of a meal in a magical context, cf. Preisendanz and Henrichs 1973: I 64-91; Bezi 1985: 5).

The most relevant parallel is the reception of the ἱερός ἐπαντές at Kyrene (LSSupp. 115 B 36f), where we have had occasion to cite frequently. For the Assyrian food offerings to ghosts, see Scullard 1988: 41-44.

bάκαν: Salt had cathartic functions (cf. Eitrem 1915: 323-34 and comments on B11 infra). Here it pertains to the washing and as a symbolic gift of hospitality, cf. Dem. 19.191, Lycoeph. Alex. 135f with Σ (έλαυν γὰρ θάκαν τοὺς ἄλας ἐν ταῖς τροπέασι συμβολων ξενοδοχείας). Oaths were taken "by salt and table," Archil. fr. 173 West; Heliodorus 6.2; cf. Leutsh and Schniedewin 1839-51: I 24.4. τοῦ καλοῦ: At the end of the line the recipient is referred to in the dative, perhaps only now because a new supernatural recipient is named in the next line when a sacrifice is prescribed for Zeus.

B5: Zeus Eumenes, Zeus Meilichios, and Meilichios alone have been mentioned in Column A. Here there is no epithet, and no place is named. One expects Zeus Meilichios, a god of purification, to be intended, but if so, which Zeus Meilichios? one of the two mentioned in Column A or, as seems more likely, the community's Meilichios in a public shrine? The shrine is no doubt presupposed in the phrase ης αὐτοῦ το. It is likely to have contained the public altar mentioned in B10.

A χοίρος (or χοιρίθου), a young pig as opposed to the full-grown βε or κάπρος, is the standard victim, the καθάρος, in purification rites. Cf. LSSupp. 7 (IG 13 129); LSCG 156 A 14f; Aesch. Eum. 283, fr. 327 Nauck; Ap. Rhod. 4.705; Paus. 5.16.8; Pollux 8.104; Hsch. s.v. θανάσεις ἔργα and s.v. καθάρος; Harp. s.v. καθάρος; Σ Ar. Ach. 44; discussion in Parker 1983: 371ff. Here, however, there is no indication that this is not a normal sacrifice to Zeus. See also 63-67 infra.

περοτοὶ: The subject is to go out from the sanctuary and "turn around." Perhaps, as in a number of magical and suchlike practices, he is to turn around and not turn back. Cf. Aesch. Cho. 99, ἀνώτατος ὅμοιος; Soph. ΟC 490, ἀφένειν ἄστροφος; Pl. Leg. 854b, τὰς δὲ τῶν κακῶν συνουσίεσθαι φύειν ἀμετακτετεί; Ap. Rhod. 3.1038f, μπέδε... μετατρέψεθαι όπισθε; Theoc. 24.96, ἀστεράκτος; Plut. Numa 14.4; Ism. 19.26.

Another possibility is that "he turn himself around" (or possibly "be turned around")—that is, perform a circular movement. The verb περοπαδεῖν is used twice in Roman ritual contexts in this sense: Plut. Numa 14.4, Mor. 267b. It is not known, however, whether this practice existed among the Greeks as well as the Romans. Cf. Boehm 1927: 2029. The Greeks frequently carried a sacrificed victim around the place or person to be purified (e.g. LSCG 156 A 14f), but that does not seem to be relevant here.

B6: The next set of instructions seems to return the subject to normal life after, it would seem, a period of isolation: he is to be addressed (evidently he had been shunned before; cf. Aesch. Eum. 448, ἀφυγοιν εἶναι τὸν καλομνιοῦν νόμος), he is to take food (had no one wished to share food with him before? cf. the use of Orestes in the aition for the Athenian festival of Chos, Σ Ar. Ach. 961, Σ Εγ. 95; Deubner 1932: 98) and to sleep where he wishes. For avoidance of being under the same roof or in the same ship as a person with blood on his hands cf. Aesch. Eum. 285; Antiph. 5.11, 82; Paus. 2.31.8; cf. Parker 1983: 122 n.67.

B7: ... γαρ... γαρ. ... γαρ... is new. Cf. the present in εἰς of verbs in εἰς (Elean and one example from Dodona), which "represents the normal phonetic development from εἰςτα, the usual εἰς τον being due to the influence of the other tenses" (Buck 1955: §161.1). At Selinous the consonantal ι has been lost and εἰςθα has been contracted to εἰςθα.

B7: These lines extend the procedure just described. For the structure of the sentence, cf. Pl. Leg. 865д, ἂν δὲ τις ἐγήθην ἄκων ἐποτότην, ταύτα μὲν καθάρμως ταύτα αὐτοῦ καθαρθήτω τὸ τῶν δύολυν ἐποτέστιναι, κτλ.

B7: ἐπακουστόν ἐφορατόν ἐπακουστόν ἐφορατόν.
does Burkert. For αὐτό- in compounds referring to homicide see Parker 1983: 351: examples are αὐτοφόνος (e.g. LSSupp. 115 B 50, on which see Stueky 1937: 39), αὐτόχειρ (Dem. 20.157), αὐθέντης (see Parker 1983: 122), and especially αὐτόσφυγς, αὐτόφυγα, formed (with erg - for reg-) of the same elements as αὐτορρέστας (cf. Aesch. Eum. 336 with Σ).

B10f: The sacrifice of a full-grown sheep on the public altar— to Zeus as at B52— concludes the procedure begun at B3. There is no reason to think that the extension of the ritual to all forms of elasteroi involves any new procedure, nor that this final sacrifice is limited to purification from this further group.

B11: The final step is for the subject to separate himself from the altar on which he has performed the sacrifice; he does so by marking a boundary with salt, διορίζεις βαλλών, and by aspersion with water from a golden vessel. Possibly this is a single action, the sprinkling of saltwater from the golden vessel. Examples of the purificatory use of salt include Theoc. 24.97 (pure water mixed with salt sprinkled from a branch bound with wool, cf. Gow 1952: II 431); LSCG 97 A 14f, 151 B 23 (cf. 156 A 16: Sophron, Page 1940: III 330; Men. Pharma 53–56 Sandbach. For the use of a golden vessel for aspersion and purification cf. Eur. Ion 435, LSCG 154 A 29, B 15, Iambi. Vit. Pyth. 153, Ἡ χρυσός ἤθαλαττη περιποίησεται.

B12: δόξα ... χρήζει neither (1) δόξα ... χρήζει, "When he wishes" or (2) δόξα = δόξα kai, and the phrase = δόξα ... χρήζει. "Whenever he wishes." The second alternative seems more likely. Cf. supra on A8, where the verb is in the optative.

B12f: ὁθὲν ὁσκερ τοῖς ὀδοντακτοῖς: This is to be normal sacrifice "as to the gods," but the last sentence of the text, ὁσκερ ὃς ἐκ τούτῳ, literally "Let him pierce the throat so (that the blood pours) into the earth," specifies a modification. It has been supposed that in those rites as oath sacrifice, in which emphasis was put on blood, and sacrifices to the dead, to heroes, and to chthonic gods, the head of the victim was held down so that the blood would pour down onto the earth (cf. Ziehen 1929: 1671). Here we have this manner of killing the victim prescribed for a sacrifice that is otherwise explicitly in the manner of sacrifice to the gods. For directing the blood to a particular place, cf. Aesch. Sept 43, ταυροφωραίοντες εἰς μελανθέντον κάκοσ; LSCG 96.36f (SIG 1024) κ[ατ][τ][ε][τ][ε][τ][τ][ε][τ][ε] τὸν ποιμένα; Plut. Arist. 21, εἰς ποιμέναν σφαιράς.

The form ὀδοντακτοῖς is poetic and is not found in the λέγεις sacrae, in contrast to A17 Θεοί. The dative plural ὀντὶς is attested for West Greek only in early Argive and Syracusan (Buck 1955: 88).
II. The Date and Language of the Inscription

INTERNAL HISTORICAL EVIDENCE and external archaeological context are lacking for the great majority of epichoric inscriptions from Sicily. We depend therefore almost entirely on letter forms, that is, the particular versions of individual letters and the style in which they are written. They yield, of course, relative chronology rather than an absolute dating. We would stress further that lead has a much softer surface than pottery or stone and that one must be diffident about drawing conclusions from comparisons between writing on lead and on these harder materials.

The following forms of the letters of the alphabet used in the inscription deserve mention (letters followed by a number refer to the chart in Jeffery 1961: 262 and Jeffery and Johnston 1990: 461f):

- \(\alpha_2\) A with cross-bar slanting down to the right
- \(\beta_3\) \(\forall\) only at Selinous
- \(\gamma_3\) \(\triangleleft\) as in most epichoric Sicilian inscriptions
- \(\delta_1\) D the usual form until the first quarter of the fifth century
- \(\epsilon_2\) \(\Pi\) with downward-slanting horizontal lines
- \(\epsilon_2\) \(\Pi\) the vertical extending below the lower horizontal barely if at all
- \(\beta_2\) H the open, not the closed, box-like form of the aspirate
- \(\theta_3\) \(\Theta\) only in the form with a central dot
- \(\nu_3\) \(\Pi\) with slanting uprights of equal length
- \(\xi\) \(\Xi\) a unique form with the vertical stroke on the right-hand side rather than in the middle (A16, 22, B5, 7, 11; in B4 the vertical is accidentally omitted)

- \(\rho_2/p_4\) \(\Pi, \Pi\) with the loop curved but not always attached to the vertical stroke
- \(\epsilon_2\) \(\varsigma\) the four-barred sigma is thin, with the strokes meeting at flat angles
- \(\nu_2\) \(\sqrt{\overline{\epsilon}}\) with the cross-bar sloping down slightly from left to right
- \(\psi_2\) \(\Psi\) the only form attested for Sicily but usable only in 'blue' alphabets such as that of Selinous, because 'red' alphabets used this form for \(\chi\).

Interpuncts are used only in Column A, lines 7ff (Writer II). They consist of two dots, one above the other, except that single dots also occur in lines 10-12, 14, and possibly 20.

We compare the \textit{lex sacra} first with two texts attributed to Selinous and then to a group of recently published lead tablets from Kamarina that has been given a plausible historical context.

(1) There are not a few lead \textit{defixiones} (curse tablets) said to come from within or near the Malophoros sanctuary at Selinous (see Ch. VII infra). The present text is similar in letter forms and general style to the large \textit{defixio} (SEG 16.573; Arena 1989: no. 63; Dubois 1989: no. 38), most fully discussed by Masson (1972: 375-88, on the letter forms, 379f) and dated by him, following Jeffery (1961: 271, 277, no. 38c), to ca 475-450 (cf. Jordan 1985b: 176f, no. 107). The letters on the \textit{defixio} are more widely spaced. \textit{Alpha} with a dot for the cross-bar, used frequently on the \textit{defixio}, is not found in the \textit{lex sacra}. Both use \textit{theta} with a central dot. The large \textit{defixio} has no examples of the distinctive Selinuntine \textit{beta} nor the unique \textit{xi} of the \textit{lex sacra}. The \textit{gamma} of the \textit{lex sacra} is more curved, less angled than that of the \textit{defixio}, and the \textit{hasta} of the \textit{oppa} tends to slope to the right. On the whole, the writing on the \textit{lex sacra} gives a somewhat more old-fashioned impression.

(2) A boustrophedon bronze tablet in eight fragments at Olympia, very likely recording an agreement between Selinous and a group of exiles being repatriated, is certainly earlier in style than the \textit{lex sacra}, even though the individual letter forms are very similar (Jeffery-Johnston 1990: 271, 276, no. 36; Arena 1989: no. 52; Dubois 1989: no. 28). It has been most fully discussed by Asheri (1979; SEG 29.403) who dates it to the late sixth or early fifth century. Neither \textit{beta} (unless possibly at f 6) nor \textit{xi} appear on the fragments. Fragment \(b\) seems to have a \textit{theta} with a dot as well as...
another with a cross, while fragment ε has the same letter with only a single cross-bar. A re-examination of the fragments would be desirable.

(3) On the basis of the usual dating of the Selinuntine inscriptions, a date before the middle of the fifth century B.C. for our lex sacra, earlier rather than later in the second quarter of the century, had seemed reasonable to us. Thanks, however, to a recent discovery of more than 150 inscribed lead tablets that formed part of the city archive of Kamarina, recording the phratry affiliations of its citizens, we can now be somewhat surer about the chronology of early Sicilian letter forms on lead and the date of the lex sacra. Federica Cordano, their editor (Cordano 1989; 1992), argues plausibly that the archive reflects the reorganization of the city along democratic lines after the tyranny was overthrown in 461. The tablets should date from that year or soon thereafter.

On 150 tablets, however short their texts, it is inevitable that a greater variety is exhibited than on a single, longer tablet. Thus the Kamarina tablets have alpha with a straight cross-bar and with a dot, as well as with the sloping crossbar of the variety is exhibited than on a single, longer tablet. Thus the Kamarina tablets have alpha with a straight cross-bar and with a dot, as well as with the sloping crossbar of the lex sacra, angled as well as curved gamma, triangular as well as rounded delta, closed as well as open beta, and theta with an X as well as with a dot. But although Kamarina used ‘red’ forms of xi and chi and a normal beta, the forms of the other letters used and the general style of the writing resemble the lex sacra, especially those parts written by Writers II and III. We may then, with fair probability, assign the Selinuntine tablet to a period roughly contemporary with the archive at Kamarina, which, if correctly dated to 461 or shortly thereafter, leads us once again to the mid-fifth century or somewhat earlier.

The dialect of the text, a variety of West Greek, agrees for the most part with Megarian, the dialect of Megara Nisaia and its colonies, of which the most important were Kalchedon and Byzantion on the Bosphorus, and Megara Hyblia and Selinous in Sicily. On the dialect, for which there is little evidence outside Selinous before the end of the fourth century, see Bechtel 1923: 165–206; Buck 1955: 165f; Thumb and Kieckers 1932: 134–42; and the commentary to the relevant inscriptions in Dubois 1989. Pérez Molina 1991 has published an index verborum for all inscriptions in this dialect.

Discussion of particular examples may be found in the Commentary (supra Ch. I.4). The following are noteworthy:

A3 καταγαγιÇεν and 12 καταγαγόντο
[β]ομοσιεν, cited in the form ὁμοσιεος from Charondas of Katane (Arist. Pol. 1252b1)

A8, B12 ἄρη-Attic-Ionic διε or =διοκα κα¬-διοσ (cf. Ar. Ach. 762; ἄρη κα, IG IV 840.12 [Kalaureia]); in A8 the verb is in the optative (ποτεία), in B12 in the indicative or subjunctive (χρέεια).

A9 ἀθροιςθεὶς: the dative plurals in -τοι (cf. A15 ποτερίδες[ξ]ι) are unexpected. No doubt they represent -τοι.

A10 ὁπολλοῦσαι: β is not otherwise attested in λείβω but is consistent with a proposed etymology.

A12 κρή: not found in Attic prose

A13, 16 καταλυνόντας ἀλλόν is attested for Cyprus and Epidauros and is glossed by Hesychius.

A15 δοτερίδες[ξι], δοτερίας: ἁρτικ [gen. ἁρτιδίος] is new.

A15 κρή for the expected κρή

A16, 19 κατακαλώντας, κα(τα)/κάς: forms known from epic poetry. A18, 20 πέδα=μετά: the first occurrence in Megarian.

B2f, 6 ὑμο, ἀμή: the first ὑμο=ὑμον or ὑμο, the second may be a mistake for ἀμῆνοι.

B4 ἀκροτικάται: cf. B11 ἀστριξασ, with the characteristic -ξ- for -ς of West Greek (Buck 1955: 115f)

B8 χάντανα=κα χάντανα

B9 δοτερέκτας=δο τωτερήκτας

B13 ἀθανάτοις: both the word and the form of the dative plural are poetic.

The use of a single for a double consonant may be suspected at A7 ὅπτειτα, for ὅπτετα. A9 ἀθροιςθεὶς and 15 ποτερίδες[ξι] B9 ἀυτοπέρκτας for αὐτοπέρκτας, and possibly B12 δικαία for δίκκα. A12f περιφράγματες shows the normal spelling of compounds of δίκαιον in inscriptions, as opposed to the double rho of manuscripts (cf. LSCG 67 A 14; 17, 154 A 44).

A feature of the prose style of the text should be noted. When actions are prescribed for a single individual, the order is object, verb ... verb, object, e.g., A10f, λοίνον ὁπολλοῦσαι ... κατακαλώντας μήν. But when the subject is plural, the order is verb, object ... object, verb, e.g. A12-16 ὑμον δίκα ... τοι ποτερίδες ἐνθέον.
III. The Character of the Text

A GENERAL INTERPRETATION of the lex sacra, together with discussion of the crucial terms elasteros and autorrektas, is offered here by way of summarizing more detailed evidence to be found in the Commentary (supra) and the chapters that follow. We begin with an outline showing the organization of the text as we understand it.

Column A

1-3  Sacrifices, with responsibilities divided between homosepuoi (members of the concerned individual's household) and the rest of the group (?)  
4-6  rasura  
7-8  The time ante quem for the series of sacrifices that follows  
8-17 The recipients of sacrifice: Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides

Zeus Meilichios en Musqo

Tritopatores (first the impure, then the pure)  
17-18 Additional sacrifices: to Zeus Meilichios en Euthydamo

Possible renewal of sacrifice  
after one year,  
making use of the public hiara  
and at home  
21-23  after two years (?)  

Column B

1-7  Purification of an individual (an autorrektas?) from elasteroi  
8-9  Purification with respect to "foreign or ancestral, heard or seen" (elasteroi), as for the autorrektas  
10-11  Sacrifice at the public altar, marking of a boundary, aspersion, withdrawal  
12-13  Sacrifice to the elasteros

Because we lack the beginning of Column A (which might have pertained only to the lines before the rasura of 4-6), the purpose of the lex sacra must be inferred from the particular regulations in the text. In the two columns the subjects are distinct but related. They share a concern with purification. This is explicit in B and implied in A by the contrasted impure (miaroi) and pure (katharoi) Tritopatores, who are to receive sacrifice successively. The subject of all legible parts of A is, in fact, sacrifice, together with associated rites, all of which are also appropriate procedures for purification (cf. 73-76 infra).

The two columns differ in that A gives instructions for a group or groups—or, rather, an individual acting with his group—whereas B is addressed solely to the individual seeking purification. (The alternation between singular and plural in A is discussed on 66f infra.) It seems likely that the law as a whole began with a statement about the possible need of groups and individuals for purification.

The beginning of A, written by a different hand (Writer I), is separated from the rest of the column by three blank lines (A4-6), which apparently had been inscribed and then erased. Sacrificial procedures had already begun to be prescribed in A3, where a distinction is made between what is to be done by some (all?) members of a group and the actual burning of the parts of the sacrificial animal in the fire by the homosepuoi (perhaps the members of the household of the individual who has incurred the pollution). It is possible that the erasure of three full lines has taken with it the beginning of the sentence we read in lines 7f. That sentence, in any case, specifies the time before which certain rites are to be performed: before the Kotytia (the annual festival of the goddess Kotytos), and, every fourth year, before the first day of the truce proclaimed for the festival of Zeus at Olympia. The time applies to the series of sacrifices that follows (up to line 18) but evidently not to the sacrifices at the beginning of the column, which either had a separately specified time or were to be undertaken whenever it became apparent that there was need to embark on these procedures, perhaps when pollution was acknowledged or proclaimed.

The procedures in Column A are not necessarily limited to a single ceremony in one year. It is possible for sacrifice to be performed also in the following year, with both a public and a private aspect ("at home," woikoi; cf. 18-21). And again in the third year something may or must be done (23). By contrast, the ritual to be performed by the individual of B1 is explicitly and entirely free of restrictions of time, and also of place, except that at one point he is to sacrifice on "the public altar" (B10). The places for the sacrifices in A are no doubt determined by the supernatural figures involved, aside from the sacrifice to be performed at home.

It is not evident whether the initiative to undertake the series of sacrifices in column A lies with the groups or with the authorities; but once a commitment is made to perform them, the authorities insist that they be completed before two critical moments in the community's ritual year. These moments, we suggest, serve to mark a ritual renewal of the whole community before which the impurity that affects the groups must be removed. Any action in the following year appears to be optional (cf. A18, 20, etc plus infinitive). The individual of Column B is on his own from the beginning. It seems to be up to him whether to undertake the
procedures that are described. The authorities, however, are sufficiently
centered to prescribe a procedure for him and require that he perform
the ritual correctly—the sacrifice to the elasteros must be made in a
very specific fashion. While the community's interests are satisfied by the rites
prescribed up to A18, the group and the particular individual may have
their own problems that require ritual in the second and perhaps the third
year. An individual beset by an elasteros may be no danger to the com-
unity if the rites in Column A have been performed, but may remain in
an undesirable state as far as he himself is concerned. Column B offers
procedures for resolving his problem.

Only one term for a group appears in the surviving text: the homo-
sepous, equivalent we suggest to an Attic oikos. This is probably a smaller
unit than the plurality assumed to be active throughout Column A, as
shown by the plural imperatives (see the Commentary on A3). The latter
are most likely gentilitial groups, either true or putative kinship
organizations, such as the gene and phratiae of Athens. Selinous had
patrai, one of which, consisting of two groups of women, made a
dedication to Zeus Meilichios (cf. 90 infra). Characteristically such groups
worshipped certain forms of Zeus, some other divinities, and
such collective ancestral spirits as the Tritopatores, all of whom were associated
with the particular group and protected its interests (cf. Ch. V.3, 4, and 5).
Through such groups in Archaic and to some degree Classical Greece the
individual households were connected to the community as a whole.
Thus the Athenian phratries controlled and recorded their membership
and the passage of members into adulthood and citizenship. Homicide
against their members concerned the group as a whole, as did pollution
incurred by a member, for it could endanger all the others as well. (One
may compare the history of the Athenian genos of the Alkmoinidai.)

The deities who receive sacrifice in Column A—Zeus Eumenes (a
title derived from his association with the Eumenides and not hitherto
attested) and the Eumenides, Zeus Meilichios, and the Tritopatores—are
figures one would expect to be concerned with bloodshed and fertility,
that is, with the protection and the perpetuation of families and the larger
units to which they were attached. Zeus Meilichios appears twice, once
with his name and epithet (9) and once just as Meilichios (17); but in both
instances his cult is specified as that in a particular place, identified by the
name of an individual—év Mòsou and év Σωθόδεμο. These places we take
to be a defined space or plot, probably containing one of the characteristic
aniconic or semi-iconic stones that have been found in the area west of the
Zeus Meilichios shrine at Selinous, referred to as the Campo di Stele
(see PLATES 6, 7a, 8a; cf. Ch. V.2–3, and VIII). The name Myskos is known
from a late seventh-century gravestone from Selinous (MP 76). Both men
were probably important figures in the early history of the settlement.
The cult at the Meilichios stones to which their names were attached
would have been continued by their descendants or perhaps by the city
itself. Conceivably they were the ancestors of two lineages whose
members had been engaged in the violence against each other that produced the need for purification.

A function for images or aniconic objects belonging to the community may be indicated in A18 where to... ἀπὸ τὸ δαμαὶ are to be
taken out (as we emend the text) for use in a theoxenia ceremony in which
supernatural figures are entertained. These objects may also be
referred to earlier, in A7 (τὸν ἱερὸν). If they are portable it seems more
likely that they were made of wood than of stone. The stone versions
found in great numbers in the Campo di Stele may represent only those
which were set up permanently in the open air.

The Tritopatores seem to have possessed a shrine throughout whose roof
and then honey mixture were to be poured. Was this the shrine of the
city's ancestral spirits or did each gentilitial group have its own? There
are parallels elsewhere for both possibilities (cf. Ch. V.4). Here it seems
more likely that individuals or groups would have been more concerned
with their own ancestral spirits than with those of the community as a
whole.

The most remarkable feature of the rituals prescribed in Column A is
the double procedure for the Tritopatores, first as impure, and then as
pure. Although it is possible that these were fixed, permanent categories,
impure and pure, we have supposed that the ritual prescribed for the
impure resulted in their purification so that the following ritual theoxenia
(entertainment of gods at a meal) could be offered to the pure Trito-
patores.

Somewhat similar procedures are suggested in accounts of rituals
associated with Orestes and Achilles. Pausanias describes Orestes' en-
counter with the Erinys (known locally as the Manai) at Ake in Arkadia
(8.34.2f). They appeared to him first as black and then, after he bit off and
ate one of his fingers and was restored to sanity, as white. Orestes sacri-
ficed first to the black, to avert them (διατετάντων), and then to the
white (cf. perhaps Demeter's two epithets at Thelpousa in Arkadia, Erinys
and Louxia, Paus. 8.25f). For Achilles on the island of Leuke on the Black
Sea the oracle at Dodona ordered the Thessalians to make annual
sacrifices τὰ μὲν ὥς θεὸν τὰ δὲ ὅς ἐν μοίρας τῶν κειμένων ("some as for a
god, others as for the dead"), according to Flavius Philostratus
(Heroicus 53.8, 11, 13 [Kayser, ed. min., 208]). First a black bull was slaughtered to
him at his grave as to a dead man (ὅς τεβγαίη εἰς τοιοῦτον), and then a white
bull was sacrificed to him as a god (ὁθυτοι ὥς θεὸν) by the shore. At the
second sacrifice Patroklos was also summoned to the feast, as were
supernatural guests to theoxenia. Both these examples are probably at
some remove from actual practice but they illustrate how the ambivalent
character of potentially dangerous spirits was recognized in ritual.

At Selinous the sequence of rites secures the removal of pollution. Perhaps a pollution incurred by an individual or a group had affected their
ancestral spirits as well, just as death in a family could pollute a member of
that family more severely than others who were not related (cf. LSCG 97
A 28f). We shall return to this question shortly.
It should be stressed that despite the identity of the Tritopatores with the ghosts of the family, they are never known to have been worshipped at graves or within the limits of cemeteries and there is no indication that this happened at Selinous, though we leave open the possibility that their cult place was in the vicinity of a cemetery. The most likely home for all these cults was the sacred area in the northern quadrant of the precinct of Demeter Malophoros (the Campo di Stele; PLT 6, 7a, 8a). There an uncounted number of aniconic stones (cf. PLTs 7a, 8a, 10, 11b, 15b, 16) and some one hundred figured stones (cf. PLT 11a, 12-15a) have been found, together with many small deposits consisting of simple votive objects (cups, lamps, figurines) and the remains of sacrifices (see Ch. VIII). The stratigraphy and chronology are complex, and the excavations have not been published in full. But there are both deposits and inscribed Meilichios stones, dedicated by groups and individuals, of fifth-century date. The numerous small deposits as well as the dedications suggest cult activity by individuals and groups rather than by the city.

The reason why the individual of Column B undertakes purification is given in the damaged first line. Fortunately a clear reference back to line 1 is found in 7-9, where another purification is described as the same as that employed by the autorrektas (οὐσίωτέρατας ὁ πτώτορόπλέκτου). The man (ανθρώπος) of line 1 who needs to be purified from elasteroi may therefore be qualified as autorrektas (which can be restored in the lacuna) or by a synonymous term. Column B begins then with the need for an individual to be purified of elasteroi, describes the correct procedure (2-7), and goes on to add that this procedure is also valid for all kinds of elasteroi, not only those incurred by an autorrektas.

