

Vom frühhistorischen Weltbild aus fragt man nicht nach der wahren Größe der Gestirne, nach dem Fallen der Erde, nach einer Vielzahl von Welten. Alle diese Fragen, sowie die Theorie des Wirbels, werden erst mit der Himmelskugel sinnvoll. Anaximenes und Xenophanes haben noch das alte Weltbild; erst Anaxagoras durchdenkt konsequent die Hypothese der Himmelskugel (§§ 4–9). Mit der Himmelskugel drängt sich allmählich der Gedanke auf, daß es kein absolutes Oben und Unten gibt, logische Entwicklung über Plato zum Philolaos-System und zu Aristoteles (§ 10).

Während sich der schrittweise erfolgende Fortschritt vom alten Weltbild über Anaxagoras zum aristotelischen Modell immer deutlicher und durch Originalstellen belegt abzeichnet, werden die nur von der Doxographie überlieferten frühen Vorwegnahmen von Himmels- und Erdkugel immer fragwürdiger. Nach den Ergebnissen dieses Aufsatzes bleibt allein Anaximander davon übrig. Diese Lage zwingt zu einer radikalen Kritik an der Anaximander-Doxographie: Die Himmelskugel ist in Anaximander hineingelesen worden (§§ 11–2).

Zwei Exkurse: Anaxagoras ist zeitlich vor Parmenides anzusetzen; Rechtfertigung der Deutung und Datierung des Philolaos-Systems in dieser Arbeit (§§ 13–4).

Kiel

Detlev Fehling

THE ORIGIN OF THE PANATHENAEA

- I. The problem
- II. Festivals of Athena resembling the Panathenaea
- III. Erichthonius, Erechtheus, and the Cecropids
- IV. Erichthonius and the fetching of new fire
- V. Hephaestus and the sixth-century reform
- VI. The ritual innovations: torch-race, *peplos*, ship-wagon

I. The problem

The evidence for the Panathenaea – for the procession, the sacrifices, the contests, the setting of the ritual, the aspect of the worshippers and the officiants – is probably fuller than for any

other ancient festival save the Eleusinian Mysteries¹). Doubt and controversy are not wanting; yet such outstanding questions as the difference between the annual and the fourth-yearly celebrations, the use of the *peplos*, the route and destination of the ship-wagon, the development of the administrative boards and of the program of events, are themselves a measure of the variety and extent of our knowledge²). But although so many details are so well illuminated, the centre is dark. There is no understanding of the origin and significance of the festival, of its social or seasonal purpose, and there has been almost no inquiry, only wild conjecture or blank indifference.

It is commonly said that the festival as we know it is adventurous or secondary, having been created or made over for political ends, and so preserves little or nothing of old customs and belief³). Some allow that an earlier festival on the same date was

1) It may be of interest to compare proportions in two general works on Athenian festivals, Deubner's of 1932 and Parke's of 1977 (n. 2 below). The Panathenaea receive from Parke about the longest treatment of any festival – 17 pages, as against 17 for the Mysteries, 13 for the Anthesteria, 10 for the city Dionysia, and 5 or 6 each for the Thesmophoria, Scira, and Dipolieia; the Panathenaea also receive the lion's share of the illustrations (pls. 4–19). Deubner by contrast gave 31 pages to the Anthesteria, 22 to the Mysteries, 16 to the Dipolieia, 10 each to the Thesmophoria and the Scira, but only 4 pages to the city Dionysia and 13 to the Panathenaea. Parke's preference is for spectacle and recreation, Deubner's for the rural and primitive side of Dionysus and Demeter; both scant the religious significance of the Panathenaea. It is also true that the archaeological and epigraphic discoveries of recent years have bolstered the Panathenaea as well as other festivals, but this increment is not reflected in Parke, who gives us no more than an *enarratio* of the Parthenon frieze, of the fourth-century schedule of prizes, and of the Lycurgan law about the Lesser Panathenaea, and is unaware that the first half of this law has been available since 1959 (SEG 18.13, 21.269, 25.65).

2) The main *ex professo* treatments are F. Dümmler, RE 2.2 (1896) 1962–1966 s. Athena; A. Mommsen, Feste der Stadt Athen (Leipzig 1898) 41–159; E. Pfuhl, De Atheniensium pompis sacris (Berlin 1900) 3–31; E. Fehrle, Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum (Giessen 1910) 179–183; P. Stengel, Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer³ (Munich 1920) 221–226; L. Deubner, Attische Feste (Berlin 1932) 22–35; L. Ziehen, RE 18.2.2 (1949) 457–489 s. Panathenaia 1; H. A. Thompson, AA 1961.224–231 (the games); J. A. Davison, From Archilochus to Pindar (London 1968) 28–69; A. Brelich, Paides e parthenoi (Rome 1969) 314–348; W. Burkert, Homo Necans (Berlin 1972) 173–177, cf. Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche (Stuttgart 1977) 352–354; J. D. Mikalson, AJP 97 (1976) 141–153 (the origins); H. W. Parke, Festivals of the Athenians (London 1977) 33–50. W. Fauth, KlPauly 4 (1972) 449–450 s. Panathenaia, supplies some further references.

3) My sampling of opinion is drawn mainly from the works cited in n. 2 above, as follows: Deubner 22–23, cf. 15–17, 35; Davison 29–34; Dümmler 1962–1963, 1965–1966; M. P. Nilsson, Griechische Feste (Leipzig 1906) 87; Mommsen 155–159; Ziehen 488–489; Mikalson 149–153; Burkert *passim*.

subsumed in the Panathenaea. Deubner postulated an ancient *Hauptfest* other than the Arrhēphoria, Plynteria, or Chalceia, presumably addressed to “the old palace goddess of the king of Athens”, the role which Deubner fleetingly discerned behind all the other functions and festivals of Athena. Davison like many others saw the Panathenaea reflected in a Homeric passage, *Il.* 2.550–551, which can only refer to the Scira (more of this below); without this warrant “the earliest form of the festival” vanishes entirely, and is unknowable in any case, if, as Davison supposed, the sixth-century organizers introduced “archaizing” rites as well as fashionable contests. Others have carried the process of reduction still further. Dümmler held that Solon fashioned the Panathenaea with his own hands out of elements taken from the Arrhēphoria and the Plynteria. Nilsson, speaking not of Athens’ Panathenaea but of similar festivals elsewhere, branded them all as late and derivative, arising from a desire to honour the goddess of the citadel with popular rites which were strictly alien to her nature.

Such conjectures as have been made about the original or the abiding significance of the Panathenaea are very unconvincing. Mommsen thought of a harvest festival honouring Athena as the true patron of agriculture at Athens, later displaced by Demeter; the harvest festival was subsequently re-interpreted and embroidered as a “victory festival” – why, he did not say. Ziehen qualified Mommsen’s view: the *Ur-Athene*, as disclosed by the studies of Wilamowitz and Nilsson, was no agrarian deity, but agrarian functions might still be attached to the palace goddess who protects both the king and his land. J. D. Mikalson has recently suggested that the festival was once addressed not to Athena but to Erechtheus as a “pre-Greek” deity, a “divine child” representing the vegetation cycle; Erechtheus and the Panathenaea are said to resemble Hyacinthus and the Hyacinthia of Sparta. Different again is Burkert’s view of the Panathenaea as a new-year’s festival marking the symbolic restoration of the civic order which was symbolically dissolved by the festivals of Scirophorion, the Arrhēphoria, Scira, and Dipolieia; he finds that when these festivals are taken together, the full range of deities, of aetiological heroes and events, and even of sacrificial victims, makes a pattern which reflects all the conditions and values of civilized life.

Some criticism of these views is needed, and will help us to understand the problem. They all invite one large objection in principle. It is generally recognized, or should be, that ritual com-

es first, and gives rise to myths and to the mythical features and attributes of the gods. Public festivals are the most conspicuous kind of ritual and recur widely in much the same form; the great gods are likely to be projections of the great festivals; witness Demeter and Kore above all. The Panathenaea are Athena's premier festival in Athena's favourite city, and the ritual – the procession under arms, the equestrian contests, the scenes of combat embroidered on the *peplos* – exactly matches the goddess' character. The same or similar ritual elements are found in other festivals of Athena, to be examined below. Then why suppose that the Panathenaea or these other festivals are foisted on the goddess at a late date as a political expedient? Or why suppose that the original focus of the Panathenaea was something remote from both the ritual business and the goddess' character, namely agriculture?

Such is the objection in principle – which also dictates a better method of interpretation, as we shall see in a moment. The agrarian hypothesis does not even fit the season of the Panathenaea, a mid-summer lull in the farmer's routine. In Attica the harvest came in Thargelion, roughly speaking, and was probably solemnized by the festival Calamaea of Attic inscriptions; the threshing came in Scirophorion, and was solemnized by the festival Scira and the conveyance of threshed and winnowed corn from Scirum to the Acropolis, from the sacred ploughland into the hands of Athena's millers; at the end of all these labours came the labourers' reward, the hilarity of the Cronia in early Hecatombaeon. From this moment until the ploughing and sowing of Pyanopsion the only agricultural rites were modest offerings on behalf of the seed corn (cf. SEG 26.136 lines 5–6, 13–14, offerings in Hecatombaeon and Boedromion as prescribed at Thoricus). The paradoxical attempts to connect Athena with agriculture or fertility have been sufficiently refuted by others⁴); some of the bits of evidence subserving these attempts – Athena the "Mother" at Elis, Athena Hellotis at Corinth and elsewhere, the Arrhaphoria or rather "Arrhetophoria", the nativity of Erechtheus and Erichthonius – will find another explanation below.

4) See Wilamowitz, *Kleine Schriften* 5.2 (Berlin 1939) 51; Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* (Munich ²1955, 1961 = ³1967) 1.442–443. The most thorough-going exponents of a maternal Athena are Fehrle, *Kult. Keuschheit* 169–201; K. Kerényi, *Die Jungfrau und Mutter der griechischen Religion* (Zurich 1952); and U. Pestalozza, *RendIstLomb* 89/90 (1956) 433–454. For Athena the "Mother" and Athena Hellotis see II below, for the Arrhaphoria and the nativity stories, III–IV below.

The hypothesis of a festival honouring Erechtheus as a “divine child” is the latest in the field and perhaps deserves more attention for that reason⁵); at all events Erechtheus must be reckoned with, for he figures largely in most accounts of the Panathenaea. The hypothesis requires us to discount the mass of evidence, including the very names “Panathenaea” or “Athenaea”, pointing to Athena as the object of worship and to rely instead on Homer’s notice of bulls and rams offered annually to Erechtheus (Il. 2.550–551), and also on the equation of Erechtheus und Erichthonius that is so dear to modern mythologists. These items can be firmly set aside. Homer’s offerings to Erechtheus as also Herodotus’ offerings to Athena Polias and Erechtheus (5.82.3) and Euripides’ offerings to “Poseidon surnamed Erechtheus” (Pap. Sorb. 2328 = Eur. Erechtheus fr. 65 Austin lines 93–94) belong to the Scira, not the Panathenaea⁶). The Scira comprised both agrarian rites for Demeter (well attested by many sources) and rites for certain deities of the Acropolis, notably Athena and Poseidon (so Lysimachides FGrHist 366 F 3) or else Erechtheus (so schol. Ar. Eccl. 18)⁷). Poseidon and Erechtheus are here the same. The relationship between the two names and between the god and the “hero” is most naturally construed as follows.

