

REVIEW ARTICLE

A NEW *LEX SACRA* FROM SELINUS: KINDLY ZEUSES, EUMENIDES, IMPURE AND PURE TRITOPATORES, AND ELASTEROI

With this superb *editio princeps* of a new *lex sacra* from Selinus, the largest Greek inscription preserved on lead, Michael H. Jameson, David R. Jordan, and Roy D. Kotansky have substantially enlarged our knowledge of Greek religious ritual, despite the numerous problems in reading and interpretation that remain.¹ They have dated it shortly before the middle of the fifth century B.C.² The text, incomplete, is inscribed in two columns; Col. A lists sacrifices and describes rituals for Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides, Zeus Meilichios in various guises, and the Tritopatores; Col. B is concerned with purification of individuals from the Elasteroi. The editors present commentary in line-by-line format and in the form of essays.³ What I wish to address here is their interpretation of the document, as a whole and in its various parts. This damaged, terse, and sometimes very difficult text will, as they acknowledge, undoubtedly elicit much discussion and disagreement.⁴ I approach it with great admiration for what they have accomplished, very much aware how difficult it is to bring this type of fragmentary text to publication. If the interpretations that I propose have merit, it will largely be due to the solid foundational discussions that the editors have given us.⁵

The appearance here, for the first time, of Zeus Eumenes,⁶ in close association with the Eumenides, and in a document written right around the time of Aeschylus' *Oresteia*, is naturally of very special interest. Although Tritopatores are well

1. M. H. Jameson, D. R. Jordan, and R. D. Kotansky, *A Lex Sacra from Selinus*, GRB Monographs, vol. 11 (Durham, 1993). I am grateful to John Morgan and Hayden Pelliccia for criticism and help with various problems, but of course I alone am responsible for the views expressed here.

2. They supply abundant information about the text itself: several photographs, two fold-out drawings (apparently full-scale), description, diplomatic transcript with epigraphic commentary, and translation.

3. All are helpful treatments of their various subjects: chapter 2, "The Date and Language"; chapter 3, "The Character of the Text" (which they recommend be read before the line-by-line commentary); chapter 4, "The Rituals," which begins with an overview of the document and includes essays on sacrifices, theoxenia, libations, and purification; chapter 5, "The Supernatural," which has essays on (1) Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides, (2) Zeus Meilichios, with a very useful full review of the evidence from the entire Greek world, (3) the uninscribed Meilichios stones of Selinus, (4) the Tritopatores, again with a full review of the testimonia, (5) the cults of groups, and (6) the Elasteros. The final four chapters treat the history of Selinus (chap. 6), curse tablets at Selinus (chap. 7), the archaeology of the area sacred to Zeus Meilichios (chap. 8), and Punic religion and the cult of Zeus Meilichios (chap. 9).

4. "But we are very much aware that problems of reading and interpretation remain" (p. ix).

5. In general I will not list supporting documentation for points made here if it has already been given by the editors. Simple page references (unaccompanied by further bibliographic citation) refer to pages in their book.

6. As opposed to the Zeus Eumenes of Hellenistic Pergamon whose eponymous epithet was given to him by the Eumenid rulers.

attested at Athens, it is a complete surprise to find them here in two guises, pure and impure. Here too, for the first time, is the *Elasteros*,⁷ and again the connections with Athenian drama are tantalizing; for example, Eur. *IT* 970–71: ὅσαι δ' Ἐρινύων . . . ἡλάστρουν μ' αἰεί. This must be the same figure as the *Alastor* or *Alastoros*, hitherto familiar from literature, but here we see, in real life, purificatory measures taken to counteract these spirits. Sacrifices to Zeus *Meilichios* suggest a possible connection with his famous sanctuary that has been excavated at Selinus.

I. ARRANGEMENT OF THE TEXT

A correct understanding of the beginning of the document is critical, for it will have serious implications for the interpretation of the whole. The text is carefully laid out, each line inscribed within incised guidelines. The beginning of Col. A is missing. Its first three preserved lines (A. 1–3) are very fragmentary; they are followed by a blank area of three lines (A. 4–6). The blank area shows that it has been erased, with guidelines for three lines clearly visible within it (they were presumably cut after the erasure, as the photograph seems to indicate; the editors do not address this question).⁸ After the blank area comes the rest of Col. A. The first question is whether this is a new self-contained section of the document, or whether its beginning has been lost in the preceding erasure.

A. The first three lines after the blank area read (A. 7–9):

- 7 τὸν ἡιαρὸν ἡα θυσία πρὸ φοτυτίον καὶ τὰς ἐχεχερίας πένπ[τοι]
 8 ρέτει ἥδιπερ ἡόκα ἡα Ὀλυμπιάς ποτεῖε. τῷ Διὶ : τῷ Εὐμενεῖ θυ[ε]y [καὶ]
 9 ταῖς : Εὐμενίδεσι : τέλεον, καὶ τῷ Διὶ : τῷ Μιλιχίοι τῷ : ἐν Μύσφο : τέλεον :

The editors translate:

. . . (?) the *hiarā* (images?), the sacrifices (are to be performed) before (the festival of) the *Kotytia* and (before) the truce, in the fifth year, in which the Olympiad also occurs. To Zeus *Eumenes* [and] the *Eumenides* sacrifice a full-grown (sheep), and to Zeus *Meilichios* in the (plot) of *Myskos* a full-grown (sheep). (p. 15)

The editors assume that the sentence in l. 7 began earlier, within the erasure; that is, the initial part of the phrase to which τὸν ἡιαρὸν belongs has been erased. They acknowledge, however, that the original inscription was displayed in precisely the way we see it (“what we read is exactly what was intended to be communicated,” p. 20), with a sentence whose beginning is incomprehensible due to the erasure. In itself this reconstruction is highly unlikely. The assumption of error, when the sentence makes sense as it stands, violates sound editorial practice. The phrase τὸν ἡιαρὸν ἡα θυσία, though unattested in precisely this form, expresses the same notion as θύειν τὰ ἱερά, an expression that the editors recognize is “common enough in the performance of sacrifices” (p. 20). Thus it should mean “the performance of the sacred sacrifices” or “the sacrifice of the sacred things.” What prevented the editors

7. Known otherwise only from Paros, where it is merely an epithet of Zeus.

8. The erased area does not seem to be separate from the incised guidelines within it; that is, there does not seem to be a demarcation between erased surface and the area immediately adjacent to the lines. It would of course be easier to erase the entire surface and then make the lines than to carry out erasure within already inscribed lines.

from taking this phrase as the nominal counterpart of the verbal θύειν τὰ ἱερὰ and, consequently, from understanding it to be the heading of this entire section, was that it would seem to imply that these sacrifices were mentioned earlier; hence their assumption that words were lost in the erasure.⁹ However, if we take everything through ποτεῖε as the heading, we then have a rubric that makes good sense: the entire following section of sacrifices and sacrificial rituals comprises "Sacrifice of the sacred things before the Kotytia and the truce in the fifth year, in which the Olympiad occurs."¹⁰

This brings up the question of the periodicity of these sacrifices. They were held before the Kotytia and the sacred truce for the Olympic games, or every fourth year, when the games were held. The Kotytia were evidently an annual festival, and we can infer from this document that they were held near the beginning of the Olympic truce, around the time of the summer solstice. Since the games themselves probably took place at the second full moon following the summer solstice,¹¹ it would be a reasonable inference (and certainly a good working approximation, as the editors themselves suggest) that the Olympic truce started a month earlier. The Kotytia obviously did not always occur before the truce, for if they did, the provision about antedating the truce would be superfluous. For the fifth century B.C. the start of the truce, or first full moon after the summer solstice, would occur on various dates ranging from June 28 to July 26 approximately.¹² The Kotytia were therefore held during this period, but no later. If they were held later, then the law would only need to say "before the truce": mention of the Kotytia would be unnecessary. In any case it is clear that different lunisolar events governed the occurrence of the Kotytia and the start of the Olympic games. The editors strangely assume that the rites in this section (A. 7–24) "may begin to be performed *any year*,"¹³ apparently when the need arises. That they are to start in an optional year, however, is not specified in our text, nor does the text allow us to assume that they could occur annually or in any year. The heading states, "Before the Kotytia and the sacred truce," meaning in the Olympic year. If it meant that the rituals were to be carried out every year before the Kotytia but in the Olympic year necessarily before the sacred truce, then we should expect not καί, as our text reads, but δέ: πρὸ φοτυτίου, πένπτοι δὲ γέται ἡοίπερ ἡόκα ἡα Ὀλυμπιάς ποτεῖε, πρὸ φοτυτίου καὶ τῆς ἐχεχερίας. Therefore the sacrifices in this section ought to be quadrennial, though some of them are allowed to be repeated the following year (πεδὰ γέτος, A. 18, 20–21) and in at least one case two years later (τρίτοι γέτ[ει, A. 23). It is difficult to see the necessity of the specification for sacrifice in a second and third year if in fact they are allowed in "any and every year." The base year for the rituals in this section is the Olympic year (not, as the editors propose, "any year").

9. "The performance 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" (p. 20).

10. Although the editors do not discuss the use of paint in the lettering of this document, it was a standard feature of documents on stone, for otherwise the letters would be quite difficult to read. Presumably the same procedure was followed here. The heading could have been painted in a different color.

11. This rule for the date is not explicitly attested but is plausible: see S. G. Miller, "The Date of Olympic Festivals," *AM* 90 (1975): 215–31.

12. See the table printed by Miller, "Date," 222–23, taken from F. K. Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1911), 557–75.