Both autorrektas and elasteros (ἐλαστέρος) are novel. What do they mean? Autorrektas we take to be equivalent to antrophos (αὐτοφόνος), “man-killer,” “homicide.” Autorregos (αὐτογρεγος), composed of the same elements, can also have this sense (cf. Aesch. Eum. 356 with Σ; and Parker 1983: 351 for auto-compounds referring to homicide). Bloodshed, of course, is one of the prime reasons for seeking purification. Elasteros (ἐλαστέρος) is equivalent to alastor and alastoros (ἄλαστορ, ἄλαστορος), used both of a wrongdoer who commits a crime or an act of violence and of the pursuer and punisher of the wrongdoer. In the latter sense it is found as an epithet of Zeus, as is ἄλαστορος (cf. Ch. IV.6). Here a person who has killed another needs to be purified of elasteros, whom we take to be the avenging spirits acting on behalf of the dead person. Before purification it appears that the autorrektas could not be addressed, take food (with others?), or sleep where he wished; all these are declared possible for him after the purification (B6f).

The procedure first requires proclamation (2f), followed by reception, the giving of water with which to wash, a meal, and salt, and sacrifice to Zeus, for whom no epithet is given but very likely Meilichios is meant (3-5). The individual is then to withdraw and turn around (and not look back?). The closest parallel to this series of actions is seen in the great lex sacra of Kyrene (LSsapp. 115 B 28-39 [SEG 9.72; Buck 1955: no. 115]).

A much-debated section under the heading Hikesion (Ἱκεσίων) gives instructions for dealing with three types of Hikesioi, which were shown by Stukey (1937) to be visitants or hostile spirits sent against the person who performs the protective ritual specified in the text. In passing, we should note the use of Hikesios, Elasteros, and Alastoros also as epithets of Zeus (see Ch. V.6); these were used equally of spirits or of Zeus performing the same functions. We give a translation (adapted from Parker 1983: 347) from which the resemblances to the procedure at Selinous will be evident:

Of Visitants. Visitant sent by spells. If a visitant is sent against the house, if (the householder) knows from whom he came to him, he shall name him by proclamation (σφακιανος) for three days. If (the sender of the visitant) has died in the land or perished anywhere else, if (the householder) knows his name he shall make proclamation by name, but if he does not know his name (in the form) “O man (ἀνθρώπος), whether you are a man or a woman. Having made male and female figurines either of wood or of earth he shall entertain them and offer them a portion of everything. When you have done what is customary, take the figurines and the portions (μύθη) to an unworked wood and deposit them there.

At Selinous as at Kyrene the hostile spirit is entertained; but whereas at Kyrene the spirits are transferred to (or is it that their attribution is transferred to?) wooden or clay figurines (κωστοερεία) that are then deposited in a deserted place, at Selinous the subject of the purification simply withdraws “out of it,” ἐξ οὗτος (the precinct of Zeus?) and turns around (and does not turn back!). What the two procedures share is the formal entertainment of a supernatural figure.

That the elasteros is indeed a supernatural being is seen in lines 8f where it is said that one can be purified from all types of elasteroi, “a foreign or ancestral one, either one that has been heard or one that has been seen, or anyone at all.” (Assyrian ghosts may be seen or heard but also make themselves known through the infliction of illness, which is not mentioned in the lex sacra; cf. Scullard 1988). The text does not say explicitly that these others are elasteroi, but the context makes that inference inescapable. (Why they may be “foreign or ancestral” is another question; see the Commentary on B7-9.) The procedures specified earlier (almost certainly at the beginning of the column) were to help an autorrektas. The same procedures apply to all other elasteroi a person may encounter, viz., those that pursue an individual for some other reason than bloodshed. The autorrektas, however, is the primary or typical target of elasteroi, and this may have bearing on the occasion for

1 It would be interesting if the figurines found in sacrificial deposits in the Campo di Stele (cf. Ch. VIII) could be connected with a practice like that prescribed at Kyrene, but there is no hint of this in the lex sacra. On the defensive use of figurines in Assyria, see Take 1988: 49f, and more generally in the Near East and Greece, Faraone 1991b.
the drawing up and recording of the present text. The last prescription in the text also indicates the supernatural character of the elasteros by explaining how to sacrifice to him if one should need to (B12f). The elasteros is not simply a hostile and dangerous spirit that must be disposed of. He may require treatment comparable to the reverence due the immortal gods.2

The individual in Column B is presumably miaros until he has purified himself of the elasteros. But why in Column A are the Tritopatres miarioi? More generally, what prompts the issuance of these instructions, including the double rites for the Tritopatres? Death is the principal source of pollution for the Greeks, and we have argued that in Column B the paradigmatic individual who must deal with an elasteros is a homicide, an autorektas. Death is also the most likely occasion for the procedures in Column A. But is this the normal death of a family or group member, or is it some extraordinary and especially disrupting form of death, either homicide, homicide within a particular group, or death occurring (perhaps again as the result of homicide) in a sacred place?

Some aspects of the instructions point to an expectation of recurrence, indefinitely into the future, of the circumstances that require these procedures. The time given for their performance is expressed as before an event that occurs annually, the festival of the Kotyra, and provision is made in case the year is one in which the quadrennial Olympic festival is held. Every and any year may be the occasion for these procedures. In the year after the (first) performance of them, furthermore, other rites may be (etco plus infinitive) carried out (A18, 20f). Rites may also be envisaged for the third year, i.e., two years after the starting point (23). The repetition after one year is reminiscent of the eniusia for a dead person carried out by family members, which, however, are treated in our sources as obligatory rather than optional (see the Commentary on A18). Is it possible, then, that every time a family or group member dies the Tritopatres, the collective ancestors of the family or group, become polluted and require purificatory rites in the form of the rituals of A9–137? The most detailed regulations concerning the rites to be performed and the pollution incurred as the result of a normal death come from late fifth-century Keos (LSGC 97). From these it is evident that family members are more affected by the pollution emanating from the death than are outsiders (A25–29; the concern of the text is to limit the range of pollution and the performance of the funerary and subsequent rites). It is possible that just as the house itself needed to be purified (though only by aspersion and washing, after which θὸς ἀπόκτητος were to be offered), so too might sacred objects such as images of the family gods, in particular the ancestors (cf. our Commentary on A7 for such hiera). That this was the situation at Selinous with the Tritopatres and that the state is legislating the funeral cult for all the year's dead are possible explanations. The optional sacrifices permitted but not required in the second and third years would be consistent with commemorative rites for the dead.

An alternative interpretation avoids a difficulty with the first explanation, viz., that the ordinary, natural deaths of the citizens of Selinous would require, in addition to purificatory rites for Tritopatres, sacrifices to Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides and to two versions of Zeus Meilichios, none of whom are known to be involved in normal funerary cult elsewhere. Furthermore, the two Meilichios are associated with two Selinuntine personages and are not, therefore, the Zeus Meilichios of the particular family or group that is conducting the rites. Figures more commonly associated with the dead, such as Hermes and Persephone, are not mentioned.

The alternative view, then, is to suppose that an extraordinary form of death needs to be dealt with, one that involves not only the gods of a particular family or group but gods of the city as well, the city as a whole having perhaps adopted the Meilichios of two persons important in its early history. Such figures may also be implied by the damosia hiera of A18 (images perhaps of the supernatural figures just mentioned). The regulations in Column B seem to be concerned primarily with the consequences of homicide, a concern that may also be manifested in Column A. Homicide in earlier Greek society has been seen as more a tort than crime, as an action requiring recourse or remedy for the injured party (cf. Gagarin 1986: 61f). The separation of early Greek law in general from religion is clear (Gagarin 1986: 15f), and for homicide religious concern on the part of the community was not necessarily original or fundamental (MacDowell 1963: Ch. 14). But by the later Archaic and the Classical periods, ritual as well as legal procedures were authorized by the
community in dealing with homicide, whereas non-violent death, though polluting to a limited degree, received little public attention.

Homicide, of course, proliferated in periods of stasis, the internal violence that beset Greek cities so frequently. According to the second explanation (outlined above), it was the incidence of homicide—perhaps some conspicuous incident, such as sacrilege in the course of stasis, of which there are many examples in Greek history (Thuc. 3.81f is the most famous description)—that prompted the Selinuntines to formulate these rules. Their aim would have been to restore proper relations between the individuals and groups that had participated in the violence and the relevant gods of city and family. As for the purpose of repeating the rites in a second or third year, this may have been related to the motivation of the individual undertaking the procedures in Column B: a belief that hostile forces from the slain person needed to be turned away and that the good will of his own tutelary spirits needed to be secured. There remains the problem of the pollution of the Tritopatores under such circumstances. It may have been thought that homicide, or homicide under certain conditions, put both the actor and his ancestral spirits in a state of pollution. They needed, therefore, to be purified before sharing in the normal sacrifices prescribed in Column A.

The authorities who issued this law seem to speak for the city, for it is in the city's interest that the rites of Column A be performed before the Kotytaia festival and the Olympic truce. But the city's involvement was limited. In Column A it seems to have ended with the first year's performance, except that if there were sacrifice in the second year the use of the public biara would be permitted. In Column B the public sphere is not prominent: the Zeus of line 5 may be that of a public cult, and a sacrifice in line 10 is to be made on the public altar. The city is issuing instructions on how individuals or groups are to cope with problems requiring ritual treatment, but who is to undertake the ritual and how far it is to be taken are decisions to be made by the parties themselves.

The detail and precision here suggest careful deliberation and the advice of specialists, not necessarily or exclusively local. We cannot be sure that there was a city cult with city priests of Zeus Meilichios (there was none at Athens, as far as we know) or of the Tritopatores, who were sometimes attached to particular gentilitial groups—though here the public biara (A18) may include images or other sacred objects used in their cults. The first recipients of sacrifice we see, Zeus Eumenides and the Eumenides, might be expected to have their own functionaries. Even so it seems more than likely that respected specialists were consulted on these matters and that their recommendations were endorsed by the civil and religious authorities in the city. Some support for this view may come from comparison with the text that offers the best parallels of language and substance, the lex sacra of Kyrene, almost a century and a half later in date (supra 55). If we had more examples of regulations for purification and for ceremonies performed by families and gentilitial groups, the common concern with ghosts or visitants in these two texts might not seem so impressive. But in the present state of our knowledge some explanation seems called for. Several possibilities suggest themselves:

1. The resemblances are due to a common heritage of Dorian Greeks, shared between the Theran and ultimately Lakonian forebears of the Kyreneans and the Megarian ancestors of the Selinuntines. We also note, however, elements shared by the Selinuntines with the Greeks of the Kyklades (the ninth part of the sacrifice [cf. 63f infra] and Zeus Elasteros/Alastoros [cf. Ch. VI]). A common Dorian tradition seems an inadequate explanation.

2. The concern is a regional phenomenon of Greeks in north Africa and western Sicily, fuelled perhaps by their contacts with Near Eastern beliefs, seen most clearly in the Assyrian texts. Resemblances between Kyrenean and Assyrian ghost-banning procedures have been pointed out by Burkert (1984: 68-71; 1992: 70f) and Faraone (1991: 181, 199) and can also be seen in the Selinuntine text (cf. the Commentary on B7f). The ultimate source of at least some of the prescriptions may be the Near East.

3. The oracle of Apollo at Delphi was the inspiration for both religious codes. In favor of this explanation is Delphi's supposed interest in purification, the fact that both cities are colonial settlements established very close to each other in time in the seventh century, and especially the explicit reference at the beginning of the Kyrenean text to Apollo as the source of these rules at the time of the establishment of the settlement. But the historicity of this claim in a text of ca 300 B.C. is questionable. On the influence and effectiveness of Delphi as a source of religious legalism in the Archaic period, scholars are divided. The positive evidence is remarkably meager (see especially Parker 1983: 138-43). The use of a word and form foreign to the vernacular, the apparently poetic athanatoisi of B14, may be an indication that the Selinuntine ritual has been influenced by religious experts, though not necessarily Delphic.

4. The development of ritual and religious theory in the Archaic period was in the hands of specialists who were in demand for their expertise and who travelled widely, propagating their ideas and furthering the spread of certain practices (e.g. Epimenides and Empedokles; cf. Burkert 1983). All these explanations may have bearing on the resemblances we have observed. What is clear is that, although some change in circumstances may account for the recording of these rules, both texts take us back to the social and religious life of Archaic Greece.

As to the occasion that prompted the recording of the lex sacra at Selinus, we should probably look to a significant event or a crisis in the life of the Selinuntines. Selinous, like most Greek cities of the Archaic and Classical periods, was repeatedly the scene of civil strife, with its accompanying bloodshed and sacrilege (cf. Ch. VI). The general pattern can be continued...
IV. The Rituals

1. Overview

The rituals prescribed in these regulations consist primarily of sacrifices, libations (A10f, 13f), anointing (A13, 16), and aspersion (A12f, B11). Some details are included as to how the sacrifices are to be performed. One set of procedures belongs to the practice of theoxenia, “hosting the gods,” though no one term is used in the text to describe it (A14–16, 18–20). Another set of prescriptions is explicitly intended to achieve purification (B2–7) and includes a series of distinctive actions (B4, the giving of water for washing, food, and salt; B5, turning around? B11, marking a boundary with salt).

Both columns are probably directed towards purification, but the aim is made explicit only in B. In Column A, in the instructions for sacrifice, the Tritopatores are first to receive cult as μουση, “polluted” (A10), and then (presumably as a result of the performance of the first rites) as κοισμένοι, “purged” (A13). Purification is known to be important in the cult of Zeus Meilichios, who receives sacrifice at A9 and A17 (see the discussion of this god at Ch. V.2). The two columns seem, therefore, to address different aspects of the same issue, perhaps pollution as it concerns groups and the community in A, and as it affects the individual in B.

A number of the ritual details have been discussed in the Commentary. Here we examine the regulations as a whole and compare them with Greek practice as known elsewhere. Our discussion is presented under several headings that overlap to some degree. We begin with an outline of the rituals mentioned in the text, so arranged as to highlight contrasts:

Column A:

1ff... burning of sacrificial parts performed by the homosepuoi
[A sacrifice must be assumed for the previous lines.]
4–6
ταυτά
[rasura]
7f A time in the year specified for sacrifice

(another for 11 persons dates from the early sixth century) and suggests that the relatively upper-class dead buried in the cemetery had been killed in battle (122f). Stasis, of course, is another possibility.

4 Late in our study of these problems we learned of a unique parallel to the twin herms of Selinous, an object recently stolen from the Tegea Museum in Arkadia. See 105 infra.
The recipients of sacrifice:
- Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides—a full-grown sheep
- Zeus Meilichios en Mysag—a full-grown sheep
- Tritopatores

/  
(1) for the impure (miarois, 10–13)
- 1/9 of one of the two preceding victims; cf. heroes
- libation of wine ("through the roof")
- anointing (of altars? statues?)
- aspersion (no theoxenia)
- libation of honey mixture
- anointing of cups

Sacrifice of ram to Zeus Meilichios en Euthydamou (17f)

The following year:
Sacrifice re public hiara (18) with theoxenia, feasting on the spot (18–20)

The sacrificer may invite whomever he wishes (20)
Sacrifice at home (21) of an ox (?), killed before statues (but?) any traditionally approved victim is acceptable (21f)

After two years ("in the third year," 23)....

Column B

In the case of purification from elasteroi (1)
proclamation, without regard to date (2f),
provision of washing, a meal, and salt (4),
sacrifice of a piglet to Zeus, followed by
withdrawal and turning around (5), being addressed,
taking food, and sleeping wherever he wishes

In the case of purification re any sort of elasteros,
purification in the same manner as for an autorrektas from an
elasteros (7–9, cf. 4–7)

Sacrifice of a full-grown victim at the public altar, resulting in purification,
after marking a boundary and aspersion (10f)

In the case of sacrifice to an elasteros,
sacrifice as to the immortals,
but with the throat cut so that the blood flows into the earth (12f).

1 Cf. Hewitt 1908: 63; Nock 1944; Rudhardt 1958: 238f; Casabona 1966: 204–09; Burkert 1985: 199–203. The verb ἐνευγήσεως (not in our text) is often used, e.g. Plut. 2.445, ὡς ἐνακριβεῖε... (cc. Ἡρακλέας) θεοῦς... ὡς ἐνακριβέως.

receive a victim of their own. The special treatment of a ninth of a victim is known from the islands of Mykonos and Thasos (see Commentary on A11). The burning of more than the usual minimum is a modification of normal sacrifice, one that can be paralleled from other texts. In effect, it moves the sacrifice into the direction of the more powerful and focused type of ritual act associated with holocaust, in which the entire victim (or all its flesh) is burnt and nothing is left for human consumption. There are other distinctions as well between the rituals for the "impure" and "pure" Tritopotare. The first receive a libation of wine "through the roof" as for heroes, and aspersion and anointing are performed for them (A10–13). By contrast, in the ritual for the "pure" Tritopotare (A13–17), "as for the gods," there is no aspersion, and the anointing is specifically of the cups used in the theoxenia.

The "pure" Tritopotare are given their own full-grown sheep and are honored with theoxenia. From the food offered at that ceremony the participants are to take "first-fruits" (απόρρυματος) and to burn them completely. Sacrifice in the ancestral manner is to be performed "as to the gods"; we take this to be the full-grown sheep for these "pure" Tritopotare, although it is conceivable that a Selinuntine reader would understand a reference to other gods who did not need to be named. The last sacrifice prescribed (for "this year" as opposed to the following year, of A18) is a ram to (Zeus) Melichios "in the plot of Euthydamos" (A17). This too would seem to be a normal sacrifice.

A sacrifice is said to be possible in the following year (A18). No recipient or victim is specified and one assumes, therefore, the same victims and recipients just mentioned for "this year," namely the Tritopotare and Zeus Evoudaimo (or perhaps for all the figures mentioned so far). Once again there is a ceremony of theoxenia, for a table is to be set out and there are "first fruits" (άπόρρυματος) to be taken from the table and burnt (A19), along with a thigh (no doubt with its flesh still on the bone) and the bones. The thigh (ναλετά, Attic-Ionic κολά) is a common perquisite of priests (see Commentary on A19). The burning of a whole thigh with flesh on it is so rare that we cannot take silence about the thigh and the bones for "this year's" sacrifice to indicate that burning of them is to be assumed there too. Like the burning of a ninth part for the "impure" Tritopotare, such an increase in what is actually destroyed in the fire effectively increases the weightiness of the sacrifice.

Certain large bones of the animal, however, were regularly included, along with certain other parts, in the central act of burning on the altar (cf. Hes. Theog. 556f.; Puttkamer 1912: 26f.; Meuli 1946: 219; Rudhardt 1958: 272). The specification here that the bones are to be burnt suggests that all the victim's bones are to be put in the fire, just as none of the flesh is to be carried away (A20) but, presumably, is to be consumed on the spot. (The phrase used, τὸ κρᾶ μεγάλοντο, is one of a number of similar phrases used for this restriction in other leges sacrae; see Commentary on A20.) The ceremony is concentrated entirely at the place and at the time of the sacrifice. It is noteworthy that the disposal of the fleece of the victims is not mentioned, whereas the fleece of a ram was important in the cult of Zeus Melichios at Athens (cf. 94f).

Some of the sacrifices in the following year are in some sense public, as they involve τὰ ... ἄρα τὰ δημόσια (A18), while others are to be performed "at home" (A20f) and are therefore in some sense private. Of the various possible explanations for the public ἄρα, the most attractive to us is that they are "public sacred objects," specifically "public images," which would be particularly appropriate to the entertaining of the gods in theoxenia (see Commentary on A7). Participation in the sacrifice is not restricted; one may invite whomever one wishes (A20).

The details of the sacrifice at home are not certain. There would seem to be some specification of the manner in which the victim (an ox?) is killed, perhaps with its throat being pierced (κοφάοντο, A21; cf. B13) before statues (ταυλήματον, A21), which may be different from the objects referred to as ἄρα. It is possible that the choice of a specific victim is optional (as an alternative to the expensive ox?), so long as it conforms with traditional practice (τὸ παρασκ. A22).

The first of the two sacrifices in Column B, the sacrifice of a piglet to Zeus (B5), is prescribed without further detail. A young pig is the standard victim for purificatory rites and is thought to have been used primarily for its blood (cf. Parker 1983: 371ff and Commentary on B5). But here it is mentioned simply as an offering to Zeus. Conceivably it would have been evident to a reader of this text that the use of a piglet in such circumstances would entail a distinctive sacrifice emphasizing blood and not followed by a meal from its flesh, but unfortunately that is not clear to us.

A second sacrifice in Column B is referred to even more concisely: after sacrificing a full-grown sheep on the public altar, the sacrifice is to be pure (B10). Since the last recipient mentioned was Zeus (in B5), we suppose that the sacrifice is once again to him. Although nothing is said of the disposal of the meat or the participation of others in either of these sacrifices, we have no indication that they are not normal sacrifices.

Both these sacrifices to Zeus are contingent on the need to secure purification (B1 f.). The last sacrifice mentioned is contingent on the need to sacrifice to the elasteros, a being from whom purification was the object of B1 and B9: Time, place, and victim are unspecified, but the mode of the sacrifice is given, "as to the immortals" (in the poetic form βους τοῖς ὀλοκληρωτοῖς, B12f). The need for this prescription comes from what follows: the throat is to be pierced (κοφάοντο) so that the blood flows into the ground (B13). The destination of the blood and the very emphasis on blood would characterize the rite as 'chthonic', of the type made to gods of the underworld, heroes, and the dead, so that if the rite is in other respects like those for gods, this has to be made clear. The elasteros here is to be treated 'as an immortal', but he belongs to the earth and not to heaven.
The transition of the Tritopatores in Column A from figures who receive heroic honors to ones treated as gods corresponds to what happens to the elasteroi in B. While he too ends up receiving divine honors, earlier in B he is associated with the need for purification. There is thus an analogy between the condition of the impure Tritopatores and the elasteroi/elasteroi before the conclusion of purification rites (B1-11).

There are two references to the actual putting of the parts to be burnt on the sacrificial fire, if we are correct in our interpretation of καταθανα[1ε]ν (A3) and κατατανα[1ε]νον (A12, on which see the Commentary on A3). In both cases the reason for the mention of this action is to indicate who are to perform it, the καταθανα[1ε]νον to A3 and "those to whom it is ritually permitted" in A12. In Column B all three sacrifices are performed by a single individual or are at least the responsibility of an individual, but for the sacrifices in A there may be further indications of different roles for an individual and for a plurality. All uses of the verb ἔναι are either in the infinitive (A8, 18, 21) with no subject or in the third plural imperative (A12, 13, 17, 17f). In all instances a plural subject is possible. Other actions to be performed by a plurality, in addition to καταθανα[1ε]νον (A12), are asperion and anointing (A12f), the taking of first fruits and burning them (A15f), deposition and anointing of cups (A16), and the piercing of the throat of a victim (A21). But there are a number of actions prescribed with verbs in the singular: libation of wine through the roof (A10f), libation of honey mixture (A13l), probably the setting out of a table and couch (no verb is given), and putting a clean cloth, olive crowns, new cups, cakes (ξάδεματα), and meat (on the table) (A14f). In the following year a single individual is to take out (?) the δοξότα ἱππόδ. Probably he is also to set out a table (for theoxenia, A19); the verb is in the infinitive without a subject but comes after a singular verb and the action corresponds to what an individual apparently does at A14. An individual would also seem to do the burning of the thigh, the first-fruits, and the bones, since there is no change of subject (the verb is once again an infinitive with no subject expressed, A19f), although the corresponding actions in A15f are taken by a plurality. It is also a single individual who is to invite whomever he wishes to the sacrifice.

The hypothesis that the alternation of singular and plural in Column A is meaningful requires that the reader for whom the text was intended would understand what parties were being referred to. They may, in fact, have been named in the damaged beginning of the column. The plurality might thus be the κομοετευον of A3 throughout; on the other hand, the καταθανα[1ε]νον of line 3 rather suggests that there was also another plurality in contrast to the κομοετευον, and the more general "those to whom it is permitted" at A12 may also suggest a second group. But it is also possible that, except for these two explicit references to the action of the verb καταθανα[1ε]νον, the alternations are entirely casual. An individual accompanied by a group, possibly further subdivided into other groups, undertakes a series of rituals. He is "the subject to whom the benefits of sacrifice ... accrue," "le sacrifiant," as Hubert and Mauss term him (1929: 11; "the sacrificer" in the English translation, Hubert and Mauss 1964: 10). At some times the ritual actions are assigned to him, at others more realistically to the group as a whole.

3. Theoxenia

At A14-16, and probably again in the following year at A18f, normal sacrifice, in which certain uncooked parts of the victim are burnt in the altar fire, is combined with arrangements for entertaining supernatural guests. This is an example of the ritual sometimes referred to as xenia or, more specifically, as theoxenia, literally, "hosting the god(s)." The essential elements for a dinner party are provided, including a table and a couch. On theoxenia see further Deneken 1881; Nilsson 1955: 135f; Dentzer 1982: 511-27; Bruit 1989; Jameson (in press).

It is necessary to distinguish between tables, set up for the most part temporarily as furniture for entertainment of the gods, and the tables, most probably set up permanently in a sanctuary, on which were placed portions of raw meat as well as cakes, all of which became perquisites of designated functionaries of the cult. The latter, which may derive from the former, are the ones we find mentioned frequently in inscribed leges sacrae, most of which are primarily concerned with expenditures and perquisites: see Mischkowski: 1917; Gill 1974: 117-37; 1991.

The textual evidence for theoxenia can be supplemented with information from representations on reliefs and vases. The type of reliefs formerly called "Totenmahreliks" (they do not represent the ordinary dead but only gods and heroes) is particularly informative (cf. Schauburg 1974: 101-17 and pl. 57; Dentzer 1982: 511-27; Verbanck-Pifard 1992). Examples can be seen in more general studies of Greek religion (Harrison 1922: 312, fig. 90; Cook 1925: 2.1162, fig. 970 [Zeus Phileos]; Nilsson 1940: fig. 32 [Dioskouroi] and fig. 16 [the Eleusinian gods, also in Nilsson 1955: fig. 39.3]). The Roman lectisternia, even if of Italic origin, may have been influenced by Greek practice (cf. Wissowa 1912: 421ff; Latte 1960: 242-44).

There is no verb governing the table and the couch at A14, but we should probably supply that used at A19, προθέμεν, "set before." A characteristic word used to refer to the rites of theoxenia is παροτιθεμεν, "set alongside," which can be used to refer to the food itself (e.g. Ath. 137e, Athens; LSSupp. 115 B 36-37; SEG 9.72, Buck 1955: no. 115), Kyrenes; LSSupp. 61.76ff, Amorgos), or of the table on which the food is placed (e.g. LSSupp. 20.15, Athens). The person alongside or before whom the food or the table is placed is the guest, i.e., the god or the hero who has been invited. In the present inscription the unusual προθέμεν suggests some physical object representing the guest before which the table is set. Sometimes images or symbols of the supernatural guests are present:

thus, for example, the xoana of the Twelve Gods are present at the
theoxenia in the festival of Zeus Sosipolis at Magnesia on the Maiandros where there is also the sacrifice of a bull (LSAM 32.41f [SIGI 589]; for further examples see the discussion of ἐναφή in the Commentary on A31). Here, we suggest, movable images were brought out and set up for the occasion. It cannot be ruled out, however, that the table and couch are to be placed before the altar on which the sacrifice is performed, or possibly before a shrine.

After the specification of the table and couch (A14) there follow instructions to "cast on (ἐνδαλέατο) a pure cloth and crowns of olive and honey mixture in new cups and πλάκαματα and meat." The same items may be expected to be placed on the table at A18f, where no details are given for this stage of the procedure; but in the next stage "the offerings from the table" (τάκτω τῶν τραφείων ἄργυραματα) are required to be burnt together with a thigh of the victim and bones. The preparation of the table for theoxenia is regularly referred to as κοσμεῖν, "to adorn," or κόσμημα, "adornment" (e.g. LSCG 7 A 12 [SIGI 1038], IG II 12 1363; IG II 12 1934.4). Covering the table with a clean cloth and setting out upon it crowns, honey mixture in new cups, etc., suit the sense of adornment very well.