Poseidon was worshipped from of old on the Acropolis, doubtless beside the great cleft on the north face leading to the Mycenaean well, and doubtless as the power presiding over

5) Mikalson however has a predecessor, to whom he does not refer, in Jacoby, FGrHist IIIb Suppl. 2.509 n. 2 s. fin. While discussing the tradition of the Panathenaea apropos of Ister FGrHist 334 F 4, Jacoby “ventures a conjecture”, namely that in early days the festival consisted chiefly of the chariot-race and honoured not Athena but “her foster-son and (later) cult-fellow Erichthonius-Erechtheus”, and that Hippocleides first made it “the State festival of Athena”.

6) In all the direct evidence for the Panathenaea Erechtheus is never mentioned as receiving sacrifice or other ritual honours, a stumbling block which has been skirted in different ways (Ziehen 470–474 is fullest) and is ignored by Mikalson. Mikalson repeatedly mistranslates the Homeric victims as “bulls and lambs”, which sounds like a vision of the millennium.

7) The god “Helios” worshipped on this and other occasions (Lysimachides *loc. cit.*; Theophr. De Piet. fr. 2.44 Pötscher; schol. Ar. Eq. 729, Plut. 1054) is probably a literary rendering of Zeus Ἰππᾶτος, whose altar stood at the entrance to the Erechtheum and was reserved for offerings like those recorded of Helios (Paus. 1.26.5) and whose cult was distinctive enough to be carried to Elea in Italy in the fifth century; see M. Guarducci, *ParPass* 25 (1970) 254–256 no. 2, publishing a *cippus* inscribed Ζηνὸς[ς] Ἰππᾶτου Ἀθη(ναίου).

underground waters⁸); this function gave him a place in two of the seasonal festivals of the corn, the Scira and the Haloa (Eust. Il. 9.530). "Erechtheus" is originally the "Thresher" personified (cf. III below), a mythical figure emblematic of the Scira, whose war with Eleusis is one of many tales of violence which threshing evokes in the ancient world. But his name could also be heard as "Splitter" and was then equivalent to Poseidon, worshipped at the same festival. Literary and epigraphic sources abundantly show that offerings were made indifferently to Poseidon or Erechtheus or "Poseidon Erechtheus"; but in the fourth century or a little earlier, as Erechtheus' mythical celebrity reached its height, an oracle enjoined separate sacrifices for Poseidon and Erechtheus (IG 2² 1146, SEG 25.140; cf. Paus. 1.26.5). Returning to the Homeric passage, we find that the god and the mythical figure are already conflated: the sacrificial bulls and rams disclose the god Poseidon, but Erechtheus is sprung from the "fertile ploughland" like the corn which he threshes⁹). Both Homer and Herodotus (speaking of a sixth-century practice) attest the importance and the renown of the Scira in early days, before the conditions of farm labour had changed, or before the changes had made themselves felt: in Classical times, when much of the work, above all the threshing, was done by slaves and hired men, the Scira and other seasonal festivals of the corn lost their meaning for the Athenian community¹⁰).

About the equation of Erechtheus and Erichthonius it will be fitting to say more in III below, apropos of Erichthonius as the mythical founder of the Panathenaea. To put it briefly, this is a modern dogma with very little warrant in the ancient sources, who mostly keep the names, myths and rites altogether separate. Unlike Erechtheus, Erichthonius remained a purely mythical fi-

8) On the siting of the Erechtheum K. Jeppesen's arguments and conclusions at *AJA* 83 (1979) 381-394 are entirely cogent and could be amplified.

9) The Homeric passage has been treated recently in studies of the rise of hero worship; see e.g. T. Hadzisteliou Price, *Historia* 22 (1973) 136-137 and again in Arktouros, *Hell. Stud. pres. to B.M.W. Knox* (Berlin 1979) 224-226; J. N. Coldstream, *JHS* 96 (1976) 16. On any view of hero worship it is peculiar; if the above account is right, it does not illustrate hero worship at all. Erechtheus was first worshipped as a hero in consequence of the oracle or in a separate cult of the tribal eponym, on which see U. Kron, *Die zehn attischen Phylenheroen* (Berlin 1976) 52-55.

10) The prevalence of slave labour on Athenian farms is demonstrated by M. H. Jameson, *CJ* 73 (1977/78) 122-145. Hesiod, *Op.* 597, already speaks of hired hands at the threshing.

gure who was never taken up in cult. His story is firmly linked with the Panathenaea, however; as infant and as adult he prefigures the *pannychis* and the equestrian contests respectively; he was also drawn into the *aition* of the Arrhēphoria and could be identified with Athena's sacred snake, more commonly projected as Cecrops. Nilsson in his reconstruction of "Minoan-Mycenaean religion" compared Erichthonius and Hyacinthus as putative instances of the "divine child"¹¹), and thus gave a handle to Mikalson's theory of the Panathenaea and Hyacinthia as equivalent festivals honouring this divine child. Now the ritual background of the "divine child" has been variously conceived, and it seems unlikely that a single explanation will be found for the many figures of literature and art who have been or might be so called; it is therefore unwise to use the term in classifying festivals.

At any rate there is no connexion or analogy between Erechtheus or Erichthonius or the Panathenaea on the one hand and Hyacinthus or the Hyacinthia on the other. The Attic Ὑακινθίδες are deities worshipped at the hill Ὑάκινθος (Phanodemus FGrHist 325 F 4; cf. Bekker, Anecd. 1.202) or the shrine Ὑακίνθιον (IG 2² 1035 = Hesperia 44 [1975] 214 line 52)¹²); i. e. the place-name produces the cult title (and since two of the group are called Ἀνθήϊς and Αἰγληϊς at Apollod. Bibl. 3 [212] 15.8.3, names evoking flowers and blossoms, the place-name doubtless comes from the flower hyacinth). These deities were reputed to be daughters of Erechtheus, the hero of the Scira, only because their shrine lay in the area of Scirum (Λουσία, eponym of the like-named deme, was of their number, according to Steph. Byz. s.v., and the mother Praxithea is daughter of Cephissus) and they were accordingly propitiated in the festival, as we see from Euripides' *Erechtheus*; it was quite inevitable that an alternative *aition* should re-

11) Nilsson, *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion*² (Lund 1949) 531–583, *Gesch. der gr. Rel.*^{2/3} 1.315–324. At Gr. Feste 140, apropos of the Spartan Hyacinthia, Nilsson had already adduced the Attic Hyacinthides as demonstrating a concern with fertility.

12) M. Ervin, *Platon* 11 (1959) 146–159, followed by G. R. Culley, *Hesperia* 46 (1977) 286 n. 14, identifies this shrine with the "public sanctuary of the Nymphs" on the Hill of the Nymphs (IG 1² 854), for no good reason. The *parthenoi* or *korai* worshipped at the hill Hyacinthus are not "nymphs" in any sense; "Geraestus the Cyclops", said to be buried on the site in the rival *aition* of Apollod., is a narrative invention which may reflect an instrument of purification used in the Scira and also in the weather magic of the festival Geraestia (weather magic being the Cyclopes' domain) and in the cult of childrearing nymphs called by similar names in several places.

present the Ὑακινθίδες as daughters of the Spartan Hyacinthus (Apollod. *Bibl. loc. cit.*). Finally, the ritual business of the Spartan Hyacinthia, so far as we know it, is very different from the Panathenaea; the similarities which Mikalson alleges are trivial or illusory¹³).

There remains Burkert's view of the Panathenaea as a new-year's festival re-consecrating the civic order. In general terms this view seems perfectly correct, for the Panathenaea fall in the first month of the year and resemble other new-year's festivals in being celebrated on a grand scale and in featuring such acts of regeneration as the bringing of new fire and the offering of a new robe. It is something of a puzzle that the festival comes at the end, not the beginning or the middle, of the first month; most public festivals come either at mid month, i.e. at the full moon, or in the second quarter, from the seventh onward. Moreover, two or three festivals earlier in Hecatombaeon might be regarded as inaugurating certain aspects of civic life in the new year. The Hecatombaea of the seventh (as we may safely assume) are revealed by their *aition*, Theseus' arrival in Athens and his reception in the palace of Aegeus, to have been a festive gathering of the political and military arms of the community for the purpose of recruiting new members, adolescents and perhaps also aliens¹⁴). The Synoecia of the sixteenth are commonly supposed to commemorate the "synoecism" of Attica, i.e. the ancient *aition* is taken at face value; it would be more sophisticated, and more respectful of the evidence contained in Nicomachus' law code (LSCG Suppl. 10 A 30–53), to interpret the Synoecia as the "rites of the combined houses", οἴκοι being the "houses" or "lodges" of the phratries, and to infer that the number and aspect of these phratries gave rise to all the antiquarian lore about the political organization of Attica before and

13) Mikalson simply adopts Nilsson's scheme for the Hyacinthia without Nilsson's reserves; the points of resemblance are said to be a banquet, a *pannychis*, and the offering of a garment. Yet the feasting and other entertainments at rural Amyclae are quite unlike the civic splendours of the Panathenaea (and are described by Polemon fr. 86 Preller and by Polycrates FGrHist 588 F 1 as distinctive of Sparta); the *pannychis* and Apollo's *chiton* are ascribed to the Hyacinthia only by conjecture. For reconstructions of the Hyacinthia which improve on Nilsson's in several respects see F. Bölte, *RhM* 78 (1929) 132–140, and Ziehen, *RE* 3A 2 (1929) 1518–1520, cf. 1456–1458, s. Sparta.

14) See F. Graf, *MusHélv* 36 (1979) 2–22, especially 13–19; I amend his results slightly in the formula given above, and also suppose that the worship of Apollo Delphinus is a Mycenaean heritage.

under Theseus¹⁵). And no doubt the Cronia as a farm holiday were a new-year's festival from another point of view. Why the Panathenaea should come later than these festivals we can only guess; possibly the date was adjusted for convenience in the sixth century, when other changes occurred.

The Panathenaea then are a new-year's festival, and we shall soon address the obvious question, what power of the goddess of the citadel was to the fore at the new year? Burkert does not put this question, but deduces a broad pattern of dissolution and return to order, *Auflösung* and *neue Begründung*, of civilized life. Yet the significance which is thus attached to old images of conflict and prowess and victory is secondary and accidental; those images once had a more immediate and concrete purpose, and so did all the ritual business, parading and sacrificing and the rest. Burkert himself at many points in his work has brought us close to the unvarnished realities of ritual, which on the whole were more familiar to scholars of an earlier generation, to Nilsson and Dieterich and J. E. Harrison. Ritual is as diverse and incongruous as the rest of life, and must not be made to yield some over-arching significance.

So much by way of criticism. It is easy to see that the results obtained up to now are unsatisfactory; but can we improve on them? It will be objected that we know the festival only as it was celebrated from the fifth century onward, after it had undergone changes of uncertain extent. The objection is not compelling. The festival program, as already said, matches Athena's character as the armed goddess of the citadel, fierce, astute and vigilant; it may be added that Nilsson has traced this character to the Mycenaean period with unanswerable arguments, and that the *apobates*, the unique kind of chariot contest that was the leading event in the program, can hardly be understood save as a Mycenaean relic. Much other evidence points the same way. A goodly number of festivals of Athena are known elsewhere in the Greek homeland, especially in the Peloponnesus (II below); some are arguably very old, none is obviously late; all show common features, and the features agree with the Panathenaea. Festivals of Athena are

15) H. T. Wade-Gery, *Essays in Greek History* (Oxford 1958) 86–115, especially 95–97 (an essay of 1931 which antedates the publication of the relevant fragment of Nicomachus' code), connected some details of the "synoecism" with the ritual of the Synoecia but did not draw the consequences, and no advance has since been made in this direction.

agonistic festivals, and the games have a military flavour; there are processions under arms, contests in manliness, horse races and the like, just as in the Panathenaea. We may suppose that festivals of the warlike Athena were as uniform and as long established as festivals of Demeter the corn goddess, of Artemis the huntress, of Dionysus the progenitor of vine and fig, of Apollo the patron of public assemblies.