13. P. 27, italics mine; "Every and any year may be the occasion" (p. 56).

The fact that the sacrifices of this section are performed before the Kotytia and the truce in the year of the Olympic games tends to suggest that other sections of this document also recorded sacrifices according to chronological arrangement, to the extent that they were susceptible of such arrangement. In Col. B the only preserved section records a ritual (ridding oneself of an Elasteros) that could be performed at any time, but it is evidently the last set of rituals in the entire document. So we may suggest, if only tentatively, that rituals in this document were arranged chronologically—perhaps, first, annual rituals, then biennial, triennial, and quadrennial, and finally rituals not carried out at set times. This order, at least, corresponds to the arrangement in this inscription so far as it exists: the last set in Col. A (ll. 7–24) concerns quadrennial rituals (with the exceptions noted above); the next section, in Col. B, which is the last in the entire document, concerns rituals not tied to a fixed time. Such an arrangement is not unique. At Athens a large fragment of the sacred calendar that formed part of the law code drawn up at the end of the fifth century (*LSCG Suppl.* 10) lists in Cols. II–III sacrifices that occurred every other year, as the heading indicates (τάδε τὸ ἕτερον ἔτος θύεται); annual sacrifices were listed in Col. I and preceding columns; and since Athens had several quadrennial festivals (*Arist. Ath. Pol.* 54.7), a list of quadrennial sacrifices must also have been included. In the calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis (*LSCG* 20) the preserved text lists annual sacrifices (τάδε ὅσα ἔτη) before the biennial (τάδε τὸ ἕτερον ἔτος); in this case there may not have been any quadrennial sacrifices.¹⁴

How much was recorded before the last set of quadrennial rituals in Col. A we do not know, but it may have been considerable. The editors indicate that there may have been at least twelve more lines before the preserved beginning of Col. A. But it is possible that there were many more. The lead inscription was clamped to the surface behind it by means of a narrow bronze bar running vertically down the center of the inscription between the inscribed columns; nails piercing the bar bound it and the inscription to the surface behind. Part of the bar and three nails, spaced at regular intervals, are preserved; if another nail occurred at the same interval above the first preserved one, there would be room for approximately twelve more lines of text. However, there seems to be no reason why there could not have been several more nails. The surface need not have been vertical. The inscription may well have been placed on a horizontal surface such as a long table, so that when the reader reached the end of Col. A, at the end of the table, he proceeded around that end of the table and would then start to read Col. B, which in fact is written upside down in relation to Col. A: thus in order to read Col. B he did not need to return to the end of the table from which he began. Furthermore, we do not know whether the document was limited to a single lead sheet.

This chronological arrangement of the sacrificial ritual, not definitely proven but valid as a working hypothesis, has further implications for the interpretation of the document. Instead of discussing a possible chronological arrangement of the rituals, the editors attempt to find a thematic connection between the two preserved sets of ritual: “They share a concern with purification” (pp. 50–51). They also note an apparently striking difference between the two sets: Col. A “gives instructions for a

14. The calendar of the deme Erchia (*LSCG* 18 = *SEG* XXXIX 319) has five lists of sacrifices, perhaps each year's sacrifices over a five-year period; but cf. D. Whitehead, “The ‘Greater Demarchy’ of Erchia,” *AncW* 14 (1986): 57–64.

group or groups—or, rather, an individual acting with his group—whereas B is addressed solely to the individual seeking purification” (p. 51). Col. B certainly concerns individuals acting alone; but in A. 7–24 a group is mentioned only for a small part of the rituals (A. 12–13), “those to whom it is permitted” (hoĩs hoĩa); otherwise the performer is not specified. At the end of the preceding set of rituals, mostly not preserved, a group called *homosepnoi* is mentioned (A. 3), but it would be hazardous to generalize that this entire unpreserved set of rituals concerned groups. Nor is enough preserved to allow us to say whether this term at Selinus refers to a family group, as in Aristotle, *Pol.* 1252b14, or to a larger gentilitial group. It is of course possible that the preserved set of rituals in Col. A. 7–24 was performed for a limited group, but in the absence of names of such groups it seems more likely that it simply represents public ritual. This possibility is reinforced by references to the “ancestral sacrifices” (τὰ πατρώια, A. 17, 22) and especially to “the public sacred things” (τὰ ἡιὰ τὰ δαμόσια, A. 18). Thus it appears that the document was issued by the city (p. 58). The rituals in Col. A are to be completed before the start of a city festival, the Kotytia, and before the Olympic truce, a truce that was announced (directly or indirectly) to the city. Nothing in the document is inconsistent with general public ritual. By not pursuing the possibility of a chronological arrangement, the editors have, it seems to me, forcibly imposed an opposition between the sets of rituals in Cols. A and B—groups vs. individuals—and they have similarly forced a common theme upon both sets: purification. Purification is indeed a central theme of Col. B; but purificatory ritual or purificatory sacrifice is in fact not mentioned at all in Col. A; there the sacrifices are of the traditional sort, both “divine” and “heroic,” not a single one clearly purificatory.¹⁵ At one point sacrifice is specified “to the Tritopatores, the impure, as to the heroes,” but here too the sacrifice is not purificatory. The notion that Col. A is concerned with purification leads the authors into unconvincing speculation (pp. 56–58) that the most likely occasion for the rites in Col. A is death, in particular homicide (“perhaps some conspicuous incident, such as sacrilege in the course of *stasis*”). Furthermore, the notion that Col. A is concerned with groups has caused the religious activities of groups (as opposed to the whole polis) to be given undue emphasis throughout the book.

It seems therefore better to stick to the hypothesis that the arrangement of rituals was chronological, with those procedures not fitting this scheme relegated to the end of the document.

II. LOCATIONS OF RITUAL ACTIONS

Much that we would like to know about the rituals in Col. A, and that we often find in “sacred laws,” is missing here: the celebrants, their perquisites, the cost of the victims and other consumables, and precise times (though perhaps not critical here). Locations are, by and large, unspecified, so it would not be unreasonable to suppose, as the editors did, that all the rites took place at a single sanctuary, either understood throughout or stated at the lost beginning of the document. A precinct can be inferred from A. 20 (“Let no meat be carried out”), and the sacrifices to Zeus

15. The aspersion mentioned in A. 12–13 is an act of purification or renewal but is not a central focus of the ritual, rather, it is a purification of the altar for a new set of sacrifices; see below, p. 171.

Meilichios seem to imply plots of land: τοῖ Δι τοῖ Μιλιχίοι τοῖ ἐν Μύσφο (“to the Zeus Meilichios in the (plot or house?) of Myskos,” A. 9), τοῖ ἐν Εὐθυδάμο Μιλιχίοι (“to the (Zeus) Meilichios in the (plot or house?) of Euthydamos,” A. 17).¹⁶ Although “house” is possible, the editors were surely right to discount the possibility of a public document prescribing sacrifice in private houses. The implied sanctuary, the apparent “plots,” and the fact that a large part of the ritual was destined for Zeus Meilichios naturally point to his sanctuary as the setting. It so happens that the excavated sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios in Selinus contained several stelai or cippi with inscriptions such as “I am the Meilichios of x” or “I am of the Meilichios of x” (where x = one or more persons or groups), and others with just a person’s name in the nominative or genitive (i.e., without the god’s name or epithet), though there is one that is a simple dedication to Meilichios (“So-and-so set up to M.”).¹⁷ In the editors’ view the stones served not only as embodiments of the god but also as markers where individuals or groups performed cult (pp. 101–2). Although the editors do not go so far as to say that the sanctuary was divided up into plots, parceled out to individuals and groups, they do believe that there were at least some such plots that could be identified by these stones (p. 52);¹⁸ ἐν Μύσφο, accordingly, would refer to the plot belonging to Myskos. The name Myskos appears on a seventh-century gravestone from Selinus; he may be the ancestor of a kin group or even an οἰκιστής of the city itself; and the same hypothesis can be proposed for the otherwise unattested Euthydamos (pp. 28–29, 120). “Even if our Myskos is only a descendant of the seventh-century person, his line has clearly maintained its prominence for almost two centuries” (p. 29). At any rate, the editors favor the hypothesis that Myskos and Euthydamos “would seem to be the names of men who had established important gentilitial groups whose cults of Meilichios had become significant for the whole community, or possibly only for the groups who had need of the rituals prescribed in this text . . .” (p. 28).

It is possible, however, to conceive another hypothesis. That they are founders of gentilitial groups or co-founders of the city does seem more likely than that they

16. Full texts of these lines are given below, pp. 165, 170, 173.

17. A complete list is conveniently presented on pp. 89–91 (but without indication of find spots).

18. While it appears to be a reasonable inference (even though the excavation reports concerning sacrificial deposits are incomplete, pp. 135–36) that individuals and groups worshipped in the sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios, it is far from clear that plots of land were parceled out to them. The photographs of part of the Campo di Stele show it to be crowded with stelai, a few inscribed, but most uninscribed. The picture we get is not that of an area divided up into plots but of one packed with these stones. While the stones may well have served to mark spots for sacrifice, their function as embodiments of the god seems to have been more important. Several of the inscribed stones, all of which belong to the archaic and early classical periods, remained in position throughout the life of the sanctuary, including the Punic period. It seems, on the face of it, unlikely that the individuals or groups mentioned in the inscriptions would have continued to use their sacrificial spots for the entire life of the sanctuary, and that these stones continued to serve as markers for such spots. It seems therefore more likely that they were objects of veneration originally and continued to be regarded as holy long after the original dedicators and their families passed from the scene. It should also be noted that not all of them were found in the Campo di Stele as the editors state (p. 134): *h*, according to the excavator, E. Gabrici, (*Il santuario della Malophoros a Selinunte*, MonAnt, vol. 32 [Milan, 1927], col. 383, no. 8), was found not in its original position but within the “ricinto di Meilichios,” a term that he reserved for the small precinct in the northeast corner of the sanctuary, separate from the Campo di Stele (see editors’ pl. 6); he did, however, find his next three inscriptions, nos. 9–11, in their original positions and his text seems to imply that they too were within this small precinct (this suggestion is repeated in the edition of M. T. Manni Piraino, *Iscrizioni greche lapidarie del Museo di Palermo* [Palermo, 1973], nos. 63, 65, 59 [= Gabrici’s no. 8, 9, 11; she omitted Gabrici’s no. 10]); the editors’ *h*, *e*, and *j* were therefore evidently not found in the Campo di Stele. This should probably be checked in the excavation diaries, since it is important.