Since the cups with their contents and the meat are surely to go on the table, it is likely that all the items listed are intended for the table. A cloth (κόσμημα) and other items, including five gold crowns "for the statues," appear in the inventory of the foundation of Diomedon on Kos (LSCG 177.120-30 [SIGI 1106]). No doubt we should imagine the couch as also being adorned with coverings (cf. στρώμαται and such related words as κοσμημένοι used of couches, e.g. IG II 12 1934.3) and cushions, as shown in reliefs and vase-paintings. The term for the preparation of the couch is κοσμημένος (cf. SIGI 255 A 5f, 15f [LSAM 11] and the κοσμημένα at Magnesia, LSAM 32.9 and 44).

Crowns were worn by sacrificers and diners (Blech 1982, Eitrem 1912: 64-75) and hence were provided for supernatural guests at this ceremony. At sacrifices in the family cult of Herakles that Diomedon established on Kos, the statues of Diomedon's ancestors (πέργυνοι) and probably also that of Herakles were to be crowned (LSCG 177.21f). The olive was, of course, an important plant in ritual and, though this is rarely mentioned, it was probably the most common material from which crowns were made (cf. e.g. LSAM 11.2f, Pergamon [SIGI 1018]).

The requirement that a clean cloth and new cups be used is consistent with the general practice of using clean and special clothing and equipment for ritual and festive activity. Thus Xenophon (fr. 1 West) describes the setting of a sacrifice with feasting and drinking to follow, "Now the floor is clean (κοσμημένοι) and the hands of all and the cups (κύπελλα), and we have put woven crowns around [our heads]." But in the present passage this aspect may be particularly important because the rites for the pure (κοσμημένοι) Tritopatres follow on those for the impure (μικρόπασοι) Tritopatres. New cups were to be dedicated on Kos among other offerings made in addition to normal sacrifice without, apparently, having first served as equipment for theoxenia (LSCG 151; see the Commentary on A15).

The last three items listed—the μελίματα ("honey mixture" in the fresh cups), πλάκαματα, and κρέας ("meat")—are the drink and the food of the entertainment, set out on the table, the ἄργυραματα of the table mentioned in A19. For the honey mixture, see 72 infra. For πλάκαματα, cf. Menander fr. 113 Kock (Demioergos), πλάκατομεν γαρ πλάκαμα (emended by Meineke to πέμματα). The word, to the best of our knowledge, does not occur in those leges sacrae that refer to cakes, the commonest term for which is πέμμα (e.g. Dentzer 1982: 519-24). Often πλάκαμα referred to images of clay (e.g. At. Av. 686) or wax (Pl. Tht. 20a, Hp. Ma. 288 a) or even of dried fruits (Diod. 17.67.3). Since fragments of small terracotta figurines have been reported from among the burnt remains associated with the Meilichios stones in the sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios at Selinous (V. Tusa 1971: 56, 1977: pl. XXIX; Dewailly 1992: 37-40; cf. Cr. VIII infra and Pl. 8b), it is tempting to interpret πλάκαματα as figurines in the present passage. But we do not hear of small figurines in theoxenia, and they are not represented in art. Furthermore the position of πλάκαματα, in the list here, between "honey mixture in cups" and "meat" very much favors their being foodstuffs. Cakes are clearly to be seen on the tables in front of the couches and seats of banqueting gods in the reliefs (e.g. Cook 1925: 1162 fig. 970; Nilsson 1940: figs. 16, 32; Nilsson 1955: pl. 39.3; Dentzer 1982: e.g. figs. 306, 316, 363, 416, 417).

κρέα at A15 and 20 refers to offerings of meat put on the table (for the form of the word, see the Commentary on A15). Strips of meat are shown on banquet tables in vase painting (e.g. Dentzer 1982: fig. 112, who, however, expresses doubts about their identification, 522), but on reliefs we do not know of examples, whereas cakes and fruits are unmistakable.

ἄργυραματος of A15f corresponds to τάκτω τῶν τραφείων of lines 19f, in the description of the rite performed in the following year. The verb ἄργυραματα here should mean "make offerings from" and refers to the taking of food and drink from the table and putting it on the altar, after which the offerings are to be burnt. Although the verb etymologically refers to first-fruits, it frequently has the broader sense of making an offering. At Od. 14.435f, 456, Eumaios offers a seventh portion of the cooked food to Hermes and the Nymphs (ὀρείπατα θόες), which we take to mean that he puts it on the fire, after having set it aside and prayed over it when dividing up the meat (436).³

The cups used (in "this year's" theoxenia) are to be "put in" and then anointed with oil (A16). If they are to be put in the fire, the order of procedure is strange. One would expect the cups to have been anointed first. It may be that some other place is referred to by the participle ἐναφίεται,³

³For recent discussions of this passage see Kadletz 1984 and Petropoulou 1987. On ἐναφή and its cognates see Beer 1914, but no thorough study of the subject has been published. It is not one of the words examined in Casabona 1966.
“having put on/in,” such as the structure with a roof, whose existence is implied at A11; but in this case perhaps some other opening is to be understood.

As for the recipients of theoxenia, it has long been recognized that while major figures such as Zeus, the Twelve Gods, and Apollo at Delphi were invited, the most characteristic guests were more intimate and familiar figures: the Dioskouroi, the heroes of the “Totenmahlreliefs,” and such lesser forms of Zeus as Zeus Xenios, for whom a table was always set up on Crete in the men’s mess-building (Ath. 143 fr), and Zeus Philos ( Dionysius Comicus, fr. 2 Kock; Pyrgion, FG VII 467 F 1 apud Ath. 2398–2408; IG II 2 4622, a dedicatory relief illustrated at Harrington 1912: 312, fig. 90, 1922: 355, fig. 106, and Cook 1925: 1162, fig. 970). Diomedon’s foundation on Kos provides for the association of the statues of his ancestors with the cult of Heraclids and perhaps also with that of Pasios (Zeus Ktesios, LSCG 177). Xouthos in Euripides’ Ion (805, 1130) offers εξία καὶ γενέθλια το γενέτευσα θεότικα on recovering (as he supposes) his son Ion. Deneken (1881: 3 n.2) raised the possibility that these were dei patrii aut Tritopatores. For Euripides’ play this cannot be determined, but clearly here at Selinous the Tritopatores seem to have been the guests on at least the first occasion (A14–16).

In the following year (A18–20) a ceremony with a table may take place before the δόμοις ἦσαρα, “public sacred objects” (as we interpret the phrase), the figures or symbols representing the corresponding divinities of the whole community. Also in the second year a sacrifice may be made “at home.” It is not clear whether a couch as well as a table would have been prepared. The actual slaughter of the animal(s) occurs in some relationship to statues, ἡγαλομα (A21). We have suggested (supra 10, 39) that the victim was an ox.

There may be a third example of theoxenia in our text, but that depends on the interpretation of B1–7 (see Ch. III). If the same person is the subject throughout these lines, he offers hospitality to a spirit, an elasteros. By an alternative explanation, the subject of B3f is a third party, someone who purifies the subject of the phrase, the figures or symbols representing the corresponding divinities of the whole community. Also in the second year a sacrifice may be made “at home.” It is not clear whether a couch as well as a table would have been prepared. The actual slaughter of the animal(s) occurs in some relationship to statues, ἡγαλομα (A21). We have suggested (supra 10, 39) that the victim was an ox.

There may be a third example of theoxenia in our text, but that depends on the interpretation of B1–7 (see Ch. III). If the same person is the subject throughout these lines, he offers hospitality to a spirit, an elasteros. By an alternative explanation, the subject of B3f is a third party, someone who purifies the subject of the phrase, the figures or symbols representing the corresponding divinities of the whole community. Also in the second year a sacrifice may be made “at home.” It is not clear whether a couch as well as a table would have been prepared. The actual slaughter of the animal(s) occurs in some relationship to statues, ἡγαλομα (A21). We have suggested (supra 10, 39) that the victim was an ox.

4. Libations

In leges sacræ libations accompanying the performance of sacrifice are described only when they are distinctive and deviate from the norm. Although they are mentioned in our text only at A10f and A13–15, there is no doubt that libations of the customary type accompanied all the sacrifices prescribed. In A10f and 13ff distinctive procedures are required, and a contrast is drawn between them. A10f: “(Sacrifice) to the Tritopatores, the impure, as (one sacrifices) to the heroes, having poured a libation of wine down through the roof.” A13–15: “... to the pure

(Tritopatores). Pouring down a libation of honey mixture (let him set out) both a table and a couch and let him put on (them) a pure cloth and crowns of olive and honey mixture in new cups...” A clear distinction is drawn ritually between the impure Tritopatores who receive wine and the pure who receive honey mixture.

The rare word ὑπολειβω here describes the action of pouring the wine “through the roof.” When it is used a second time for the pure Tritopatores we should probably understand it again as referring to the action of pouring liquid through an opening in the roof of a structure devoted to these figures. The word occurs in the medical writers (Hippoc. Mul. 1. 34, VIII 234 Littré; Galen Ling. exp. XIX 149 Kühn) of the dripping of blood. In poetry it is used of ritual in Aeschylus (Ag. 69f, in a much-emended passage1) and of the dripping of sweat in Nicander (Alexipharmaka 24).

The basic meaning of λειβω and its compounds and derivatives is “to pour drop by drop” (Rudhardt 1958: 240; Casabona 1966: 276; Chantraine 1968–80 s.v.; Benveniste 1973: 476ff; cf. Henrichs 1983: 96, “in measured spurts”). In common usage it was widely replaced by καταβα, which maintained the same general sense, in contrast to ἔχω and its derivatives, which referred to pouring the entire contents of a container at once. The latter, not found in our text, is characteristic of offerings to the dead and figures of the underworld.2 The action of consecrating all that a vessel contains, however, may be implied in the reference to honey mixture in new cups (see on theoxenia, supra 67ff).

4 συν ὡς ὑποκαιτεὶς ὑπολειβῶν / ὑπὸ τὰ κεραυνά / ἄπειρον εἶρων (ὑποκαιτεὶς Casabon, ὑπολειβῶν codd.). See Frankel 1950: 42f and Denniston-Page 1957: 74f. The latter cite Dover’s comment that Greek not infrequently uses the same preposition in two compounds when it is appropriate to only one. Beeston’s emendation, ὑπολειβῆς for ὑπολειβῶν, adopted by Denniston and Page, supposes that the verb governs the following genitives, ἄπειρον εἶρων, “pouring from unfired offerings.” But the passage refers to three separate ritual actions: sacrifice (we accept Casabon’s τὸ βάπτισμα), libation, and offerings deposited without fire. After ὑπολειβῆς the Mor. read ὑπὸ δικαιρω, which is almost universally regarded as a gloss (influenced by the common Homeric phrase δικαιρο λειβων) on the false reading ὑποκαταιτειων and deleted. Wilamowitz, however, suggested that δικαιρω had displaced δικατισι γιγαντων. Whether or not that precise phrase occurred here, the retention of the third ὑπὸ, after ὑπολειβῆς, has the virtue of preserving the three distinct procedures. With the third ὑπὸ retained, the suggested ὑπολειβῶν no longer has a genitive to govern and has no advantage over the manuscripts’ ὑπολειβῶν. 

5 Cf. Casabon 1966: 279–7ff; Benveniste 1973: 476ff; Graf 1940. Sophocles OC 477 uses the phrase γοιδικε γεφυρας of appealing the Eumenides whose grove Oidipous has violated. This is also the language of Plutarch in describing how Apollo was said to have "made libations (guot) and performed what men perform when they are appeasing the anger of δικε, who are they call δικαιοκρατος and πολιοματις" in Thessaly, for the killing of Python (Mor. 418f; cf. n.10 infra). For the dead cf. LSCG 97 A 8ff.
In the present text the verb ὑπόλειψαμεν is used both for wine and honey mixture and for heroic and divine procedures. The choice of the unusual prefix would seem, therefore, not to be determined by the nature of the liquid or the character of the recipients but by the place into which the liquid is poured, the structure with a roof, which we think is most likely to have been set into the ground. Pausanias describes how the Phokians poured the blood of victims through a hole into the grave of a hero άρηνηματος at Tronis (10.4.10, το μέν αίμα δι' ὧν ἐκέχοιτο εἰς τὸν τάφον; the meat was consumed on the spot). Aside from the act of pouring down from above, the Phokian rite (for which Pausanias' verb is ἐκτίνα, and which uses blood and is performed daily) is quite different from the Selinous rite. The preposition in ὑπόλειψαμεν may reflect the idea of pouring under, i.e., of the liquid's passing through the roof and coming under it, or perhaps more plausibly, the idea of gradual passage, dripping drop by drop (cf. LSJ s.v. ὑπόπει, τάφος).

Wine mixed with water was both a normal drink of the Greeks and the drink from which they normally poured a limited quantity to their gods and heroes. Unmixed wine, milk, and honey mixture (whether with water or milk) were unusual and signalled departure from the norm (Graf 1980; Henrichs 1983 and 1984). It is frequently said that wineless offerings (μηράτα) were characterised by their impurity, the dead, and figures of the underworld rather than to the Olympian gods (cf. Ziehen 1935, as well as more recent studies just cited). The most common wineless libations were μελικρατα, a mixture of honey and water or honey and milk (Graf 1980: 212). The Eumenides were said to receive μελικρατας σκονδη (Paus. 2.11.4), honey and water (Soph. OC 481), and milk and honey (Σ Soph. OC 115), or at least no wine (Aesch. Eum. 107, Soph. OC 100). Another figure close to the concerns of the present text, Zeus Elasteros on Paros, has an altar for which the only rite specified is that it should receive libations of honey (LSSupp. 62; IG XI.5 1027: ἴσαυρος Διός ἐκκεχοΰσαν δι' ὑπὸν ἑκατοντάρπιον). μέληται / κατεχόμεται, 480–450 B.C.? see 116 infra.

Greek practice was complex, and while we may believe that structural significance was inherent in the various types of libation offered, we usually know too little of an entire ritual and its context to interpret this aspect adequately. What is novel about the distinctions made at Selinous is that although the impure Tritopatores would appear to be the more abnormal and even dangerous figures, they receive wine while the pure Tritopatores receive the less normal type of libation, the honey mixture.

4For wine to heroes and the dead cf. Henrichs 1983: 98, who notes that wineless libations to heroes are the exception rather than the rule. Lucian (Charon 22) speaks of sumptuous dinners burnt and libations of wine and honey mixture poured into pits for the dead. It is possible that the bare reference to wine in A10 is to unmixed wine, dripped down into a chamber, and not to mixed wine drunk by participants and shared with gods and heroes. If so, a distinction is being made here between two types of abnormal liquid offerings.

5Purification

Death, and especially the shedding of blood, was the most serious source of pollution for the Greeks and one known to have engaged Zeus Meilichios (see 94f). The new word ἀποτραπτεται at B9 denotes, we have suggested, one who has shed blood. The impurity of the Tritopatores at A10 is also likely to come from death, more probably extraordinary, violent death such as homicide than death from natural causes. The closer kin of the dead are more affected by the pollution of death than persons more distantly related or unrelated (cf. LSG 97 A 25–29 [SIG 3 877]). It is conceivable, though unparalleled hitherto, that the ancestral spirits known as the Tritopatores could be contaminated by a death, especially a violent death, or by a homicide involving members of the group to which they were attached (cf. supra 53f).

The need for purification arose both from contact with polluting acts or substances and from the danger of supernatural forces. Between the two, no clear demarcation can be drawn. The relationship of the two concepts for the consequences of bloodshed has been much discussed, but there is no concept to suppose uniformity of belief throughout the Greek world or in all periods of Greek history, or even among different individuals within the same society (cf. Parker 1983: 10f, 70, 104–43).

Rites of purification involved two types of procedures: (1) symbolic actions that express the removal of pollution metaphorically, such as washing, aspersion (the sprinkling of water), fumigation, especially with sulphur; and the manipulation of the body of an animal or its blood (e.g., applying blood to remove the stain of blood); and (2) propitiatory or averting sacrifices made to hostile forces. At the shrine of Amphiaraoos, for instance, Pausanias reported that "Purification consists of sacrificing to..."
the god.” (Frazier’s translation of 1.34.5, ἐπὶ δὲ καθάρσιν τῷ θεῷ θεοῦ.) The distinction and connection of the two procedures have been noted frequently. Although it might seem logical and historically plausible to suppose that the first type of ritual, employing symbolic cleansing, was used for pollution and that the second, employing propitiatory sacrifices, was directed towards the anger of gods and spirits, such a division is not confirmed by Greek practice. Both sources of pollution and both types of remedies seem to have been thoroughly intertwined, as, for example, in Theocritus 24.94–98, where fumigation and aspersion of a house are followed by sacrifice. This is also the case in the Selinuntine regulations. Sacrifice predominates, but there are also symbolic acts of cleansing: aspersion (prescribed for the impure Triteptatcs at A12) and as the last action mentioned for the person purified from an elasteros at B11) and perhaps washing (ἀνόνωπος, B4).

Washing, while attested in rites whose whole purpose is purification, is also a general, preliminary act of purification before sacrifice and formal meals (see Commentary on B4). At B4 it is inseparable from the other two acts of hospitality prescribed in that line (the giving of a meal and salt), all three of which are followed by a sacrifice to Zeus. It is not clear that in this context it is directed toward the particular pollution incurred by the person seeking purification. Both columns, however, are filled with specification for sacrifice and offerings, that is, with the procedures for appeasement and averment, and it is these that seem to produce the desired state of purification (cf. B10f).

Most of the references we have to rites of purification are couched in very general terms. All we can say for sure about them is that sacrifice or law allowed the unintentional homicide to return from exile once he had been forgiven by the state of purification, that is, with the procedures for ap-

The distinction and connection of the two procedures have been noted by Apollonius Rhodius (4.685–717): Jason and Medea seek purification from Kirke for the killing of Apsyrtos and go to her hearth (693). Kirke’s ritual is in two parts:

1. She kills a piglet and lets the blood pour on the hands of the murderers (704–07).
2. With other φαγητα (poured offerings; cf. LSSupp. 115A49) she calls on Zeus Katharsios (707–09); she burns grain and honey offerings (πελανούς μελακτεῖ τέ) at the hearth, accompanied by “wineless vows.”

A distinctive feature of the purification ritual in the Selinuntine lex sacra is the instruction at B4 to give (water for) washing, a meal, and salt. Although washing and salt (for aspersion) are known from other descriptions of purification, their combination here with the provision of a meal (ἀναπτίγαθα) has no close parallel. The person who provides the washing, meal, and salt does so as a host who receives the other (lμπονομενος του τοι αυτοφθονοδε αναπτίγαθα).

There is, however, a quotation from Athenian regulations that is exceptionally explicit. A group of sacrificers wash themselves, and one of them then washes away the blood (symbolically) from the person seeking purification, after which the water is shaken up and poured “into the same place,” perhaps a trench into which blood from the sacrifice has been poured. But the sacrifice itself, since it includes the communal tasting of the inwards (κάλδος τα τρητα τα), the sacrificers are referred to as of καθαρσύς (purification), was in its essentials a normal sacrifice, not σφάγη. Washing, as at B4, was apparently subordinate to a sacrifice. But whereas in the Athenian practice the water is used by the purifier to wash off blood symbolically from the one being purified, at Selinus it is not evident that a purifier performed the act of washing (if, in fact, a purifier had a rôle in the proceedings).

Most literary instances of purification are also described only very generally. An unusually detailed account of symbolic actions and placatory offerings (which, to be sure, are also symbolic in character) is given by Apollonius Rhodius (4.685–717): Jason and Medea seek purification from Kirke for the killing of Apsyrtos and go to her hearth (693). Kirke’s ritual is in two parts:

1. She kills a piglet and lets the blood pour on the hands of the murderers (704–07).
2. With other φαγητα (poured offerings; cf. LSSupp. 115A49) she calls on Zeus Katharsios (707–09); she burns grain and honey offerings (πελανούς μελακτεῖ τέ) at the hearth, accompanied by “wineless vows.”

A distinctive feature of the purification ritual in the Selinuntine lex sacra is the instruction at B4 to give (water for) washing, a meal, and salt. Although washing and salt (for aspersion) are known from other descriptions of purification, their combination here with the provision of a meal (ἀναπτίγαθα) has no close parallel. The person who provides the washing, meal, and salt does so as a host who receives the other (lμπονομενος του τοι αυτοφθονοδε αναπτίγαθα).

There is, however, a quotation from Athenian regulations that is exceptionally explicit. A group of sacrificers wash themselves, and one of them then washes away the blood (symbolically) from the person seeking purification, after which the water is shaken up and poured “into the same place,” perhaps a trench into which blood from the sacrifice has been poured. But the sacrifice itself, since it includes the communal tasting of the inwards (κάλδος τα τρητα τα), the sacrificers are referred to as of καθαρσύς (purification), was in its essentials a normal sacrifice, not σφάγη. Washing, as at B4, was apparently subordinate to a sacrifice. But whereas in the Athenian practice the water is used by the purifier to wash off blood symbolically from the one being purified, at Selinus it is not evident that a purifier performed the act of washing (if, in fact, a purifier had a rôle in the proceedings).

Most literary instances of purification are also described only very generally. An unusually detailed account of symbolic actions and placatory offerings (which, to be sure, are also symbolic in character) is given by Apollonius Rhodius (4.685–717): Jason and Medea seek purification from Kirke for the killing of Apsyrtos and go to her hearth (693). Kirke’s ritual is in two parts:

1. She kills a piglet and lets the blood pour on the hands of the murderers (704–07).
2. With other φαγητα (poured offerings; cf. LSSupp. 115A49) she calls on Zeus Katharsios (707–09); she burns grain and honey offerings (πελανούς μελακτεῖ τέ) at the hearth, accompanied by “wineless vows.”

A distinctive feature of the purification ritual in the Selinuntine lex sacra is the instruction at B4 to give (water for) washing, a meal, and salt. Although washing and salt (for aspersion) are known from other descriptions of purification, their combination here with the provision of a meal (ἀναπτίγαθα) has no close parallel. The person who provides the washing, meal, and salt does so as a host who receives the other (lμπονομενος του τοι αυτοφθονοδε αναπτίγαθα).

There is, however, a quotation from Athenian regulations that is exceptionally explicit. A group of sacrificers wash themselves, and one of them then washes away the blood (symbolically) from the person seeking purification, after which the water is shaken up and poured “into the same place,” perhaps a trench into which blood from the sacrifice has been poured. But the sacrifice itself, since it includes the communal tasting of the inwards (κάλδος τα τρητα τα), the sacrificers are referred to as of καθαρσύς (purification), was in its essentials a normal sacrifice, not σφάγη. Washing, as at B4, was apparently subordinate to a sacrifice. But whereas in the Athenian practice the water is used by the purifier to wash off blood symbolically from the one being purified, at Selinus it is not evident that a purifier performed the act of washing (if, in fact, a purifier had a rôle in the proceedings).

Most literary instances of purification are also described only very generally. An unusually detailed account of symbolic actions and placatory offerings (which, to be sure, are also symbolic in character) is given by Apollonius Rhodius (4.685–717): Jason and Medea seek purification from Kirke for the killing of Apsyrtos and go to her hearth (693). Kirke’s ritual is in two parts:

1. She kills a piglet and lets the blood pour on the hands of the murderers (704–07).
2. With other φαγητα (poured offerings; cf. LSSupp. 115A49) she calls on Zeus Katharsios (707–09); she burns grain and honey offerings (πελανούς μελακτεῖ τέ) at the hearth, accompanied by “wineless vows.”

A distinctive feature of the purification ritual in the Selinuntine lex sacra is the instruction at B4 to give (water for) washing, a meal, and salt. Although washing and salt (for aspersion) are known from other descriptions of purification, their combination here with the provision of a meal (ἀναπτίγαθα) has no close parallel. The person who provides the washing, meal, and salt does so as a host who receives the other (lμπονομενος του τοι αυτοφθονοδε αναπτίγαθα).
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We have already discussed this passage (see supra 55), noting the
similarity of the Kyrenean hikesios to the Selinuntine elasteros and the
possibility, therefore, that these types of spirits were to be dealt with in a
comparable way. Though much debated and much misunderstood,
despite Stukey's early and cogent explanation (1937), the directions for
the procedure at Kyrene are less laconic and clearer than what we have at
Selinous. At Kyrene the host (ποιοδεξάμενου, LSSupp. 115B36; cf.
[hu] ποιοδεξάμενον at B3f of the Selinous text) makes a proclamation
(προετθημι, cf. B2f of our text) and entertains the supernatural visitants,
probably represented by figurines. The verb for setting out "a portion of
everything" is παρατιθημι, used for setting food or a table carrying food
beside a guest when entertaining either a human or a god or hero at
theoxenia (cf. supra 67). Possibly other items of hospitality (including
washing water and salt?) were also offered. Both the figurines and the
"portions of everything" were then deposited in an unworked wood.
Selinous lacks these figurines, unless the
 glyphiaxta apparently referred to
in the lacunose line A21 correspond to the Kyrenean κολοκτώ, but shares
with Kyrene the ritual of hospitality. Both texts seem to concentrate on
procedures of appeasement. Sacrifices occur at Kyrene at the end of the
preserved text for the third type of hikesios (cf. Stukey 1937: 39 n.36).
Both make use of theoxenia rites of which those at Selinous are the more
developed, being found in both Columns A and B, prescribed both for
spirits that protect (A) and spirits that threaten (B). It is possible that at
Selinous images or symbols of the protecting spirits are employed (see
Commentary on A3), while at Kyrene there is mention only of specially-
made figurines of the threatening spirits.

V. The Supernatural

1. Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides

A8-9: "To Zeus Eumenes [and] the Eumenides
sacrifice a full-grown (sheep)."

The epithet of Zeus is new. A Zeus Eumenes is, in fact, found in Asia
Minor, but he is a creation of the Eumenid rulers of Pergamon, and his
epithet refers to the name of their dynasty and not to his association with
the Eumenides (see SIG3 985.6f [1 B.C.], with note; Cook 1925: 960). Here
Eumenes is a title indicating his partnership with the lesser figures in a cult
to which they contributed the distinctive character. One can compare, for
example, Athena Areia with Ares in the oath of the Athenian ephebes
(Tod 1948: II 204.2f, 17f; Robert 1938: 302f). At Lindos Zeus Damatrios
accompanied the Damateres (cf. Nilsson 1935: 87 n.33; for further
examples see Schwabl 1972: 266).

The name of the Eumenides has been read on a sixth-century stone of
Zeus Meilichios from the Campo di Stele at Selinous (cf. 89 infra), but the
most recent discussion of the text favors the reading Ευμενίδος, a
personal name, rather than Ευμενίδος τό... (cf. Lazzarini 1976: 150f; Jordan
1991: 281). The cult of the Eumenides elsewhere in western Sicily is sug-
gested by the month Eumenideios at Entella in the third century (SEG
30.1117.3, 1118.3, 1120.3; cf. Nenci and Asheri 1982: 775-78); Dubois (1986
and 1989: 60) unnecessarily posits the cult of a local divinity Ευμενίδης
to explain the month name.

The closest parallel for the link between Zeus and the Eumenides is
seen in a series of some twenty rock-cut inscriptions at Ain el Hofra,
about two kilometers outside the town of Kyrene (SEG 9.325-46), and in
another group of four whose precise location is not given in the publica-
tion (SEG 20.723; see also 88 infra).