The analogy of other festivals of Athena has been neglected in studies of the Panathenaea, and so has another form of evidence, the myth of Erichthonius as the specific *aition* of the festival (III–IV below). Every Greek rite or festival has its *aition*, which however fabulous and bizarre is still a faithful transcript of the actions and the mood of the worshippers; indeed, the more bizarre the *aition*, the more revealing it will be¹⁶). The myth of Erichthonius runs parallel to certain other myths associated with festivals of Athena, and taken together they throw a flood of light on the ritual background. The story of Hephaestus' pursuing and assaulting Athena, with Erichthonius as the strange but valuable result, is not itself so very old; as we shall see, it probably arose in the mid sixth century, just when the festival was being refurbished. The god Hephaestus is yet another aspect of the problem of origins. He is by every token a late-comer to Athenian worship, both as a fire god at the Academy and as a god of crafts in the city; and he comes from a very alien milieu, being invested with the mystery of Pelasgian Lemnos and with the ribaldry of Homer and Alcaeus. Why was he received so cordially at Athens, and joined with Athena in the ancient rites of the Panathenaea and the Chalceia, and in the new dispensation of the Hephæstia?

It was remarked above that the Panathenaea might be regarded as one of several new-year's festivals at Athens, renewing some activity or resource that was under the protection of the

16) It is easier to state the rule than to find examples that will be universally acknowledged. Nilsson used *aitia* frequently and to exemplary effect in *Griechische Feste*, but not so much in his later work; the survey in *Gesch. der Gr. Rel.*^{2/3} 1.26–35 is not fully representative. They have no place in Deubner's *Attische Feste*. Burkert in a series of papers and in his book *Homo Necans* has found many important correspondences between myth and ritual, but the objective results are sometimes obscured by theoretical constructions. It seems to me mere ignorance of ritual that causes it to be discounted in recent and influential works on the topic of "myth" (and there has also been a blind revulsion against the obsolete doctrine of myths as ritual texts); there is perhaps no Greek myth, however embellished for literary or other purposes, that cannot be plausibly traced to ritual, and direct observation of ritual always continued to fertilize literary treatments.

goddess of the citadel. In what follows I shall argue that the Panathenaea and similar festivals elsewhere signalize the bringing of new fire for the new year; the fire is sacred to Athena as goddess of the citadel because it is so important for the welfare of the community, not only for the preparation of food and other domestic and social concerns, but for the technology of war. The martial games which follow the torch-race celebrate the new fire and exemplify its value. Hence too the myth of Erichthonius and the advent of Hephaestus. The producing and the bringing of the new fire are the procreation of Erichthonius and his nursing by Athena; these are common images for the new fire and have nothing to do with agrarian customs or fertility rites. In Hephaestus the Athenians discovered a deity of Panhellenic renown who personified the fire, and on Lemnos they discovered a fire festival honouring Hephaestus and comparable with the Panathenaea; therefore they adopted Hephaestus as their own.

II. Festivals of Athena resembling the Panathenaea

We shall first survey the older festivals of Athena (and of one congener) that resemble the Panathenaea significantly, proceeding in geographical order through Attica, the Peloponnesus, Boeotia, and Thessaly. The survey will also acquaint us with a few *aitia* to be compared with the *aition* of the Panathenaea.

1) The renown and the opulence of the cult of Athena Hellotis at Marathon presuppose a public festival, which may have been called either Ἀθήναια or Ἑλλώτια¹⁷). At Od. 7.80 Athena withdraws from Phaeacia to Marathon and Athens, and in the calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis the offerings to Athena Hellotis are by far the richest of all, and there are greater and lesser celebrations, as of the Panathenaea, although the lesser celebration comes but every second year (IG 2² 1358, LSCG 20). At the greater celebration the offerings are as follows: "for Athena Hellotis an ox, 90 drachmas, three ewes, 33 drachmas, priestly emoluments, 6 drachmas; for Curotrophos a ewe, 11 drachmas, a

17) For the cult of Athena at Marathon see S. Solders, *Die außerstädtischen Kulte und die Einigung Attikas* (Lund 1931) 15; N. Yalouris, *MusHelv* 7 (1950) 62; P. Amandry, *BCH* 95 (1971) 625 n. 105; N. G. L. Hammond, *Studies in Greek History* (Oxford 1973) 187-189, from whom I take details of the topography and remains.

young pig, 3 drachmas, priestly emoluments, 1 drachma; for the bearers of laurel branches, *daphnephoroi*, 7 drachmas" (B 35–39). At the lesser celebration they are: "for Athena Hellotis a ewe, 11 drachmas; for Curotrophos a young pig, 3 drachmas, priestly emoluments, 7½ obols" (B 41–42)¹⁸). Both the offerings and the processioners of the larger celebration are reminiscent of the Panathenaea. Moreover, the worship at Marathon comes in Hecatombaeon; it too is a sort of new-year's festival.

The festival very likely included games, at least in early days. The Hellotia known to Pindar (Ol. 13.40) were connected with Athena Hellotis at Marathon by some commentators (schol. Pind. Ol. 13.56a, d; cf. Et. Magn. s. Ἐλλωτίς); Pindar plainly meant the Corinthian festival (which is also dealt with in the scholia), but the comment seems to presuppose games at Marathon. Pindar repeatedly extols victories at Marathon (Ol. 9.89–90, 13.110, Pyth. 8.79), and though some of these are accounted for by the Heracleia (schol. Pind. Ol. 9.134e, 137a; SEG 10.2)¹⁹), there is room for games in honour of Athena too, especially if the Heracleia were newly founded in the early fifth century, as the fragmentary inscription, SEG 10.2, rather suggests (Pindar's victories however are of the 460's and the 440's). In later days, when the epigraphic record is copious, no games are heard of at Marathon, either for Athena or for Heracles, and indeed we might expect that the Panathenaea would eventually swallow up a local celebration occurring at the same time of year. In any case a passage of Nonnus to be considered below indicates that at Marathon as at Corinth Athena Hellotis took a special interest in horsemanship.

Athena's precinct, called the Ἐλλώτιον at IG 2² 1358 B 25, is securely located by an inscribed boundary stone (Praktika 1933.42) at the south-west corner of the plain of Marathon; if the stone was *in situ* or nearly so (and to judge from the freshness of the lettering it did not travel far), and if an enclosure wall and

18) The suppletion of "Athena Hellotis" elsewhere in the calendar, as receiving a young pig (A 56), is quite uncertain, and in any case should not have prompted speculation about the character of the goddess (cf. Solders *loc. cit.*).

19) S. Koumanoudis, AAA 11 (1978) 237–244 (cf. SEG 26.51, 28.25), now finds the Heracleia in a fifth-century epigram, but this (or any) interpretation of the fragment seems very insecure. The fourth-yearly civic Heracleia commonly restored at [Arist.] Ath. 54.7 and Poll. 8.107 have been expunged by A. Wilhelm, Opuscula 8.2 (Leipzig 1974) 1–8. If the Heracleia of Dem. 19.86 are the Marathonian, they came just at the end of Scirophorion or at the beginning of Hecatombaeon, as others have observed.

temple foundations belong to the cult, this was an extensive sanctuary. Argos too had a shrine Ἐλλώτιον (Mnemosyne 47 [1919] 162), but nothing more is known of it; perhaps it was identical with one of the several sanctuaries of Athena attested at Argos. The names Ἐλλωτίς, Ἐλλώτια recur at Corinth and at Gortyn in Crete, and Ἀλώτια at Tegea; evidence for the forms Ἄλ-, Ἐλ- will be considered below. Whatever the reality behind the name, this distribution takes it back to an early date²⁰). Athena Hellotis of Marathon was once a powerful independent deity, probably coeval with the Mycenaean remains on the acropolis nearby²¹). To suppose that the trappings of her cult were borrowed from the Panathenaea is perverse²²).

A version of the Erichthonius story was attached to the cult and festival of Athena Hellotis at Marathon; more surprisingly, yet another version was attached to the cult of Nemesis at neighbouring Rhamnus. It will be necessary to examine in some detail the evidence for locating the stories at Marathon and Rhamnus.

The evidence for Marathon comes from Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*. Nonnus gives the name "Erechtheus" to the commander of the Athenian contingent in Dionysus' Indian expedition; he is the posterity of an earlier "Erechtheus", whose miraculous origin is repeatedly described or alluded to; the first bearer of the name sprang from the earth after Hephaestus assaulted Athena and spilt his seed, and he was carried to Athena's "maiden-chamber" where the goddess suckled him by lamplight (13.172-179, 27.111-117, 317-323, 29.336-339, 33.123-125, 39.206, 41.63-64, 48.956). This earlier "Erechtheus" is of course otherwise known to literature and art as "Erichthonius". In Erichtheus the captain of Dionysus' army Nonnus means us to recognize Errechtheus the king of Athens famous for warring against Eleusis, for Errechtheus the king is elsewhere said to be either the son of Erichthonius (Eur. Ion 265-274, 999-1007), or, quite commonly, the grandson (Marm. Par. FGrHist 239 A 10-12, etc.). Nonnus therefore evokes the famous Athenian story of Erichthonius, and nearly all the passages cited above are fully conformable with the Athenian setting, which as we shall see in III-IV below spans the Academy

20) See A. Lesky, WS 45 (1927) 152-173, 46 (1928) 48-68, 107-129 (unprofitable speculation); Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (Basel ¹1955 = ³1959) 1.382-384 (a sharp antidote).

21) See R. Hope Simpson, *Mycenaean Greece* (Park Ridge, N.J. 1981) 51.

22) So Deubner, *Att. Feste* 27.

and the Acropolis; moreover, one or two of the passages seem to echo a passage of Callimachus in which the story is plainly linked with the Acropolis and Lycabettus (fr. 260 Pfeiffer; HSCP 72 [1967] 131, lines 20–29)²³). Yet at two points Nonnus refers to Marathon as the setting.

At 27.317–323 Zeus rouses Hephaestus to join the battle by recalling his ties with Athena and the Athenians. “And you, Hephaestus, maiden-loving bridegroom of procreative earth, do you sit still and care nothing for Marathon, where gleams the wedding torch of the unwedded goddess?” There follows mention of the ever-burning lamp, of the maiden-chamber and the chest containing the offspring of Earth and Hephaestus, and of Athena’s nursing. At 48.951–968 a child of Dionysus deserted by its mother is reared at Athens amid mystic revels to which Athena, Dionysus und Eleusis all contribute. He is suckled by Athena in her temple, just like Erechtheus (954–957), “and the goddess entrusted him to Eleusinian Bacchants” (958), whose ministrations are thus described: “round the boy Iacchus the ivy-bearing wives of Marathon circled in the dance, and for the new-born deity they raised the night-revelling Attic pine” (959–961). In this eclectic fantasy (in which Nonnus expressly recognizes three avatars of Dionysus at lines 962–965) the women at Marathon, coming just after mention of Erechtheus and receiving the infant from Athena, must be interpreted in the light of the passage previously cited (for Marathon was not renowned for any cult of Dionysus): the worshippers of Athena Hellotis conducting a *pannychis* are momentarily assimilated to Bacchants.

Thus Nonnus, a poet of very miscellaneous learning, knew not only the familiar story of Erichthonius but another which was laid at Marathon. He was sometimes addled by his learning, and the name “Erechtheus” in place of “Erichthonius” might be only a mistake. Quite conceivably, however, it was Nonnus’ source who used this name for the prodigy of Marathon, to distinguish it from the prodigy of Athens; for a similar *aition* deducible at Rhamnus also makes play with “Erechtheus”, as we shall see in a moment.