are contemporary citizens, for it is not very probable that the state, in a general law of this sort, would be involved in regulating the religious activities of contemporary families.¹⁹ Granted that Myskos and Euthydamos were founders of some sort, it follows that they were very special figures, of considerable importance to the city. If we think along these lines, it is also legitimate to suppose that they may be local heroes (cf. Battos at Cyrene, etc.). If indeed they were heroes, we should expect them to have sanctuaries of their own, as for example at Athens, where the eponymous heroes of tribes had individual sanctuaries. The Athenian situation is particularly relevant because an Athenian decree states that the stele is to be erected ἐν Πανδίοιοις, “in (the sanctuary) of Pandion,” the eponymous hero of the tribe Pandionis.²⁰ Thus we receive encouragement to translate the Selinuntine text: “to Meilichios in (the sanctuary of) Myskos” and “to Meilichios in (the sanctuary of) Euthydamos.” There is, in addition, relevant evidence from Megara (mother city of Megara Hyblaea, in turn the mother city of Selinus). As the editors note, in Megara a sanctuary of the eponymous tribal hero Pamphylos evidently had a sanctuary of Meilichios in it or attached to it. An inscription on a fifth-century boundary marker from this sanctuary reads Διὸς Μιλιχίου Πανφύλο (p. 84), and the editors’ interpretation gives it essentially the same sense as if it read Διὸς Μιλιχίου ἐν Πανφύλο. It seems therefore legitimate to assume that Myskos and Euthydamos were Selinuntine local heroes who had a precinct of Zeus Meilichios in or attached to their sanctuaries. This hypothesis seems to be better grounded in parallel texts and practice than the notion that plots were set aside for gentilitial groups in the sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios on the Gaggera in Selinus.

If this is the case, then the procedures for Zeus Meilichios in our text do not concern the major sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios on the Gaggera. Thus the other procedures also need not be associated with this sanctuary. We may suppose therefore that several sanctuaries were involved in the procedures of A. 7–24: (1) the sanctuary of Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides, (2) the precinct of Zeus Meilichios in (the sanctuary of) Myskos, (3) the (double?) sanctuary of the Tritopatores, and (4) the precinct of Meilichios in (the sanctuary of) Euthydamos.

Let us now consider the various regulations of Col. A. 4–23.

III. ZEUS EUMENES AND THE EUMENIDES AND ZEUS MEILICHIOS IN (THE SANCTUARY) OF MYSKOS

A.

- 8 τῶι Διὶ: τῶι Εὐμενεῖ ἡύ[ε]ν [καί]
9 ταῖς: Εὐμενίδεσι: τέλεον, καὶ τῶι Διὶ: τῶι Μιλιχίῳ τῶι: ἐν Μύσφο: τέλεον:

Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides receive a single full-grown (sheep) at their altar, perhaps in a shared precinct. What their connection was with Zeus Meilichios in (the sanctuary) of Myskos, whether it was temporal or spatial or perhaps both, we cannot know. There was, at any rate, a connection among the three, for “the practice of this inscription is to employ asyndeton at the beginning of a set of prescriptions”

19. The *ἡμοσέπνοι* perform a ritual at the end of the mostly lost preceding set of rites, but the term might refer to a broader kin group at Selinus than a family, as in Arist., *Pol.* 1252b14; cf. above, p. 163.

20. *IG* II² 1138.8.

(p. 41, B3f);²¹ this therefore is a single set of related rites. The “rule of asyndeton” can be further refined: each set of prescriptions in the entire section A. 7–23 begins with the name of a deity preceded by asyndeton.

This new information about the Eumenides, coming as it does from right around the time that the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus was produced, is very precious indeed. In post-Aeschylean literature the depiction of the Eumenides has often been affected, or may be suspected of having been affected, by the poet’s spectacular representation of the Erinyes transformed into the Semnai Theai (whose close similarity to Eumenides led to the title of the play).²² Even some later descriptions of the cult of the Eumenides did not escape this influence. Given the date of this document, however, there can be no doubt that Aeschylus had no influence on the Selinuntine cult of the Eumenides as it appears here.

Concerning the nature of the Eumenides (or the similar Semnai) and Erinyes there are two schools of thought.²³ Some scholars take them to have been originally distinct deities until they were identified in the classical period, perhaps first by Aeschylus. Others see them as simply names for two opposite aspects of the same group of goddesses—Eumenides/Semnai in their kindly aspect, Erinyes in their guise as terrifying, avenging spirits. In the present document the Kindly Ones are associated with Kindly Zeus; they and Zeus both receive the typical sort of sacrifice that goes to “Olympian” gods—a full-grown sheep. Here there is absolutely no hint of anything abnormal or sinister about these goddesses. This text therefore offers no help whatsoever to the holders of the theory that the Erinyes and Eumenides were originally the same deities with dual aspects.²⁴ It is, to be sure, not decisive in settling the matter, but it can only be an encouragement to those who regard the Eumenides and Erinyes as originally distinct deities with distinct characteristics.

The editors favor the theory of single goddesses with dual aspects. They explain: “All Greek divinities were potentially both beneficent and dangerous, depending on the contexts in which they functioned, and the kindly Eumenides are but a different aspect of the terrifying Erinyes” (p. 79). This is more a statement of dogma than an explanation. In fact, not all Greek gods had two aspects, beneficent and dangerous. Hades, the great Host, though usually not aggressively malicious, was rarely considered beneficent. He could only be regarded as beneficent, in a superficial sense, when he was called Plouton, the agrarian god who fosters abundance, the name Greeks were frequently using for him by the classical period. However, at an early stage, as reflected in Homer, he was not equated with Plouton in this way; he was simply the dread Lord of the Underworld. Nothing in Homer’s description sug-

21. They do not list this (A. 9) as an example of the practice, but since the composer did use asyndeton in this way, there seems to be no reason to think that he did not so use it here.

22. A. L. Brown, “Eumenides in Greek Tragedy,” *CQ* 34 (1984): 260–81, demonstrated that the goddesses into whom the Erinyes were transformed were called the Semnai and not Eumenides; cf. *Aeschylus. “Eumenides,”* ed. A. H. Sommerstein (Cambridge, 1989), 6–12.

23. To the recent bibliography given on p. 79 now add: A. Henrichs, “Anonymity and Polarity: Unknown Gods and Nameless Altars at the Areopagus,” *ICS* 19 (1994): 27–58, who argues that Erinyes and Eumenides represent different names for the same deities (“two names for the polar identities of the same group of powerful divinities who dwell beneath the earth,” p. 28). Although he is usually careful to associate each of these names with its proper ancient context, he has a tendency, unjustified in my view, to see features of the Erinyes in the Eumenides and to deduce from activities concerning one group conclusions concerning the other; see below, nn. 37, 39.

24. Henrichs, “Anonymity.” Although aware of this new *lex sacra*, he makes no mention, so far as I can see, of this sacrifice to the Eumenides.

gests that he might have the aspect of a kindly, agrarian god. This fact was emphasized by Martin Nilsson.²⁵ This early perception of Hades persisted in iconography: the Lord of the Underworld was never depicted with agrarian attributes.²⁶ The iconographical consistency and the virtual absence of cult to Hades suggest that the conflation with Plouton, which apparently occurred later than Homer, was no more than superficial. Pausanias is especially revealing when he mentions that Hades received worship only in Elis (6.25.2: "Of all men we know only the Eleians worship Hades. . . ."), but if the periegete were fundamentally convinced that Hades was really identical with Plouton, he could hardly have made such a statement, or at least not without qualification, for he knew very well that Plouton was worshipped everywhere.²⁷ In addition to the fact that in iconography there is no confusion between Plouton and Hades,²⁸ the original separate existence of Hades and Plouton remained, in a kind of fossilized way, in the Eleusinian Mysteries. There Hades was worshipped under the name of Theos, and Plouton as Plouton (the phenomenon was paralleled by Persphone, worshipped under the name of Thea side by side with Kore).²⁹ While it is true that most Greek gods had both a beneficent and a dangerous aspect, they did not need two names to express the phenomenon. Apollo Smintheus, for example, could be either helpful or vengeful, but he did not receive a different name for each mode. Gods with double names reflecting diametrically opposite qualities, on the other hand, often look like the end-products of a fusion. The Greeks found they could mitigate, to some extent, the fearsome nature of such figures as Hades, Persephone, and the Erinyes by confusing or merging them with Plouton, Kore, and the Eumenides, who were basically kindly, gentle, chthonian gods.³⁰

The Greeks' treatment of the Erinyes was similar to their treatment of Hades. In Archaic poetry the Erinyes show no sign of a kindly nature. The bulk of the evidence, which happens to be in epic, was discussed most recently by A. Heubeck,³¹ after a study of the etymology of "Erinyes" by G. Neumann, who concluded that the

25. *GGR*³, 452–56.

26. On the iconography see K. Clinton, *Myth and Cult: the Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Stockholm, 1992), 51–52, 105–13.

27. Further recent discussion: Clinton, *Iconography*, 62–63.

28. There is some mixture, however, in the iconography of Kore and Persephone, in that the latter is sometimes shown with stalks of grain; and the name Persephone occasionally appears in documents where we would expect Kore. This may be due to the success of the Mysteries in promoting the view that initiates would be under the protection of Kore in the underworld; cf. Clinton, *Iconography*, 62–63.