The first series was published by Ferri (1923), discussed further by
him in 1929, and restudied (though without autopsy) by Forbes (1956).
Rock-cut inscriptions are difficult to read at best, and Ferri's publication,
from which all discussion derives, was sketchy. Most names are ab-
breviated (e.g. EYM) or incomplete. The inscriptions may be classified
roughly as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eumenides and Zeus</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zeus alone</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Eumenides, Zeus, and Heroes 1
Eumenides and Heroes 1
Eumenides alone 3

The Eumenides occur in nine inscriptions, Zeus in nine, and the Heroes in five. Personal names occur in five, and in four there are only personal names. Zeus with the epithet Meilichios appears once with the Eumenides (SEG 9.327, Ferri 1923: no. 2, Forbes 1956: no. 2), once alone (SEG 9.329, Ferri 1923: no. 5, Forbes 1956: no. 3). There are also two examples of the epithet alone (one is incomplete). Because no other epithet of the god occurs, Zeus is probably always Meilichios. The deities are always in the genitive, with the exception of SEG 9.327, in which both Zeus and the Eumenides are in the dative. At least two, and perhaps all, the personal names are in the genitive. The inscriptions appear to be of the fourth century.1

Of the four at an unspecified location, SEG 20.722a-d (Oliviero and Pugliese Carratelli 1961: no. 9), one consists of two letters EA, two others have the beginning of the word Eumenides, probably with a personal name, and the last has the Eumenides in the genitive, Mn(A)tic in the nominative, and two other names (human or divine; cf. 88 infra).

There are a number of parallels between the cults at Selinous and Kyrene. All the Kyrenian inscriptions we have been considering mark places on bedrock, and at some of these the rock has been cut out to serve as an altar or as the setting for a statue or some other dedication. On the sandy hill of the Gaggera at Selinous, where no bedrock is exposed, individual blocks of stone were used as markers and as the loci of ritual. Both areas, Ain el Hofra and the Gaggera, lie outside town but are not funerary. Ferri described the valley of Ain el Hofra as a "τέμνεων funerario" but was unable to point to any graves in the area, nor have any been mentioned in connection with Oliviero's group. At Selinous individuals or groups named after an individual are responsible for the inscriptions and the erection of the stones. At Kyrene, at a later date, individuals but not groups seem to have been involved. The Meilichios stones at Selinous, when inscribed, refer only to this Zeus, though just possibly in the one instance noted above also to the Eumenides. At Kyrene the Heroes, in the genitive case as are Zeus and the Eumenides for the most part, appear five times. Are they comparable to the Tritopaters, sanctified

1Ferri (1923) published drawings of twenty-one inscriptions. His no. 19 is of much later date and is not apparently related to the rest. Two numbers were repeated, 6 and 15 (the latter as 15 and 134), perhaps to indicate that each pair may have belonged to a single inscription. We have counted them as four inscriptions. Ferri (1923: 19) speaks of no. 20 (SEG 9.336) as showing that the dedicant constructed an altar, perhaps because of the shape of the rock on which it was cut (cf. Forbes 1956: 237). Forbes points out that the dialect of this inscription suggests koiné influence, though it is dated in SEG 9, p. 64, as fifth century: Δημητρίου Δως / Ευμενίδων Ηρώων. Publications subsequent to Ferri all correct his Δως to Δως.
name and both a dangerous and a benevolent aspect; and like him they are
guardians of the integrity of the oikos (cf. Aesch. Eum. 895). But at
Selinous they are not only associated with Meilichios; they also have
their own Zeus: Eumenes. He and they may be expected to have rôles
related to but distinct from that of Zeus Meilichios.

Although the Erinyes have no cult places and receive no honors, one
may try to appease them when they are hostile through offerings and rites
of purification. In seeking to purify themselves for the murder of
Apsyrtos, Jason and Medea make offerings to Zeus, referred to as Hikesi-
os and Katharios, and to the Erinyes (Ap. Rhod. 4.700-17; cf. 119 infra).
Cakes and honey-mixture (μελίκτερα or μελίκρατα) without wine are
offered to appease the anger of the Erinyes and make Zeus εὖμεθις ...
καὶ ἡμῶς (715). Thus the Erinyes, with their ὑμελίκτοις ἤτοι (II. 9.568),
are converted to figures who are eumenides and associated with Zeus
who is, in effect, meilichios. This concept of Zeus who may become
εὖμεθις is close to that of Zeus Eumenes of the lex sacra.

Pausanias’ version of Orestes’ encounter with the two aspects of the
goddesses at Ake in Arkadia (8.34.21) has already been noted (supra 53).
Known locally as the Maniai, they initially appeared to him as black. When
he bit off and ate one of his fingers, they then appeared to him as white.
Regaining his sanity at this sight, he first sacrificed to the black Erinyes to
turn away their anger. The word Pausanias uses for this sacrifice is
ἐὕνυσεν, the term for sacrifice to underworld figures, heroes, and the
dead (cf. Casabona 1966: 204-10; Rudhardt 1958: 238f, 250f). The word for
Orestes’ subsequent sacrifice to the white ones is ἔθυσεν, the term for
normal sacrifice (though when not used in contrast to other more
specialized terms, it covers sacrifice in general).

Literary sources tend to overschematize the categories of ritual (cf.
Nock 1944). The picture derived from inscriptions is more complex, as
we have already seen is the case with the pre-stat text (supra 63). The
contrasts are not as simple and sharp as Pausanias’ description of the
Arkadian tradition would suggest. At Selinous we do not find the
distinctive rites that are reported for the Eumenides and their like:
wineless offerings of water, honey-mixture, and milk, or black sheep in
the two rituals for the Tritopatores—who with their two aspects, μιαροί
and καθαροί, resemble the black and white Erinyes—all the sacrifices are
normal (θυσία), with the Eumenides sharing a full-grown sheep with Zeus
Eumenes. The principal elaboration is in the form of the theokria, the
entertainment of supernatural guests, in addition to the normal sacrifice.
In this column it is primarily the kindly, protective aspect of the figures,
including the Eumenides, that is addressed.

Column B, by contrast, is explicitly concerned with purification, ex-
cept perhaps for the concluding sacrifice to the Elasteros. The procedure,
which seems to consist essentially of hospitality (offered to the threat-
ening power) and of sacrifice, finds its closest parallel in the great lex sacra

of Kyrene (see supra 55, 76). The elasteros, as we shall see (116-20 infra),
corresponds to the dangerous, vengeful Erinyes, the supernatural pursuers par excellence, the dark side of the Eumenides of Column A. The
dual character, however, of the Tritopatores of A, μιαροί and καθαροί,
shows a link with the purification of B. The untitled Zeus who receives a
sacrifice as part of the purification procedure (B5) could be either Zeus
Eumenes or Zeus Meilichios of A. The subjects and the supernatural
figures of the two columns are different but related.

2. Zeus Meilichios

Attica

Agrai
(a) Thuc. 1.126.6, ἐκτι γὰρ καὶ Ἄθηναίοις Δίας ἐπιτίθεται ἄτοι ἁμαρτηθέντων καὶ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἢ ἐν πανδημίᾳ θυσίαν πολλὰς ὧν ἤρεθα ἅλλα θυσίας ἐπικράτει (7th and 5th cent.).

Akropolis (Athens)
(b) Sacrificial calendar (of an unknown organization): LSCG 1 A 3-5 (IG P 234), ΛΕΛΗΕΛΙΟΧΙΟΝ ΕΠΗΝΟΔΟΣ ΜΕΤΡΙΩΝ: Ἐν ΤΩΝ ΑΓΓΑΝ [480-460]

Thorikos
(c) Sacrificial calendar of the deme: SEG 33.147 (Daux 1983) 34f, ΔΑΣΗΙΑΙΟΣ ΛΕΛΗΕΛΙΟΧΙΟΝ ΟΕ ΠΡΟΣΩΝ (later 5th cent. [ed. pr.: 4th])

Agora (mostly in the area of the Odeon of Agrippa, probably also from this sanctuary)

(b) Relief of large snake and (at least one) man (Pl. 9): Raubitschek 1943: 49f no. 9, Ὄλομπος Δίω Μηλιχίων (ca. 330)

(i) Relief of man and woman (venerating snake?): SEG 21.790 (ibid. 51 no. 10), Δίω Μηλιχίων (for Μιλίς, / Αριστόξ- - - -), καὶ Φιλακχί[ῶ τῶν]’ / ἐν(θε)κε[ῶν] (3rd cent.)

(j) Relief of snake (and worshippers?): SEG 12.167 (Meritt 1952: 377f no. 33), Θεόθε[ - - Δίω Μηλιχίων (2nd cent.)

(k) Dedication: SEG 21.781 (Meritt 1963: 45 no. 58), [- - Δίω Μηλιχίων (4th cent.)

(l) Dedication: Raubitschek 1943: 51f no. 11 [Δίω Μηλιχίων / - - Δίω]

Shrine of Nympha, south of Akropolis

(m) Relief of snake: SEG 17.87 (Διαξ 1958: 366f; Meliades 1958: 9), Ἴδεα Δίω / Μηλιχίων (4th-3rd cent.)

Athens

(n) Relief of snake with three worshippers (man, woman, girl) much smaller in scale: Metropleous 1975: 121f, Ἀριστομένης / Δίω Μηλιχίων (end of 4th cent.)

Alopeke (Ambelokipi)

(o) Stele: IG II 2 866, ἱκερὸν : / Δίω: Μηλιχίων: Πηθ.: 'Αθηναίος (late 5th cent.)

Petraiuss (all probably from same shrine near Zea and Mounichia harbors)

(p) Relief of bearded male holding scepter in left hand, phiale in right, seated to left of altar; man, woman and boy approaching from right as worshippers (drawing, Cook 1925: 1106, fig. 943): IG II 2 4569; [- - Ζωοβόλων Δίω Μηλιχίων (first half of 4th cent.)

(q) Relief of snake: IG II 2 4617, Ῥίδικτον / Δίω Μηλιχίων (4th cent.)

Sounion

(u) In fortress outside temple. Relief of two snakes. Dedication to Zeus Melilichios, text unpublished. Welter 1925: 314

(v) Sacrifices of sheep (by whom?) to Zeus Melilichios and Zeus Ktesios, the fleeces of which were kept and called divine (δία) or addressed as Zeus (Δία, as in the MSS.) and then used by the organizers of the Skirophoria, by the Eleusinian Daidouchos, and by “certain others for purifications, putting them under the feet of the polluted” (Suda s.v. Δίω κρόδόν; Hsch. s.v.; Anecd. Bekk. I p.7.15-20 and p.242.26-28). The fleece was also carried, together with a kerykeion, in the procession and ceremonies called the Pompeia in the last ten days of the month Maimakterion, at which time also occurred the casting out of pollutions at crossroads (Eust. Od. 22.481, 1934-45; cf. Hsch. s.v. μαμίλκτες–μηλίχως, καθάρσις: Deubner 1932: 157f; Tresp 1914: 86f; Parker 1983: 375).

(x) Family cult? Xen. Anab. 7.8.1-6, holocaust sacrifice of piglets πατρῷο (vel paterpō) νύμφοι (4th cent.)

(λ) The Diasia as a festival of family and kin: Ar. Ned. 408f, Τισιόκεννα / ὄπως γαλακτος εὐγενέσι; 864, προῖκην τοι διασία δαμαίδα (later 5th cent.)

Peloponnesos

Corinth

Petachora. Small stele (boundary marker?): Payne 1940: 7, Δίως Μηλιχίων (not earlier than 4th cent.)

Sikyon

Near heroon of Aratos and the council chamber, an image of Zeus Melilichios likened to a πατρὶς and one of Artemis (Patroia) likened to a κλώ (Paus. 2.9.6

Achaea

Pellana. Small bronze snake: Neugebauer 1922: 76 no. 25, ἅπαξ ἐμι τῷ Μηλίχιῳ τῷ Πελάναι (6th or 5th cent.)
Argos

Paus. 2.20.1f. Stasis in 417 required acts of purification, including the dedication of a statue of Zeus Meilichios (a seated figure in marble by Polykleitos) for the shedding of ἀίμα ἔμφυλον (cf. Jameson 1965: 170).

Tegea

IG V.2 90, Διό Μειλιχίου Μικρόλοφος ἀνέθηκε (2nd–1st cent.)

Megara

Boundary marker for the precinct of the cult for one of the three Dorian tribes: Richards 1898: 332, Διός Μίληχιος Πανυόλο (5th cent.). Jones, 1987: 64, suggests it may mean “for all the tribes,” comparing Artemis Παμφυλία at Epidauros (IG IV2.1 503), where, however, the tribe of the Pamphyloi did not exist and consequently there was no ambiguity.

Boiotia

Thespiæ

(a) Votive plaque: IG VII 1814, Θωνοκλίδας Διονυσίω Αντί Μίληχι κή Μειλίχιον

(b) Small stele: Plassart 1926: 422 no. 43, Δεξιάδας / Πέτρον / ίαρείς / Διό Μειλίχιον / κή Μειλίχιον ... (4th cent.)?

(c) Stele base? Plassart 1926: 423 no. 44, Θαρτώμασος Θεός ίαρείς / Διό Μειλίχιον (Hellenistic)

Orchomenos

Decree by the city, with the priest as proposer, to build a fountain in the sanctuary of the god for the use of those sacrificing there. IG VII 3169, ... Διό Μίληχιον ... (end of 3rd cent.)

Lebadeia

(a) Rectangular pillar with omphalos on top and relief of snake climbing up front: Keramopoulos 1917: 421 no. 2, [Κ]οίλαι / Αῖοι / Μίληχιον

(b) Rectangular pillar with omphalos on top: Jannoray 1940–41: 49 inv. 7 and 51 fig. 5.1, Ἑρμαῖος / Ἀριστοκλῆς / δήμος / Μειλίχιον (3rd or 2nd cent.). Lerat (1952: II 147) restores a head, not an omphalos on top, as also for (d).

(c) Rectangular pillar with omphalos on top (broken); male genitals on front, below inscription; projections on left and right sides, as on herms: Jannoray 1940–41: 49 inv. 12, and 51 fig. 5.2 Ὀνᾶλλο / δήμον [s] / Μειλίχιον (3rd–2nd cent.)

(d) Rectangular pillar, originally with a second element attached on top; projections and genitals, as for a herm, incised: Jannoray 1940–41: 49f inv. 15 and 51 fig. 5.3, Μεταφορά / Μειλίχιον (3rd–2nd cent.)

CHAPTER V.2: ZEUS MEILICHIOS

Antbedon

Stele with relief of snake: Jardé and Laurent 1902: 324f no. 15, [Ἀ]πολλόνιος / Κλαμπουδικόν / Διός Μιλείχιον (3rd cent.). Lukouri-Tolia 1986 identifies a large snake engraved on the inside of a marble περιβάλλωμα from Antbedon as Zeus Meilichios, accompanied by another figure, perhaps Demeter.

Elateia

Limestone cone, inscribed on side, with a hole in its truncated top: IG VII 174 (Paris 1887: no. 15, ΜΕΙΛΙΧΙΟΝ / Δεμοστάτα / Μίληχιον (4th cent.?)). Three women dedicate a "meilichion? Cf. the distinctive shape of the stone. Previously taken to be the names of four women.

Phokis

Physkos

Roughly worked rectangular block: Wilhelm 1909: 135f no. 125, "Λόκρα / Διό Μειλίχιον / Ἄγαμος Θεός (late 4th/ early 3rd cent.). Set up outside the city wall, facing the northwest gate, according to Lerat (1952: I 135).

Thessaly

Phthiotic Thebes

IG IX.2 145, Αντί Μηλαχίου / Κριντώ / Άριστος / ἀνέθηκε (Roman date?); cf. IG IX.2 1329, Λυκίμαιος Μειλιχίου (2nd cent.)

Goritsa (near Demetrias)

Rock cut inscription ca 40 m. outside the east gate, near a cave. SEG 27.197 (Bakhuizen 1972: 492; Riele 1977: 408f, pl. 342c), Διός Μήλιχιον (2nd cent.)

Demetrias

Stele with profile of a head: Habicht 1987: 273 no. 6, Διός Μήλιχιον (2nd cent.)

Larisa


(b) Votive plaque: IG IX.2 579, Ἐνοίκων / Μειλίχιος Σενόλας Θεόσαλον (4th cent.?)
ALEX SACRA FROM SELINOUS

Thyrrheion

Boundary marker: SEG 25.629 (Mastrokostas 1965: 157f), Διός Μείλιχιος (3rd cent.). Written thus:

ΔΙΟΣ ΜΕΙΛΙΧΙΟΥ
E
Δ

Kerkyra

Relief of god seated on rock, flanked by two snakes; traces of a small female worshipper: Plassart 1926: 424 n.3 (photograph, Hausmann 1960: 94, fig. 57). 'Ἡγεμονικός Μείλιχιος (3rd cent.). Though found on Kerkyra, the dedication may be from Attica.

Nisyros

(a) Honors, in verse, for priest of Ζυνός Μείλιχιος: Peek 1932: no. 8 (Roman date)
(b) Tabula ansata: IG XII.3 95, Κλεούχος Βουλαγόρα / το Κλεούχικου / Διϊ Μείλιχιου / και τον δήμο (Roman date)
(c) List of names (servi aut liberti [gladiatores?]): IG XII.3 96. At the end of the list (16f), Διϊ Μείλιχιου / χαρακτηρίου (Roman date)
(d) Statue base with honors for Gnomagoras son of Peritheos: IG XII.3 104. Among those honoring him are (15) Διϊ Μείλιχιαταί (Roman date).

Thera

(a) Rock-cut inscription: IG XII.3 406, ---ΕΥΣΤΑΜΗΛΙΧΙΟΙ (6th or 5th cent.)
(b) Rock-cut inscription: IG XII.3 1316, Ζευς Μηλίχιος τον περί Πολύηενον (3rd cent.)
For Zeus without an epithet and a group, in the genitive, identified by the name of an individual, cf. IG XII.3 1317f; for Zeus without an epithet and the name of an individual in the genitive, 399–401, 1315.

Andros

Palaiopolis

Large rough stone: IG XII.5 727, Διός / Μείλιχιος (5th cent.)

Chios

District of Agbia Anna, beyond Bouvaki

Boundary stone; Cook 1925: 1156f, 1157 n.1 (after Paspatas), Διός / Μείλιχιου (Roman date)

Samos

Tigani

Dedication inscription (the object is not described): Preuner 1924: 42 no. 9, Κλεος Μεγάλου / Διϊ Μείλιχιου (4th–3rd cent.?)

Amorgos

Arkesine

(a) Rough stone: IG XII.7 89, [Διϊς Μείλιχιου (4th cent.)
(b) Fragmentary stele: IG XII.7 90, [Διϊς Μείλιχιου

Thasos

The Diasia in a list of festivals of the late fourth century, LSSupp. 69.3.

Euboia

Chalkis

IG XII.9 1018, Έρμιον Μείλιχιου Διϊς (θηκεν)

Crete

Lato

(a) The city restores a stoa and a doorway for the god: I/Cret I xvi 29.3ff, καὶ πόλις Ζηνι / Μηλίχιοι έπεκέκλεξεν τον στώαν / και τὸ θέραμα, followed by a list of subscribers (Roman date).

Hierapytna

(b) Small altar: I/Cret III iii 14, Ζηνι Μηλίχιῳ καὶ 'Ηρι / Μηλίχιοι / θάτος / τοῦ Παρθενίου / εύχην (1st cent. A.D.)
Near Olous
(c) Rock-cut inscription of Zeus Melenchios reported by French scholars (I/Cret III p.60)

Knidos

Small altar: Hicks 1874–1916: IV.1.24f no. 817, Διός Μείλιχιου (4th–3rd cent.?)
A LEX SACRA FROM SELINOUS

Ephesos

Relief: Engelmann et al. 1980: no. 1241 (Keil 1929: 45 fig. 25; SEG 4.529), Δημαγόρος / Ἑστίατος / Άλ Μειλιχίου (early 3rd cent.)

Pergamon

Preliminary offerings to Zeus Apotropaios and Zeus Meilichios of a cake (άλματος ἐνευμάραλος) in a lex sacra for the Asklepios cult. Other gods who receive preliminary offerings are Artemis, with two different epithets, and Ge. Worrle 1969: 169, A 19–23, B 5–7 (1st half of 2nd cent. AD).

Cyprus

Amathous

Boundary marker: Mitford 1937: 29 no. 2, Δῖος Μειλιχίου (3rd cent.). The two letters at the beginning of the second line have not been explained.

Kyrene

Rock-cut inscriptions:
Ain el Hofra, about 2 km. outside the town
(a) SEG 9.327 (Ferri 1923: no. 2), [Ζ]ηνί Μειλιχίου / Εὔμηνινίκυ (?) / Εὔ-
(b) SEG 9.329 (Ferri 1923: no. 8), Ἄπλεαρχος / άρχος / Ζηνίς Μειλιχίου
(c) SEG 9.328 (Ferri 1923: no. 4), [Μ]ηλιχίου / άρχος
(d) SEG 9.331 (Ferri 1923: no. 15a), [Μ]ηλιχίου / άρχος
See also supra 78. All the inscriptions appear to be of the fourth century, except for one probably of later date. Zeus appears five other times in these rock-cut inscriptions and is probably to be understood as Meilichios in all cases (SEG 9.325, 326, 330, 336, 334 [Ferri 1923: nos. 1, 5, 10, 20]).

Unspecified location, presumably outside town
(c) SEG 20.723 (Oliverio and Pugliese Carratelli 1961: no. 9, 4; 4th–3rd cent.?):

Λόςεος / Τίταθεος / Εὐμνενίδος Κορής Μ

Oliverio took Λόςεος to be a god of the dead or Dionysos for whom the word is attested as an epithet. The inscriptions at Ain el Hofra, however, lead us to expect a personal name. Κορής also appears on a stone altar on the cliffs of the Wadi Ommgebab at Messa (Oliverio and Pugliese Carratelli 1961: no. 27 [SEG 20.757–760?]) and on three others from the

CHAPTER V.2: ZEUS MEILICHIOS

town of Kyrene (Oliverio 1933: nos. 45ff). On the first of these his name is preceded by Κυρίων, and on the third he is qualified as Κυρίων. He has been identified as Kourois, a version of Zeus, known from rock-cut inscriptions in Kyrene's mother-city of Thera (IG XI.3 354f) where Meilichios and Zeus Meilichios also appear (see supra Thera; cf. Cook 1914: 142, 144; Fraser 1962: 24f).

Italy

Kroton

Small sandstone pillar, inscribed on two faces: Jeffery 1961: no. 22, pl. 50 (Guarducci 1967: 113f no. 6, fig. 16a, b), (a), reading from bottom up, to Δίος / to Μειλιχίος. (b) Φαράλας / άρχος (6th–5th cent.; the famous athlete? cf. Hdt. 8.47, Paus. 7.3).3

Pompeii


For terracotta figurines of Jupiter and Juno from the temple, see Eschebach 1978: 49–51.

Sicily

Regalbuto (Ameselos?)

Graffito on a krateriskos: SEG 34.932 (Manganaro 1977: 150f pl. XLIV.1), Δῖος Μειλιχίου (3rd cent.)

Haldia

IG XIV 352 : 15f, κατὰ τὰς θόδους τὰς παρὰ τὸ / Μειλιχίου... (first half of 2nd cent.)

Selinous

All the inscribed stones from the Meilichios precinct at Selinous have been included by Manni Piraino (MP: 89–102) and Arena (1989), and most of these also by Dubois (1989: 55–60). Here we limit the information to what seems relevant for interpreting their functions. The stones on which the inscriptions occur are usually described as stelai or cippi. They show considerable diversity. Some approximate the shape that these terms denote, but others do so only in that they are taller than they are wide. We refer to them simply as stones and describe any distinctive features. As to their date, Manni Piraino gives approximate dates from the early sixth century to the mid-fifth for those that are certainly Meilichios stones (assigning one possible example to the third quarter of the fifth). We give her dates below, diffidently: all the inscriptions may in fact fall within the first half of the fifth century.
Six inscriptions refer explicitly to Meilichios. Three identify the stone, using the nominative and the first person singular, as ho Meilichios (bas personal names, as proposed by Lazzarini 1976: no. 880a; cf. Jordan 1991) (end of 6th cent.). Five of the six include the name, in the genitive of one (c, e) or more persons. The sixth (d) has the name in the nominative of the person who set up the stone. Rightly, also to be stones sacred to the god.

Rough pillar, approximately square in section, a small knob on top (larger than that on h supra), perhaps representing a head, with a toothed pattern scratched below it. 'Shoulders' somewhat rounded. MP 69 pl. 42 (cf. Manni Piraino 1970: 276f). Beneath the toothed pattern letters to be read as INI or, if retrograde, IBI (3rd quarter of 5th cent.).

Manni Piraino prefers INI, assuming the dative of INI, a poetic and Cypriot word for son or daughter: "Iviic [sic]=Kômp=Πατηρίαπεις. She moors but rejects the possibility that the word may be masculine and may refer to Zeus Meilichios, under Punic influence, as son of Ba'al Hammon. Manni Piraino 1977: 149, with the aid of a good light, reads the toothed pattern and the next line as 'ΑMtIWI (q. Manni Piraino, but damage to the stone is clear) boustrophedon, which seems plausible. If his reading of the first line is correct, we have another Archaic/Early Classical example, comparable to h in shape and to j, k, and l in the use of the genitive. 3

Manni Piraino interprets a rectangular block with MOIΣA in large letters (MP 72 pl. 44) as a boundary marker of ca 500. Her explanation exempli gratia, po(P)pa hka(nehtCtv), comparable to boustrophedon, is not promising.

Many uninscribed, aniconic stones have been found in the precinct of Meilichios, but we know of no published list of them. The uninscribed 'hermes', dated stylistically after the fifth century, are discussed separately (103-07 infra).

ii. The name

The god's epithet seems transparent, but there is little that can be said about it beyond the fact that the Greeks of the historical period regarded μελίχιος as propitiatory in sense (cf. Plut. Mor. 166b, [θεος] ... σοφήμα και μελίχιος). They connected the word with μέλι, "honey," and sometimes with μελίς, "figs." 4 But nothing from specific cults and rites of the god lends support to these etymologies. In the lex sacra, the libations of μελικράτα, "honey mixture" (A13, 15), are for the Tritopatores, not Zeus Meilichios. More significant is the use of an apparently related verb, μελίκεσαι, for appeasing the dead as early as Il. 7.140.

The adjective μελίχιος is not limited to Zeus, though for no other figure are there more than one or two attestations. 5 A group of unnamed

---

1 MP 70 and 71 have fragmentary texts compatible with dedications with the verb ἀνακαίνου, but these do not resemble the Meilichios stones.


3 Cf. Pfister 1932. Manni's attempt (1975: 180f) to identify the Meilichieion at Halaisa in Sicily as that of Dionysos rather than Zeus is strained. Riodo 1985: 44 regards the attachment of the title to Zeus at Selinous as a secondary development.
Lokris (Paus. 10.38.8), and the μελήξιοι were honored in the second century at Phthiotic Thebes (IG IX.2 1329), where Zeus Meilichios was also worshipped. It is clear enough that Zeus Meilichios has little in common with the Olympian Zeus of poetry and art but belongs to a familiar type of more mundane Zeus. It seems to have been a matter of indifference whether he was addressed as Meilichios or Zeus Meilichios. At Lebadeia, Meilichios is referred to four times as Δείης and only once as Zeus. It may be that originally Meilichios was a separate figure, distinct from Zeus, as Jane Harrison (1922: 19) argued, but the distinction was no longer significant in the historical period.

