

## ATTISCHE FESTE, THE EPIDAURIA AND THE ARKHON

---

*The Epidauria.* A standard, indeed a classic, work, L. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, in the course of a highly-praised section on the Mysteries, deals with the Epidauria. The Epidauria, which honored Asklepios, were a one-day festival which can hardly have existed with that name, and for that deity, before the formal introduction of Asklepios. Deubner determines the day of the Epidauria as 18 Boedromion, the day before the procession to Eleusis. (Without independent investigation, I assume this is correct.) The principal event of the Epidauria was another, lesser *πομπή*, the course of which presumably was within the limits of Athens. During the time of this procession, the Mystai remained in their houses.

*The Official in Charge.* The rites at the Epidauria were of course performed by the Priest of Asklepios, but the festival – the marshalling of the procession and all the other arrangements – were not in his hands. Deubner states (p. 73, line 3) that the procession etc. were in charge of the Basileus. In support of this statement he quotes in a footnote (p. 73, n. 3) Aristotle *AthPol* 56. 4, supplying the Basileus as the subject: *πομπῶν δ' ἐπιμελεῖται (\*ὁ βασιλεύς) τῆς τε τῶ Ἀσκληπιῶ γιγνομένης*. This is an error: the passage comes from Aristotle's section (56) on the (eponymous) Arkhon, and there is no question whatsoever that Aristotle means to say the Epidauria were under the Arkhon. Deubner cites no evidence; he had no evidence; as will be seen presently, there is not the slightest reason to think there ever was evidence, that the Epidauria were under the charge of any official except the Arkhon.

*The Error in Attische Feste.* For once Deubner slipped. He knew well that the Mysteries themselves were under the Basileus (with four elected Epimeletai, 57. 1; *infra*), and without careful thought Deubner assigned the Epidauria – which as he had

determined came in the middle of the period of the Mysteries – to the Basileus.

It may be notable that Deubner's chief predecessor, A. Mommsen, *Feste der Stadt Athen im Altertum* (1898) is correct about the Arkhontes, on p. 247, and again in 217 n. 2, where he quotes from *AthPol* 56. 4 the very same words as Deubner, but supplies (ὁ ἄρχων) correctly as the subject. So far from copying Mommsen in this section, Deubner had left him aside.

It may be notable also that all the reviews, which welcomed the book unanimously with hearty (and well-deserved) praise, alas! – but they had much to absorb – missed the present error entirely.

*Reviews.* *Attische Feste* is so important a work that the reviews, nearly all of which make contributions, are worth listing.

#### REVIEWS (Complete List) of

Ludwig DEUBNER, *ATTISCHE FESTE*

Berlin, Keller, 1932; anastatic reprint, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1956

- 1933 R. Carpenter *American Journal of Archaeology* 640  
 J. Leiboldt *Theologisches Literaturblatt* 305-307  
 M. P. Nilsson *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 1969-1974  
 H. J. R(ose) *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 146-148
- 1934 O. Kern *Historische Zeitschrift* 102-103  
 A. D. Nock *Gnomon* 289-295  
 H. Philippart *Antiquité Classique* 288-289  
 C. Picard *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 378-379  
 C. Picard *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 237-242
- 1935 G. van Hoorn *Museum: Maandblad voor Philologie en Geschiedenis* 43 (1935/6) 17-19  
 L. Ziehen *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen* 449-460

*Index in Attische Feste* (pp. 255-265). References to the Basileus are gathered under the heading Archon Basileus, but it would have been better to print (Archon) Basileus. There is no entry Basileus, not even a cross-reference. Under Archon Basileus there is no entry for the (erroneously ascribed) Epidauria, and none even for the Mysteries (for them the Basileus is first mentioned on pp. 70-71). Under Archon (Eponymos) – again insert parentheses, the epithet being unknown in inscriptions until the Roman Empire – there is of course no entry for Epi-

dauria. Under Polemarch add Enyalios 209, Harmodios und Aristogeiton 230. There is no entry Ares, despite the presence of Enyalios (s. v.).