Another mention of Marathon by Nonnus suggests a different aspect of the cult. Erechtheus the commander drives a pair of horses which were sired by Boreas and then given by him to the

23) For the echoes see H. Lloyd-Jones and J. Rea, HSCP 72 (1967) 136–137.

earlier Erechtheus as the bride-price for Oreithyia (37.155–161); this team is afterwards called “Marathonian” (37.322). Possibly the rape of Oreithyia was sometimes told so as to represent the girl and her father as natives of Marathon; for according to Simonides Oreithyia was carried off from Brilessus (fr. 534 Page), i.e. Pentelicum, the mountain overlooking Marathon. Or possibly the horses’ epithet points back to the birth story. A third possibility, however, is preferable to either of these. Erechtheus the commander speaks of his “Marathonian” team while invoking Athena’s aid in a chariot race; and in the sequel Athena as patron of horsemanship gives victory to Erechtheus over Scelmis son of Poseidon, Poseidon being the other divine patron of horsemanship. Very likely then it is the goddess of Marathon, Athena Hellotis, whom Erechtheus is supposed to be addressing; as we shall see below, the main concern of Athena Hellotis at Corinth is horses and horse-races, and the same may be presumed of her Marathonian avatar.

To sum up briefly, Athena Hellotis at Marathon was perhaps as old as Athena Polias at Athens, and the customs were similar. At Marathon as at Athens the festival in Hecatombaeon was celebrated on a larger scale in every fourth year, with processioners carrying boughs and with sacrifice of ox and sheep; there was a *pannychis*, and there may have been games, with horsemanship to the fore. Here as at Athens observers said that Hephaestus produced a marvellous creature from the earth, to be nursed by Athena in her temple.

2) Nemesis of Rhamnus is the most enigmatic of deities, bearing a name which is a common noun in Homer (but of unusual form and meaning) and a moralizing personification in the *Cypria* (but with fabulous attributes)²⁴. It is likely however that the name “Nemesis” for the deity of Rhamnus is secondary, for a fifth-century dedication is rather cautiously addressed “to this goddess here, who possesses this precinct here” (IG 1² 828); the name suited the deity, and so did the story of Nemesis in the *Cypria*, which was surely not inspired in the first instance by this

24) “Nemesis as a cult goddess still seems to me to be an unsolved riddle”, said Nilsson, *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology* (Berkeley 1932) 170, apropos of views linking Nemesis with a cycle of ancient deities and myths in north-east Attica. For the cult at Rhamnus see Solders, *Ausserst. Kulte* 67–69; H. Herter, *RE* 16.2 (1935) 2346–2352 s. Nemesis; J. Pouilloux, *La forteresse de Rhamnonte* (Paris 1954).

remote cult²⁵). The story would suit a deity of the type of Athena²⁶), for Nemesis like Athena is fierce and proud and unwilling to consort with an amorous god, and she flees while he pursues. Moreover, the sequel has some resemblance to the Erichthonius story. The intercourse and the delivery are of a surprising kind – a goose trodden by a gander, and an egg laid in the wild²⁷). The offspring are nursed by another, namely Leda (she “gave the breast” to Helen, says Paus. 1.33.7). And the egg containing the offspring is laid upon a blazing altar in a series of red-figure vase-paintings of the late fifth and fourth centuries (Brommer, *Vasenlisten zur gr. Heldensage*³ 514–515); Erichthonius, we should remember, was concealed in a chest or basket and nursed by lamp-light in Athena’s temple.

In view of these similarities between Nemesis and Athena it is of interest that an *aition* of the cult at Rhamnus gives us “Erechtheus” again, said to be a son of Nemesis who established the cult after his mother had ruled as queen in the area (Suda, Phot. s. *Ῥαμνουσία Νέμεσις*; schol. Dem. 18.38; Paroemiogr. Gr. 2.769 Leutsch). No father is named, and as a queen ruling in her own right Nemesis had no husband. So at Rhamnus too Erechtheus was probably the outcome of a pursuit and an assault, but of Nemesis, not Athena.

Rhamnus had a festival *Νεμέσια* which was interrupted by warfare in the 230’s and then resumed with a subvention from a Macedonian commander (Moretti, *Iscr. Stor. Ell.* 25 lines 27–30). To this festival we may ascribe both the athletic and choregic contests for men and boys attested in the early third century (IG 2² 3109, cf. 3108) and the torch-race, probably of ephebes, attested in the late fourth century (IG 2² 3105 line 3)²⁸).

25) In the case of Themis, worshipped beside Nemesis from the fourth century (IG 2² 4638, etc.), Rhamnus plainly draws on the *Cypria*, not the reverse.

26) The cult statue wore a crown with figures of Victory, but other features of the statue and of the goddess’ reputation are admittedly closer to Artemis or Aphrodite. B. Petracos, *BCH* 105 (1981) 227–253, has made significant progress in assembling the fragments of the base.

27) W. Luppe, *Philologus* 118 (1974) 193–202, shows that the swan as a guise for Zeus had no part in the original story.

28) IG 2² 3105 has been re-edited by Pouilloux, *Forteresse* 111–114, and by O. W. Reinmuth, *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.* (Leyden 1971) 51–55. The fifth-century dedication already noticed, IG 1² 528, is inscribed on a base which supported the statue of a boy – hardly the victor in a torch-race, as the excavator, Stais, suggested.

To sum up, Nemesis at Rhamnus was a deity akin to Athena, worshipped with an agonistic festival, including a torch-race. Observers said that Nemesis like Athena was pursued by an admirer, and a strange encounter produced a marvellous creature, either Erichtheus or the egg containing Helen *et al.*, who were nursed by another after the egg was warmed upon an altar.

3) The Ἑλλώτια of Corinth, a festival of Athena Hellotis, included a torch-race and both athletic and equestrian contests²⁹). The torch-race of young men, νεανίαι, must have been a leading event, for it is singled out in the brief mention of the festival at schol. Pind. Ol. 13.56c. A full range of athletic contests will have accompanied the foot-race in which Pindar's victor excelled (Ol. 13.40). The equestrian contests follow from the Bellerophon story; the festival was said to commemorate the bridling of Pegasus (schol. Pind. Ol. 13.56c), and it was precisely Athena Hellotis who gave assistance to the hero (*ibid.* schol. d; Et. Magn. s. Ἑλλωτίς). The starting lines of two successive race-courses (for foot races) have been excavated at Corinth towards the eastern end of the area that became the Roman forum. Some votive figurines and plaques – stelae twined with snakes, horses and riders, reclining heroes, standing goddesses, and so on – were built into a wall supporting a terrace nearby. The race course and the votive objects have been connected with Athena Hellotis by the excavators, but in the absence of more specific indications this can only be a rather wistful conjecture.

Pindar's scholia give another *aition* besides the Bellerophon story, in two slightly different versions. During the Dorian sack of Corinth women sought refuge in the temple of Athena Hellotis; when this too was burned by the Dorians, most of the women escaped, but two sisters, Eurytione and Hellotis, were burned up together with an unnamed infant; plague ensued, and the cult and festival were established – despite the pre-existing temple – as a remedy (schol. Pind. Ol. 13.56c). Or else it was just Hellotis who threw herself into the fire at the end; but Chryse, the young, or youngest, sister whom she had “snatched up” and taken to the temple with her³⁰), was perhaps also conceived as a victim, equivalent to the infant in the other version (*ibid.* schol. b). Once again, as with the nursing of Erichthonius and the hatch-

29) For the Corinthian cult and festival see Nilsson, Gr. Feste 94–95; O. Bronceer, *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 128–161; E. Will, *Korinthiaka* (Paris 1955) 129–143.

30) τὴν νέαν τὴν Χρυσὴν ἢ Ἑλλωτίς ἀρπάσσασα: νεωτάτην Wilamowitz.

ing of Nemesis' egg, we have both a child and a fire on sacred ground³¹).

Thus the Hellotia of Corinth can show a program – torch-race, athletic and equestrian contests – which is like the Panathenaea, and a pair of *aitia* – a child consumed by fire in a temple, and Bellerophon bridling Pegasus – which are like the stories of the infant and the adult Erichthonius.

4) The Ἀλώτια of Tegea were an agonistic festival which made use of a stadium near the temple of Athena Alea (Paus. 8.47.4). This setting and the context in Pausanias bespeak a festival of Athena, and the name Ἀλώτια can be safely equated with Ἐλλώτια; the form in Ἀλ- was probably current at Corinth too, for although Pindar's scholia are bound to speak of Ἐλλώτια, Ἐλλωτίς so as to agree with Pindar, one of the *aitia* derives the festival name from Ἀλήτης the Dorian conqueror of Corinth (schol. Pind. Ol. 13.56b), a derivation inappropriate to the form in Ἐλλ-³²). The *aition* of the Halotia recalls the "capture", εἶλον, of Spartan soldiers; warfare, which recurs in the *aitia* at Elis and Pellene (see below), was doubtless suggested by some military aspect of the festival, e.g. a procession under arms. Moreover, the title Ἰππία which Athena bore at Corinth (Pind. Ol. 13.82) was likewise given to the cult statue in the temple of Alea and explained from the gigantomachy, when Athena drove a chariot against Enceladus (Paus. 8.47.1). Yet it is not expressly stated that the Halotia belonged to Athena Alea, and the inference is not quite straightforward, inasmuch as Athena Alea was honoured by another agonistic festival, and another cult of Athena existed elsewhere in Tegea.

The other agonistic festival, conducted in the same stadium, was the Ἀλέαια (Paus. *loc. cit.*), which had a wider reputation, appearing in several victory lists of Hellenistic date (IG 5.2.142; IG

31) Nilsson thought of the Hellotia as a fire festival, *Jahresfeuer*, like the Daedala of Plataea and other instances in which puppets are thrown into the flames. But since the bonfires of fire festivals are constructed out of doors in some special setting, it is then hard to see why the Corinthian *aition* situates the fire within Athena's temple. And the *aitia* of undoubted fire festivals – of the Daedala, of the Septerium at Delphi, of the Laphria at Hyampolis, of Asclepius' festival at Titane and of Heracles' on Oeta – are all very different from ours.

32) A form *Ἐλωτίς perhaps existed at Marathon, where the name was traced to ἔλος (schol. Pind. Ol. 13.56a,d; Et. Magn. s. Ἐλλωτίς). Note too Ἐλωός as a "Dorian" name for Hephaestus (Hsch. s.v.), and Ἐλωφεύς as son of Hephaestus (schol. Il. 5.609); all these names may be derived from a word meaning "fire"; cf. n. 71 below.

4.1² 629; IvPerg 156; cf. schol. Pind. Ol. 7.153e)³³). This festival obviously goes with the cult of Athena Alea nearby, and it may have included the ritual washing of the goddess' robe that gives rise to the myth of Auge³⁴). After treating Athena Alea Pausanias points to Athena Poliatis, the goddess of the citadel whose sanctuary lay on one of the low hills to the north (8.47.5). Yet the worship here was perhaps no older than the synoecism of Tegea in the Archaic period; whereas the site of Alea's temple was occupied or visited in Mycenaean times³⁵). Surely a cult so ancient and renowned might be credited with two agonistic festivals. And indeed the cult is expressly said to have incorporated different elements; for the statue of Athena Hippiia came, together with the story of the gigantomachy, from the outlying community of Manthyrea³⁶); an ancient statue proper to the Tegean cult, a work of Endoeus, was to be seen in Rome, not Tegea, having been removed by Augustus. Thus it is very likely that the synoecism of Tegea led to the merging of separate cults and festivals of Athena Alea and Athena Halotis/Hippiia.