It has been suggested that foreigners from the eastern Mediterranean equated Zeus Meilichios in the Peiraeus with their own Moloch/Molek (cf: Cook 1925: 1107–11). There is nothing explicit to show that this happened, and none of the dedicants in the Peiraeus or Athens can be identified as coming from the east. But a much earlier adoption or adaptation of the cult, in the eighth or seventh century, should not be ruled out and may in fact help explain the constant fluctuation in spelling between Meil-, Mel- and Milichios. (We return to the problem of Phoenician connections in Ch. IX)

iii. The worshippers

According to the great majority of testimonia, the cult of the god is undertaken by individuals or groups rather than by the state. A genos possesses an altar of the god in Attica (ε), and it may be another genos or similar cult group that dedicated Attica f. On Thera the group is identified by the name of an individual: cf. Thera b, τῶν περὶ Πολυδέκατων, and other examples without the god's epithet. At Megara Nisata, the grandmother city, so to speak, of Selinus, each of the three Dorian tribes may have had the cult of the god, since one of the three, the Pamphyloi, erected a stone with his name on it.

Two Attic demes (Thorikos and Erchia, Attica c and d) are known to have participated in the god's festival, the Diasia, one explicitly at the common sanctuary of all Athenians at Agrai, not in the deme. Attica a and b (probably) are also testimonia to the festival at Agrai where Thucydides (a) speaks of many individuals participating en masse (συνοδεύσα) with their own offerings which might not be sacrificial animals (Wachsmuth 1868: 178; Jameson 1965). There was apparently no priest, temple, or treasury in the state's charge. Athenian families had their own traditional rituals for Zeus Meilichios (or those of a genos to which they belonged), to judge from Xenophon's following his ancestral manner of conducting sacrifice to him (ω); Aristophanes' allusions to the Diasia (σ) suggest a celebration by the nuclear family and its kin.

Although groups below the level of the polis were prominent in the cult, many dedications were made by individuals who did not record their patronymics or demotics, a number of whom were very likely freedmen or metic (cf: Attica g, h, i, m, p, q, r; Tegea; Lebadeia a, c, d, e; Kerkyra; Kyrene a, b). At Selinous both groups and individuals (the latter all or almost all without patronymics) are found. This shows that the fortune of the individual without regard for his or her rôle in the community is at issue when the god is worshipped. Comparison has been made with the Agathos Daimon, the anonymous kindly spirit, also at times shown in the form of a snake.6

Women are well represented (Attica g, i, m, p, q, r; Lebadeia c; Phthiotic Thebes; Kerkyra; Selinous d, f, and i), another indication of the largely private character of the cult (Selinous f, dedicated by two gentilitial groups of females, is exceptional).

The two references to the god in our text (A9, 17) are to the Zeus Meilichios τῶν Μοσίου and τῶν Ευθυδόμου, which we take to be Meilichios stones in the plot, i.e., demarcated space, associated with these names. In the former case the individual may be the man whose gravestone, dating near the end of the seventh century, is known (Guarducci 1967: 317ff fig. 156; MP 76; Arena 1989: no. 16; Dubois 1989: no. 71). They were, perhaps, the ancestors of two gentilitial groups. In the lex sacra, however, these two 'private' Meilichios appear to be significant for more people than the kin or associates of the named person, for sacrifices are required to be made by all those to whom these rules are meant to apply; and while it is conceivable, we think it improbable that only those in their two descent groups were involved.

iv. The sanctuaries

Consistent with the picture that we get of cult activity being initiated largely by groups and private individuals, the sanctuaries of the gods appear to have been sacred places where people came by their own choice to perform ritual or to set up a dedication. At Orchomenos provisions were made for water for the use of individuals sacrificing in the sanctuary. The dedication of a temple by a prominent individual at Larisa (a) in the second century is exceptional. That act of generous piety may indicate that a city temple did not already exist.7 We know of only one other temple to the god, at Lato on Crete, where, in the Roman period, the city repaired a stoa and a doorway.

The precinct of Meilichios at Selinous, which is not so named in any surviving text, also appears to have been a place in which various individuals or groups set up their stones and performed their rites rather than being the scene of a central, communal ritual. The small Ionic temple on the site has been shown to date from the Hellenistic period, the time of

6Cook 1925: 1125–29; Gallivotti 1975–76: 100, “il nome protettore di una o più persone.”
Punic control, and we do not know that any building existed in the precinct in the Greek period.\(^4\)

The propensity for reserving spaces for the god's cult is also seen in the number of boundary markers, horoi, bearing his name (Attica o, shared with Ge and Athena; Corinth; Megara; Physikos in Ozolian Lokrise; Thyrriheion; Amorgos, Arkaike a [?] Chios [?]; Andros [?]; Cyprus, Amathous). Blocks of stone, however, with inscriptions of the god's name in the genitive may be altars or aniconic images rather than horoi (see 98–103 infra). The possibilities are reduced when the inscriptions occur on bedrock (Thessaly, Goritsa; Thera a–b; Crete, near Ólous; Kyrene a–e), for there they clearly mark sacred places where ritual was performed. At Thera they are designated with the god's name in the nominative, as once at Kyrene (e) as well, a feature they share with a number of the Meilichios stones at Selinous. The spot is sacred to the god and the god is present. At Selinous, in the absence of outcroppings of bedrock, inscriptions on simple blocks of stone served to mark out areas on the sandy slopes of the Gaggera. While this concern with a defined space and presence of the god are not found in the majority of examples of the cult, they occur in a number of comparable cults (see 114ff infra).

v. Iconography

The god was sometimes represented on reliefs as a mature, bearded man seated on a throne, indistinguishable from certain other aspects of Zeus, especially Ktesios and Phílios.\(^9\) Two symbols are found on his dedications, the snake and the cornucopia. The snake is usually represented alone (Attica m, q, s–u [two snakes], Pellana in Achaia [a bronze snake], Lebadeia a, Anthedon) but is sometimes shown as of great size and the object of veneration by worshippers (Attica b, j [?]). The isolated snakes might then be regarded as avatars of the god or, alternatively, as his familiars, as are the two that accompany the bearded god seated on a throne with a relief from Kerkýra. Similar dedications were made to Zeus Ktesios and Zeus Phílios, and to the Agathos Daimon (Nilsson 1908: 1932; 1940, pl. 26–28). The snake, whatever his title, functioned as the protector of the household (cf. Sjövall 1931: 70–73; Nilsson 1938: 162–65; 1952: 719–22). The cornucopia is held by the seated god on one Attic dedication (o) and is also found on reliefs of Zeus Ktesios for whom as a god of household wealth it is particularly appropriate.\(^10\) That Zeus Meilichios too was concerned with wealth we know from Xenophon's sacrifice to him and its happy consequence, the arrival of a man with money (An. 7.8.1–6).

At Selinous there are no reliefs or fully anthropomorphic representations of the god, and no symbolism such as the snake or the horn of plenty has appeared in connection with his cult, nor indeed has it in most places where he was worshipped. The associations they suggest may nonetheless be relevant for Selinous.

vi. Purification

The god's involvement in purification from bloodshed is not evident from the dedications but is clearly shown in Pausanias' account of the civil strife at Argos (2.20.1f), in the story of the Phytalidai and Theseus in Attica (supra 84), and from the lexicographers' explanation of the "fleece of Zeus," the ὁ ὄς κρότων (83). In the last the god once again appears as equivalent to Zeus Ktesios. Giallombardo (1980–81) has seen the purificatory aspect of the god in the presence of water at the Meilichioi at Halaisa in Sicily. At Orkomenos, however, a fountain was built for the use of sacrificers and not specifically for purposes of purification.\(^11\) Purification is important in the Selinuntine lex sacra although the Zeus in Column B, where purification procedures are prescribed, has no title. In A it is the Tritopatres who are both polluted, μικροι, and pure, καθαροι. But one cannot doubt that their cult and that of Zeus Meilichios are closely connected.\(^12\)

vii. Chthonic associations

There is general agreement that Zeus Meilichios is associated with the Earth and figures of the underworld, but it is not so clear what his own rôle was in this company. The snake may be the surest link with the underworld, but that symbol also has other connotations (supra 94). In Attica the god shared a precinct with Ge but also with Athena (82: a), and the chief focus of his cult in all of Attica was the sanctuary of the Mother by "Aypac (81: a, b[?], d), where his festival, the Diasia, was celebrated close in time to the Lesser Mysteries in the goddess's honor. He has been compared to a figure of the Eleusinian circle who appears under three similar names (all propitious), Euboulos, Euboulous or Zeus Euboulous, and Plouton, with whom he shared an interest in wealth.\(^13\) Elsewhere, at

\(^{84}\) Di Vita 1961: 64; White 1967. See Ch. VIII infra.

\(^{9}\) Burkert 1985: 201, "the fatherly figure signifies reconciliation with the dead, just as his name epitomizes the appeasing effect of the offerings to the dead." His relationship with the dead, however, is indirect (cf. 96d infra).

\(^{10}\) Cf. Cook 1925: 1123. Despini (1965: 135, pl. 63) assigns to Zeus Meilichios a fragmentary relief in Berlin showing a god holding a cornucopia, very similar to Attica o, but without the inscription one cannot be sure.
Larisa (a) in the Hellenistic period he shares a temple with Enodia (sc. Hekate). At Kyrene he is closely associated with the Eumenides (propitiously named) and anonymous Heroes (supra 77ff). At Selinous the proximity of the Campo di Stele to the sanctuary of the goddess Malphoros looks very similar to the god's relationship to the Mother ev "Ayvoc at Athens; both areas are near but outside the town itself.

viii. The dead

Many scholars have supposed that Zeus Meilichios has a close connection with the dead. The extreme form of this view was that of Ferri, who believed that the person whose name appears in Melichios inscriptions had died and become assimilated to the god. It needs to be emphasized, however, that there is not a single instance of Zeus Meilichios at a grave or in a cemetery; in particular, the Selinuntine Campo di Stele has yielded no grave after repeated campaigns of excavations. It is, therefore, by no stretch of the imagination a necropolis. The Selinuntine cemeteries have been located and well investigated. Whether after 409 the area became a Punic tophet, containing the bones and ashes of sacrificed animals and human infants, is another matter (cf. Ch. IX). Furthermore, the very idea that corpses or other human remains could be buried in a god's sanctuary is incompatible with the basic principles of Greek religion (Parker 1983: 33-48; Burkert 1985: 199-203). There are, indeed, examples of heroes whose supposed graves were identified in sanctuaries, but most were mythical figures and their graves sometimes prehistoric burials (propitiously sc. Hekate).
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The occasional historical figure so honored is removed from the ordinary dead by his heroization. The dead who believed that the person whose name appears in Meilichios inscriptions was a hero of heroes whose supposed graves were identified in sanctuaries, but most were mythical figures and their graves sometimes prehistoric burials (propitiously sc. Hekate). The dead who believed that the person whose name appears in Meilichios inscriptions was a hero of heroes whose supposed graves were identified in sanctuaries, but most were mythical figures and their graves sometimes prehistoric burials (propitiously sc. Hekate).
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iv. The God: The Cult

None of the inscriptions or monuments for the god suggests a connection with dead individuals or their remains. The symbolism of the snake, which, as we have seen, is not always found with Zeus Meilichios, has associations with the dead but also with the underworld in general and with such figures as the Eumenides (cf. Wüст 1956: 126f). It is also linked to household gods and the protection and fostering of the household's prosperity (cf. supra 94). Since material good fortune is known to be a concern of the Zeus Mellichios, it is not always evident which aspect is the more important. In any case, the snake has not so far appeared at Selinous.

Cook's interpretation of Zeus Meilichios as the embodiment of a dead king has not been taken up. He granted, however, that the god could be seen as "a chthonian power resembling the divinized dead" (Cook 1925: 1111, 1159f; cf. Zuntz 1971: 102). That seems, in fact, to have been the character of the Tritoportes (see 107-14 infra). The spirits of the dead, as opposed to their material, human remains, may, like heroes, be associated with the gods. It might be argued that in the lex sacra the Zeus Meilichios ev M6ciov (A9) and the Zeus Mellichios ev E6thodou (A17) are divinized forms of Myskos and Euthydamos respectively. But the language of the text keeps the gods and the men distinct. The gods are more likely the protectors of the two men, and if Myskos is correctly identified with the man whose Archaic gravestone has been found, of their descendants as well, since cult at the two plots is being continued.

ix. A consort for the god?

Zeus Mellichios usually appears without a female companion. Overall, the male figure alone serves both men and women. Exceptions are two dedications to Zeus Mellichios and Miliche at Thespiai (a-b) and one to Zeus Meilichios and Hera Melichia at Hierapytta (first century A.D.). The Zeus (or Dionysos?) mentioned after Aphrodite Milichia in IG IV 2 1 282 (Epidaurus, fourth/third cent.) may have been Meilichios. The appearance of a female paredros in two cities may show the assimilation of the cult, by the Hellenistic and Roman periods, to the common pattern. There is no exception at Selinous to the general absence of a paredros or consort for Zeus Mellichios. The worn head on stone f is described (optimistically) by Manni Piraino (MP 68) as a young male god, and the inscription explicitly identifies the stone as ά Μίλικιος. The stone seems to have been set up by a kinship or pseudo-kinship group, a patria, of women who are the daughters or descendants of two men, presumably regarded as related. As elsewhere, women as well as men are involved in
the cult, as worshippers in their own right and not solely as companions of males (besides the women of f, the dedicators of d and i may be female).

A number of so-called double herms, each with a female as well as a male head, none of which is identified by inscriptions, begin to appear after the fifth century, when the Greeks were no longer dominant in the city. This is in sharp contrast both to previous practice at Selinous and to the cult of Zeus Meilichios as it is known elsewhere. Indeed the double herms—with one possible exception—are not, so far as we know, found elsewhere in the Greek world (see 103–07 infra). They cannot be used as evidence for the earlier cult, and there is nothing to show with which, if any, of the Greek goddesses attested at Selinous the female partner should be identified.18

x. Aniconic representation of the god

The character of the Selinuntine stones as aniconic or roughly iconic representations has been the focus of much attention. Unfortunately a distinction has not always been made between the inscribed and at least roughly datable stones (which we have listed above) and the uninscribed, both unworked and sculpted, which are undatable except by the style of the sculpture of the latter. Excavation may yet provide clues in some cases. Assemblages of votive and sacrificial material containing, for instance, Corinthian pottery, could date the stones with which they are associated in the Greek period, but hitherto only the inscribed stones have been fully published. Except for stone f, of the fifth century, with its single head and unique groups of female worshippers, all the iconic stones appear to be of the fourth century or later (see 103–07 infra). Otherwise, to the end of the fifth century we have to do only with aniconic stones, more or less worked, of which fourteen bear inscriptions, and probably with an uncounted number of uninscribed stones.

Elsewhere in the Greek world, Zeus Meilichios inscriptions are found on rough blocks at Physkos in Ozolian Lokris, Thyrrheion in Akarnania, Andros, Amorgos, and Krotos. None of the stones, however, explicitly identifies itself with the god, as at Selinous, and all but the last may have been boundary markers (cf. supra 93f). A pyramidal stone was said to represent the god at Sikyon (where a columnar stone represented Artemis: Paus. 2.9.6; Pausanias also knew of a pyramidal stone representing Apollo Karinos at Megara Nisia, 1.44.2). At Lebadeia in Boiotia four herm-like pillars of Meilichios have been found, with omphaloi rather than heads on top. Two of these display a snake on the front (a, b); there are male genitals on the other two (c, d, the latter also with stubby ‘herm arms’ on either side). All four are of Hellenistic date and may be understood as an adaptation of a local aniconic or semi-iconic tradition (in wood?) under the influence of the widely diffused Attic herm. At Elateia a cone-shaped block may be an aniconic version, but the significance of the inscription on it is uncertain.20

There is a much larger body of parallels from other cults, such as the betyl form of Apollo Agieus, the rectangular shafts topped by pyramids of Zeus (with various epithets) and other supernatural figures in Arkadia, and the stones sacred to Apollo Lykeios at Metapontion.21 Two general associations of these stones have been proposed: with fertility and with the dead. Schachter (1986: 148) speaks of the Lebadeian pillars as phallic and supposes that “the functions of Milichios at Lebadeia included the assurance of human fertility.” The penises on two of the four stones are not, in fact, erect but are the perforactory indications of male identity customary on post-Archaic stone herms. Lazzarini (1976: 146) speaks of herms, meliichios, and lykeioi as all images of the symbol of fecundity. Aside from the Archaic and early Classical Attic herms, none of these stones have phalloi. It could be argued that the overall shape of the stone—such as Lebadeia a, a pillar topped with a rounded cone, or the stone of Zeus Storpaos in Arkadia with its glans-like head (IG V.2 59)—is phallic, but the same shape is used for Artemis and Aphrodite. Some of the Selinuntine stones are long and narrow, but others are relatively squat and even approximate the shape of stelai. The problem has also arisen in the interpretation of grave markers, with no persuasive evidence emerging for an explicitly phallic character (cf. Robinson 1969: 21, Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 24–44). It appears that sexual symbolism and a fertility function are neither universally nor fundamentally associated with any group of stones.


19Lazzarini 1976: 150, without considering this possibility, takes the Akarnanian, Andrian, and Krotonian examples as comparable to the Selinuntine stones.20The Isidion stelai in stone and terracotta with inscriptions in Oscan from Capua (third century) seem to have a relationship to Jupiter similar to that of the various aniconic stones to Zeus Meilichios. Cf. Heurnon 1942; Franchi de Bellis 1981; for their interpretation see especially Duboux 1988. We have Jan Bremmer to thank for calling our attention to this interesting parallel.

21The literature on the subject is large: see especially de Visser 1903; Mass 1929; Nilsson 1955: 201–02. On the Arkadian figures, cf. Arvanitopoulos 1906, Rhomaios 1910: they are primarily “Hausgötter”; for the inscriptions IG V.2 59–66; S. G. Miller 1975, particularly on aniconism in Thessaly; Le Roy 1965: 371–76 (a pyramidal block with a ram’s head [=Apollo Karneios]); Burkert 1985: 85. Cf. also the aniconic wooden images listed in Clem. Al. Protr. 4.40. Stones could also be sacred because they were regarded as having fallen from heaven and because they were used in purification and other ceremonies; see Simon 1976: 1412f. For Apollo Lykeios at Metapontion, cf. Manni Piraino 1968; Adamesteanu 1970; Burzacchei 1979; Graf 1987.
associated with sacred stones, which is not to say that a guardian spirit of a household would not be concerned with the fecundity as well as the material prosperity of the family.

Although Zeus Meilichios has chthonic associations, we have seen that there is nothing in his cult to show that he is to be identified with a specific dead person or with dead ancestors in general. The stones also do not function as the equivalent of grave monuments, and there is no warrant to describe them as fluctuating in character between the votive and the funerary, as does Lazzarini (1976: 149). There are, to be sure, physical similarities: the stones from Lebadeia with omphaloi on top resemble grave monuments surmounted by omphaloi, and the unworked or roughly worked stones of the Selinuntine Meilichios precinct are like the rough gravestones found in the city's cemeteries. What all these stones have in common is their function as markers, whether of a grave or of a sacred area. It has frequently been observed that plain or roughly worked stones serve to mark boundaries, a particularly important function of the god Hermes and the herms (e.g. Nilsson 1955: 205). We have noted (supra 92) that the lex sacra refers to two demarcated areas in which were located the Meilichios of two individuals. It seems likely that each contained a stone which, whatever else its function, no doubt served to mark the two plots.24

Simple stones in Sicily did not belong only to Zeus Meilichios. At Selinous the recently excavated sanctuary of Hera contained a number of roughly triangular stones that were set up near an altar, around which were located the Meilichios of two individuals. It seems likely that each contained a stone which, whatever else its function, no doubt served to mark the two plots.25

The common view is that the stones are images of gods, survivals of a primitive stage of Greek religion. Pausanias, in the second century of our era, reported that the people of Pharai in Achaia worshipped rectangular stones, to each of which they assigned a god's name, and that in ancient
times all Greeks honored plain stones (argoi lithoi) instead of images (agalmata, 7.22.4). Fritz Graf (1987), in his important study of the stones of Apollo Lykeios at Metapontion, has taken issue with this interpretation.26 He sees the stones at both Metapontion and Selinous as dedications marking the place where a group or an individual has performed a regular or special ritual, noting that at both cities traces of ashes, bones, and votive pottery were found with those stones still in situ. The published reports of more recent investigations at Selinus fully confirm earlier observations.27 Graf suggests, in the light of comparable inscriptions by groups on Thera, Thasos, and Kos, that subdivisions of the community, such perhaps as the patria of f at Selinous, conducted rituals of initiation into the community at those marked places. The use of the language of dedication at Metapontion and the cutting of the inscription on bedrock at Thera militate, in his view, against seeing any particular significance in the use of the nominative for the gods.28 Specifically, he would not identify the stones at Metapontion and Selinous with aniconic images of the gods, and he would go so far as to question the validity of Pausanias' interpretation of the stones dedicated many centuries before his own time.

At Selinous, at least, it is difficult to avoid seeing an embodiment of the god. First, there is the explicit language of two of the inscriptions, "I am Meilichios" (b, f). The formulae in the genitive ("belonging to Meilichios") and the dative ("given to Meilichios") are no obstacle to supposing that the stones were regarded as images of Zeus Meilichios. Secondly, the variation between fully aniconic stones, as with the majority of the stones, and partly iconic examples, as with b (and perhaps m), shows that both forms serve the function. The question then is how to explain the nominative form of Zeus in the Theran rock-cut inscriptions. We suggest that they say, in effect, "Here is Zeus of so-and-so's group," i.e., "in this place he receives ritual and is manifest." The same would be the case for the rock-cut inscriptions of Kyrene.29

22Ch. Picard 1942-43: 100f interpreted these as funerary because of the use of omphaloi on graves (bibliography: Robinson 1969: 22). Cf. White 1987: 83, a monument topped by an omphalos in a hero relief at Kyrene also showing a rider, a snake, a small altar, and a woman and child. On the face of the monument, which White refers to as a large grave stele but which might also be a pillar, is an inscription with a man's name, his patronymic, and the designation heros.

23Cf. MP 75-103, pl. 45-42. Selinous m (with a doubtful inscription) and a number of uninscribed stones (cf. 103, 105f infra) can be compared to the rectangular block with a rectangular 'head' found in a cemetery at Akragas (Salinas 1901: 29) though not to any known from Selinous' cemeteries. The type is also known from Corinth (Robinson 1969: 22f, pl. 9; Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 244, fig. 52).

24For stelai as markers of a place of ritual cf. Williams 1981 on stelai set up on destroyed houses at Corinth so that the family or group might continue to honor gods and heroes of the house. These stelai may have had painted panels depicting the gods.

25Cf. Paris Presepe 1985 and S. Tusa et al. 1986: 51, fig. 84. One stone is marked with a large X.

26Ch. Picard 1942-43 also did not regard the stones as images of the god but as kolossoi, substitutes for men like the clay images in the lex sacra of Kyrene (LSupp. 115 B 35-39). On kolossoi see also Benveniste 1932a, b. In the light of the subject of Column B in our text the suggestion is intriguing but the differences in the character of the objects are not trivial.

27Gabrici 1927: 156f; V. Tusa 1972: 429. Manni Piraino 1970: 268 speaks of many stelai found in the Meilichios precinct as showing traces of burning, and in her full publication (1973) she cites Gabrici for such traces surrounding stone f (= her no. 68) and notes that the upper right corner of a (= her no. 60) showed evidence of burning; if this is the upper right corner as shown in the photograph (her pl. 30), that would have been part of the end of the stone that was partly buried in the ground, and the damage to the stone would be consistent with a fire having been made on the ground in front of it. Cf. also V. Tusa 1984b: 14.

28See the examples at Thera supra 86; there is a single case of Apollo's name in the nominative at Metapontion, Burzachechi 1979: 293f no. 12.

29A rock-cut inscription of ca 400 B.C. near the entrance of a cave on Thera requires the deixis and the bios to be held npo toqios, a marker of some sort (IG XII.3 452 and p.301; LSCG 133). Sokolowski compares SIG 976.S: xeiqai 3Aoi tōv xeiηuav κοινηγενήν cr:...
In other respects we accept Graf’s argument, to which the _lex sacra_ gives strong support. The stones marked the place where sacrifice was made. We would stress the private character of each stone. These are not versions of a single public, city statue (though one may well have existed at Selinous as at Argos, where it was made for a civic crisis, and probably in Hellenistic Larisa, where there was a temple), but the particular god of a person or a group before whose symbolic representation rites were performed. In Athens it was the bond between the image and the household before which it stood that made the herms so important and their mutilation in 415 so shocking. Everywhere we may suppose that the good fortune of the household was bound up with the Zeus Meilichios represented by a stone or a relief.

As we have remarked, the _lex sacra_ does not speak of a number of individual or group Meilichioi but only those of two persons, Myskos and Euthydamos. Conceivably other persons’ or groups’ Meilichioi were referred to in the mutilated beginning of Column A, or perhaps they are the διεξαγοράς of A7 (cf. Commentary on A7). But if the latter and those of A18, which could be “taken out,” were in fact aniconic figures, they are likely to have been smaller and more easily movable than the identifiable Meilichios stones of the Greek period, whose apparent function as markers, as well as their size, suggests that they were meant to be left in place permanently. Any portable figures would have been more comparable in size to the later iconic but uninscribed stones of the Punic period (103–07 _infra_). One set of them, τὰ δαμάσκια (A18), may have been common to the whole community.31

---

31Bergquist: 1992, in the most detailed consideration of the subject so far, regards the Selinuntine stones, along with the Metapontine, as expressing “a particular emphasis on the remains of a singular or recurrent sacrifice. They form a sign commemorating the event of the collective sacrifice, a secondary, individual sacrifice and/or the subsequent sacrificial meal.” She concludes that “the remains of ashes and animal bones and of cultic and feasting equipment ... derive from the worshipping’s sacrificial meal, after the sacrifice, on their portion of the sacrificed animal(s) and that a ceremonial (secondary, individual sacrifice?) and/or practical (disposal?) burning took place in the cooking pit or barbecue-site of the individual family, kinship or tribal group.” (46). The _theoxenia_ of gentilitial groups would fit her hypothesis excellently.

32It is arguable that the Athenians used wooden herms more commonly than those of stone, in view of the relatively few examples that have been found of what is said to have been a very widespread practice, though that may have been an exaggeration (cf. Jameson 1990: 194). So too it may be that Selinuntine households and groups had wooden or terra-cotta figures totaling a much greater number than the stones that have been found in the precinct. There are more terracotta than stone versions of the _Iovijas_ stelai of Capua (Duhoux 1988: 354). The new excavations in the Meilichios precinct found terracotta figures mixed with bones and ashes, but these seem to have been female and stereotyped votive offerings; cf. V. Tusa 1971: 56 fig. 10; Dewailly 1992: 38ff. On portable representations of gods, especially detachable heads, see S. G. Miller 1975: 241–50.

---

CHAPTER V.3: THE UNSCRIBED STONES

ix. Conclusions

This review of the evidence for Zeus Meilichios has shown his wide diffusion and popularity with individuals and families, his concern with prosperity and with purification from bloodshed, and his association with underworld powers though not explicitly with the dead. In our interpretation of the _lex sacra_ we have set out what does not emerge directly from the previously known evidence but is consistent with it: the god is especially concerned with bloodshed committed both against the family and by the family. This role is comparable to that of Zeus Alastor and Elasteros elsewhere (see 116–20 _infra_) and of the Eumenides/Erinys. That, we believe, is his distinctively chthonic concern, but it does not exhaust his possible roles. Bloodshed between families within a community, and within families, looms larger in story and in the history of the Archaic and early Classical periods than it does in later Greek society, when we should suppose that the many dedications by women and non-citizens were aimed at the maintenance of the prosperity of the individual and her or his family rather than at the consequences of bloodshed.