29. See now Clinton, *Iconography*, 51–52, 114–15. Plouton, in a preliminary sacrifice: *IG* I³ 5, with Clinton, "The Eleusinia and the Eleusinians," *AJP* 100 (1979): 1–12. In iconography, Plouton and Theos, side by side: the Lakrateides relief, *IG* II² 4701; Clinton, *Iconography*, 51–53, fig. 5. Kore and Persephone, under the name "Thea": see especially *IG* I³ 78.37–39, where they appear together in the same list of sacrifices, and the Lakrateides relief, just cited.

30. Though inherently kindly, they could, like all gods, be roused to anger. The fusion had the effect of rendering them, to a greater or lesser extent, somewhat uncanny.

31. "ἐρινύς in der archaischen Epik," *Glotta* 64 (1986): 143–65. The editors count Heubeck among those who share their view of the Eumenides and Erinyes, but this seems unjustified. Heubeck sees elements in the epic treatment of the Erinyes, especially, I gather, their interest in just punishment, from which Aeschylus could create his image of the Semnai/Eumenides: "Der Wandel der dämonischen Gestalten von unerbittlichen Rachegeistern zu gütigen Helfergöttheiten, von den Erinyes zu den Eumeniden, ist in der Komplexität ihres voraischylenischen Bildes angelegt." He does not refer to the Erinyes as a polar aspect of the Eumenides.

On the Erinyes and Xanthus, only briefly discussed by Heubeck, see most recently S. I. Johnston, "Xanthus, Hera, and the Erinyes (*Iliad* 19.400–418)," *TAPA* 122 (1992): 85–98 (she makes a common slip in referring, p. 97, to Argos, Colonus, and Sicyon as sites of important cults to the "Erinyes").

word, which first appears in Linear B, originally meant "the strife-producing one" ("die Zwietracht-bewirkende").³² Neumann acknowledged that the nature of the Erinyes underwent further development in the course of the first half of the first millennium: "etwa so, dass die Erinyes primär eine bloße Unheilsbringerin war und dass ihr die 'soziale' Funktion der Vergeltung, des Wiederherstellens der Gerechtigkeit, erst sekundär zuerkannt worden ist."³³ In Homer the Erinyes live in the underworld (*Il.* 9.571–72; cf. 19.259–60, 3.278–79), can be sent to deliver justice by Hades and Persephone (9.454–57), and sometimes impart Ate to humans (19.87–88).³⁴ To those who call upon them, they would presumably be regarded as helpers, but the help that is typically requested of them is punishment, and to those whom they punish they are seen as *στυγεραί*, goddesses of vengeance. They were not worshipped in cult.³⁵

Where we have evidence for cult of the Eumenides (or the very similar Semnai), we see nothing sinister about them, that is to say no obvious connection with the underworld.³⁶ At Athens, Pausanias found nothing frightening (*φοβερόν*) about the images of the Semnai³⁷ (or of the other chthonian deities) in their sanctuary by the Areopagus (1.28.6).³⁸ At Sicyon the Eumenides had a temple within a grove of holm oaks, and were worshipped in an annual festival with a sacrifice of pregnant sheep and with libations of honey and water, by worshippers wearing flowers

32. "Wortbildung und Etymologie von 'Ερνύς," *Die Sprache* 32 (1986): 43–51.

33. Neumann, "Wortbildung," 44. He noted the similar view of W. Radt, in *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasiens: Festschrift für Kurt Bittel*, ed. R. M. Boehmer and H. Hauptmann (Mainz, 1983), 45–46: "Ursprünglich waren sie wohl Mächte die alle Menschen bedrohen, erst später beschränkte man ihr Wirken auf die Verfolgung von Missetaten."

34. Cf. M. P. Nilsson, *GGR*³, 100–101.

35. Cf. Brown, "Eumenides," 264–65 (n. 22 above); Henrichs, "Anonymity," 37–38 (n. 23 above).

36. Henrichs, "Anonymity," 28, 43, seems to assume that all chthonian gods belonged to the underworld ("the subterranean world was not only the common destination for all departed souls . . . but was also the realm of powerful chthonian deities who were invoked by a variety of regional names and who had the dual power to bless and to curse the living"). He does not seem to distinguish between the underworld (i.e., Hades), which is the final destination of souls, and the living earth, residence of fertility gods, such as Zeus Meilichios or the Eumenides. When Athena offers to escort the Semnai to their new abode (*Eum.* 1022–23; cf. 1007), she surely does not intend a journey to Hades but "to your place below, down in the earth" (*κάτω* [or *κατὰ*] *χθονός*, not "beneath the earth," as Henrichs, "Anonymity," 47, following H. Lloyd-Jones): she takes them to their cave at the Areopagus. The word *χθόνιος* of course can be ambiguous, and this inherent ambiguity, along with the fact that the physical remains of the dead were placed in the earth, promoted apparent confusion between denizens of the underworld and fertility gods resident in the upper earth, but I think that for the most part Greeks could, if necessary, make the appropriate distinctions.

37. It is important to keep in mind that Pausanias refers to them not as Erinyes but as Semnai; so also Dem. 21.115 and Aeschin. 1.188; it is misleading therefore to call these goddesses "Erinyes/Semnai Theai" as Henrichs, "Anonymity," 40; cf., correctly, R. W. Wallace, *The Areopagos Council, to 307 B.C.* (Baltimore, 1985), 122. Henrichs, "Anonymity," 40, notes that Pausanias "shows more interest in the goddesses' benevolent aspect than in the terrible one they equally embody." The reason, I think, is simple: Pausanias saw no sign of the terrifying aspect. Nor, I suspect, was this aspect generally evident; it is probably significant that in the *Eumenides*, after the Erinyes have accepted Athena's offer (916–1020), only Athena speaks of their terrible aspect, they themselves speak only of their kindly, supportive roles.

38. As he immediately goes on to say that Aeschylus was the first to represent them with snakes in their hair, it was presumably this element of their iconography that represented their frightening aspect and therefore was absent in the images of the Semnai. Pausanias, it so happens, may be incorrect in attributing this invention to Aeschylus. A white-ground Attic lekythos in Würzburg, dated to 460–450 (*LIMC*, "Erinyes," no. 1), shows a winged Erinyes with a snake in each hand and a snake in her hair; it may predate Aeschylus' play or, at any rate, have been influenced not by it but by an artistic tradition that Aeschylus also drew upon: as the wings are not derived from Aeschylus, the same may be true of the snake in the hair. H. Sarian, *LIMC*, "Erinyes," 839–40, takes the vine branches that seem to emanate from the bodies of Erinyes on a black-figure lekythos in Athens (his no. 7 = NM 19765) as indicating their connection with fertility; the branches are, on the contrary, merely decoration, of a sort commonly found on late black-figure vases. I am grateful to J. Oakley for discussion of this point.

instead of wreaths (Paus. 2.11.4). The scene suggests deities connected with the earth and fertility, chthonian in a wholesome sense, as opposed to dread goddesses from the underworld.³⁹ From the Argolid we have their iconography, displayed in reliefs: women with a snake in one hand and a flower in the other (sometimes only a snake or only a flower, but once with a snake in each hand).⁴⁰ To the Greeks snakes were, in many contexts, not sinister (mythical snakes were often another matter, e.g., the wriggling snakes on Athena's aegis or those in the hair of Erinyes), and were usually associated with the earth and fertility (e.g., the serpent of Asclepius or the snakes that help to draw the chariot of Triptolemus)—this is the sort of snake we see in the Eumenides' reliefs.⁴¹ Most of the reliefs show worshippers, none of whom, as we should expect, appears to be frightened.⁴² Otherwise, the evidence concerning cult of the Eumenides is scanty.⁴³ J., J., and K. have adduced a new piece of evidence: the month Eumenideios at Entella in western Sicily (p. 77), surely named, as they point out, after the Eumenides, testifying therefore to the existence of a festival and the high respect these goddesses were accorded in that city. The present text allows similar inference for Selinus (though not necessarily for a festival). Most importantly, the new information in this document reveals that in the Hellenic world the Eumenides possessed the fairly typical range of sacrificial ritual characteristic of chthonian goddesses, from so-called Olympian (unmarked) sacrifice, as here, to the marked type, pregnant sheep, as at Sicyon.

39. On the meaning of *χθόνιος* cf. Clinton, *Iconography*, pp. 61–63, esp. n. 189; S. Scullion, "Olympian and Chthonian," *CIAnt* 13 (1994): 75–119, correctly emphasizes connection with the earth. I am sceptical whether the distinction Olympian/Chthonian is of much value, since nearly all gods were associated in some way with the earth (as Scullion, "Olympian," 115–17, realizes, though he regards the distinction to be of value). The nature of a god's chthonian aspect seems to me a more interesting question.

Brown, "Eumenides," 261 (n. 22 above), calls attention to the fact that the Sicyonian Eumenides dwelt in a grove, like nymphs, not in a cave. At Cos a pregnant sheep is attested for Athena Polias (Sokolowski, *LSCG* 151.A55–56); on this victim, "attested only for female divinities connected with the prosperity of the earth," cf. Scullion, "Olympian," 86, with bibliography.

It may be asked by what sort of criteria a cult is to be identified as that of gods of the underworld as opposed to gods of the earth. The trouble is, of course, that gods of the underworld were very rarely worshipped, but we should expect at least some similarity with so-called heroic or funerary sacrifice. Clytemnestra's offerings to the Erinyes in *Eum.* 107–10 show us how such ritual could be imagined: wineless, on an *ἐσχάρα*, in the dead of night (*νυκτίσμενα δειπν' ἐπ' ἐσχάρα πυρὸς ἔθουσ, ὦραν οὐδενὸς κοινὴν θεῶν*), with emphasis on the latter aspect. (Offerings to Persephone are not really relevant, because in cult documents references to her are probably really to Kore; see Clinton, *Iconography*, p. 63, n. 200, n. 26 above.) Henrichs, "Anonymity," 44, is unpersuasive in suggesting that Clytemnestra's private sacrifice at Argos to the Erinyes reflects historical cult of the Semnai at Athens.