Since Manthyrea contributes the statue of Athena Hippiia and so perhaps the festival Halotia, it is worth mentioning that at a sanctuary beside the Manthuric plain Pausanias heard of the marvellous suckling of a marvellous child; Ares begot a boy Aeropus on Aerope daughter of Cepheus, and when the mother expired in childbirth, he caused her breasts to yield milk nonetheless; hence the title Ἀφνειός, "Abundant", for the deity of the sanctuary (8.44.8). The nursing of Aeropus was as extraordinary as that of Erichthonius or of the progeny of Nemesis; did this sanctuary figure in the festival Halotia? Admittedly this is mere conjecture.

33) A votive capital erected at the Argive Heraeum in the late sixth century records victories at Nemea, Tegea, Cleitor and Pellene (IG 4.510, Jeffery, LSAG p. 169 no. 16); the Tegean games may have been either the Halotia or the Aleaea.

34) Auge's connexion with the ritual washing, already intimated by the Pompeian scenes of her undoing and by the analogy of Aglauros at Athens, is now made explicit by the papyrus hypothesis to Euripides' *Auge* (Pap. Colon. 264). L. Koenen, ZPE 4 (1969) 7–18, who publishes the hypothesis, argues for the festival Aleaea, but not conclusively. In Attica and the Ionian domain there was a separate festival named from the "washing" of the robe, and so there may have been at Tegea too; though it does seem that the washing of the robe or the bathing of the statue was sometimes part of a more extensive celebration.

35) See Hope Simpson, *Myc. Greece* 85.

36) Bölte, RE 14.1 (1928) 1255–1256, s. Manthurea, finds a possible site for the settlement Manthyrea and the shrine of Athena Hippiia.

To sum up, the Halotia of Tegea resembled both the Hellotia of Corinth and the Panathenaea. There were athletic and equestrian contests, and stories of war and of the gigantomachy, and just possibly of a marvellous child.

5) The Ἀθάναια of Sparta were addressed to Athena Poliachos, goddess of the citadel, and included athletic contests and horse and chariot races (IG 5.1.213 = Moretti, *Inscr. Ag. Gr.* 16 = Jeffery, *LSAG* p. 201 no. 52, lines 10, 65, 67, 75, Damonon's victory list of the later fifth century³⁷). As in the Panathenaea the citizens paraded under arms to the acropolis, where sacrifice was offered (Polyb. 4.35.2).

6) A festival of Athena at Elis was noted for a men's beauty contest, ἀγὼν κάλλους (Ath. 13.90, 609F–610A, citing Theophrastus, Dionysius of Leuctra, and Myrsilus *FGrHist* 477 F 4; Ath. 13.20, 565F), the beauty doubtless consisting in size, strength, and feature (cf. Xen. *Mem.* 3.3.12–13³⁸). The victors were crowned with myrtle and received posts of honour in the festival procession. The first-place winner carried Athena's armour, the second-place winner conducted the sacrificial ox, and the third-place winner carried the other sacrificial offerings. This custom resembles the men's beauty contest, ἀγὼν εὐανδρίας, at the Panathenaea, and reminds us that two kinds of prize are attested for this contest – shields ([Arist.] Ath. 60.3) and an ox (IG 2² 2311 line 75). At Elis Theophrastus mistook the armour which the victor carried in procession for the victor's prize, no doubt because he was familiar with the prize shields at Athens. The old men who carried olive boughs at the Panathenaea were also "chosen", ἐκλέγονται (Xen. *Symp.* 4.17), obviously in a separate beauty contest for their age group, so that the myrtle crowns at Elis can be compared with the θαλλοφόροι³⁹).

The Elean festival will belong to the cult of Athena on the acropolis of Elis, where the chryselephantine statue of the warrior goddess was sufficiently like Athena Parthenos to be ascribed to Pheidias (Paus. 6.26.3); at Elis, as at both Athens and Sparta (Paus. 3.17.4), the warrior goddess was conjoined with Athena

37) See Nilsson, *Gr. Feste* 90–91; Ziehen, *RE* 3A 2 (1929) 1455, 1509, s. Sparta.

38) For the Elean festival see Nilsson, *Gr. Feste* 94, who resolves the slight contradiction between Theophrastus and the other authorities.

39) Deubner, *Att. Feste* 29, and Ziehen, *RE* 18.3 (1949) 484 s. Panathenaea 1, object to a beauty contest for the old men, but on no convincing grounds.

the Worker, Ἐργάνη. Outside the city, at a place called Bady, "Sweet Water", Pausanias records a sanctuary of Athena the Mother and an *aition* about war and a sudden mating of men and women (5.3.2); if the worship here was part of the civic festival, the main elements of the Panathenaea are repeated at Elis.

After Heracles' invasion, says Pausanias, Elis had no men of military age, and the women prayed to conceive as soon as they consorted with their husbands; the mating took place at Bady with the desired result, and was commemorated by the cult of Athena the Mother. Now as everyone knows, mythical matings may sometimes reflect the very thing in the service of agrarian fertility, as when a chosen man and woman copulate in a newly ploughed field; the Elean *aition* has often been interpreted in this sense, with large consequences for Athena's reputation⁴⁰). Yet the details of the *aition* do not really point this way. Instead of a mythical couple we have a concourse of all Elean men and women, who cannot be conjointly engaged in a fertility rite. Nor are the women concerned with fertility as such, either agrarian or human; there is no famine or plague or miscarriage, the obverse of fertility which we find in myths of Demeter and Dionysus; instead the women's purpose is to restore the military levy. The *aition* is best understood as follows. Suppose that the citizens of Elis and their wives paraded from the city to Bady and conducted a *pannychis*, the sort of nocturnal revel that might lead (at least in imagination) to promiscuity, as we know from New Comedy. And suppose further that the men paraded under arms, or else that a sequel to the rites at Bady was a procession under arms, perhaps also the carrying of armour to Athena on the acropolis. These elements are similar to the worship of Athena elsewhere, and given the story of Heracles' sack of Elis, might well inspire Pausanias' *aition*. No doubt the "mothers" of Elis prayed separately at Bady on behalf of Elis' military arm; this explains Athena's title and does not imply any interest in fertility.

To sum up, the festival at Elis honoured the warrior goddess of the acropolis (portrayed as another Athena Parthenos) and included a men's beauty contest and a procession with offerings emblematic of this goddess; if we may appeal to Pausanias' *aition*, the men marched under arms.

40) See e.g. Fehrle, Kult. Keuschheit 183–184; Deubner, Att. Feste 16; Kerényi, Jungfrau und Mutter 20. Nilsson, Gesch. der gr. Rel.^{2/3} 1.443–444, while rejecting views of a maternal or agrarian Athena, could find no explanation for the title and *aition* at Elis.

7) The festival of Athena Κορία at Cleitor, called either Κοριάσια (so the inscriptions) or Κόρεια (schol. Pind. Ol. 7.153a, e), included both athletic and equestrian contests⁴¹). The games at Cleitor are first mentioned by an Argive victor of the late sixth century (IG 4.510 = Jeffery, LSAG p. 169 no. 16); later inscriptions attest several athletic events (IG 7.47, Megara; BCH 10 [1890] 326–327, Tralles; Robert, *Op. Min. Sel.* 2.1094–1095, Perge), and since Athena Koria like Erichthonius invented chariots (Cic. *Nat. Deor.* 3.59; Harp. s. Ἰππία, citing Mnaseas ἐν Εὐρώπῃ, says the same of Athena Hippiā), the festival was once known for chariot races. The sanctuary lay on a mountaintop some way off from the city (Paus. 8.21.4); the setting is also reflected in the genealogy which makes Koria daughter of Zeus and Κορυφή (Cic. *loc. cit.*; Athena Hippiā was daughter of Poseidon and Coryphe).

8) A festival of Athena at Pellene with several features of interest here can be deduced from a “stragem” of Polyaeus (8.59)⁴²). During a siege of the city “Athena’s priestess, following the custom for that day, put on a panoply and a three-crested helmet, and thus attired and being the loveliest and tallest of the maidens, looked out from the acropolis upon the multitude of citizens under arms”; the enemy thought that Athena had come to help Pellene. Here is a festival of the warlike Athena in which the citizens are assembled under arms in front of the acropolis; a procession has obviously gone before, and a sacrifice will follow. The seeming epiphany was compared by Nilsson with the ruse by which Peisistratus made himself appear Athena’s favourite, and he inferred that the city-protecting goddess was sometimes impersonated by her priestess. Although Polyaeus invites this interpretation, there may be another which agrees better with the attested facts of ritual. It was customary to exhibit or convey the Palladium, the ancient wooden image of the armed Athena⁴³), and

41) See Nilsson, *Gr. Feste* 91; L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta* 2 (Amsterdam 1969) 1095; R. Stiglitz, *Die Grossen Göttinnen Arkadiens* (Vienna 1967) 100, 106–107.

42) See Nilsson, *Gr. Feste* 91. The Aetolian attack on Pellene was narrated differently by Aratus, *FGrHist* 231 F 2, but this is no reason to discount the ritual details in Polyaeus, as Ernst Meyer does, *RE* 19.1 (1937) 357, 363, 365 s. Pellene 1; the attack, memorable as it was, came to be associated in spite of history with a festival which itself evoked the alarms of war.

43) The conveyance of the Palladium between Athens and Phalerum has been studied by Burkert, *ZRGG* 22 (1970) 356–368, together with the Demophon story; but Peisistratus’ ruse is not mentioned.

a fanciful observer might trace the custom to an occasion when the goddess was impersonated for some momentary end, either by a priestess (as at Pellene) or by a lay person (as in Peisistratus' ruse). At any rate this was a major civic festival which included a procession under arms; whether games were held we cannot say.

9) Athena Itonia at Coroneia was a warlike deity, variously represented with helmet, aegis, shield, spear, and a familiar snake, and the Pamboeotia were a proud national festival like the Panathenaea⁴⁴). The games were both athletic and equestrian. A *pannychis* is implied by another "strategem" of Polyaeus (7.43).

10) Games of Athena Itonias in Thessaly are attested by Callimachus (H. Cer. 74-75); since the "Ormenidae" brought an invitation to Erysichthon, they were perhaps held at Orminium or Pagasae, and were deemed to be very old.

These are the festivals of the Greek homeland which the *prima facie* evidence aligns with the Panathenaea. Some other cults of Athena and some cults or festivals of kindred deities (besides Nemesis at Rhamnus) might be brought into the pattern by plausible conjecture, but this would not greatly strengthen the present argument.

The points of resemblance can be summarized as follows. The warrior goddess of the citadel (or occasionally of some other quarter) is honoured with distinctive rites, which fall just at the new year at Marathon – and perhaps everywhere else, for all we know. There is a *pannychis* (Marathon, Elis?, Coroneia), and a great procession of the whole citizen body; the men march under arms (Sparta, Elis?, Pellene) and officiants bear offerings emblematic of the goddess (Marathon, Elis). The agonistic events include a torch-race (Rhamnus, Corinth), a men's beauty contest (Elis), and both athletic and equestrian events (Marathon?, Corinth, Tegea, Sparta, Cleitor, Pellene, Coroneia, Orminium?). The *aitia* give us the invention of horsemanship (Corinth) or of chariots (Cleitor) or Athena driving her chariot (Tegea), and also the birth and fostering of a marvellous creature (Marathon, Rhamnus, Tegea?, Cleitor) or a conflagration which consumes an infant (Corinth).

44) See A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia* (BICS Suppl. 38, 1981) 1.117-127, a full treatment which makes it unnecessary to cite the evidence here.