3. The Unscribed Stones

As we have seen, all the inscribed Meilichios stones of Selinous date from before the fourth century and thus from the period when the city was predominantly Greek. Of the hundred or so inscribed stones now in the Palermo Museum—both unworked or sculpted, more or less crudely—a representative selection of eighteen was published by Gabrici (1927: 174–81, pls. XXVII–XXIX; the figure of _ca_ 100 is his). He provided no details on the circumstances in which they were found. Dating has depended entirely on style. Gabrici believed the cult of Meilichios and his partner Kore (as he identified the female figure on twin herms) went back to the beginnings of the sanctuary and continued well into the fourth century. But because contrasting examples had been found in the same strata, he denied that a chronological progression could be observed from the crude to the more sophisticated. All the iconic representations (the inscribed stone _f_ with a single head was discovered only in 1970) were attributed by Di Vita (1961–64) and V. Tusa (1971) to the period of Carthaginian dominance of the city, from the end of the fifth to the mid-third century. Aside from stone _f_, their view seems justified. It follows, however, that there is then no evidence for a consort for Meilichios in the Greek period of the sanctuary. V. Tusa (1971: 63) identified the male and female figures of the Punic period as Ba’al Hammon and Tanit.32

32Di Vita (1961–64: 245) regarded all the non-Hellenic and almost all the hellenizing faces as having the eyes closed and therefore showing an absence of life and the presence of death. When the eyes are represented by a single horizontal line they could equally be
Gabrici's selection ranged from an aniconic stone with a rectangular 'head', through narrow stones with a single bearded head either in relief or fully in the round (he noted that all single figures were bearded males), to both very schematic and quite naturalistic, 'Hellenic' examples of twin heads topping a more or less rectangular block. A single example (his pl. XXVII.1) shows a male and a female seated figure on a rectangular base, the male holding a vessel in his left hand. It may be significant that in all but two of the fourteen twin figures that Gabrici published, the male is on the left, i.e., from their point of view on the right (the exceptions are pl. XXIX.2, 7; although Gabriči thought pl. XXIX.4 was another example, from the photograph it is hard to tell). The three twin herms in the Getty Museum that we describe below (1, 2, 4) also have the male on the left. All are made from a yellowish or whitish tufa.33

Gabrici wrote that only about ten of the hundred or so stones were at all reminiscent of Greek art. He suggested that artistic efforts were concentrated on the cult of the major figure in the sanctuary complex, Malophoros, and that therefore no artistic tradition was created for the two secondary deities, Mellichios and Kore (or Pasistrateia). Di Vita and V. Tusa explicitly compare the rest with examples of Punic art. Despite similarities to the Punic in the simple, schematic style, we are more struck by the difference in iconography.34 Furthermore, we have noted that twin herms, with male and female heads side by side, are, with the single exception described below, unique to Selinous, and that no Punic symbols have been discovered in this sanctuary. Without doubting the Punic involvement in the production of these stones in the period of Punic dominance, we should stress the unique, local development they represent. In one respect they continue the religious impulse of the earlier Mellichios stones: what was important was the manufacture and setting up of the Herm at the site, not the quality of the object. Essentially these were not dedications, gifts to the god, but embodiments of the deity, powerful objects in themselves.35

In the absence of inscriptions, a further criterion for distinguishing the earlier from the later stones may be size. All the uninscribed figures published by Gabrici, with one exception, are between 0.18 m. and 0.40 m. high, while the unbroken inscribed stones are between 0.53 m. and 1.08 m. high. The exception in Gabriči's selection is his pl. XXIX.5, a stone 0.53 m. high with the outline of a face cut in relief (his pl. XXIX.4, with twin heads, is broken at the bottom). It may belong with the stones of the Greek period.

The only other twin herm of this type (with two figures or heads side by side) of which we are aware is a stone of very crude workmanship reported as stolen from the Tegea Museum (no. 165; see Palagia and Coulson 1993: 275 fig. 10). It appears that it should be classed with the other aniconic and aniconic stones from eastern Arkadia that have been discussed by Rhomaios (1911; supra 99 n.21). Since there is no reason to suggest direct influence in either direction between Tegea and Selinous, we take the similarities to be a case of parallel development in popular art, in both regions in the service of private or family cult.

In the collection of the J. Paul Getty Museum there are three twin herms and two separate heads, probably broken off from herms, and four aniconic stones. All are of tufa, and the sculptured heads, at least, are unmistakably of Selinitine origin, a view confirmed by Professor Vincenzo Tusa (per epist.), who has examined them. Their small size conforms to the criterion suggested above for a date in the fourth or third century. A small altar with a Punic inscription of four letters (discussed in Ch. IX) may belong with these stones. If it too comes from the Meilichios stones, the face is rendered by a triangle and a few horizontal lines (cf. the small circle on the base of Gabrici 1927: pl. XXVII.1). Bisi is able to point to two steiae from Mora on which a bearded face is rendered by a triangle and a few horizontal lines (143f, from Whitaker 1921: 272, fig. 53; cf. Gabriči 1927: pl. XXIX.5). She suggests that these may be the most ancient documents of the cult of Baal Hammon in a tophet, an inference she makes from the similarity to the Selinitine stones. Is the influence moving not only to but also from Selinous? V. Tusa (1971: 63f) compares a rough, rectangular stele of sandstone from a tomb at Libybaion (65 fig. 23; Bisi 1971b: figs. 7, 10). On a rounded knob at the top, eyes, nose,
The Tritopatores (or Tritopatreis)

4. The Tritopatores (or Tritopatreis)

i. Testimonia to the cult

Athens

(a) (Pt. 17) Four inscriptions associated with a small temenos at the juncture of the Sacred Way and the Street of the Tombs, about 70 m. outside the Sacred Gate of the city of Athens (Travlos 1971: 302 fig. 391, 305 figs. 394f). The temenos is in two parts: an area in the shape of a truncated triangle on the east adjoining a walled trapezoidal area on the west. Three probably identical inscriptions mark the area as not to be entered. One is at the northeastern point of the truncated triangle, the

chios sanctuary it may shed light on the cult carried on in that area by the Carthaginians.

(1) (Pt. 12) Museum no. 81.AA.135: twin herm with bearded male head on the viewer’s left, female head on right. Both heads are carved on cylindrical projections that continue above the simply-rendered band of hair. Cf. the effect of the polos-like headgear on Gabrici 1927: pl. XXIX.3 (=White 1967: pl. 106 fig. 22; V. Tusa 1971: 64, fig. 22). A feature no other published example exhibits is the projecting tenons, as in Attic herms and their derivatives, on both sides of the stone. In this case they are useful for lifting the stone. In style the heads most closely resemble Gabrici 1927: pl. XXVIII.4.

H. 0.213 m, W. 0.175 m, max. Th. 0.08 m. H. of heads 0.06 m. Roughly finished on the left side and back, smoothly finished but with chisel marks on the front. H. of tenons 0.027 m, W. approx. 0.018 m, Th. 0.025 m. The left-hand tenon is set higher and is slightly larger than the one on the right.

(2) (Pt. 13) Museum no. 74.AA.44: twin herm with bearded male head on the viewer’s left and the female head on right, very similar to the previous example except that it has no tenons, the ‘polos’ above the hair has almost vanished, and the two heads are closer together. The beard of the male figure lacks the vertical grooves of (1) and is very similar to that of Gabrici 1927: pl. XXVIII.4.

H. 0.22 m, W. 0.152 m, max. Th. 0.063 m. H. of heads ca. 0.06 m. Smoothly finished on all sides; no chisel marks on front.

(3) (Pt. 14a, b) Museum no. 81.AA.138: separate male head of similar style, from a herm, of the same size as (1) and (2). There is no ‘polos’, the nose is somewhat pushed in (perhaps damaged and then smoothed off), and the beard is frizzy. The effect aimed at is rather more naturalistic than (1) and (2).

Max. pr. H. 0.07 m, W. 0.045 m, Th. 0.055 m.

(4) (Pt. 14c–f) Museum no. 81.AA.136: twin herm with bearded male head on the viewer’s left and female head on right. The faces are on long ‘necks’ and are very flat and rendered by means of a very few cuts. In style the heads are most comparable to Gabrici 1927: pl. XXIX.2 and 3, XXIX.4.

H. 0.22 m, W. 0.135 m, max. Th. 0.065 m. The base is set off from the rest of the stone by a horizontal bevel (cf. Gabrici 1927: pls. XXVII.2 and XXIX.4). The base is bevelled vertically on the left and right sides. The back is flat. A roughly circular cutting, 0.03 m., runs from front to back towards the right side of the base. Two channels cut by a drill at the base of each head, on the inner side, show that the stone between the heads was removed by drilling.

(5) (Pt. 15a, b) Museum no. 81.AA.137: separate male (?) head, similar in style to (4) and no doubt from a herm of roughly the same size.

Max. H. 0.05 m, W. 0.04 m, Th. 0.03 m.

In the same collection of objects there are three, possibly four, stones that may have been aniconic forms of a deity.

(6) (Pt. 15c, d) Museum no. 81.AA.139.C: small semi-iconic stone with a knob for a head and two slightly damaged projections at the bottom, evidently representing feet. The back, slightly rounded, is rough. Two of the inscribed stones from Selinous (supra 96f) have such a knob on top, b (MP 63) and m (MP 69), but both are about five times as tall.

H. 0.14 m, W. 0.10 m, Th. 0.05 m. on top.

(7) (Pt. 16a) Museum no. 81.AA.139.D: rectangular, chalky white stone with rounded pyramidal knob on top.

H. 0.132 m, W. 0.06 m, Th. 0.055 m.

(8) (Pt. 16b) Museum no. 88.AA.139.A: rectangular stone with rounded knob on top.

H. 0.27 m, max. W. 0.13 m, max. Th. 0.088 m. H. of ‘head’ 0.05 m.

(9) (Pt. 16c) Museum no. 81.AA.139.B: rectangular block on which a column has been roughly carved in relief on one side. The upper left is recessed in the form of two small rectangular cuttings. The top is broken and seems to have formed a decorative element. There are traces of a metal dowel for a repair when the breakage on top first occurred. It is likely that this object is not to be classed with the three preceding examples.

H. 0.40 m, of which the ‘capital’ is 0.10 m. and the base is 0.088 m. The base is 0.123 m. wide and 0.154 m. thick.
other two at the eastern corners of the walled trapezoid. On the first, only the last four letters are preserved: \textit{IG I}^{2} 1066 (information kindly supplied by D. M. Lewis; \textit{IG I}^{2} 870; Brückner 1910: 102), \textit{hēρος} : \textit{τριτοπατρεύς}. / \textit{hēρος} (454–410).

A fourth inscription is on an unworked block set into the face of the south wall of the precinct: \textit{IG I}^{2} 1067 (Travlos 1971: 305, fig. 395; Brückner 1910: 105ff, cf. commentary on \textit{IG II}^{2} 2615), \textit{τετράκτος} / \textit{τριτοπατρεύς} (ca 500–480).

On the history of the temenos see Oby 1965: 327f, Kübler 1973: 189–93, Knigge 1974, 1988: 25, 103–05. The cult actually goes back to the seventh century. The present wall was added after the fifth century (Knigge 1974: 191f). It is tempting to see a correspondence between the divided precinct in Athens and the pure/impure condition of the Tritopatores. The whole of the Athenian precinct, however, is marked as out of bounds, not just the walled area, and division into two parts was not evidently an original or fundamental feature of the cult. There seems to have been an entrance at the southwest corner of the walled area, perhaps to allow access to cult personnel exempt from the prohibition. In the absence of any family or group name in the inscriptions we must suppose that the shrine is that of the whole community of Athenians, as its prominent location suggests, at the crossroads just outside one of the important gates of the city. This is emphasized by Bourriot (1976: 1177ff). There is nothing, however, to support his contention (1154) that the triangular precinct is to be explained by the number three seen in the Trito- of Tritopatores.

(b) Sacrificial calendar (of a tribe, \textit{genos}, phratry?) on a four-sided stele: \textit{IG P} 246B15–17 (\textit{IG I}^{2} 842, \textit{LSGC} 2), \textit{[...φηρος} / \textit{τετράκτος} / \textit{τριτοπατρεύς} (470–450)

The calendrical and ritual context are lost. Jacoby on Phanodemos, \textit{FGrHist} 325 F 6, is unjustified in assuming that this is the state cult.

(c) Boundary marker probably for the precinct of a \textit{genos} or a phratry. Reported by Svoronos (1916–17: 141 n.4) to have been found near Agrai (cf. \textit{Zeuα Mellichios at Agrai, supra 81}). The last line was cut at right angles to the first four: \textit{IG II}^{2} 2615, \textit{δρός} \textit{τριτοπατρεύς} / \textit{τριτοπατρεύς} (4 th cent.).

(d) Boundary marker for the precinct of a \textit{genos} or a phratry from the Athenian Agora: Meritt 1961: 264 no. 80, pl. 50, \textit{δρός} \textit{τριτοπατρεύς} (early 4 th cent.).

(e) Deme of Erchia, calendar of sacrifices: \textit{LSGC} 18 A 41–46 (Daux 1963: 604–10, \textit{SEG} 21.541), \textit{Μοντισιγνωσ \δεκέτει θεότεροι, Τριτοπατερεύς, Έργῳ \οίς, νηφόλαος, οὐ φορά : ΔΙ Ι} (second quarter of 4 th cent.)

The sacrifice occurs on the 21st or 22nd of Mounichion (depending on the length of the month), the day after the identical sacrifice of a male sheep to Leukapsis (f 48–53). The place of sacrifice for both is at Erchia but is not further specified. These are the only two sacrifices in the calendar for the month of Mounichion, and one suspects that they are connected. Both are to be performed without wine (\textit{βαιρόνιος}), whereas the sacrifice to Zeus Mellichios in the deme calendar (A 37–43) is only partly without wine. Leukapsis has been identified as a Sicilian hero (Dunst 1964: 482ff; Manganaro 1965: 166, arguing for an origin of the hero in old Greece; Giangiuilo 1983: 816f). The Tritopatores are too well established in the Aegean for us to suppose that they were imported along with Leukapsis. Perhaps the hero was given a place in their sanctuary.

(f) Calendar of the deme of Marathon in a sacrificial calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis: \textit{LSGC} 20 B 3–33 (\textit{IG II}^{2} 1358), \textit{Εχθροφόρους} πρὸς Κτίρων. \textit{Τυγχανότα τὸν ἅρπα[ή]ν οἷς ΔΙ Ι Κοροφόρου χάριτος Ι Ι Τριτοπατερεύς οἷς Τριτοπατερεύς} Ο Ἀκάματων οἷς ΔΙ Ι Τριτοπατερεύς Ι Ι Τετράκτος Μ 51–54, \textit{Σκυροφωτάνος} πρὸς Κτίρων. \textit{Γαλατης κοῦρος ΔΙ Ι Τριτοπατερεύς Ι Τριτοπατερεύς} / \textit{τριάξεσα Ι} (2nd quarter of 4 th cent.)

Every year the \textit{demarchos} of the Marathonians sacrificed a male sheep (wether) to the Tritopatores. Every other year (Β 39 τὸ έτερον έτος) he also furnished them with a table, \textit{i.e.}, he set out food offerings including sacrificial meat on a table when the hero Galitos received a ram. (On the \textit{τριαξῶ} in sacrifice cf. Gill 1974, 1991).

Two aspects of the Marathonian ritual may have bearing on the Selinous Tritopatores. In the annual rite they were associated with Hystenios (a local hero), Kourotophos (a female figure, "Nourisher of the Young," widely worshipped in Attica), and the Akamantes, who also received a male sheep. The Akamantes are not well attested but in the great Kyrenian \textit{lex sacra} the \textit{Ἀκαμάτων} (sic) again appear to be associated with the Tritopatores (see \textit{LSSupp.} 115 A 21–25 and \textit{Kubler 1973 infra}). Secondly, the offerings to the Tritopatores are to take place before the festival of the Skira in the early summer month of Skirophorion. At Selinous the rites prescribed in Column A are also dated before another festival, in this case the Kotytia. The unusual form of dating occurs in another place in the Marathonian inscription (B 5) and the similarity with the Selinite usage may not be significant. But it is possible that the Tritopatores and the figures with whom they are associated are not given a fixed date in the ritual calendar. Instead, their rites need to be accomplished before a larger festival, perhaps because of their chthonic connections. (However, no particular similarity between the Skira and the Kotytia is evident.) If, as appears to be the case at Selinous, they are figures worshipped more by individual families than by the community, a flexible date would be appropriate.
foundating hero of the settlement, the community's ancestral spirits, and perhaps an early religious adviser.36

ii. Discussion

The Tritopatores have a much narrower geographical range than does Zeus Melichios. They are known from Attica, Athenian-dominated Delos, Troizen, Selinous (which presumably derived its cult from another Saronic Gulf city, Megara) and Kyrene. Their presence in that Theran colony suggests that they are not a purely Athenian phenomenon that influenced its neighbors but are rather another indication, along with the ninth part in ritual (A11f, cf. Mykonos and Thasos) and the elasteros (B1, 9, and 12, cf. Paros and Thasos [discussed 116f infra]), of a zone of shared cult practices that encompassed the central and western Aegean. In the case of Kyrene, however, the geographical link might have been between Sicily and North Africa, rather than via Thera. There are cults of the city (Athens, Kyrene, and probably Troizen), of local communities (Attica and Erchia in Attica) and of gentilitial groups (Euergidai, Zakyadai, Pyrrhakidai). Bourriot (1976: 1174f) argues that the communal Tritopatores, for whom the evidence is earlier, were prior to the gentilitial; Kearns (1989: 76f) suggests that in Athens they were associated more with prarties than with gene because of their concern with generation. But, in truth, neither proposition can be demonstrated. At Selinous it seems to us more likely that, although the public hours of A18 may have been comprised of (or included) representations of the city's Tritopatores, the impure and then purified Tritopatores of A9–17 were the particular spirits of the group or family from which they received cult, rather than ancestral spirits of the city as a whole. Otherwise it is hard to see how several groups or individuals, the apparent subjects of the actions prescribed, would all need to convert impure Tritopatores into pure ones, or, if conversion did not occur, to deal with two categories of the city's Tritopatores.

36For detailed discussion of these problems see Parker 1983: 336–39, Brunel 1984, and, most recently, Malkin 1987: 206–12. Akamantia "shrines of the Akamantes? Possibly a generic word meaning something like 'hero shrine,'" Parker 1983: 337. In place of 'A'kamantia' some read E or ou 'moni. Parker (336) translates: "There is hoia in respect of the Akamantia for everybody, both pure and profane. Except for the man Battos the leader and the Tritopatores and from Onymastos the Delphian, from anywhere else, where a man died, there isn't hoia for one who is pure; in respect of shrines [ou moni] there is hoia for everybody." In one respect, however, the interpretation of Brunel (1984: 37) is attractive: 'there is hoia for everyone, from anyone else who has died," rather than the local "from anywhere else." In other respects we agree with Nock (1944: 145) who, in a brief review of possible pollution from hero shrines and rites, assumes, without discussion, that there is a contrast here between the ordinary dead and the heroized men who receive cult. This seems also to be the preference of Parker (without reference to Nock). At Selinous we have two types or two conditions of Tritopatores, pure and impure. At Kyrene they and their associates are, in effect, either polluting or, as we think the context suggests, not polluting.
The Tritopatores are not known to have been represented iconically; the same is true for most examples of Zeus Melichios, and like him they are found in defined spaces rather than in temples or shrines. They are neither numerous nor very explicit. Thus in the century pediment on the Athenian acropolis as the observances of the oikos, a practice so much taken for granted that the yeyovhvat ("private establishments of ancestral gods worshipped according to custom") certainly refers to ancestors (γονεούς), perhaps specifically to their images (cf. England 1921: 452f, and Morrow 1960: 462, who sees here an allusion to the Tritopatores). Lycurgus (25) speaks of τὰ λεπτὰ τὰ πατρίδα, clearly referring to objects, most probably images, that have been taken away from the native land of the accused. But since they are said to leave τοὺς νέους κατὰ τὰ δόξαν, by the images would have included gods as well as ancestors. Isaeus (9.7), in speaking of the customary rites (τὰ νομίζομεν) for a particular dead man and for the ancestors, makes clear the similarity of the honors to the two categories (Wise's commentary on the passage [1904: 69ff] contains the more important testimonia). The adjective πατρίας occurs in reference to both and is found in the lex sacra at A17 and 22 (and more ambiguously in B7). πατρίας has been understood as an adjective referring to personal ancestors, ancestors conceived of as particular individuals, rather than as having the more general sense of "ancestral" (Benveniste 1969: 220). Against this background, Tritopatores would seem to be a term used in relatively few areas for a concept that was universal in the Greek world.

Neither in conception nor in ritual does there seem to be a sharp distinction drawn between a specific dead forebear and the ancestors in general. Nonetheless, there are differences. The individual dead were commemorated on a given number of days (3, 9, 30, a year) after the funeral. Except for the birthday and at the grave (cf. Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 144-48), whereas the impersonal group of ancestors could be recognized in the festal calendar of the community, and not necessarily, perhaps never, at actual graves. Which would be chosen? All that were known to the descendants? In the best known part of the Greek world, Attica, the variable and on the whole limited attention and degree of continuity in the matter of family graves has been shown by Humphreys (1980). The Attic variable and on the whole limited attention and degree of continuity in the matter of family graves has been shown by Humphreys (1980). The Attic festival of the Genesia has been interpreted as an example of communal commemoration of the ancestors (Jacoby 1944; Bourriot 1976: 1126-31, who, however, dissociates it from the gene). In some respects the Attic and Ionian Anthesteria was an All Souls Day for the community's collective ghosts (Deubner 1932: 111-14; Parke 1977: 116f). At Nakone in western Sicily, some two hundred years after the Selinuntine lex sacra was inscribed, public sacrifice was specified for the ancestors and for personified civic harmony, Homonoia (συνομολογείται), and worship was performed for the community's collective ghosts (Deubner 1932: 111-14; Parke 1977: 116f). At Nakone in western Sicily, some two hundred years after the Selinuntine lex sacra was inscribed, public sacrifice was specified for the ancestors and for personified civic harmony, Homonoia (συνομολογείται). The festival the Selinuntine lex sacra the initial ceremony is not given a fixed date but must be performed by a certain time each year, and sacrifice is allowed again after one year (A18, 20, at home and with the damosia biara, A20f), and again after two years (A23). In these respects the ceremonies

37Furtwangler (1905: 435-38) identified the triple-bodied "bluebeard" from a sixth-century pediment on the Athenian acropolis as the Tritopatores, an idea taken up by Bentos (1965). It is an intriguing suggestion that cannot, unfortunately, be substantiated. Accordings to Rohde (1915: 171), "nothing else than the souls of the ancestors." The fullest discussions are by Wust (1939), Cook (1940: 112-40), Jacoby on Phanodemos FGrHist 325f 6, Hemberg (1954), and Bourriot (1976c: 1135-39).

38This took place at the time of the dokimasia, "when all the citizens have a festival with each other during the adelphonesia": Nenci and Asheri 1982: 776f no. 3.28f (SEG 32.358), Daux 1984: 396.
resemble those for a particular person, and the distinction between the 
*homosepuoi* (A3), members of the household or restricted kinship group, and others (the subject of *καταλείποντας*) would be consistent with 
such a procedure. The preserved text, however, makes no allusion to the 
usual funeral ceremonies, though there is, of course, the possibility that 
the fragmentary beginning of Column A did so. At the same time, the 
detailed ritual prescriptions for figures who are to some degree public 
(Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides and the two Meilichios), together with 
the use of public *hiara*, show that more than funerary or private com- 
memorative cult is involved. An incident that affects a family, presumably 
a death of some sort, requires engagement in the complex of rites for 
these more or less public figures. It is interesting that in third-century 
Nakone the ancestors are linked in sacrifice with Homonoia. We have 
noted the role of Zeus Meilichios in stabilizing a society after *stasis* (Paus. 
2.20.1f). The ritual expert Epimenides in the sixth century was said to have 
assisted Solon in introducing the Athenians to gentler funeral rites and to 
have made them more inclined to *homonoia* (a reference surely to their 
civil strife arising from the Kylonian incident) by means of ἀναμνήσεως τιμής 
καὶ καθαρμός καὶ ἱλαρότης καὶ καθοδός (Plut. Sol. 12.5, 
cf: 21). There seems to be a linking of honors to the ancestors, civil 
harmony (after civil strife), and perhaps the reform of funerary rites.40

5. The Cults of Groups

Our examination of the cults of Zeus Meilichios showed that while the 
larger community in some cities might undertake ritual in his honor, his 
cult was predominantly that of individuals, families, and the gentilitial 
groups that appear as subdivisions of society throughout the Greek 
world. For the Tritopatores communal cult seems more common than 
that of groups; the reason is probably that some communities preferred 
the more specialized term, as against the generic *progonoi* or the like. The 
affinity of the cult of Zeus Meilichios at Selinous with other cults main- 
tained by groups has long been recognized (cf: Hanell 1934: 178 n.4, who 
gives some examples collected by Martin Nilsson, and Nilsson 1951: 
162-66). Rather than offering a survey of this large subject here, we call 
attention to a number of parallels that are especially relevant.

40Restrictions were imposed on a family’s or gentilitial group’s elaboration of 
commemorative rites in various parts of the Greek world, especially in the late Archaic 
and early Classical periods, and these might include the prohibition of a particular ritual, 
as was the case with the Thirty Day ceremony on Keos (*LSCG* 97 A 2d). At Gambriat 
in Asia Minor all rites had to be completed within three months (*LSAM* 16.16). At 
Selinous the explicit permission (*ἐγκώριον*) for sacrifice after a year and after two years sounds 
like a clarification or modification of more general restrictions (cf: the declaration on Keos 
that the third day and annual rites did not cause pollution so long as the performers did 
not enter shrines: *LSCG* 97 B).
PLATE 2
A LEX SACRA FROM SELINOUS

PLATE 3
A LEX SACRA FROM SELINOUS

Column A

Column A, detail (lines 1-7)
Sanctuary of Malophoros

(a) Campo di Stele, 1924 (from the south)

(b) Temple of Zeus Meilichios (?) and Campo di Stele, 1924 (from north)
(a) Campo di Stele, 1924 (from north)

(b) Votive and Sacrificial Deposit, 1970

Dedication to Zeus Melichios, Athens
(a) Meilichios stone, Selinous a (MP 60)
(b) Meilichios stone, Selinous b (MP 58)
(c) Meilichios stone, Selinous c (MP 61)

(a) Meilichios stone, Selinous f (MP 68)
(b) Meilinios stone, Selinous k (MP 62)
Twin herm, 1 (81.AA.135)

Twin herm, 2 (74.AA.44)
PLATE 14

A *Lex Sacra* from Selinous

(a, b) Head broken from a herm, 3 (81.AA.138)

(c–f) Twin herm, 4 (81.AA.136)

---

PLATE 15

A *Lex Sacra* from Selinous

(a, b) Head broken from a herm, 5 (81.AA.137)

(c, d) Semi-iconic stone, 6 (81.AA.139.C)
(a) Aniconic stone, 7 (81.AA.139.D)  (b) Aniconic stone, 8 (81.AA.139.A)  (c) Block with column in relief, 9 (81.AA.139.B)  

The Tritopatreion in the Kerameikos, Athens
(a) The Underground Shrine at Paestum (Posidonia)

(b) Miniature altar with Punic inscription (81.AA.143)
On Thera two of the Doric phylai had spaces marked on bedrock for the Nymphs (IG XII.3 377, 378), just as the Pamphyloi of Megara had a space reserved for Zeus Meilichios (supra 84); at the place marked for the Nymphs of the Hyileis, sacrifice was to be made and consumed on the spot (378). The branch of the genos of the Pyrrhakidai on Delos had not only their Tritopator but also their Nymphs (supra 109). We have seen that on Thera (supra 86) various individuals and groups also reserved spaces for Zeus, probably Meilichios in most cases.