40. See now *LIMC*, "Erinyes," nos. 112–19; snake in each hand, no. 117.

41. On snakes in Greek cult: E. Küster, *Die Schlange in der griechischen Kunst und Religion*, RGVV, vol. 13 (Giessen, 1913). Strangely, Brown, "Eumenides," 261, understands these snakes of the Eumenides as ambivalent, namely, as reminders of Persephone.

42. Though it is sometimes hard to interpret fright in Greek art, in this case the worshippers, since they dedicated the reliefs to the goddesses, would naturally not be depicted as frightened of them. Clear fright is certainly represented in scenes with the Erinyes (e.g., on an Apulian volute crater in the National Museum in Naples, inv. no. 82270 [H 3249]; *LIMC*, "Erinyes," no. 50). It is therefore not germane to say that "the iconography of the Erinyes and Eumenides is equally euphemistic" (Henrichs, "Anonymity," p. 51, n. 122). The Erinyes were regarded as inherently frightening; so it was enough for the artist to make their identity clear in order to allude to the emotions that they were known to elicit. So also in the case of Hades and Persephone one might call their iconography itself "euphemistic," but what was important was their identity. With their identity the viewer would associate the traditional emotions.

43. For a useful survey see Brown, "Eumenides." On the Eumenides in the Derveni papyrus, worshipped by mystai, see A. Henrichs, "The Eumenides and wineless libations in the Derveni Papyrus," *Atti del XVIII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, vol. 2 (Naples, 1984), 266–68; Clinton, "Sacrifice at the Eleusinian Mysteries," in *Early Greek Cult Practice, Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 26–29 June, 1986*, Skrifter Utgivna av Svenska Institutet i

Since an extended treatment of this important subject is out of place in the present context, I have offered the above as a relatively succinct statement that there is still much to be said for the view, not shared by the editors of the *lex sacra* but encouraged by the new information in this document, that the Erinyes and Eumenides were originally distinct.⁴⁴ Aeschylus may have been the first to identify them, in the *Semnai*.

IV. THE TRITOPATOIRES, IMPURE AND PURE

A.

- 9
10 ιτοπατρεῦσι · τοῖς · μιανοῖς ὅσπερ τοῖς ἡρώεσι, ροῖνον ὑπολῆει- τοῖς Τρι-
11 ψας · δι' ὀρόφο · καὶ τῶν μοιρῶν · τῶν ἐνάταν · κατακα-
12 ἰεν · μίαν. θυόντο θῦμα : καὶ καταγιζόντο ἡοῖς ἡοσία · καὶ περιρά-
13 ναντες καταλινάντο : κῆπειτα : τοῖς κ(α)θαροῖς : τέλεον θυόντο : μελίκρατα ὑπο-
14 λείβον · καὶ τράπεζαν καὶ κλῖναν κένβαλέτο καθαρὸν ἡῆμα καὶ στερά-
15 νος ἐλαίας καὶ μελίκρατα ἐν καιναῖς ποτερίδε[σ]ι καὶ : πλάσματα καὶ κῆρ κάπ-
16 ἀρξάμενοι κατακαάντο καὶ καταλινάντο τὰς ποτερίδας ἐνθέντες .
17 θυόντο ὅσπερ τοῖς θεοῖς τὰ πατῖα :

(Sacrifice) to the Tritopatoires, the impure, as (one sacrifices) to the heroes, having poured a libation of wine down through the roof, and of the ninth parts burn one. Let those to whom it is permitted *sacrifice (the) victim* and consecrate (*it*), and having performed aspersion let them perform the anointing, and then let them sacrifice a full-grown (sheep) to the pure (Tritopatoires). 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 and cakes and meat; and having made offerings let them burn (them), and let them perform the anointing having put the cups in. Let them perform the ancestral sacrifices as to the gods.⁴⁵ (p. 15)

The document's lack of interest in the identity of the celebrants is more evident here, and it is hard to know whether the shift from singular to plural verb (and vice versa) is significant, but it is perhaps best to assume that at least sometimes it does signify a change in performers.

Before turning to the Tritopatoires, impure and pure, let us review the sacrificial procedure. The celebrant pours a libation of wine through the roof of a structure that is presumably either partially or entirely underground, and then burns one of the ninth parts of a victim (a very significant portion of the victim, as the editors point out, as opposed to the trivial amount burned in a normal sacrifice). The ninth parts,

Athen, 4^o, vol. 38, ed. R. Hägg, N. Marinatos, and C. Nordquist (Stockholm, 1989), 69–70. On the inscription from Selinus and the rock-cut inscriptions from near Cyrene see J., J., and K., *Lex Sacra*, 77–78. For Cerynea in Achaia Pausanias (7.25.7) tells us nothing about cult; whether the holocaustic sacrifice of a black sheep there by Orestes (Schol. Soph. *OC* 40) reflects cult practice is unclear, but such sacrifice would not be inappropriate for goddesses of the land; cf. the sacrifice of black victims to Zeus Chthonios and Ge Chthonia ὑπὲρ καρπῶν on Melos (Sokolowski, *LSCG* 96.24–25 with M. P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung* [Leipzig, 1906], 13). That the Maniai of Arcadia (Paus. 8.34.1–3) were Eumenides is unlikely, despite Pausanias calling them such: cf. Brown, “Eumenides,” p. 262, n. 15 (n. 22 above).

44. Further encouragement is given by the function of the Elasteroi at Selinus; see below, pp. 174–79.

45. I have put in italics a slight change to the editors' translation. The θῦμα, it seems, is not the act of sacrificing (cf. θυσία, A. 7) but the sacrificial victim, an early and frequent meaning of the term; yet it can mean “sacrifice,” and so the editors' translation may not be wrong.

I assume, are those of a victim (of unspecified type) selected for the Tritopatores. (The editors, on the other hand, assume that the ninth parts come from the two victims for Zeus Eumenes, the Eumenides, and Zeus Meilichios. However, the use of part of one god's victim for another god in a subsequent ritual is highly unusual, and seems to be an unnecessary assumption here.) *θυόντο ὄψμα* refers of course to the sacrifice for the Tritopatores, as does *καὶ καταγιζόντο*. This sentence specifies a qualification for those who officiate, but it also parallels the preceding sentence in that *καταγίζεν*, consecration by fire, is another way of referring to the burning (*κατακαίεν*) involved in the offering of the ninth part of the victim for the Tritopatores. What exactly the celebrants anoint here is not immediately obvious, but is most likely, as the editors suggest, the altar. However, it seems extraordinary that they do this after the sacrifice, unless it is in preparation for another sacrifice. The editors adduce a third-century parallel from the Attic sanctuary of Aphrodite Pandemos: in preparation for a festival, first a sacrifice is made "for the purification of the sanctuary," then the altars are "anointed," the doors coated with pitch, and the statues washed.⁴⁶ A similar set of events occurred at Eleusis in preparation for the Mysteries of 408 B.C.: the sanctuary is cleaned (or purified) with water, the altars are anointed, and the doors are anointed (with pitch).⁴⁷ Although the "anointing" in these two cases probably consisted in administering a coat of stucco, the process is very similar to what we see here: the altar needs to be renewed for the new set of sacrifices that are to be made to the pure Tritopatores, and this renewal is carried out (after the remains of the preceding sacrifice are removed of course) by sprinkling the altar with water and anointing it. *κῆπειτα* emphasizes the necessity of doing the sacrifice to the impure Tritopatores, including the anointing, before proceeding to the sacrifice to the pure Tritopatores.

The sacrifice for the pure Tritopatores (done in the manner of traditional divine sacrifice, according to A. 17) involves entertainment of these gods, *θεοξένια*, a practice well discussed by the editors (pp. 67–70): offerings are laid out on a table, and a couch is made up for the divine guests. In this case, after a sacrifice of a full-grown sheep, and a libation of honey mixture, clean cloth is laid on the table and (evidently also) on the couch, and then placed on the table are wreaths of olive, honey mixture in new cups, cakes called *πλάσματα* (presumably made in the form of images),⁴⁸ and meat. From the offerings on the table a portion is put on the altar (*ἀπαρξάμενοι*) and burnt. The rest of the sentence makes difficult sense, unless we perhaps understand *τὰς ποτερίδας ἐνθέντες* as modifying the subject of both *κατακαάντο καὶ καταλινάντο* and the action described by *τὰς ποτερίδας ἐνθέντες* as preceding both the burning and anointing: after a portion of the table-offerings is placed on the altar, the cups from the table are placed on it too, and then they are burnt and the altar is anointed (as above, line A. 13). But this seems more awkward

46. Sokolowski, *LSCG* 39.24–26.

47. *IG* I³ 386.153–56, with my new reading, *Iconography*, 23. In 329/28 the altars underwent *περι-αλείψαι καὶ κονιάσαι καὶ λευκῶσαι*, all done by the same contractor (*IG* II² 1672.140–41), therefore *περι-αλείψαι* probably means restuccoing, and this must be the sense also in the two preceding examples. For a discussion of the process see A. K. Orlandos, *ΤΑ ΥΑΙΚΑ ΔΟΜΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΡΧΑΙΩΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ*, vol. 2 (Athens, 1958), 50–55.

48. The editors adduce examples of *πλάσματα* of clay, wax, and dried fruits, but the most precise parallel for the present use was the custom of depositing *πλάσματα* in the pits called *μέγαρα* at the Thesmophoria. Schol. Lucian, p. 276, ll. 11–16 (ed. Rabe) informs us that these *πλάσματα* are made of dough and are likenesses of snakes and male *σχήματα* (i.e., penises).

than to punctuate differently and take τὰς ποτερίδας ἐνθέντες with the following θύοντο: “Having put the cups on (the altar) let them sacrifice as to the gods the ancestral sacrifices.”