III. *Erichthonius, Erechtheus, and the Cecropids*

In IV below we shall come to the story of Erichthonius' birth and nursing and of his founding the Panathenaea – of how he invented and drove the first chariot and established the first games and appointed the first basket-bearers and bearers of olive boughs and set up the first statue of Athena and built her first temple. All this is the *aition* of the Panathenaea. As inventor and founder Erichthonius is expressly linked with the festival; his birth and nursing are not, but the *mise-en-scène* leaves no doubt, as we shall see. Between the birth and the nursing there is an intermediate stage, Erichthonius concealed in a basket and discovered by the Cecropids; this stage was added later to form the *aition* of a lesser festival of Athena, the Arrhephoria. By some accounts Erechtheus is likewise sprung from the earth, and in the line of Athens' kings he is enrolled as the son or grandson of Erichthonius; yet the stories about Erechtheus and his family go with the Scira, not the Panathenaea as we saw in I above. Before proceeding further we must dispose of Erechtheus as a seeming doublet of Erichthonius and explain why the Cecropids have intruded in the story. This can be done in summary fashion; the evidence is copious and familiar and accessible, and need be cited only for a few points.

First Erechtheus⁴⁵). His role in the Scira was treated in I above, and it was remarked that the equation of Erechtheus and Erichthonius is mainly due to modern theorists. Among ancient writers Xenophon, in a compendious reference to the birth and nursing and to the war against Eleusis, attaches both to "Erechtheus" (Mem. 3.5.10), and the biographer of the Ten Orators speaks of the ancestor of the clan Butadae as son of Earth and Hephaestus ([Plut.] Vit. X Or. 843E); both are prey to inadvertence. Nonnus is more misleading, for although he fancies the story of Erichthonius' birth and nursing, he repeatedly uses the name "Erechtheus"; but as we saw in II above, apropos of the festivals at Marathon and Rhamnus, the choice is understandable and may even have conformed with the Marathonian version of the story. For the rest the names are interchanged or identified by late sources, mainly grammatical notices, which have no authority at all⁴⁶). Against this we can set the nearly uniform testimony of literature and art, as follows.

45) Much the fullest account of Erechtheus, taking in Erichthonius too, is Kron, *Phylenheroen* 32–83.

46) These sources are listed by Escher-Bürkli, RE 6.1 (1907) 410 s. Erechtheus 1.

1) The two names Ἐρεχθεύς and Ἐριχθόνιος are perfectly transparent and altogether different; it is astonishing to see it stated in every modern handbook that the one is an altered form of the other⁴⁷). Ancient grammarians did better, correctly deriving Ἐρεχθεύς from ἐρείκω and Ἐριχθόνιος from χθών, though with fanciful interpretations. Ἐρείκω was inevitably heard as Poseidon's "rending" of the Acropolis rock; but a common meaning of the word was to "crack" or "grind" vegetables or corn (LSJ s.v. I 2; there are a dozen derivative nouns and adjectives for garden and kitchen products), and the frequentative form ἐρέχθω meant to "thresh" corn, as we see from its metaphorical use at Il. 23.317; given the season and the rites of the Scira, Ἐρεχθεύς can only be the "Thresher". It is generally and quite feasibly agreed that Ἐριχθόνιος shows the intensive prefix ἐρι- and means "He of the very earth" or "He who is truly of the earth".

2) Erechtheus and Erichthonius are separately lodged on the Acropolis. Erechtheus has his own precinct and shrine, adjoining the cleft opened by Poseidon's trident and overlying the "sea"; precinct and shrine are variously called δόμος, ναός, σηκός, ἱερόν, Ἐρέχθειον; the small square temple shown on modern plans (and often labelled the "Arrhophoreion") was perhaps built in the late fifth century, at the same time as the Ionic temple of Athena⁴⁸), but an earlier structure lies beneath. Of course the temple of Athena always overshadowed the shrine of Erechtheus, and Homer may well say that the goddess installed Erechtheus ἐῶν ἐνὶ πύλῳ νηῶν (Il. 2.549) – doubtless meaning "at" her temple, not "in" it. No other source, least of all Pausanias, suggests that Erechtheus' shrine was the same as Athena's temple or was part of it; and yet, if the same building housed both Athena and Poseidon, this would be a paradox that could not pass without remark⁴⁹). With

47) Most authorities, including Frisk and Chantraine in their respective dictionaries, take "Erechtheus" as a short form of "Erichthonius", which they correctly derive from ἐρι-, χθών. H. Usener, *Götternamen* (Bonn 1895) 140–141, correctly derives "Erechtheus" from ἐρείκειν but regards "Erichthonius" as an equivalent form with another element, ἐρικ-χθον-ιο; his rendering "sodbreaker", *vervactor*, is not so different from ancient views of Erechtheus. Mikalson, *AJP* 97 (1976) 141 n. 1, considers "Erichthonius" a "secondary formation" after "Erechtheus"; the logic of this is hard to see.

48) Cf. Jeppesen, *AJA* 83 (1979) 394 n. 68, citing H. A. Thompson.

49) C. J. Herington, *Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias* (Manchester 1955) 20, speaks of "the universal testimony of antiquity . . . that Athena and Erechtheus shared the same temple on the Acropolis", but there is no such testimony, only circular argument. For the "house", "temple", etc., of Erechtheus as a separate

the perspective of time the conglomerate "Erechtheion" will be seen as one of the stranger aberrations of modern scholarship. Erichthonius on the other hand either lies buried in Athena's temple, like Cecrops (Apollod. Bibl. 3 [191] 14.6.7; Marc. Sid. IG 14.1389 II 28–29; Clem. Protr. 3.45; Arnob. Adv. Nat. 6.6), or becomes the snake coiled beside Athena's shield (Paus. 1.24.7; Hyg. Astr. 2.13).

3) As mythical figures Erichtheus and Erichthonius differ completely from the outset⁵⁰). Erichtheus the ancient and worthy king is known not only to Euripides but to red-figure painters, who show him at the death of Procris or at the rape of Oreithyia – or at the birth of Erichthonius (Berlin F 2537, ARV² 1268.2)! Erichthonius the marvellous offspring of Earth and Hephaestus is taken back to the sixth century by literary references, and the presentation or the discovery of the infant is a favourite subject of red-figure painting (Brommer, Vasenlisten zur gr. Heldensage³ 262–263). Erichtheus and Erichthonius are juxtaposed and distinguished in Euripides' *Ion* and on the Berlin vase above mentioned.

From Erichtheus we turn to the Cecropids, the three girls to whom Athena entrusted the basket containing Erichthonius, with unhappy results. In some vase-paintings the infant or the basket is simply presented to Athena or Cecrops, but others show a scene of confusion and alarm: the basket has just been opened, and the infant and the snakes are revealed, and the girls run off. In the story of Erichthonius, of his birth and nurture and handiwork, the prying Cecropids are a pointless complication. The story is complete without them. We may infer that when the *aition* of the Panathenaea was already familiar, observers of another rite were reminded of the infant Erichthonius, and explained the rite ac-

entity see Od. 7.81; Hdt. 8.55; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 14.2; [Plut.] Vit. X Or. 843E; Cic. Nat. Deor. 3.49; Paus. 1.26.5; Hsch. s. οἰκουδὸν ὄφιν. Him. Ecl. 5.30 juxtaposes "the precinct of Poseidon" and the temple of Athena Polias.

50) For early renderings of Erichtheus see F. Brommer in Charites, Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft (Bonn 1957) 160–161 and Vasenlisten zur gr. Heldensage³ 262; for the same of Erichthonius, Brommer in Charites 157–158 and Vasenlisten³ 262–263; M. Schmidt, AthMitt 83 (1968) 200–212, pls. 73–76; C. Bérard, Anodoi. Essai sur l'imagerie des passages chthoniens (Bibl. Helv. Rom. 13, 1974) 34–38, 172, pls. 1–2 fig. 3–6. A South-Italian pelike from Policoro, of the late fifth century, shows Poseidon and Eumolpus on horseback, and on the other side Athena and a female companion in a chariot; C. Clairmont, GRBS 12 (1971) 491–493, pls. 4–5, identifies the companion as the daughter of Erichtheus destined for sacrifice, but this is unconvincing.

cordingly. It has long been recognized that the Cecropids prefigure the Arrhaphori, two young girls who served Athena by going at night from the Acropolis to a destination in south-east Athens, where they exchanged one burden for another, and whence they returned to the Acropolis⁵¹). These burdens and the purpose of the ritual are matter for conjecture, which since J. E. Harrison has strangely fixed on such things as snakes, phalli, real or pretended infants, and fertility or initiation rites⁵²).

To reconstruct the festival Arrhaphoria would take us too far afield and is hardly necessary, for we are interested only in the point of attachment for the Erichthonius story. It is naive to suppose that the Arrhaphori like the Cecropids tended an actual infant or else handled mysterious tokens which suggested fertility and offspring. Whatever the actual burdens, they were undoubtedly carried on the head in baskets. Lobeck suggested long ago that the girls' title, ἀρρηφόρος or ἐρρηφόρος or ἔρρηφόρος, comes from the stem of ἄρρηχος "wicker basket", and in the light of other -φορος compounds used in cult this proposal is far superior to any other, ancient or modern⁵³); moreover, the grammarians record a long

51) That the Arrhaphori descended through the cleft in the north face of the Acropolis to a sanctuary on the north slope was cautiously suggested by O. Broneer, who excavated the sanctuary and afterwards the lower reaches of the cleft, revealing the Mycenaean well; later this suggestion became a dogma and the starting point of every discussion of the Arrhaphori. But as Jeppesen observes, *AJA* 83 (1979) 386, the stairway shows no trace of use after the Mycenaean period. To think of the little girls as climbing down this vertical cleft in the dead of night, perhaps with swaddled infants on their heads, is both terrifying and ridiculous. E. Kadletz, *AJA* 86 (1982) 445-446, now points to Pausanias' use of οὐ πόρρω as confuting Broneer; it would have been appropriate to say that Pausanias' usage was not only noted but fully documented by Broneer, *Hesperia* 1 (1932) 51 n. 1.

52) For this line of speculation see Burkert, *Hermes* 94 (1966) 1-25, *Homo Necans* 169-173, *Gr. Rel.* 348-349. It has ostensible warrant in schol. *Luc. Dial. Meretr.* 2.1, pp. 275-276 Rabe, which somehow aligns and conflates the Thesmophoria, Scirophoria, and "Arrhetophoria" as expressing the same mythical and physical "principle"; but the ancient philosopher who stands behind the scholium and *Clem. Protr.* 2.17 and a sentence in *Steph. Byz. s. Μίλητος* - possibly Theophrastus, hardly Poseidonius or Apollodorus of Athens as Jacoby affirmed, *FGrHist IIIb Suppl.* 2.204 n. 77 - is so equivocal and tendentious that his testimony cannot be admitted until it is explained. In my opinion he starts from the use of underground chambers, to which he gives several names, in the three festivals: at the Thesmophoria the *megara* were opened to receive the slaughtered pigs, at the season of the Scira they were mucked out as a necessary and unceremonial operation, and at the Arrhaphoria (as I shall suggest in a moment) a lair of sacred snakes was entered by girls bearing food.

53) Etymology is most fully dealt with by F. R. Adrados, *Emerita* 19 (1951) 117-133, who has a new explanation for the first element of the word: it is the stem of ἄρρην in the sense of "male" parts, i.e. phalli!

series of words of similar shape and the same meaning which perhaps indicate a non-Greek culture term and help to explain the fluctuating form of the cult title. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in a comment which draws on general observation of Greek ritual, speaks of αἱ κανηφόροι καὶ ἄρρηφόροι λεγόμενοι as commonplace processioners (Ant. Rom. 2.22.2) – evidently the bearers of different types of baskets. The title ἄρρηφόρος *vel sim.* was indeed adopted in other cults besides Athena's, quite understandably if it referred to a type of basket that was distinctive and admired. Now the basket containing Erichthonius, round and wide and low, is prominently depicted in the vase-paintings, and it is often mentioned in literary accounts. This is very likely the basket of the Arrhephori. The Arrhephori, in other words, were small girls bearing large baskets on a secret nocturnal mission, and as such were said to reenact the task with which Athena charged the Cecropids, of guarding the infant Erichthonius.