On Kos six stones, probably markers, bear the name of Zeus Hikesios in the genitive, followed in four instances by the name of a group in the genitive plural (Herzog 1928: 35; cf. Nilsson 1951: 163). Thirteen similar stones of various deities, both with and without group names in the genitive plural, and ranging in date from the fourth to the second century, may all have come from the Asklepion of Kos. A private cult foundation of the second century includes Zeus Hikesios and the Theoi Patroioi with an Artemis whose epithet is lost (LSCG 171.2l). The groups were probably regular civic subdivisions, of gentilitial, not geographical, character (Sherwin-White 1978: 165-69). Three inscriptions on Thera are for Hikesios, the first two on bedrock, and are followed by the name of a man or a group (IG XII.3 402ff). The significance of the epithet Hikesios will be discussed with Elasteros (166-20 infra).

On Thera, Kos, and Thasos, and at Kyrene (supra 77ff) and Metapontion (Graf 1987 and supra 100f), gentilitial groups used areas outside their cities, in some cases precincts of major deities with special places marked for the particular deities of the group. At Metapontion the god is always Apollo Lykeios, just as in the Meilichios precinct at Selinous all the stones appear to be for Zeus Meilichios, although the lex sacra names other figures as well. Elsewhere a variety of deities are attested. At Kos, besides Zeus Hikesios there are stones of Zeus Patroios (two), Zeus Machaneus (without a group), Zeus Phratrios, Athena Phratria, Zeus without an epithet, Apollo Karneios, and the Moirai (Herzog 1928: 35).

On Thasos a common sanctuary of the patrai of the city was located in the Thesmophorion, on the slope of the hill known as Evraiokastro (Rolley 1965). Its use is thought to go back to the foundation of the colony. Twelve short inscriptions of the classical period have been published (two of which are too fragmentary to be useful). All have a deity's name in the genitive and seven have the name of a gentilitial group (names ending in -6at except for the Galeontes) also in the genitive. Seven of the divinities are each designated as πατριώτης. The gods are Zeus (four times, with the epithet Alastoros twice and Ktesios once, but cf. also IG XII Suppl. 407, for Ktesios, perhaps originally from this sanctuary); Athena three times (once with the unique epithet MuKετίν); Artemis Orthoria (cf. the boundary marker of Artemis Orthoria of the Athenian Demokleidai, IG II 2 2615); the Nymphs Koradai; and the name Kore alone. The two inscriptions for Athena πατριώτης stand somewhat apart;
one gives sacrificial specifications (Rolley 1965: 447 no. 6; LSCG 113; Guarducci 1978: 12f); the other (Rolley 1965: 448 f no. 7) is an altar.

Taken as a whole, the Thasian inscriptions suggest that the Thesmophorion was the site of such ceremonies as the Apaturia (LSSupp. 69.1) for the introduction of members into the groups: at birth, on reaching puberty or adulthood, or at marriage. Analogous are the cults of Zeus Phratrios and Athena Phratria at Athens (cf. Hedrick 1984) and elsewhere, e.g. on Kos (see above) and at Lindos (Blinkenberg 1941: no. 615). At the Thasian Thesmophorion the lex sacra for Athena specifies that women are to share in the sacrifice. The site gives support to Graf’s contention that the use of stelai in this fashion, some perhaps originally coated with stucco (ptapoi) restored, (a) An altar of the god: LSSupp. 62; Kontoleon 1948-49: 2 no. 3; Jeffery 1961: pl. 56; Guarducci 1967: 161f; IG XII.3 1027), (b) A small column on which another object rested, perhaps a basin for lustral water (perirhanterion): Kontoleon 1948-49: no. 1, Δως Ἠλλάκτερον (mid-5th cent.).

(b) A small white marble stele used as a boundary marker: Kontoleon 1948-49: 3 no. 2 (IG XII Suppl. 208), Δως Ἠλλάκτερον πατρίου (early 4th cent.) (c) A small white marble stele used as a boundary marker: Kontoleon 1948-49: 3 no. 2 (IG XII Suppl. 208), Δως Ἠλλάκτερον πατρίου (early 4th cent.) (c) A small white marble stele used as a boundary marker: Kontoleon 1948-49: 3 no. 2 (IG XII Suppl. 208), Δως Ἠλλάκτερον πατρίου (early 4th cent.) (c) A small white marble stele used as a boundary marker: Kontoleon 1948-49: 3 no. 2 (IG XII Suppl. 208), Δως Ἠλλάκτερον πατρίου (early 4th cent.) (c) A small white marble stele used as a boundary marker: Kontoleon 1948-49: 3 no. 2 (IG XII Suppl. 208), Δως Ἠλλάκτερον πατρίου (early 4th cent.) (c) A small white marble stele used as a boundary marker: Kontoleon 1948-49: 3 no. 2 (IG XII Suppl. 208), Δως Ἠλλάκτερον πατρίου (early 4th cent.) (c) A small white marble stele used as a boundary marker: Kontoleon 1948-49: 3 no. 2 (IG XII Suppl. 208), Δως Ἠλλάκτερον πατρίου (early 4th cent.) (c) A small white marble stele used as a boundary marker: Kontoleon 1948-49: 3 no. 2 (IG XII Suppl. 208), Δως Ἠλλάκτερον πατρίου (early 4th cent.) (c) A small white marble stele used as a boundary marker: Kontoleon 1948-49: 3 no. 2 (IG XII Suppl. 208), Δως Ἠλλάκτερον πατρίου (early 4th cent.) (c) A small white marble stele used as a boundary marker: Kontoleon 1948-49: 3 no. 2 (IG XII Suppl. 208), Δως Ἠλλάκτερον πατρίου (early 4th cent.) (c) A small white marble stele used as a boundary marker: Kontoleon 1948-49: 3 no. 2 (IG XII Suppl. 208), Δως Ἠλλάκτε...
form alastoros, reminiscent of elasteros, for the more familiar alastor is also attested for Aeschylus (fr. 92, 294 Radt). Zeus with this epithet was known to Pherekydes (FGrHist 3 f 175) who associated Zeus Alastoros with Zeus Hikesios (Jacoby's Ἀλάστορ, nominative, is a misprint). The more common form is seen in the lemma of Hesychius s.v. ἀλάστορ- πυρός δαίμονες. Zeus, and in Cornutus (9, p. 10.20ff Lang) ἄλαστορ (τοῖς Ἔλεεν), ἀλάστορ καὶ παλαμναίοις τῷ τοίς ἄλαστορας καὶ παλαμναίανοι κολάζειν. . . . Zeus Palamnaios is also mentioned in the Suda, Photius, Etym. Gud. (448.28ff) and Etym. Magn., all s.v. παλαμνάιοι. The two Etymorphoi localize him at Chalkis in Euboia. An inscription reading Ζηνί παλαμναίον χείσθηκεν was found at Gomphi in Thessaly by Leake (IG IX.2 291).

Both ancient and modern commentators have remarked on the use of ἄλαστορ/ἄλάσταρος and a number of other words, such as ἄλαστήριος, παλαμναίοις, προστρόπαιος, to refer equally to a wrongdoer and to a punisher of wrongdoing. 44 The underlying concept is that the anger of a dead person who has been wronged pursues and exacts vengeance on the wrongdoer or on his kin. The force that embodies the anger may be referred to as a μανιάς θεῶν, "wrath of the gods" (cf. H. 22.358, Od. 11.73), as an alastor or aliterios (Antiphon Tetral. 3.13f, 2.8, 3.7, 4.10), or as a daimon (sometimes further defined as alastor and palamnaios, Plut. Mor. 418f; cf. 297α and Pollux 5.131). 45 Or it may take the form of such named supernatural figures as the Erinys or, as it would seem, Zeus with corresponding epithets—Alastoros, Palamnaios, and Elasteros.

The notion of the wrath of the dead who have been wronged taking the form of vengeful spirits is widespread and has a long history in Greek culture. It has been argued that despite the role attributed to them in the achievement of justice in the late fifth-century Tetralogies of Antiphon, by the fourth century in Athens at least they were no longer taken seriously (Mikalson 1983: 50ff; Parker 1983: 124-28). The silence of the orators about them and Aeschines' reference to avenging Erinys as being theatrical and not realistic (1.190) would seem to support this view. But except for Lyssias 1, which was written for the defendant and not designed to call attention to supernatural sanctions, none of the fourth-century speeches are for cases of homicide, which was the principal source of vengeful spirits. The use in Classical Athens of curse tablets and other

forms of hostile magic (cf. Pl. Leg. 933a; Jordan 1980, 1985a, 1988a; Faroane 1985) is a reminder that traditional, irrational modes of thought by no means banished from even that most sophisticated of Greek cities. In more isolated and provincial cities, we may believe that public recognition of what might have been regarded as superstition in Athens continued throughout the Classical period and beyond.

The most detailed evidence of the enduring strength of such beliefs comes from the lex sacra of Kyrene, in an inscription of the late fourth century that nevertheless claims—no doubt justifiably—an ancient pedigree (LSSupp. 115 [SEG 9.72; Buck 1955: 115]). In a section (B 29-59) headed "Visitors" (ἱερεῖα, rituals are described for dealing with different types of these beings. That all three types are hostile spirits was demonstrated many years ago by Harold Stukey (Stukey 1937; Parker 1983: 344-51 accepted the interpretation for the first only, but Burkert 1984: 68-72 reaffirmed that all three are demonic). We have drawn attention to the parallels between the procedures prescribed at Kyrene and those in Column B of the Selinuntine text (supra 55, 76). In effect, the elasteros at Selinous corresponds to the hikiesios at Kyrene. 46

We have seen that terms such as ἄλαστωρ, παλαμναϊος and προστρόπαιος, used to describe dangerous, vengeful spirits, are also found as epithets of Zeus. The Kyrenian ἱερεῖα also corresponds to Hikiesios, an epithet of Zeus linked by Pherekydes with Alastoros (FGrHist 3 f 175, ἄλαστωρ ἐξ Ἀλαστορ δαίμων, 181-1), and by Aplonion Rhodites with Zeus Katharion (4.275; cf. the Erinys described as ἱερεῖα and paired with νεῦμις θεῶν at 4.1042). We have encountered evidence for the cult of Zeus Hikesios on stones set up by gentilitial groups on Kos (Herzog 1928: 35, cf. LSCG 171.2f and the discussion supra 114f) and in three inscriptions on Thera, two of which are on bedrock and followed the name of a man or a group (IG XII.3 402-04). Only at Thera do we find both Zeus Melichios and Zeus Hikesios or Alastoros, which may suggest that they normally have the same functions.

Why would gentilitial groups have a cult of the protector of suppliants, the usual sense of Zeus Hikesios (e.g. Aesch. Suppl. 616)? It might be argued that they anticipate the need of the members to seek refuge with him, but it is equally if not more likely that the god protects them against hikiesios, "hostile spirits," sent to attack them, or that he acts as an avenger on their behalf. In his discussion of Zeus Hikesios, Alastoros, and prosterpais Cook (1925: II 1101) noted that "the protective and punitive powers of Zeus are fused."

Terminology and practice varied from place to place, but it emerges from our review that it was common in Archaic and Classical Greece for gentilitial groups to have cults of a Zeus who showed by his epithets that
he was concerned with the vengeance of the angry dead. We have seen that the words used applied both to the victim and the avenger, whether demonic or divine. At Selinous the dangerous spirit is supernatural but is not Zeus. Here, we suggest, Zeus Meilichios’ role is to protect the group to which he belongs against hostile elasteroi from outside the group, but also perhaps to despatch elasteroi against any persons who did violence to the group. These functions are consistent with the god’s close identification with a group or an individual and their welfare. But in some places it seems that he played this part with the title Elasteros, Alastor, or Hikesios.

The activity of the spirits seems to have been aroused primarily by bloodshed and could result in death, madness, or sickness for the wrong-doer or his descendants. There were, however, procedures for propitiating the spirits, i.e., purifying oneself from them (see the discussion supra 73ff). The spirits could also be directed against the living kin of the victim if they failed to take action against the wrongdoer (cf. Aesch. Cho. 269-305, esp. 283ff, the attacks of Erinyes; Antiphon Tetral. 3.4.1; Pl. Leg. 8668, where the miasma turns against them). The responsibility not only of the kin but also of the putative kin, the victim’s phratri, survives in Athens in the late seventh century. The republication of the law of Drakon on homicide specified that the members of the victim’s phratri should participate in the prosecution and in any forgiveness of the murderer (Meiggs and Lewis 1969: no. 86.13-23). This was the legal, secular equivalent of the ritual action that it in no way precludes. In widely scattered parts of the Greek world, these at once vengeful and protective cults of Zeus were maintained primarily by gentilitial groups, roughly the equivalent of the Attic gene and phratriai. Archaic and Classical Greece, whose lots a Meilichios cult existed in the fifth century, had been a co-founder of the city. This name of the oikistes was Pammilos, according to Thucydides (6.4.2; for the spelling see Dover 1970: 207), and it is usually supposed that he came from Megara in old Greece (Megara Nisaia, as it is sometimes called to distinguish it), the mother city of Megara Hyblaia. But it is arguable that he was from Megara Hyblaia and that the name of the oikistes from Megara Nisaia has been lost from the text (Dover 1970: 216f, following Steinkeller). This leaves open the possibility, as we have pointed out (Commentary on A9), that either Myskos or Euthydamos, in each of whose lots a Meilichios cult existed in the fifth century, had been a co-founder of the city with Pammilos.

In the late seventh century a native settlement existed on the Manuzza plateau to the northwest of the later acropolis (Martin 1977: 53). Commercial relations with the peoples of the interior, notably the Elymians of Segesta (Graham 1982: 168), or with the Carthaginians and the western Mediterranean (Di Vita 1988: 10), have been seen as the reason for a settlement so far west (Graham 1982: 168); the opportunities for territorial expansion, however, have been regarded as more important (de La Genière 1977: 258ff). In any case, conflict with the Segestans had occurred by the early sixth century (Diod. 5.9.2, on Pentathlos’ expedition to the territory of Lilybaion). In the later fifth century the hostility between these two cities, which alternated with periods of peace marked by treaties that raised such issues as intermarriage (Thuc. 6.6.2), led to Segesta’s appeal to Athens. In Athens’ ensuing Sicilian expedition, Selinus contributed troops to the Syracusan alliance (cf. Thuc. 6.46.3-47.1, 65.1, 67.2).
The most serious threat to Selinous, given its exposed position to the west of all of other Greek settlements, was posed by Cartaghe and the Carthaginian developments at Motya and Lilybaion (for Carthaginian relations with Greek Sicily, including Selinous, see Huss: 1985). Antiochos (FGrHist 557 F 1) had Phoenicians as well as Segesteans engaged against the Selinuntines at the time of Pentathlos’ expedition in the early sixth century. The gravenstone of Aristogeitos, killed at Motya, if from Selinous, would point to fighting in the third quarter of the sixth century (Diod. 80; Jeffery 1961: 461, 1 and pl. 77). A Selinuntine defeat by Cartaghe mentioned in Polyenaus 1.28 is not dated. At the time of the great battle between the Greeks and Carthaginians at Himera in 480, Selinous was the only Greek city on the Punic side (Diod. 11.21.4; 13.55.1). The city seems, however, to have escaped punishment in the aftermath of the war, and in 466 it assisted the Syracuseans in ridding themselves of Tharsiboulos (Diod. 11.68.1). The victory celebrated in the inscription from Temple G (Meiggs and Lewis 1969: no. 38) probably dates from the second half of the fifth century, but the circumstances have not been determined (Calder 1963 proposed the defeat of Athens in 413).

After Athens’ defeat, Selinous invaded the territory of Segesta which had put itself in the hands of the Carthaginians (Diod. 13.431). Hannibal, whose father Giskon had been an exile in Selinous (13.433), defeated the Selinuntines in the field and proceeded to lay siege to the town, which he captured and destroyed—sparing the temples—after nine days. Sixteen thousand Selinuntines were said to have been killed and more than 5,000 made prisoners, while 2,600 escaped to Akragas (13.54–58; cf. Xen. Hell. 1.1.37, 2.8, 10). The survivors were allowed to return to farm their fields and live in the town in return for paying tribute to Cartaghe (13.59.1–3).

Thereafter Selinous was under Punic control with only brief interruption, as under Hermokrates in 408/7 (Diod. 13.63.3–4; the Carthaginians returned in 406, 13.80.1, Dionysios I in 405 (13.114.1), 397 (14.7.6), 383 (15.17.5), and 368 (15.7.3), and Pyrrhos in 276 (22.10.2). In treaties with Cartaghe by Dionysios I in 405 (13.114.1), 392 (14.96.4), and 383 (15.2), and by Timoleon in 339/8 (16.82f; Plut. Tyr. 34) and Agathokles in 314 (Diod. 19.71.7) and 306 (20.79.5), the boundary between Greek and Carthaginian spheres was set at the river Halykos, and Selinous’ tributary status was recognized. Finally, ca 250, the Carthaginians, in the course of their struggle with Rome, removed all the inhabitants of Selinous to Lilybaion (24.1.1). In the first century B.C. Strabo (6.2.6.2) spoke of the town as deserted.

The population in the last century and a half of the town’s existence was presumably Greek and Punic in varying proportions and degrees of mixture. In the early fourth century it would seem to have been sufficiently Greek to declare for Dionysios I when it had a chance (Diod. 14.47). By the later fourth century Selinous probably shared in the general depopulation of Sicily encountered by Timoleon when he arrived in the island (21.44.24; Martin 1977: 59f). Only toward the end of the century

(only after ca 306, according to de La Genière 1977: 263) is there archaeological evidence for vigorous rebuilding of fortifications, public buildings, and houses. The character of the construction is consistent with what is known of Punic techniques elsewhere.

The internal history of Selinous, as for all west Greek cities, is considerably more obscure than its foreign relations. Even in a sparse record, instances of tyranny and civil strife recur. A certain Peithagoras was ruling the city when Euryleon, a survivor of Dories’ failed expedition to Drepanon near Erx ca 510, expelled him and in turn seized power. Euryleon was overthrown by the citizens and killed, though he took refuge at the altar of Zeus in the agora (Hdt. 5.46; the epitaph quoted by Plutarch Mor. 217f [cf. Lyc. 20.5] may be connected with Peithagoras’ overthrow, as Freeman suggested (1891: 96f)). A Theron, son of Miltiades, made himself tyrant by a stratagem in the wake of a Selinuntine defeat by the Carthaginians (Polyaen. Strat. 1.28.2). Homer (1979; SEG 29.403), in restudying a fragmentary inscription on bronze found at Olympia, detects a reconciliation between exiles and those in the city in the late sixth or early fifth century.1

None of these events can be brought into direct connection with the lex sacra, which belongs, in our opinion, to the middle years of the fifth century. With the powerful and dangerous presence of the Carthaginians nearby, however, Selinous was even more subject than were most Greek cities to the temptation of calling upon outside force to support partisan interests. The incident mentioned without comment by Herodotus (5.46), in which sacrilege was committed by the murder of Euryleon at the altar of Zeus, is not likely to have been unique; massacre of groups and factions would have been “the order of the day” (Asheri 1979: 496). Comparable sacrilege at Athens and Argos led, we believe, to recourse to Zeus Meilichios for purification (cf. supra 58, 60, 84 and Jameson 1965: 165–72). The lex sacra envisages the possibility of a continuing need for the procedures it sets out, but that does not preclude the likelihood that a particular outburst of bloodshed within the city prompted the formulation and recording of these measures.

1Freeman (1891: 81f) put the events ca 579, but that was only a guess. Martin (1977: 55) would relate a lack of habitation on the acropolis in the mid-sixth century to the coming of tyranny under Theron, but there is nothing in the story that provides a date for him.

2Selinuntine ties with Olympia are seen in the treasury they built (Paus. 6.19.10), as well as in the place of the Olympic truce in the lex sacra. Mention should also be made of a devastating plague that caused infertility among women; it was attributed to the unhealthy rivers nearby and was said to have been stopped by Empedocles’ diversion of fresh waters (Diog. Laert. 8.70).
VII. Curse Tablets at Selinous

The sanctuary of Malophoros and the Campo di Stele, which we think was the provenance of the lex sacra, was also the source of twelve other texts on lead, an important group of curse tablets dating to the fifth century.

Curse tablets are inscribed sheets intended to harm, by supernatural means, the persons whom they name. The 1,100 Greek examples excavated so far date from the late sixth or early fifth century b.C. to the fifth century A.D. The tablets are found throughout the Mediterranean, but in the classical and Hellenistic periods chiefly in Sicily and Attica. A discouragingly small number of findspots are known for the earlier curse tablets; those found in recorded excavations seem to derive largely from graves and chthonic sanctuaries, and in this respect at least present a contrast to examples from later times, which come also from wells and from places close to the intended victims. They are almost always found rolled up into scrolls, and often the earlier tablets, particularly the Attic, have been pierced with nails. Our only early evidence for the Greek term for these tablets, κτουδεςμοι, is found in Attic writers and may reflect the fact that the texts of most early Attic examples begin with the word κτουδο, "I bind"—and possibly the idea that the rolling up of the tablets was a kind of binding. In the literature of present-day scholarship curse tablets are often called defixiones; the Latin noun, from the verb defingo, "nail down," is late but seems to reflect the earlier Attic use of nails. Although the excavation record for curse tablets is far from complete, the earliest published examples, nineteen in number, come from Selinous. It will be convenient to list them here; three other early

1The basic corpora are Wünsch 1897 and Audollent 1904; see Jordan 1985b for examples that have appeared subsequently, and, for general treatments, Preisendanz 1969 and Paroone 1991a.

2Wünsch 1897: 1 (=3 in 1976 reprint) tells how Prussian customs officials removed from most of the Attic examples the labels with records of their findspots.

3For a list of wells and other underground bodies of water that have yielded Greek curse tablets see Jordan 1985a: 207 n.3, 209. It cannot be demonstrated (so Jordan 1980: 232 n.24) that tablets earlier than the Roman period were in situ, if found in a well.

4E.g. the curse put on Germanicus, Tac. Ann. 2.30; for curses found in circuses at Carthage and elsewhere, directed against charioteers and such, cf. Jordan 1988b: 119.

5Versnel 1991 urges that both this term and the Greek κτουδεςμοι are inappropriate.

6The last few years have seen three publications, produced independently and appearing virtually at the same time, that include compilations of Selinuntine curse tablets: Dubois 1989, López Jimeno 1988-89 (a corpus of the curse tablets of Sicily), and Arena
Selinuntine examples remain unpublished. In all, the twenty-two constitute over half the curse tablets from Sicily. Whether this suggests an unusual situation at Selinous is a question that we leave open.

Buffa\(^7\)


| a | 1 (2\(^{nd}\) half) 29 (2\(^{nd}\) half) | 1 (1\(^{st}\) half) 29 (VI) 59 (VI/V) | 94 |
| b | 4 (beg. V) 32 (beg. V) | 7 (beg. V) 66 (V) | 97 |
| c | 2 (end VI) 31 (VI) | 3 (end VI) 60 (beg. V) | 95 |
| d | 3 (end VI) 30 (VI) | 2 (end VI) 62 (beg. V) | 96 |
| e | 5 (1\(^{st}\) half) | 15 (1\(^{st}\) half) | 98 |

Campi di Stelle\(^8\)

Ferri 1944-45

| f | 168-75 (450) 38 (475-450) 12 (475-450) 63 (475-450) | 107 |
| g | 174 33 (ca 500) 13 (475-450) 67 (475-450) | 108 |

Gabrici 1927

| b | 12 (earlier than 450) 37 (ca 500) 10 (500-475) | 61 (beg. V) 99 |

---

1989. Dubois and López Jimeno made use of published editions, neither consulting the tablets themselves—indeed, for presumably most of the curses from the Gaggera, autopsy may have been useless, as several of the tablets were badly corroded when found (Gabrici 1927: 385), and others have deteriorated since their discovery—but Arena has published good photographs, sometimes new, of several and presumably saw the tablets himself.

\(^7\)Buffa, the area east of the river Modione, in the gorge of the river Cottone between the hill with the ancient city and the hill on which temples E, F, and G are located (see Adriani et al. 1971: map 17, and supra Fig. 1), had a cemetery (Tusa ap. Adriani et al. 1971: 177, map 18) that has yielded pottery dating from the second half of the seventh through the end of the fifth century (Tusa: 226-30, pls. 81-84). Two early funerary inscriptions are in fact known from the site, MP 85 (θεῷ τοῦ το[υ]τοῦ, τοὺς πατ[ρ]ίδαν) and 86 (πατρίδα τῷ [-]), both assigned to the second half of the sixth century. Unfortunately, we lack details about find-spots for the lead tablets from Buffa.

\(^8\)On excavations at Selinous, see Ch. VIII. Two tablets (f, g) were chance finds from "near the outer side of the retaining wall of the sanctuary of Malophoros"; others (b-q) were excavated apparently in the various campaigns between 1889 and 1915 and appear in Gabrici's final publication of the site, unfortunately again without any record of exact find-spots or contexts. One (f), for example, is reported to come from sand overlying the Campo di Stelle, and two others (j and m), from the temenos of Mellichott; from the excavation notebooks Dewailly (1992: 39) cites the contexts of five inscriptions on lead, without, however, identifying them. Most of the tablets (Gabrici 1927: 385) were found folded or rolled up. "Raro è il caso, in cui la laminetta fu trovata piana"; that one exception seems to be k.

---
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| i | 13 | --- | 9 (500-475) 65 (1\(^{st}\) half V) 100 |
| j | 20 | --- | p.176 |
| k | 15 | 36 (V) 19 (mid-V) 69 (450) | 104 |
| l | 14 (end V) 40 (end V) 23 (end V- beg. IV) | --- | 106 |
| m | 19 | --- | 14 (mid-V) 68 (450) | 102 |
| n | 16 | 35 (V) 8 (end VI- beg. V) | 64 (1\(^{st}\) half V) 101 |
| o | 17 | 34 (V) 20 (V) 70 (V) | 103 |
| p | 18 | 39 (ca 450) 4 (VI) 71 (450) 103 |
| q \(^{10}\) | 21 | --- | p.176 |

Selinuntine provenance inferred\(^11\)

r Simon 1989: 340 (ca 500)
s Simon 1989: 341 (V)
t-u Unpublished (Getty Museum)

With one possible exception (t),\(^12\) no Selinuntine tablet is later than the fifth century, and most seem to be from the middle or earlier part of that

---

\(^{11}\)These are safely assignable to Selinous on the basis of their letter-forms and formulae.

\(^{12}\)It is also the only Selinuntine tablet that was found pierced with a nail, and one of its phrases (lines 4-8, καί τέκνα [κέι] ὥσπερ μελέτη / μελέτη θ' / λήγειν θ' πολίκευν, "whoever is about either to speak or to act on their behalf") finds parallels in fourth-century curse tablets from Attica, e.g. Audollent 1904: no. 60.10f, καί τέκνα [κέι] ὥσπερ μελέτη τοίς μελέτης [κέι] τοις μελέτης καταστροφος, "and all the others who are categorized with Nectere," and Wünsch 1897: no. 1034.81, καί τέκνα [κέι] τοίς μελέτης [κέι] τοις, "and if anyone else is a friend (?) to them."
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Here, what happens to the names themselves is to happen to their bearers, and we may assume that the 'magic' is in the act of inscribing the text in a special way. There seems to be a consistency in the places of deposit of early tablets from Sicily and Attica: cemeteries and chthonic sanctuaries, places connected with the dead (Jordan 1985b: 152). Presumably this connection with the dead was considered important. We may speculate that in the case of the tablets with twisted writing, it was the proximity to the dead that somehow activated the analogical magic.