The editors’ excellent essay on the Tritopatores is an especially helpful contribution to our understanding of these rather obscure deities (pp. 107–14). They were worshipped at Athens, both by the city as a whole and by groups (gene, phratries), and seem to represent the group’s collective ancestors. Here the existence of two types, polluted and pure, is a surprise. Since at Athens the Tritopatores who were worshipped by groups are so designated, and since a name of a group is not given here, it seems reasonable to suppose that these Tritopatores were worshipped not by a group but by the city. The editors, however, understand just the opposite: “Otherwise [i.e., if the Tritopatores belonged to the city as a whole] 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” (p. 111). This argument is a bit hard to follow, until one realizes that it is based on their general assumption about this section, namely, that it concerns groups, not the city as a whole, an assumption that seems not well founded (see above, p. 163). The editors also assume that the polluted Tritopatores are the same as the pure ones: after sacrifice has been performed for the polluted ones, they become pure, and receive sacrifice again as the pure Tritopatores (pp. 29, 53). They are aware of the alternative interpretation, that there were two types of Tritopatores, polluted and pure, but were dissuaded from adopting it by “the language of the text and the lack of good parallels.” The language of the text, however, does not clearly indicate that it is a question of one type that is changed from impure to pure. If that were the case, one would expect, after the sacrifice to the impure Tritopatores, that they would then be referred to “as pure,” ὡς καθαροῖς, but, instead, the text presents a ritual for “the pure ones.”⁴⁹ A parallel, with separate sets of impure and pure deities, seems to be offered by the cult of the Maniai and Ake near Megalopolis as described by Pausanias (8.34.1–3): καλοῦσι δὲ καὶ αὐτὰς τὰς θεὰς καὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν Μανίας. Nearby was a sanctuary to the goddesses called Ἀκη. (Pausanias calls both groups Eumenides, but that clearly is his term, not the local one.)⁵⁰ The Maniai were believed to be black goddesses, the Ake white; and an aition has it that these goddesses appeared black to Orestes when he was mad, but after he bit off his finger, they appeared white. Although the aition represents them as the same goddesses, who changed color, this part of the aition is not reflective of the local cult; in cult they were clearly regarded as related but separate: each group had a permanent and separate name and a permanent and separate sanctuary. And, judging by the aition, at each sanctuary a different type of sacrifice was offered: ἐνάγισμα at the sanctuary of the Maniai, but divine sacrifice, θυσία, for the Ake. At Selinus the situation looks rather similar; there may have been two precincts, but if so, both were evidently served by a single altar.⁵¹

49. Note that according to the story in Flavius Philostratus, *Heroicus* 53.8, 11, 13, about the oracle given to the Thessalians to sacrifice to Achilles in two forms, a dead man and a god, they sacrificed to him ὡς τεθνεῶτι and then ὡς θεῷ.

50. Cf. Brown, “Eumenides,” p. 262, n. 15 (n. 22 above).

51. In favor of two sets of Tritopatores the editors point out (p. 29, n. 6) that a possible permanent state of religious danger may be seen in the Cyrenean Cathartic Law, *LSCG Suppl* 115 ¶4 (their cross-reference to discussion of this passage on p. 100, n. 35 seems to be a mistake for p. 111, n. 36).

V. SACRIFICES TO MEILICHIOS IN (THE SANCTUARY OF) EUTHYDAMOS

A.

- 17 τῷ ἐν Εὐθυδάμῳ : Μιλιχίοι : κριὸν θ[υ]-
 18 ὄντο. ἔστο δὲ καὶ θῦμα πεδᾶ ρέτος θύεν. τὰ δὲ ἡιὰρὰ τὰ δαμόσια ἐξῆ(α)ἡρέτο⁵²
 καὶ τρά[πεζα]-
 19 ν : προθέμεν καὶ ῥολέαν καὶ τὰπὸ τὰς τραπέζας : ἀπάργματα καὶ τόστέα κα[τα]-
 20 κᾶαι · τὰ κρᾶ μέχφερέτο. καλέτο [h]όντινα λῆι. ἔστο δὲ καὶ πεδᾶ ρέτ[ος ρ]-
 21 οἴφοι θύειν : σφαζόντο δὲ · (damaged text follows)

To (Zeus) Meilichios in (*the sanctuary of*) “Euthydamos let them sacrifice a ram. And let it also be possible to sacrifice (*the*) *victim* after a year. Let him take out the public *ἡιὰρὰ* and put out a table before (them) and burn a thigh and the offerings from the table and the bones. Let no meat be carried out (of the precinct). Let him invite whomever he wishes. And let it also be possible to sacrifice after a year, at home. Let them slaughter . . . statues. . . . [Let them sacrifice] whatever *victim* the ancestral customs permit . . . in the third year. . . .”⁵³ (p. 15)

The reasons for translating “sanctuary” of Euthydamos are given above (p. 165). In their discussion the editors assume that the ritual in A. 18 concerning the public *ἡιὰρὰ* is part of the procedures to be carried out as stated above for Tritopatores (pp. 29, 53). But as they themselves point out (p. 43), in this document a new set of procedures begins with asyndeton; more precisely, a new set of procedures for a deity (or deities) begins both with asyndeton and with the name of the deity (or deities) in the dative (see above, pp. 165–66). Thus the procedures in A. 18–21 were carried out for Zeus Meilichios, not for the Tritopatores.

Like the other rites in this section, these are done every four years, in the year of the Olympian games, but allowance is given here for repetition of a sacrifice of this victim in the year following the games⁵⁴ (and in A. 23 allowance is made for repetition of some ceremony in the year following that). The editors believe that the repetition depended on the need or desire of an individual or his group. If these sacrifices were performed on behalf of the city, as seems more likely,⁵⁵ then the decision to repeat was probably left up to the city or the responsible authority (perhaps a priest).

Once again, as with the Tritopatores, *θεοξένια* are prescribed. The public *ἡιὰρὰ*, sacred objects, may include images, as the editors rightly argue, and images would be particularly appropriate to the entertainment of gods at *θεοξένια*. Only one god, Zeus Meilichios, is entertained here, however; hence a plurality of images is unlikely; other objects were probably included.⁵⁶

The prohibition against removing the meat and the freedom to summon guests are surely related. A sufficiently large group must be on hand to consume the meat, the composition of this group being left up to the officiant. In view of our ignorance of the identity of the officiant, the editors’ view that the permission to invite

52. Lead sheet: ΕΞΗΠΕΤΟ.

53. The editors’ translation, with my modifications in italics.

54. On repetitions of this sort see above, p. 161. In the translation I have taken *θῦμα* here, as elsewhere in this document (see n. 45 above), to refer to the victim, not as a cognate accusative.

55. See above, p. 163.

56. The examples adduced by the editors, pp. 21–22, present some possibilities.

“may indicate that the ceremony is to provide an opportunity for the sacrificer to re-integrate himself and his gentilitia group into the community by securing the participation of people outside his own group” (p. 39) seems overly speculative.

Permission is given for the sacrifice to be repeated a year later [ε]οῖκοι. Note that the earlier permission for repetition concerns the θύμα, the victim; here the repetition concerns the locale, the οἶκος. The editors’ translation, “at home,” is a natural one, but it seems to me that we should not rule out “at (the) οἶκος,” that is, a building used for sacral purposes, perhaps the building in which the *ἡιρά* were kept, or even a temple.⁵⁷ The fact that public *ἡιρά* are involved would tend to suggest a public οἶκος as opposed to a private house.

VI. PURIFICATION FROM THE ELASTEROI

B.

- 1 [2-3]..ἄγθροπος [6-7]..τ.[(?) ἐλ]αστέρον ἀποκα[θαίρεσθ]-
- 2 [αι], προειπὸν ἥπο κα λῆι καὶ τὸ ἐξ[τ]εος ἥπο κα λῆι καὶ [τὸ μενὸς]
- 3 ἡοπέιο κα λῆι καὶ (τᾷ)⁵⁸ ἀμέραι ἡοπέια κα λ(ἐ)ι, π[ο]ροειπὸν ἥποτι κα λῆι,
καθαίρεσθ, [3-4?] ἡυ]-
- 4 ποδεκόμενος ἀπονίψασθαι δότο κάκρατιξασθαι καὶ ἡάλα τῷ αὐ[τῷ]
- 5 [κ]αὶ θύσας τῷ Δι χοῖρον ἐξ αὐτὸ ἴτο καὶ περιστ[ι]ραφέσθο *vacat*
- 6 καὶ ποταγορέσθο καὶ σίτον ἡαρέσθο καὶ καθευδέτο ἥπε κ-
- 7 α λῆι.

[If a . . .] *person* [wishes] to be purified from ἐλάστεροι, having made a proclamation from wherever he wishes and whenever in the year he wishes and in whatever [month] 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 ἐλάστερος), let him give (water) to wash with and (something) to *break-fast on*⁵⁹ and salt to this same one, and having sacrificed 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. (p. 17)

The word Ἐλάστερος has hitherto been known only as an epithet of Zeus, and only from Paros. It may be related in some way to ἀλάστωρ/ἀλάστορος.⁶⁰ The present rites, directed at the ἐλάστεροι, reveal that a rather dark religious dimension familiar to us from the world of tragedy was also part of everyday life. In tragedy we have: ὅσαι δ' Ἐρινύων . . . ἡλάστρουν μ' αἰεῖ (Eur. *IT* 970–71); and similar language for the purificatory response: ἀφ' ἐστίας πᾶν ἐλαθῇ μῦσος καθαρμοῖσιν ἀτᾶν ἐλατηρίοις (Aesch. *Cho.* 966–68). In their illuminating essay on the Ἐλάστερος (pp. 116–20) the editors note that the absence of reference to vengeful spirits in fourth-century oratory may not actually reflect disappearance of belief in such spirits, as is often thought, but rather the simple fact that none of the preserved speeches concerns homicide (with one exception, which happens to be irrelevant).⁶¹ More significantly, in the classical period the use of curse tablets and “other forms

57. All of these meanings are well attested for οἶκος in inscriptions and elsewhere.

58. The article was omitted.

59. Italics indicate minor changes to the editors’ translation; “(something) to breakfast on” does not differ significantly from the editors’ “meal” and is simply intended to reflect the Greek infinitive.