This explanation seems almost sufficient, and would be entirely so if we embraced a view of the Arrhephori which cannot be argued here – namely that the little girls were engaged in feeding sacred snakes as a mantic ordeal. The secret nocturnal rite and the myth of the Cecropids resemble nothing so much as the feeding of sacred snakes, best known from first-hand descriptions of the cult of Juno at Lanuvium (Prop. 4.8.3–16; Ael. Nat. An. 11.16; cf. [Plut.] Par. Min. 14A = Pythocles FGrHist 833 F 1a; [Prosper Tyro] De Prom. et Praed. Dei 3.38.43), but also recorded or deducible in different parts of Greece. Sacred snakes always evoke a divine ancestor, who at Athens is Erichthonius or Erechtheus or Cecrops. If the Arrhephori were thus engaged, we see exactly why they were drawn into the story of Erichthonius' birth and nurture, already familiar from another context.

IV. *Erichthonius and the bringing of new fire*

After this process of elimination we are free to interpret the rest of the Erichthonius story as the *aition* of the Panathenaea. Euripides in some unnamed play, perhaps the *Erechtheus*, gave a vivid account of the birth of Erichthonius (Eratosth. Cat. 13, citing Eur. fr. 925 Nauck²; Hyg. Astr. 2.13): rebuffed by Athena, Hephaestus concealed himself “at a place in Attica” which was

thereafter called Ἡφαιστεῖος or Ἡφαιστεῖον⁵⁴); he surprised Athena but she struck him with her spear, so that he spilt his seed. Thus Euripides situates the birth at a place where Hephaestus was worshipped; it may be that Athena was worshipped here too. Other sources may or may not presuppose the same setting, for they give no indications at all, apart from Nonnus' mention of Marathon. Outside of central Athens the only worship of Hephaestus that we know of is at the Academy, in the precinct of Athena; other instances sometimes alleged are illusory⁵⁵). To infer a cult at Marathon from Nonnus, Dion. 27.318 (discussed in II above), is quite gratuitous, for given both the Erichthonius story as current at Athens and the common metonymy of "Hephaestus", Hephaestus' assault could easily be transferred to Marathon to explain a similar rite – scil. a torch-race, if we may anticipate conclusions – which made use of fire from another source than a cult of Hephaestus. Euripides undoubtedly means the worship at the Academy.

At the Academy Hephaestus was closely linked with Athena, Prometheus, and Eros, and this grouping is important here. The main precinct at the Academy was Athena's; within it stood an altar of Prometheus, and at the entrance an altar of Eros (Soph. Oed. Col. 55–56; schol. ad loc., citing Apollodorus FGrHist 244 F 147; Paus. 1.30.1–2; Ath. 13.12, 561E; Apul. Plat. 1.1); the altar of Eros bore a dedication by Charmus, a friend of the tyrants (PA 15520), and prompted stories about his relations with Hippias or Peisistratus (Ath. 13.89, 609C–D, citing Cleidemus FGrHist 323 F 15; Plut. Sol. 1.7). Torch-races were run from the precinct to the city, whether the starting point was the altar of Prometheus (Paus.

54) ἐν τινι τόπῳ τῆς Ἀττικῆς κρύπτεσθαι, ὃν λέγουσι καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου προσαγορευθῆναι Ἡφαιστον: Ἡφαιστεῖον Matthiae. *in eo loco, qui propter Vulcani amorem Hephaestius est adpellatus*. The masc. nom. in Latin might be a misunderstanding of the neut. acc. in Greek. The Latin wrongly makes Minerva hide, not Vulcan.

55) Solders, *Ausserst. Kulte* 58–59, gives instances at Agrae, Phlya, the deme "Hephaestiadae", and Marathon; F. Brommer, *Hephaistos* (Mainz 1978) 158–159, at the deme "Hephaestiadae", Laureium, and Marathon. The instances at Agrae and Phlya rest on conjectures of Svoronos (as Brommer observes) which need no refutation. Steph. Byz. has the entry Ἡφαιστιάδαι: δῆμος Ἀκαμαντίδος φυλῆς, ἐν ᾧ ἦν Ἡφαιστοῦ ἱερόν, but since inscriptions and even a ms. at Diog. Laert. 3.41 (cf. H. S. Long in the OCT, vol. 1 p. vii) show the deme-name to have been Ἡφαιστιάδαι, "the shrine of Hephaestus" is a figment of the grammarians. The form of the place-name Ἡφαιστικόν at Laureium indicates that it is not a shrine but some natural feature or local activity evoking Hephaestus.

loc. cit.) or the altar of Eros (schol. Pl. Phaedrus 231E; Plut. *loc. cit.*); they belonged to the Panathenaea, the Hephaestia, and the Promethia (Harp. s. λαμπάς, citing Polemon fr. 6 Preller; and many derivative notices). Also at the entrance, and so presumably adjacent to the altar of Eros, was an "old base" with a scene in relief (Apollodorus *loc. cit.*); a relief that seemed "old" to a Hellenistic antiquarian was probably Late Archaic, so that the base and the altar of Eros may well be coeval. At any rate the base showed the two fire-gods, "Prometheus first and elder with a staff in his right hand, Hephaestus young and in second place", and also an altar in relief that was shared by the two gods. In the light of this relief and of the rest of our evidence for the cult of Hephaestus at Athens, it is commonly and reasonably supposed that Prometheus was the original fire-god of the Academy, and that Hephaestus was an afterthought⁵⁶). Eros too will be a late-comer⁵⁷), but why is he there at all?

The torch-racers ran from the altar of Prometheus, says Pausanias; Plato's scholiast says with equal emphasis that the torch-racers of the Panathenaea ran from the altar of Eros, and Plutarch that the torch-racers ran from the "image" of Eros⁵⁸). These conflicting reports have been variously evaluated and reconciled; the true explanation follows from the points already noted. The entrance to Athena's precinct was adorned with a Late Archaic relief (as it seems) and with an altar of Eros dedicated by

56) See Wilamowitz, Kl. Schr. 5.2.18–21, Glaube^{2/3} 2.139–141; Nilsson, *Gesch. der gr. Rel.*^{2/3} 1.529; Brommer, *Hephaistos* 159.

57) Cleidemus *apud* Athenaeus reports that Charmus was the first to set up an altar of Eros at the Academy, and according to Pausanias Charmus said so in his dedication, but this is belied by the transmitted couplet; P. Friedländer, *Epigrammata* (Berkeley 1948) 108, rightly says that "πρώτος is an element of the tradition, not a part of the epigram". The tradition is doubtless correct; Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIIb Suppl. 1.72, has no grounds for calling it "polemical".

58) Plutarch's ἀγάλμα is somehow mistaken (the senses "ornament" or "gift", LSJ s.v. 1–2, are early and poetic and neither could be intended by Plutarch); in all other sources, including the dedicatory epigram quoted by Cleidemus or another, it is an "altar", βωμός; the note in Manfredini and Piccirilli's recent edition of the *Life of Solon* (Rome 1977) is inaccurate in this respect. Either Plutarch is speaking in ignorance of the actual object that was dedicated (and this is not unlikely, since he ascribes the dedication to Peisistratus, not Charmus), or a statue was added in later days, which Plutarch rather foolishly took as the dedication. Some think of an altar and a statue as co-existing from the start, perhaps set up by Charmus and Peisistratus respectively – see e.g. F. W. Hamdorf, *Griechische Kulptersonifikationen der vorhellenistischen Zeit* (Mainz 1964) 8, 75 – but this is neither plausible in itself nor commended by the evidence.

Charmus. In the same period Hipparchus brother of Hippias built a grandiose wall round the Academy (Suda s. τὸ Ἰππάρχου τεῖχίον). A boundary stone of the Academy recently found *in situ* dates from the end of the sixth century (Deltion 22 [1967] Chron. 46–49). Whether “Hipparchus’ wall” enclosed just the precinct of Athena or something more, the entrance to the precinct was probably marked by a monumental gateway in the wall – which might then attract the relief and the altar. In any case there was extensive construction at the Academy in the Late Archaic period. The construction must have provided for the starting point of the torch-race, which of course required a broad track. It was not feasible, we may be sure, for the race to start precisely at the old altar of Prometheus, somewhere within Athena’s precinct; therefore a new altar, the altar of Eros, was installed at the entrance, so that the ephebes could kindle their torches and sprint away: both Plato and Plutarch measure the race from the “kindling”, ἀψάμενοι, ἀνάπτουσιν. But since the fire was first brought to the altar of Eros from its proper source, the altar of Prometheus, it was still correct to say, as Pausanias does, that this was the starting point.

More of Eros in a moment. Prometheus like Hephaestus lusted for Athena; the story confirms our inference that the encounter which produced Erichthonius took place at the Academy. Duris explained the punishment of Prometheus from this affair, διὰ τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐρασθῆναι (schol. Apoll. Rhod. 2.1249, citing Duris FGrHist 76 F 47). Duris further said that dwellers in the Caucasus refused to worship Zeus and Athena, and honoured Heracles instead, because of their respective roles vis-à-vis Prometheus; yet we must not suppose that historians of Alexander, in recounting the customs of the Caucasus, simply invented the imbroglio of Prometheus and Athena⁵⁹), which would then be extremely far-fetched; it is rather that this Athenian story was sufficiently well known to be invoked in a very different context. On the other hand it would be rash to assume that Duris alone preserves the original form of the Erichthonius story, antedating the advent of Hephaestus at the Academy; Prometheus might equally be a later variant. But that the stories are related should be obvious.

These tales of lust throw light on the altar of Eros. It was

59) So Jacoby on Duris F 47.

predictably said that Charmus was the lover of Hippias (Cleidemus *apud* Athenaeus) or Peisistratus the lover of Charmus (Plutarch), and other writers dwell on the social or the cosmic significance of the cult of Eros. The only direct evidence however is the epigram inscribed on the altar, as quoted by Cleidemus⁶⁰: “Eros of manifold devices, to you Charmus set up this altar at the shaded boundary of the *gymnasion*”. This epigram does not identify Charmus as a gratified lover or as an early adept in the homosexual ways of the *gymnasium*. The epithet ποικιλομήχανος, though a *hapax*, is only a variation of other epithets applied to several deities in early poetry, ποικιλομήτης, πολυμήχανος and πολύμητις; the last is applied to Hephaestus at Il. 21.355, where his power as fire-god is to the fore. In the *gymnasion* or exercise ground of the Academy Athenians of the late sixth century trained for the races and other events at the Panathenaea and doubtless other festivals. So the altar of Eros does not represent a new outlook; it expresses a familiar aspect of the worship of Athena, Prometheus and Hephaestus, the aspect which is also expressed in the Erichthonius story and which, as we shall see, is associated everywhere with new fire. For the moment we need only observe that the Erichthonius story was current and perhaps *à la mode* in the later sixth century, when Bathycles of Magnesia depicted Hephaestus and Athena on the Amyclaeon throne, and when, very probably, it was taken up in the epic *Danaïs* (more of this below). In setting up the altar of Eros at the Academy, Charmus could not conceivably have been unmindful of the *eros* that produced Erichthonius.