As for the Selinuntine tablets inscribed in a normal manner, their 'magic' must consist in something other than their spelling.

(a) "For |--jko, whatever she wants, let her works and words be unfulfilled (έπτελευτά), and for Silena(s), let her (?) works and words, whatever she (?) wants (sc. be unfulfilled)."

(b) Two lines that have not yielded sense, plus "for unfulfillment (έπταλευτά), whatever they want."

Although in later times lead itself came (possibly because of its increasing use for curse tablets) to have 'magical' associations,14 there is no evidence that in the early fifth century, when the Selinuntine curses were inscribed, the association had yet developed. For the 'magic' of these early tablets inscribed normally we should no doubt look not at the material of the tablets but rather to their places of deposit: among the dead at Buffa and at a scene of rituals for dead ancestors and divinities with chthonic association on the Gaggera.

The most obvious reason for depositing a tablet among the dead would be the misma that the dead generate. Simple physical contact should be enough to ensure that the persons named on tablets so deposited will be affected by that misma. At work again is a kind of analogical magic: just as the names written on the tablet are polluted by contact with the dead, so too the bearers of those names should be.

It will be seen that three of the Selinuntine curses quoted above—one with twisted (b) and two with 'normal' writing (a, h)—urge that their victims should suffer "unfulfillment" (έπτελευτά) and that their victims' words and works be "unfulfilled" (έπτελευτά). This too is analogical magic, but of a kind best illustrated in curse texts from elsewhere. In phrases in a fragmentary Attic example (Wünsch 1897: no. 90) in which the inscriber has "bound down" the victim before Hermes, one reads καλείς (πρώτον Ἐρμήν; καὶ δὲ Χίττορας γινομαι, "and before Hermes the controller (κατοχός); and you (i.e. the intended victim? the lead tablet?), come under control (κατοχός)" (a.ii.1-5); and πρώτον Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμήν / Ἐρμή

13As for any closer dating, there is much room for agnosticism; for cautionary remarks see Jeffery 1955. Partly to illustrate the possibility of disagreement here, we have included in the list the dates proposed by the editors; the order of our list by no means implies a relative chronology. Of no Selinuntine tablet, for example, do we have any chronologically useful excavation context recorded. It should be stressed that this is true for every Sicilian curse tablet. A decade ago, with the publication of a curse tablet found between two graves in the cemetery at Passo Marinaro at Kamaria (Cordano 1984: 44-49), it was hoped that the exception had presented itself, for one of the graves contained a coin of Agathokles (317-310), but Di Stefano (1984) has argued that the tablet could have been washed there from elsewhere and should not be assumed to be in situ.

We are fortunate, on the other hand, that Kamarina has yielded a large public archive of lead tablets, over 150 in number, probably to be assigned to the years 461 and following (Cordano 1984: 1992); their letter-forms may yield a chronology useful for dating early Sicilian curse tablets.

14Cf. e.g. the phrase ἤ γεγέντος ἐντὸς μέλαθρος γίνομαι ("let his tongue become lead") on a fourth-century curse tablet from the Peiraieus, Wünsch 1897: 96.
The modern reader who finds this punning far-fetched may also object that this technique of composition, if we may call it such, occurring as it does here in an Attic text, is not necessarily applicable to our Selinuntine texts. Against such a reasonable objection we would urge that the formula of Audollent 1904: 68 occurs also in Audollent 1904: 69 (its provenance also unrecorded), where instead of the Attic καταδίομι, one finds the non-Attic (here Boioitan?) καταδίομι. The evidence is too slight to support any hypothesis, but it may be that this early 'punning' is representative of an early stratum of analogical magic, now lost, that transcended geographical boundaries. We would instance a fifth-century curse tablet from a cemetery at Italian Kyme (SEG 4.93): “Let the affairs of Oporis and Akron be atelesta. I bind down, before chthonic Hermes and the atelestoi and Tethys, let her deeds with respect to Charias and other men be atelesta, etc.”

In his edition of 1904 Audollent, commenting (ad 68) on the term ἀτέλεστος, referred the reader to Pl. Phd. 69c, δὲ ἂν ἀμφίποτε καὶ ἀτέλεστος ἐτε “Ἄνθοι ἀφίσται, ἐν βρονθῷ κείεται, "whoever arrives in Hades uninitiated and without τέλη will lie in mud." “Sunt ignum ateléstos homines qui quod alius religionis tō τέλος non persolverunt idem poenas dant in inferis,” Audollent comments, but he should have put this as a question. These ἀτέλεστοι dead are called into play presumably because for the purposes of the writer of the curse tablets they are more useful than other dead might be. It is at least as likely, we would suggest, that their usefulness—indeed their dangerous state—comes not from the fact that they are paying penalties for omissions in their lifetimes but because they have not received, after death, τέλη from others, the tendance due to the dead.16

“Leave me without proper marker and rites,” Elpenor warns, “and I shall be an occasion for wrath (μυγμα) of the gods towards you” (Od. 11.72–76), and Teiresias voices to Creon the conviction that this lack of tendance, this ἄτελεστοι, surely brings miasma (Soph. Ant. 998–1032). If they are like the Attic curse tablet (Audollent 1904: 68) in this respect, the Selinuntine curses that urge ἄτελεστα on their victims urge on them, by analogy, this same miasma.

One of the purposes of the new lex sacra, we believe, was to deal with comparable miasma arising from deaths and perhaps from ineffective funerary rites for those dead (cf. the miasra Tritopatores of Column A) and to provide ritual cleansing from the pollution of hostile spirits (Column B), similar to those instigated by curse tablets. While curse tablets are not mentioned in the lex sacra, their quantity at Selinous, and in particular in the Campo di Stele, suggests that the deliberate manipulation of miasma by means of them may have been one of the reasons why the law was written.

VIII. The Archaeology of the Area Sacred to Zeus Meilichios

Selinous was built upon three low hills near the sea (fig. 1). The easternmost was the site of the great temples. The central, separated from the eastern by the river Cotton, served at various times as the acropolis, city center, and residential area. Another residential area was located on the Manuzza plateau, adjacent to and northwest of the central hill, though in the earliest years of the Greek settlement it had had an indigenous settlement and a Greek cemetery. The westernmost and lowest of the three hills, the area known today as the Gaggera, was about a kilometer beyond the acropolis and separated from it by the river Modione (Selinous in antiquity).

Excavations on the Gaggera, begun in 1874, were conducted more intensively by Gabrici between 1915 and 1926. Sand has covered much of the hill, and until recently it was thought that there were but two sanctuaries upon it, those of Demeter Malophoros and Zeus Meilichios, with the latter sometimes taken to be merely a subdivision of the larger sanctuary of the goddess. But explorations since 1950 have revealed that there were at least five precincts here.1

The precincts of Demeter and Zeus together cover approximately 110 m. by 80 m., with the area thought to belong to Zeus Meilichios lying in the northeast quadrant (Pl. 6). The earliest Greek material (pottery and terracotta figurines) is of the late seventh century, contemporary with the earliest found on the acropolis and indicating therefore that the sanctuary was established soon after the founding of the city (Dewailly 1992). It has also been shown that when a grid pattern of streets was laid out on the acropolis in the late sixth century, the northernmost street was aligned with the entrance to the main building in the Malophoros sanctuary, a fact that confirms the importance of the cult for the city (Theodorescu 1975: 115).

The sanctuary has been assigned to the goddess Malophoros, taken to be a form of Demeter, because of a dedicatory inscription of the second quarter of the fifth century (Jeffery 1961: 271, 277, no. 42; MP 56). The presence of many female terracotta figurines (cf. Panara 1984; Ferruzza 1987; Dewailly 1992) is consistent with this identification. The goddess is also named in the victory inscription of the mid- or late-fifth century, found in temple G (Meiggs and Lewis 1968: no. 38; MP 49).2 A reference in this inscription to Pasikrateia has been taken to show that Persephone was also worshipped in the Malophoros sanctuary (cf. supra 98 n.18).

The name of a second goddess, Hekate, is attested in a dedicatory inscription of the mid-fifth century, found in front of the propylon that formed the entrance to the sanctuary (Jeffery 1961: 271, 277, no. 41; MP 53). The small rectangular area within the precinct to the south of the propylon has been thought to be sacred to Hekate, but it should be noted that the dedication to Malophoros was found there. The relationship of Hekate to Malophoros is discussed by Dewailly (1992: 146ff).

The chief building in the precinct was a rectangular structure without columns, divided internally into three parts and usually referred to as the megaron. Before it stood a long altar of ashlars blocks showing repairs made with small stones; its interior was composed of sand, ash, and fragments of pottery and figurines, the whole covered by tiles (Gabrici 1927: 53-62; Dewailly 1992: 23-36). At a lower level a small pile of rubble was identified as an earlier, primitive altar (Gabrici 1927: 145-48; Dewailly 1992: 1-9). The building had a smaller predecessor, built sometime after the mid-sixth century, before which there has been a still simpler structure. White (1967) has argued that the last phase of the megaron shows distinct Punic characteristics and that it dates from the period of Punic control (fourth or early third century).

In the space between the Malophoros shrine and altar and the complex to the northeast there was found a great quantity of ash and animal bones, primarily sheep or goat but also some cattle, deer, and a few pig, dog, and perhaps chicken bones. Out of 2,800 pieces of bone, 2,620 were astragals (Gabrici 1927: 160f). It is not clear from Gabrici’s reports to which of the two cults this material is to be assigned. Dewailly (1992: 146ff) gives from excavation notebooks lists of finds that are specifically to be associated with Zeus Meilichios. The more recent excavations, in the area of the Meilichios stones (the Campo di Stele), are said to have found sheep, bird, and rodent bones (V. Tusa 1977: 117). Comparison with other deposits of sacrificial remains suggests that the bird and rodent bones (easily confused) are not the remains of sacrificed victims (cf. Reese 1989).

At the northeast corner of the precinct are the remains of a small shrine, whose foundations measure 5.30 m. by 2.97 m. (Tusa 1977: 167). It has been assigned to Zeus Meilichios because of the inscriptions to that god found in the area to the west of it, the Campo di Stele. Gabrici, however, noted that when the shrine was first built the


2On Malophoros cf. Paus. 1.44.3 (on the name in Megara Nisia); Gabrici 1927: 400ff; Hanell 1934: 175, 207; despite Pausanias and Mantzoulou-Richards 1986, the stem malo- refers to fruits, not sheep, for which the Doric is μιαθω.
precinct or sub-prencinct in which it was located did not communicate directly with the Campo di Stelo (1927: 102). The precinct is some 17 m. square. Two rectangular altars lie before the entrance, one larger than the other. Two porticos run parallel to the naissos, to its northeast and southwest.3

The naissos has been dated to no earlier than the fourth century (Santangelo n.d.: 93). Riotto (1985: 36), who alone describes it as Ionic rather than Doric, believes an older building was reconstructed at a later period, almost certainly after 409. S. Tusa et al. (1986: 96), however, are agnostic on the date. White (1967: 348–51), followed by V. Tusa (1977: 63ff), proposed that since the shrine was constructed under Punic control, it was dedicated to Tanit and Ba'al Hammon, with whom were also to be connected the stones surmounted by a male and a female head found to the west of this complex, the site also of the earlier Meilichios stones. (These virtually unique “double herms” have been discussed supra 103–07). The identification of the gods of the shrine is discussed below (Ch. IX). White stressed the popularity of distyle prostyle buildings in the Carthaginian sphere and their comparative rarity in the Greek world. His comparison of the facade of the naissos with painted funerary stelai from Lilybaion is less compelling, given that the Selinunte shrine apparently had a flat roof.

It is not clear what—if any—construction there may have been here in the seventh through fifth centuries B.C. Gabrici (1927: 96f) firmly denied that reused Archaic building material came from a predecessor in this area. This has been questioned by Riotto (1985: 35f) who, however, has not given the grounds for his view that the final building was of pre-Punic origin. Most recently Dewailly (1992: 36f), on the basis of a study of the surviving notebooks and photographs, reports that Gabrici saw peribolos walls of earlier date than those he published. To prevent flooding, the precinct of Meilichios was moved to the west and raised about two metres. Thanks to the renewed study of the area by Professor Vincenzo Tusa and his associates, the information provided by Gabrici (1927) can be amplified. Of particular interest are the small, discrete deposits of ash and bone with pottery and terracotta figurines. Over 200 of these were observed, some with as few as three, five, or seven objects, others with as many as fifteen (on the hundreds of hearths found in the earlier excavations, see Dewailly 1992: 37f). The gender of the figurines from the new excavations is not mentioned, but like most such dedications they appear from the illustrations of the deposits to be female, as were the majority, it seems, from the earlier excavations. This could either indicate the presence of a female divinity not otherwise attested before the fourth century, unless the Eumenides of A9 are relevant, or that women worshippers might dedicate images as well as loom weights (cf. Dewailly 1992: 39 for women in the cult of Zeus Meilichios here, cf. 97, Selinous f). V. Tusa also speaks of vases, lamps, and some plates (1971: 56 and figs. 10ff; 1977: 115 and pl. XXIX.1ff). Most of the curse tablets from the Gaggera were found either in the Campo di Stelo or in the area of the naissos (Dewailly 1992: 38ff; supra 126ff). As yet there has been no publication of the miniature terracotta altars and tables described by Gabrici (1927: 181–203). The pottery in the published photographs seems to include miniature votive vessels, especially kotylai, a shape to be expected in view of the predominantly Corinthian origin of the pottery; a lesser quantity is of East Greek type.


and there has been no plan showing the position of the stones, most of which apparently had been displaced when found. There are photographs from the earlier and the more recent excavations, judging from which the area was crowded with stones, though not as closely packed with them as were Punic tophae (Plt. 7a, 8a; cf. Gabrici 1927: 104 fig. 61; V. Tusa 1971: pl. XXIX, fig. 4, and 1977: 55 fig. 9; Dewailly 1992: 37, fig. 12; for a tophet, cf. White 1967: pl. 104, fig. 13). Gabrici published eighteen stones, all but one figured (1927: 174–81), and we have reviewed the inscribed Meilichios stones (supra 89ff). The majority of the stones found would appear to have been roughly shaped and without markings (cf. V. Tusa 1971: 56 and fig. 12, which shows a stone bearing a circle divided in two by a vertical). From the recent excavations some 100 double stelai are reported, of which about ten are described as “Grecizing,” i.e., as approaching the style of Greek sculpture of the fourth century B.C. (V. Tusa 1971: 63f; 1977: 117). This suggests that ninety per cent are of the cruder type described as Punic (see our discussion of examples of both types in the Getty Museum, supra 105ff and Plt. 12–14). The marked difference in size we have observed between the inscribed Meilichios stones of the sixth and fifth centuries and the double-headed stelai of a later date is not mentioned by the excavators. It may be that there are larger examples of the later stones than we are aware of. A number of roughly triangular stelai, one marked with an X, have been found in the new shrine attributed to Hera (Parisi Presicce in S. Tusa et al. 1986: 51).

Thanks to the renewed study of the area by Professor Vincenzo Tusa and his associates, the information provided by Gabrici (1927) can be amplified. Of particular interest are the small, discrete deposits of ash and bone with pottery and terracotta figurines. Over 200 of these were observed, some with as few as three, five, or seven objects, others with as many as fifteen (on the hundreds of hearths found in the earlier excavations, see Dewailly 1992: 37f). The gender of the figurines from the new excavations is not mentioned, but like most such dedications they appear from the illustrations of the deposits to be female, as were the majority, it seems, from the earlier excavations. This could either indicate the presence of a female divinity not otherwise attested before the fourth century, unless the Eumenides of A9 are relevant, or that women worshippers might dedicate images as well as loom weights (cf. Dewailly 1992: 39 for women in the cult of Zeus Meilichios here, cf. 97, Selinous f). V. Tusa also speaks of vases, lamps, and some plates (1971: 56 and figs. 10ff; 1977: 115 and pl. XXIX.1ff). Most of the curse tablets from the Gaggera were found either in the Campo di Stelo or in the area of the naissos (Dewailly 1992: 38ff; supra 126ff). As yet there has been no publication of the miniature terracotta altars and tables described by Gabrici (1927: 181–203). The pottery in the published photographs seems to include miniature votive vessels, especially kotylai, a shape to be expected in view of the predominantly Corinthian origin of the pottery; a lesser quantity is of East Greek type.
Precise descriptions of the contents of these deposits, their date, and their relationship to the stones are awaited eagerly. Were they associated with both the larger stones of the sixth and fifth centuries and the smaller two-headed stones of the later period, or only with the former? One gets the impression that the deposits represent routine ritual on a small scale; the miniature vessels, like the miniature terracotta tables published by Gabrici, seem more appropriate to dedication in a simple ceremony than to the more elaborate ritual prescribed in the *lex sacra* for problems arising from pollution. Each deposit, however, seems to have involved animal sacrifice, though not necessarily the holocaust assumed by Di Vita (1961–64: 240). On some of the inscribed Melichios stones traces of burning have been reported, which could be the result of sacrifice being performed close to them (Gabrici 1937: 156f; V. Tusa 1972: 409; Mani Piraino 1970: 268).

The excavations of the 1970s went below the levels explored by Gabrici and reached virgin soil, on which rested a layer of mixed sand, soil, and burnt matter of some 0.70 m., in contrast to the pure sand mixed with burnt matter as much as 4.00 m. deep that lay above it. At that level in an area defined by blocks of stone were found two altars, one oval and the other rectangular (1.50 m. by 3.50 m.), composed of compacted sand, burnt matter, and the remains of sacrifice. The datable material runs from the seventh through the fifth century, with most of it from the sixth century (V. Tusa 1977: 117).

At a higher level, a rectangular stone altar that has long been known was fully uncovered. It had three upright slabs on top of it dividing the upper surface into two parts, one twice the size of the other.4 V. Tusa describes these stones as betyls and proposes an oriental source for the type of altar. The level of the altar, at best one can tell, seems to suggest that it is contemporary with the naiskos and its associated structures. It may date, therefore, from the period of Punic control and settlement when the double herms were set up and two divinities were worshipped, corresponding perhaps to the two sections of this altar, and the two altars, one larger and one smaller, before the naiskos. One might also point, however, to the two altars at the Archaic and Classical level as the antecedents of this stone altar.

---

IX. Punic Religion and the Cult of Zeus Melichios

Historical evidence shows that Selinous was effectively under Carthaginian occupation for most of the time between 409 and ca. 250 B.C. The archaeological evidence offers confirmation, although, as we have indicated, it is not clear in what proportions Greeks and Phoenicians were represented in the population. The Punic element in Sicily and in Selinous in particular has been discussed by Di Vita (1953; 1961–64), V. Tusa (1961–64; 1971), and White (1967). The Malophoros sanctuary and its associated cult areas have been examined in the light of Punic dominance during the last century and a half of their existence. The most extreme view is that of White (1967) who believes that the naiskos to the east of the *Campo di Stele* and the structures around it are entirely of Punic date and inspiration and were dedicated to the cult of Ba'al Hammon and Tanit. Both Di Vita and V. Tusa had earlier expressed their opinion that the double-headed stelae represented this pair of Punic deities. We have noted that the paired deities only appear, as far as can be seen, in the fourth century or later, while to the period of Selinous' independence as a Greek city there can be attributed only single aniconic stones and a solitary figured stone, also single (*supra* 90, Selinous f. 1 and 103–07). Under these circumstances the female figure at least is more reasonably equated with Tanit than with Pasiphrate, Kore, or Melichia (as *e.g.* by Gabrici 1927: 175f).

Even so, to describe the precinct of Zeus Melichios as a Punic tophet, as do Di Vita (1961–64: 240, "quasi") and White (1967: 342), is to scant both the long history of the cult before 409 and ignore the absence of characteristic features of the Punic sacred places. As we have seen (*supra* 114ff), the use of aniconic stones to represent a deity and to mark a sacred place is not uncommon in Archaic and Classical Greece. Zeus Melichios belongs to that class of deity that is more usually recognized by a place or marker sacred to him than by means of an image. His worship by gentilitial groups lends itself to the proliferation of such aniconic markers. The cult of Zeus Melichios at Selinous fits the pattern discernible elsewhere; no element in the cult of the sixth and fifth centuries is without parallel in Greek cult practice. If a Greek population, however attenuated, continued to live in Selinous and worshiped the Malophoros precinct after 409, it needs to be demonstrated that a foreign cult displaced that of Zeus Melichios. It is more likely that a syncretism occurred between the religion of the old and new inhabitants.

---

4Gabrici 1927: 103ff; V. Tusa 1977: 116f; Riotto 1985: 37 fig. 6; Fama 1980: fig. 63; Shaw 1989: 179 and fig. 2. Shaw questions the basis for the reconstruction shown in photographs. One supposes that there were indications on the surface of the horizontal slabs showing where the uprights stood. Unlike the triple pillars and columns Shaw surveys in his article, the uneven separation of these slabs and their appearance on an altar favors their use as dividers for the placement of offerings. Before the altar was excavated completely, much was written about the chthonic character of the monument, set directly into the earth, as it was supposed.
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A sign of this may be the popularity of the double herms or stelai with a male and a female head, which is unparalleled in the Greek world. In terms of Punic culture, however, the double herms are no less anomalous. The Greek style of a number of them is, of course, not inconsistent with a Punic ambience, for Greek art was widespread and by the fourth century B.C., widely imitated throughout the Mediterranean. We have argued that the simpler examples are less distinctively Punic than they are evidence of unsophisticated, amateurish workmanship, whether by speakers of Greek or Phoenician.

When it comes to the specific features of the Punic tophet, the Melichios area is strikingly unfruitful. The characteristic stelai of tophets are well known (cf. Bisi 1967, 1971 a, 1971 b; Bartoloni 1976), but none of the aniconic stonework from Selinous we have seen has any close resemblance to those from Punic contexts. The tophets make considerable use of symbols and inscriptions. No symbols or other signs have been reported from the Melichios area or from the whole Malophoros precinct (unless the small circle on the base of Gabrici 1927: pl. XXVII.1 is to be so regarded). Two representations of the Tanit symbol are known from Selinous, but they are on the acropolis hill (V. Tusa 1971: 62 figs. 18 f; 1980: 213 f). The quantity of ash and bone reported from the precinct is as characteristic of Greek sacrifice as of Punic and is found at the earliest.

A tophet was the scene of child sacrifice. The bones of the victims were placed in urns and left at the tophet, which was at once a place of sacrifice and of burial (S. Brown: 1991). Such a combination is the antithesis of Greek practice. Human death polluted a sanctuary and required thorough purification (cf. Parker 1983: 33). The sanctuary itself has sometimes been spoken of as a necropolis (e.g. Ch. Picard 1942–43). No burials contemporary with the life of the town have been reported in or near the precinct. Of the actual cemeteries of the Greek period that have been described, the necropolis of Byblos (FGrHist 1990: 2.22), the necropolis of Carthage (Parker 1968, but we do not attempt to assign a date to them. The sanctuary itself is not likely to be earlier than the fourth century.

1Bergquist’s recent study of the practice in Sicily and Magna Graecia of setting up stelai associated with sacrifice deposits is equally firm in distinguishing them from Canaanite or Phoenician types (Bergquist 1992: 45 l and n.19).
2E.g., Di Vita 1961–64: 239; Santangelo, n.d.: 97; Kustermann Graf 1991–102, cautiously, and with reference to the nearer Temple M, 500 m. away; cf. Zuntz 1971: 103 n.2: “It would be an excess of scepticism to deny the original interconnection of the sanctuary and the necropolis.”

3Philon of Byblos speaks of beryls as lithoi empychos (FGrHist 790 r.2.23); cf. also the mastabah of the OT: Header 1985: 368; Pope 1981: 160 f; Wolff 1991: 497. The Melichios stones, however, did not embody or represent the dead, as they did in Phoenician belief (cf. Pope 1981: 161), but the divinity who was patron of a family or a lineage.

4Philon of Byblos (FGrHist 790 r.2.11) identified the Phoenician Xoropus, a craftsman god, with Hophnastus, but added that he was also known as Zeus Melichios. Chousor is the Canaanite god Kogar-and-Hasis, according to Attridge and Eden 1981: 84 n.66; cf. Troiani 1974: 115–19. It is hard to see that this has any relevance to the cult at Selinous.

5Susan Ackerman, Franz Rosenthal, Mark Smith, and Michael Barre have at various times answered our questions knowledgeably and patiently.
This reading gives a personal name, "servant of MLK" (cf. Benz 1972: 164). We must leave it to others to judge what, if any, significance this has for the later use of the area sacred to Zeus Meilichios.

We have been at pains to show the Greek parallels to the cults mentioned in the lex sacra, dating as it does from a period when Selinuntine independence and its Greek traditions flourished. This background needs to be kept in mind if we are to understand what was contributed from either side when syncretism did occur. A degree of affinity between parallel but distinct traditions, we have suggested, would have facilitated the process. Despite the etymological connection both ancients and moderns have claimed for Meilichios and the Greek word for honey, meli, we have noted that linguistically no sure explanation for the name has been offered (cf. Chantaine 1937–38 and 1968–80: 677f; supra 91f). Contacts and borrowings in the realm of cult, as well as myth and art, between Greece and the Near East in the Archaic period have come to be regarded as plausible in recent years (cf. Burkert 1983, 1984=1992). Shaw (1989) has proposed that a shrine that contained three upright, tapering stones, established in the eighth century B.C. on the south coast of Crete, is Phoenician. Is it possible that through their contacts with Phoenicians in the Levant and the Aegean the Greeks adopted aspects of the cult of MLK/Molek (Mo1och)—the name and simple stelai associated with the spirits of a gentilitial group or of ancestors—that helped to produce the cult of Me(i)lichios? The Greek divinity had chthonic aspects, was associated with the well-being of the lineage and with purification but not, as in the Near East, with necromancy and child sacrifice. The connection with Molek has been proposed before, and support has been seen in the presence of Phoenician metics in Classical Athens; their interest in Meilichios has yet to be demonstrated and in any case would be much too late to account for the origin of the Greek cult. Now that the contacts between the Greeks and the Near East earlier in the millennium are being reexamined, a Semitic etymology for Meilichios and the cult contacts it would imply deserve to be reconsidered. The vigorous continuity or revival of cult in the Campo di Stele after the fifth century may owe some-

---

6Stampolidis (1990) identifies an isolated stone from Eleutherna in northwestern Crete as a Phoenician funerary cippus. His article has an extensive bibliography.


8Foucart 1883, 1904; Cook 1925: II 1107–11, who gives the literature on the subject. A proposed connection with a Semitic word for “sailor,” melah, finds no echoes in the Greek Meilichios. It is perhaps worth adding as a final word that our failure to discuss possible native Sicilian elements in the cults of the Malophoros sanctuary is no oversight: we have found no grounds on which to do so, such is the paucity of information on the indigenous religion of the island.

9Cf. Dewailly 1992: 149, cautiously and with stress on the long period of contact with the Phoenician-Elymian sphere. We have not, however, seen evidence of this contact in the Selinuntine cult before 409.
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Corrigenda and Addenda to *A Lex Sacra* from Selinous

CORRIGENDA TO THE TEXT:

page 75, n. 13: for “preciosely” read “precisely”
page 134, eleven lines from bottom: for “Thie view” read “This view”
page 154, at Lukouri-Tolia, E.: for ’Ανθηδόνα read ’Ανθηδόνα.

Plate 10 (c): the photograph has been inverted
Plate 11 (b): for “Meilinios” read “Meilichios”
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