60. P. Chaintraine, *ἀλάστωρ*, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grec*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1968), 54–55, did not consider this possibility, but of course he did not have the wealth of information provided by the present document.

61. “Except for *Lysias* 1, which was written for the defendant and not designed to call attention to supernatural sanctions . . .” (p. 118).

of hostile magic” suggests that belief in vengeful spirits, at least in some quarters, was alive and well.

Procedures in this section of the document seem to show a striking similarity to some regulations in the Cyrenaean Cathartic Law of the late fourth century. The editors have relied heavily on this similarity for their interpretation. According to the Cyrenaean law a person wishing to rid himself of a visitant sent by spells (ἰκέσιος ἐπακτός) must proclaim (προειπεῖν) the name of the visitant for three days.⁶² In addition, this law prescribes entertainment for the visitant (ὕποδεξάμενον παρτιθ[έ]μεν τὸ μέρος πάντων),⁶³ though the form of entertainment is different from the Selinuntine procedure: at Cyrene the purificand makes a male and female figurine of wood or clay, entertains them, and then takes the figurines and portions (μέρη) to the woods (ἐς ὕλαν ἄεργον) and deposits them there. Presumably the purpose of the proclamations was to lure the visitant to the entertainment, a visitant of unknown name being addressed ὦ ἄνθρωπε, αἶτε ἀνὴρ αἶτε γυνή (which reveals that the visitant was believed to be human).⁶⁴

Lines B. 3–4 of our text present serious difficulties. It seems that in addition to putting out water and a meal for the visitant, the purificand is to give the visitant salt. In one sense this practice seems quite logical, for a host traditionally binds a guest to himself in large part by providing a meal and salt. But the text now refers to the visitant, strangely, as “the same one”: “and let him give . . . salt to the same one,” instead of simply “to him,” αὐτῷ. The phrase τῷ αὐτῷ is uncalled for. (Nor is it necessary, as the editors note, to express a pronoun in the dative at all, since the indirect object, on their interpretation of this clause, has already been understood with ἀπονίψασθαι δότο κάκρατιξασθαι.) Furthermore, the use of salt in this way, to solidify a bond with the recipient, is very odd indeed. It is hard to see why anyone would want to bind an ἐλάστερος to himself. In the Cyrenaean law, on the other hand, the meal was used not so much to appease the visitant as to entice him to a certain spot, where he would presumably fall under the control of the host.

These difficulties largely disappear if we replace the strange τῷ αὐτῷ with what seems to be the only possible reading, τῷ αὐ[τορέκται]. The size of the lacuna is just adequate. The farthest point to the right that the preserved surface extends occurs in B. 12; if a vertical line is drawn through that point, the iota of αὐ[τορέκται] occurs just at or slightly to the left of it.⁶⁵ This restoration then suggests

62. *LSCGSuppl* 115.B.30–31.

63. *Ibid.*, B. 35–36.

64. The logic of the text suggests, however, that the one so addressed is the person who sends the visitant, and the principal purpose of the rite is to propitiate the sender or, more precisely in my view, to nullify his power; cf. R. Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, (Oxford, 1983), 347. But the visitant and sender cannot be neatly distinguished. The danger is the visitant, and the purpose of the address is surely to get the attention of the visitant so that he or she comes to the entertainment, or, more precisely, is assimilated to a figurine at the entertainment. Through the visitant, who is a kind of extension or other self of the sender (most clearly seen in the case of a deceased sender), the sender's power is nullified. Surely the visitant, not the sender, is believed to receive the entertainment in the first instance (most obvious in the case of a living sender).

65. This assumes of course that the lettering of the restoration is the same size as that in the latter half of B. 4. In the following lines the lettering becomes larger and more widely spaced, and blank space is generally left at the ends of lines, with no word-division: the cutter has now realized that space is not a problem. In B. 12 he carried over the final sigma of καθάρως to the next line, evidently because with the generous size and spacing that he was now allowing the sigma would have broken the vertical margin. A single iota is nowhere carried over in the preserved text (besides B. 4 the relevant lines would be A. 7, 8). It should also be noted that the cutter does not always adhere to a relatively even right margin: A. 8 extends considerably to the right of A. 9–20.

that we restore at the beginning of the clause [καὶ ὁ ἡ]ποδεκόμενος.⁶⁶ For B. 1–2 I assume something like the “more radical solution” the editors describe on p. 12: [αἶ] κ’ ἄγθροπος [αὐτορέκ]τα[ς ἐλ]αστέρον ἀποκα[θαίρεσθαι | λεῖ]. Thus the translation of the revised passage: “If a person (who is an) αὐτορέκτας wishes to be purified of ἐλάστεροι, having made a proclamation . . . , let him purify himself, and let the one serving as host give (water) to wash with and (something) to breakfast on and salt to the αὐτορέκτας.” Although providing a purificand with food and salt is unattested, the entire process does conform to what is in fact typical: the purificand seeks a purifier, or host, who provides for both the purification and the social re-integration of the purificand.⁶⁷ Here purification is accomplished by washing; integration with the host and his community by partaking of the host’s meal and salt. As is also customary in purifications, the purificand makes a sacrifice, here it is to Zeus and it is surely a καθάρσιον.⁶⁸ The rest of the instructions reflect the fact that his reintegration has been achieved.

In the phrase ἐξ αὐτῷ ἵτο the editors understand αὐτῷ as referring to the sanctuary in which the purificand makes sacrifice (p. 42), but the lack of an antecedent renders this extremely unlikely. It seems most natural to suppose that αὐτῷ refers to the ἡ]ποδεκόμενος: “And having sacrificed a piglet to Zeus, let him go apart from him (sc. the host).”⁶⁹ The sacrifice took place surely therefore at the host’s house, or, at any rate, a spot designated by the host.⁷⁰ At this point the purificand departs and, no longer needing to fear the ἐλάστερος and now reintegrated in the community, he may turn around, be addressed, take food, and sleep wherever he wishes.

Thus the resemblance of this procedure to the one at Cyrene concerning visitants is only superficial, the common features being merely an announcement, reception, and a meal, but in each case the announcement, reception, and meal have different purposes. The Selinuntine procedure is actually closer, in its main lines, to the one at Cyrene concerning the αὐτοφόνος.⁷¹ Although the Cyrenaean text is fragmentary and somewhat difficult to construe, it mentions (1) an announcement concerning the arrival of the αὐτοφόνος,⁷² (2) seating him on a white fleece on a threshold, (3) [washing] and anointing him, (4) persons called ὑποδεκόμενοι, (5) various procedures aimed at re-integrating the αὐτοφόνος in the community, and (6) sacrifice.

The language of receiving and helping a person driven by an avenging spirit appears also in Aeschylus, *Choephoroi* 294, where Orestes describes how Apollo will punish him if he does not avenge Agamemnon. Orestes will, like a polluted person (λυμανθὲν δέμας), be driven from the city, pursued by the wrath of his father (291–96):

καὶ τοῖς τοιοῦτοις οὔτε κρατῆρος μέρος
εἶναι μετασχεῖν, οὐ φιλοσπόνδου λιβός,
βωμῶν τ’ ἀπείργειν οὐχ ὀρωμένην πατρός

66. This restoration is easily contained within the right margin described above.

67. See especially Parker, *Miasma*, 370–74.

68. Cf. Pausanias 1.34.5.

69. For ἐκ meaning “from” a person with a verb of motion cf. Hdt. 1.112.1.

70. The editors prefer to think that it took place in the shrine of the community’s Meilichios, but there is no support in the text, and we do not even know whether the Zeus of B. 5 is Zeus Meilichios.

71. *LSCG Suppl* 115.B.59, with Parker, *Miasma*, 350–51.

72. It should be noted that this announcement is not precisely analogous to the one in the Selinuntine text, where the announcement is made by the purificand in order to attract a host. How the purificand at Cyrene notifies a host of his need is not specified. The announcement in the Cyrenaean law marks the arrival of the purificand and the start of his purification.

μηνιν· δέχεσθαι (δ') οὔτε συλλύειν τινά,
 πάντων δ' ἄτιμον κᾶφίλον θνήσκειν χρόνῳ
 κακῶς ταριχευθέντα παμφθάρτῳ μόρφ.

Line 294 is usually translated following the scholiast on the meaning of συλλύειν: "And none may receive or entertain such a one" (so Lloyd-Jones). The scholiast explains συλλύειν as equivalent to (an otherwise unattested) συγκαταλύειν, "to lodge with." But there are difficulties. This meaning is not found elsewhere for συλλύειν,⁷³ and even καταλύειν is not used transitively in connection with lodging, but only intransitively, "to lodge with." Thus in l. 294, if συλλύειν is to have the transitive sense "to lodge (or entertain)," we have to suppose an unparalleled equivalency of συλλύειν with καταλύειν and an unparalleled transitive use of καταλύειν in this sense. On the other hand, the clause reads very easily, in the light of the Selinuntine practice, if we use a standard meaning of συλλύειν, "to help in releasing": "And none may receive or help in releasing such a one." At Selinus the host receives the homicide and helps in releasing him from the Elasteros. It is precisely this that Apollo will deny to Orestes.

The rest of this section, B. 7–13, in which the Greek poses few problems, gives us an idea of the variety of ἐλάστεροι:

B.