It does seem fair to conclude that the lay magistrates did not interest Deubner. Many lay groups simply are not mentioned: there is no entry Arciopagos, Epimeletai, Bouleutai, Prytaneis, Strategoi, Ekklesia, Volksversammlung (e. g. 73, 142). Others: Kalendar is solely *makedonischer*; Dramosyne is lacking; there is one Pompe and no Prozession. But then there is no index of passages cited from Authors, Inscriptions, etc.

*The Epidauria and the Arkhon.* In Deubner's book as a whole, the official in charge of the Epidauria is only one matter out of the hundreds he deals with, and the last thing I should wish to do is to imply that even in the case of lay officials such slips are to be expected in his pages. (As to indexes, most are faulty.)

But the present matter itself is not a trivial one. To be sure, Aristotle, himself not an Athenian citizen and seldom if ever a participant, was not greatly interested in Athenian cults. (Of course he could not have participated like a citizen in politics, but he was no doubt vividly interested in contemporary politics.) With regard to cults, however, Aristotle is emphatic about both Arkhontes. On the Basileus: *ὡς δ' ἔπος εἰπεῖν καὶ τὰς πατρῶνς θυσίας διοικεῖ οὗτος πάσας* (*AthPol* 57. 1). In contrast, "The Arkhon does not administer any of the ancestral rites" (*AthPol* 3. 3; in the light of this statement, the details, in 56. 4-5, are interesting). On these facts, and evidently on them alone, Aristotle bases his inference (which I think there is reason to doubt) that the Arkhon was created later than the Polemarkhos. This applies, of course, to State sacrifices. There may have been other exceptions, but the only major ancestral sacrifices known that are not under the Basileus are under the Polemarkhos. He sacrifices to Artemis Agrotera and to Enyalios (58. 1; general statement, 3. 3).

Because the festival was intruded, as it were, into the Mysteries, the Epidauria, though I think Deubner is not alone in failing to appreciate its lay significance, are perhaps the sharpest case in point. From some date doubtless remote, probably from the Synoikismos itself, the Basileus *πρῶτον μὲν μυστηρίων ἐπιμελεῖται* (57. 1) – it is a duty of such outstanding importance that it is mentioned first and numbered first –; then from some date hard to guess (the text continues), "with the Epimeletai

whom the Demos elects, two from the whole body of the citizens, one from the Eumolpidae, and one from the Kerykes". It is a carefully contrived arrangement; but for the Epidauria it is wholly set aside. A quite different official, the Arkhon, is put in charge. The reason may not be solely because it was a late creation, nor because the Arkhon marshalled other processions as well, but rather because for the Mystai it was an unlucky day; at least, they stayed indoors. Unlucky or not, the day of the Epidauria gave them a rest in preparation for the ensuing strenuous days of the Mysteries. The relatively new festival was meant to be distinct, and giving it to the Arkhon helped to emphasize this.

Boston College

Sterling Dow

---

ON THE FIRST VERSE OF EURIPIDES'  
*ELEKTRA*

---

*Dedicated to A Turyn on the  
occasion of his 70th birthday.*

My dear Turyn,

I take this opportunity to wish you *πάντα καλά* and to iterate the profession of my indebtedness to you. We share a concern with Euripides; it therefore seems proper on this occasion to offer you a few lines about him.

Step by step, and largely through your immense labours, we have gained some clarity about the extant evidence for his plays – its kind, value and shortcomings; and we know that, without a well-founded notion of the history of his text, any approach to his poetry is liable to miss the mark. I am not now, of course, speaking of those who, for the benefit of the Greekless crowd, translate corrupt texts as fluently as sound ones, but of those who are concerned to grasp the real word of the real poet. They will, I feel sure, before long be provided, by students younger than you and I, with the full evidence for the Byzantine triad; for the rest of the plays with scholia, the same has already been achieved or, at any rate, is within our grasp. And, finally, concerning the 'alphabetic plays', we know that the slender evidence is basically authoritative but beset with numberless cor-