- 7 αἶ τις κα λῆι ξενικὸν ἔ πατρῷον, ἔ πακουστὸν ἔ φορατὸν
- 8 ἔ καὶ χῶντινα καθαίρεσθαι, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καθαιρέσθω
- 9 ὁνπερ τοῦτορέκτας ἐπεὶ κ' ἐλαστέρο ἀποκαθάρεται. *vacat*
- 10 ἡιαρεῖον τέλεον ἐπὶ τοῖ βομῶι τοῖ τοῖ δαμοσίῳ θύσας καθαρὸ-
- 11 ς ἔστο. διορίζας ἡαλὶ καὶ χρυσῶι ἀπορανάμενος ἀπίτο.
- 12 ἡόκα τοῖ ἐλαστέροι χρέζει θύεν, θύεν ἡόσπερ τοῖς *vacat*
- 13 ἀθανάτοισι, σφαζέτο δ' ἔς γᾶν. *vacat*

If anyone wishes to purify himself, with respect to a foreign or ancestral one (sc. ἐλάστερος), either one that has been heard or one that has been seen or anyone at all,⁷⁴ let him purify himself in the same way as the αὐτορέκτας (homicide) does when he is purified of an ἐλάστερος. 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 ἐλάστερος, sacrifice as to the immortals. But let him slaughter (the victim so that the blood flows) into the earth. (p. 17)

73. Cf. *Aeschylus, "Choephoroi,"* ed. A. F. Garvie (Oxford, 1986), 119.

74. It is clear that in the protasis of this sentence the accusative adjectives modify an understood ἐλάστερον. The relation of these accusatives to καθαίρεσθαι was susceptible of two interpretations in the editors' view: "if anyone wishes that a foreign, etc., (ἐλάστερος) be purified" or the interpretation they have actually adopted, "if anyone wishes to be purified himself with respect to . . ." They correctly rejected the first (the aim throughout is expressly to purify not the ἐλάστερος but the one visited by the ἐλάστερος). However, the construction is strange. The three parallels that they cite for the notion "be purified with respect to someone" are "quite abstract" (p. 44). That is to say they are not true parallels. In the first, *Aesch. Cho.* 73–74, φόνον καθαιρόντες, the accusative is more likely the direct object than an accusative of respect, and καθαιρόντες may even be a false reading, an intrusive gloss (so Garvie, ad loc.). In the next, *Hdt.* 1.43, "purified with respect to murder," the accusative does not refer to a person. Nor does the last example refer to a person, *Timaeus Locrus*, 224, l. 8 (ed. Marg), "purified with respect to false notions," which does not use this verb but ἀποκαθαίρειν. We might be tempted to understand καθαίρεσθαι, καθαίρεσθω as forms not of καθαίρειν but of καθαιρεῖν, here "overpower" or "subjugate," or "reduce," but the emphasis on purification as the goal—καθαρὸς ἔστο—suggests otherwise. There seems little choice but to accept this construction.

The editors are surely right in taking the new word αὐτορέκτας to mean homicide, and in inferring that the preceding B. 1–7 concerns his purification. The specification to “purify himself *in the same way* as the αὐτορέκτας does when he is purified by an ἐλάστερος” seems to demand that all purifications from ἐλάστεροι are to follow the same pattern as was described in B. 1–7: (1) an announcement by the purificand of his need, a host in response purifying and receiving him into his household, sacrifice of a piglet to Zeus (presumably at the home of the host), departure, and (2) sacrifice of a full-grown sheep on the public altar, followed by certain procedures which mark the completion of the ritual, and departure. In B. 1–7, however, the completion of the rituals for the αὐτορέκτας is quite clearly marked by the sacrifice of the piglet (at the host’s house)—at this point he is to depart and all indications are that he is pure—but now we learn of a sacrifice of a sheep to an unspecified god on the public altar and further procedures, of which nothing was said earlier in connection with the αὐτορέκτας. According to these new procedures, the purificand evidently marks off a boundary around the altar, perhaps, as the editors suggest, in a single action, sprinkling salt water from a golden vessel. This ceremonial departure seems to parallel the earlier one prescribed for the αὐτορέκτας after a sacrifice of the piglet to Zeus: there too the purificand achieves finality of relief in departure. Thus, since two departures and two purifications seem incorrect for the same individual, and since if the sacrifice of the sheep was to be one of the rituals for the αὐτορέκτας, there is no reason that it would not have been mentioned above following the other rituals for the αὐτορέκτας, it seems as if two separate rituals are meant, one for dealing with the ἐλάστεροι that haunt the αὐτορέκτας, the other for persons suffering from other sorts of ἐλάστεροι. What, then, does “purify in the same way” mean if in fact two separate rituals are involved? The editors do not address this difficulty: “The same procedures apply to all other ἐλάστεροι a person may encounter, viz., those that pursue an individual for some other reason than bloodshed” (p. 55). But if this is the case, then the person being pursued for some reason other than murder must obtain his purification by means of a far greater sacrifice (a full-grown sheep) than that provided by the αὐτορέκτας for his own purification (a piglet). Surely, it is just the opposite. The ξενικός or πατρώιος ἐλάστερος must be in pursuit of someone who committed a greater crime than simple homicide, and the nature of that greater crime is given by the epithets of the ἐλάστεροι, namely, ξενικός or πατρώιος: murder of a guest (or host) or a blood relative.⁷⁵ The next three adjectives describe how this ἐλάστερος may manifest himself, “either as one seen or heard or whoever at all,” the “whoever” referring to whatever other way the ἐλάστερος may make himself known (e.g., by his effect on the body or mind of the person pursued). These three adjectives therefore should not be construed as parallel with ξενικός ἢ πατρώιος, but rather as qualifiers of the ξενικός or πατρώιος, according to the way in which the ξενικός or πατρώιος is perceived.⁷⁶

75. It is also possible of course that the ξενικός ἐλάστερος is the ἐλάστερος of a foreigner. But the distinction here does not seem to lie between citizen and foreigner as in Plato’s homicide laws (*Leg.* 869D).

76. Plato uses the same sort of expression, though more elegantly and without confusion, in *Leg.* 865B: ἐὰν δὲ αὐτόχειρ μὲν, ἄκων δὲ ἀποκτείνῃ τις ἕτερος ἕτερον, εἴτε τῷ ἑαυτοῦ σώματι ψιλῷ εἴτε ὀργάνῳ ἢ βέλει ἢ πόματος ἢ σίτου δόσει ἢ πυρὸς ἢ χειμῶνος προσβολῇ ἢ στερήσῃ πνεύματος, αὐτὸς τῷ ἑαυτοῦ σώματι ἢ δι’ ἑτέρων σωμάτων, πάντως ἔστω μὲν ὡς αὐτόχειρ. The instruments of the αὐτόχειρ are all joined by “or,” and then follows “(either applied) by himself or with the help of others.” The last two categories, himself or with help, are qualifiers of the various instruments, that is, an instrument may be used by the αὐτόχειρ acting by himself or with the help of others.

The document states that the person pursued by a ξενικός or πατρῷος ἐλάστερος should purify himself in the same way as the common αὐτορέκτας, but his final sacrifice is different: a full-grown sheep, not at the spot where the host received him, but on the public altar, presumably to Zeus (Elasteros?). This progression from simple homicide to marked type⁷⁷ (homicide of blood relatives or guest/host) and from less serious crime to more serious, seems to be typical of homicide law, insofar as the limited number of examples allows us to generalize. The Draconian code on homicide, as preserved, begins with unintentional homicide and other lesser types, and must proceed to more serious categories.⁷⁸ Similarly, Plato begins his code on homicide with unintentional killing (*Leg.* 865) and moves on to more serious types, concluding with the most serious, murder of members of one's immediate family (872–73). The Selinuntine *lex* conforms to this progression, with regard to types of ἐλάστεροι: those who pursue killers in general to those who pursue more grievous killers.

What kind of a being was an ἐλάστερος? Supernatural, to be sure. But perhaps not a clear-cut god or at least not an upperworld god, for the law specifies that one is to sacrifice to the ἐλάστερος “as to the immortals.” Letting the victim's blood flow into the earth suggests a being that belongs to the earth or underworld, definitely the underworld according to the editors, and they may well be right, rare though sacrifice is to divinities of the underworld. Although the editors believe that the Selinuntine ἐλάστερος corresponds to the Cyrenaean ἰκέσιος ἐπακτός, or visitant (p. 119), this correspondence seems unlikely. The ἰκέσιος at Cyrene was evidently addressed ὡς ἀνθρώπε,⁷⁹ and there is no mention of sacrifice to him or her or purificatory ritual; this ἰκέσιος looks rather like a ghost. The ἐλάστεροι, on the other hand, seem to correspond, in function, to the figures we know elsewhere as Erinyes. They haunt murderers. Like the Erinyes (cf. *Eum.* 50–56), they are themselves polluting, and the suppliant must be purified of them. Though they differ from the Erinyes in that they receive cult, they do nevertheless seem to be the Erinyes' Selinuntine equivalent. There can be no question, of course, of identifying them with the Selinuntine Eumenides (A. 8–9). Thus Selinus offers us an example of Eumenides distinct from local spirits (Elasteroi) who resemble the Erinyes. The language of Euripides' description of the Erinyes suggests that the correspondence of Erinyes and Elasteroi was generally recognized: ὅσαι δ' Ἐρινύων . . . ἡλάστρου μ' αἰεί (*IT* 970–71).

That spirits were being heard and seen toward the middle of the fifth century who were apparently similar in function to the Erinyes and had such power that they were the subject of law, tells us much about the religious mentality of Greeks of this time. This Selinuntine *lex* confirms that the late-fourth century Cathartic Law of Cyrene is no aberration but simply further evidence of the variety of local practice in dealing with vengeful spirits: “Archaic and Classical Greece, one is led to think, was a more violent and spirit-infested world than is usually supposed” (p. 120).

KEVIN CLINTON
Cornell University

77. H. Pelliccia first suggested to me that a progression of this sort might be at work here.

78. Text and discussion: R. S. Stroud, *Drakon's Law on Homicide* (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1968) (= *IG* I³ 104); further discussion: *SEG* XL 15.

79. See n. 64 above.