Leaving the Academy, we follow Erichthonius to his nursing. The Cecropids are entrusted with the infant's basket; we saw in III above that this episode is secondary and does not affect the outcome; but we should note the setting. The Cecropids keep vigil on the Acropolis, whence the guilty sisters leap to their doom. Ovid describes their quarters on the Acropolis, not indeed with reference to Erichthonius, but in a sequel, Hermes' trysting with one of the sisters, which he likewise takes from Callimachus and knits together with the Erichthonius story (Met. 2.552–565,

60) Athenaeus seems to cite the epigram from Cleidemus, but there are doubts about the name and the sequence; see Jacoby on Anticleides FGrHist 140 F 6 and Cleidemus FGrHist 323 F 15. The literary source does not matter here, since the epigram looks authentic in any case – and even if it were not, the present argument in respect of Eros would stand.

708–835)⁶¹). The Cecropids occupy “a secluded part of a building”, three adjoining rooms entered by a common door with valves (lines 737–739, 814–815, 819); this can only be the west chamber of the Parthenon, divided into three parts by parallel columns – i.e. the παρθενών proper, the “maiden chamber” destined here as in some other cults for maiden servitors of the deity⁶²). But Euphorion, in a very fragmentary passage dealing with the vigil of the Cecropids, mentions a “lamp” which is almost certainly Athena’s (fr. 9 Powell, 11 van Groningen, line 3)⁶³); this lamp, in the sculptural form imparted by Callimachus, was kept in the Ionic temple that succeeded the Archaic temple (Paus. 1.26.6; cf. Str. 9.1.16, p. 396).

Athena fostered Erichthonius in her temple on the Acropolis. In Apollodorus’ narrative the fostering leads to the story of the Cecropids and is resumed afterwards “in the precinct” (Bibl. 3 [189–190] 14.6.4–6); according to Hyginus Erichthonius in snake form fled from the opened basket to Athena’s shield “and was reared by her” (Astr. 2.13). Athenian vase-painters know the fostering as well as the presentation of the infant to Athena and the opening of the basket by the Cecropids; Athena and Erichthonius are shown in privacy together, the latter as a bouncing boy, on at least four vases spanning the whole fifth century, of which three were votive offerings found on the Acropolis (Athens, Acr. 433, ARV² 216.10, c. 500–490 B.C.; Athens, Acr. 396, ARV² 628.1, c. 450 B.C.; Louvre CA 681, c. 450 B.C.; Athens, Acr. 1193, c. 400 B.C.)⁶⁴). Athena faces or dandles the boy; in one scene, Acr. 396, he wears a wreath and drinks from a phiale. Athena’s fostering –

61) A. Henrichs, in a paper to appear in the forthcoming volume for M. Gigante, will present a new decipherment of a passage of Philodemus *De Pietate*, P. Herc. 243 II, which puts it beyond doubt that Callimachus like Ovid told of a Cecropid turned to stone for obstructing Hermes.

62) A. B. Cook, *Zeus* (Cambridge 1914–1940) 3.246 n., rightly noted the particularity of Ovid’s description, but thought that he had somehow blended the “Erechtheium”, i.e. the Ionic temple of Athena, with the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol. The Cecropids stand for the Arrhephori, and Pausanias, speaking of the Arrhephori apropos of Pandrosos (to whom, together with Athena, statues of Arrhephori are sometimes dedicated: IG 2² 3472, 3488 as restored, 3515), says that the girls “dwell not far from the temple of the Polias” (1.27.3); this might well be the west chamber of the Parthenon.

63) Despite van Groningen’s comments on pp. 32, 37 of his edition of Euphorion (Amsterdam 1977), Athena’s lamp is not elsewhere connected with the Cecropids. Cf. Burkert, *Hermes* 94 (1966) 11.

64) The vases are illustrated and discussed by Kron, *Phylenheroen* 72–75, 254–255, pls. 7.1–2, 8.1–3 (E 35–37, E 40 in her catalogue); she rejects two other putative instances.

τρέφειν in Apollodorus, *educare* in Hyginus – can be evoked by the dandling and the drinking from a phiale. Nonnus however, who repeatedly refers to both the birth and the fostering of Erichthonius, says just as often that Athena suckled him at her breast, a paradox which he enjoys – she is a maiden mother with a “male breast”, and so on (Dion. 13.173–177, 27.113–115, 319–323, 29.338–339, 48.956–957). Nonnus undoubtedly took the scene and the language from some Hellenistic poet. The fostering of Erichthonius was thought of no less concretely than his begetting.

Nonnus insists on certain other details which must likewise come from his Hellenistic source: the nursing was done by lamp-light in Athena’s maiden-chamber, and the light was kindled by Hephaestus. The phrases in question deserve to be quoted. Athena suckles Erichthonius “in a recess of her torchlit maiden-chamber”, πυρσοφόροιο κατὰ πύχα παρθενεῶνος (13.173), or does so in secret “by the wakeful gleaming lamp”, ἀγρύπνῳι . . . αἴθοπι λύχνῳι (27.115). When Athena and Hephaestus enter the fray together, it may be that Hephaestus has “kindled the bright torch of the Cecropian lamp”, Κεκροπίου λύχνῳιο φεραυγέα δαλὸν ἀνάψας (33.124). At 27.317–323, a passage discussed in II above, the nursing together with the maiden-chamber, the lamp and perhaps torches are transferred to Marathon; here are “the mystical sparks of your ever-burning lamp”, i.e. Hephaestus’, μυστιπόλους σπινθήρας ἀειφανέος σέο λύχνου (27.320), and here is the “wedding torch-light”, γάμιον σέλας, of Athena as Hephaestus’ bride (27.319). From these passages the following picture emerges. A chamber in a temple of Athena is illuminated by a lamp (13.173, 27.115); the lamp has been lit from torches (33.124, cf. 27.319); the torches and therefore the lamp have been kindled by Hephaestus (33.124, 27.320, cf. 27.319).

Nonnus’ source was addressing readers familiar with the Acropolis and expected them to see the lamp-lit chamber with the mind’s eye. Yet his indications create a dilemma. The “maiden-chamber”, παρθενεῶν (13.173, 27.117, 321), points to the Doric temple and particularly to the west chamber, where Ovid and doubtless Callimachus before him situate the Cecropids or Ar-rhaphori. Yet the sacred lamp, for such it is⁶⁵, points to the Ionic

65) It might be said that a lamp was often needed by nursing mothers (cf. Lys. 1.14) and for nocturnal rites and might therefore be found in the west chamber of the Parthenon; but this is a lamp of special sanctity, kindled by Hephaestus and also said to be “ever-burning”, the leading attribute of the lamp in the Ionic temple (Paus., Str. *loc. cit.*, Plut. Numa 9.12, Sulla 13.3).

temple, and agrees with Euphoriion's mention of the Cecropids. The dilemma is not due to modern subtlety or modern ignorance; it was proposed to ancient readers by these repeated indications. It is very unlikely that Nonnus himself spliced these indications from different sources; but even if he did, we are left with conflicting views of the setting, as between Callimachus and Euphoriion. There can be no doubt that two different settings were envisaged, the Ionic temple and the west chamber of the Parthenon. The explanation is that the nursing was traced to two different rites, the Panathenaea and the Arrhēphoria. The features of the Arrhēphoria which lent themselves to this aetiology were considered in III above; it may be added here that as a nocturnal rite the Arrhēphoria made use of torches, not surprisingly (HSCP Suppl. 1 [1940] 521–530 lines 32–34, Oliver's re-edition of the honours for Julia Domna, in which the officiants who "set up a torch" are convincingly restored as the Arrhēphori⁶⁶). The Parthenon setting goes with the Arrhēphoria and can be disregarded for our purposes⁶⁷).

The details of Erichthonius' birth and nursing have now been fully canvassed. The story in brief is this. Hephaestus or Prometheus desired Athena, and at the Academy, where these fire-gods and also the god Desire were held in honour, the fire-god's desire was consummated in such fashion that a marvellous creature, Erichthonius, sprang from the earth; Athena then nursed him in her temple on the Acropolis beside the sacred lamp. It is obvious at a glance that the story is a ritual *aition* and that the rite is the bringing of new fire from the Academy to the Acropolis. This was done at the Panathenaea, on the night preceding the great procession and sacrifice of Hecatombaeon 28: ephebes kindled torches at the altar of Desire and ran a relay-race to Athens, and the victor's torch was used to light the fire for sacrifices to Athena (schol. Pl. Phaedrus 231E). The myth and the rite correspond exactly, and the correspondence proves again what has been argued on other grounds, that the Arrhēphori and the Cecropids are interlopers.

Erichthonius was enrolled, as we might expect, in the line of Athens' kings, coming between Amphictyon and Pandion; but his

66) θύειν] δὲ καὶ τὰς [ἀρρη]||[φόρ]ους τὰς ἀπολυ[ομένα]ς καὶ δᾶ[ι]δα ἰσ]τᾶν κτλ.

67) Before the Parthenon was built the Arrhēphori may have been lodged, or may have performed some duties, in the Archaic temple of Athena; but such early practice will not be reflected in Hellenistic renderings of the myth.

only act is to found the Panathenaea and to ordain or invent the festival gear. After his birth and fostering he became king “and set up the *xoanon* of Athena on the Acropolis and instituted the festival Panathenaea”, says Apollodorus (Bibl. 3 [190] 14.6.6); after his birth and fostering, *primo tempore adulescentiae*, “he held the games of the Panathenaea for Minerva and himself competed in the chariot-race”, says Hyginus (Astr. 2.13); similarly other sources. This sequence presupposes that the fetching of new fire was the start of the festival, to be followed by the procession and sacrifice and then by the games. In historical times the extensive and extensible program of events at the fourth-yearly Panathenaea must have begun well before the torch-race and the sacrifice of the 28th⁶⁸), but the events that preceded were doubtless the later innovations. We may safely assume that the premier event, the *apobates*, was always staged immediately after the sacrifice.

The tradition of Erichthonius' founding the Panathenaea is invariable (Harp. s. Παναθήναια, citing Hellanicus FGrHist 323a F 2 and Androtion FGrHist 324 F 2)⁶⁹), and must have been age-old. The Panathenaea are reckoned the oldest of festivals (Marm. Par. FGrHist 239 F 10) – or the second oldest, if the renown of Eleusis gives first place to the Eleusinia ([Arist.] Peplus fr. 637 Rose). As founder of the Panathenaea Erichthonius is above all the inventor of the chariot and of the *apobates* event. The rest of his dispensation is plainly secondary – the *xoanon* (Apollod. *loc. cit.*), sacrifices and temple (Hyg. *loc. cit.*), *kanephoroi* and *thallophoroi* (Philochorus FGrHist 328 F 8–9), and so on. His reputation for introducing money to Athens (Plin. Hist. Nat. 7.197; Hyg. Fab. 274.4; Poll. 9.83) comes from the money prizes for some events, itself a late development.

The *apobates* event, a favourite subject in Athenian art of the Classical period, both vase-painting and relief sculpture, is taken back to the eighth century by several Geometric vases⁷⁰). Erich-

68) See e.g. Ziehen, RE 18.3 (1949) 474 s. Panathenaea 1; Mikalson, The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year (Princeton 1975) 34.

69) In view of Plut. Thes. 24.3–4 Jacoby insisted on distinguishing a rival tradition which made Theseus founder of the Panathenaea: see Das Marmor Parium (Berlin 1904) 45–46 and his comment on FGrHist 239 A 10 and FGrHist 334 F 4. This is a wrong emphasis. Nothing could displace Erichthonius as originator of the *apobates* event and hence of the *Ur-Panathenaea*; Theseus was merely said to have extended the festival to all the inhabitants of Attica, a step which was sometimes correlated with a change of name, from “Athenaea” to “Panathenaea”.

70) For renderings of the *apobates* event and of Erichthonius therein, see Kron, Phylenheroen 75–76.

thonius is plausibly identified in two black-figure scenes which show Athena beside her favourite (Berlin 2049, ABV 390; Copenhagen 108, ABV 435.1); in one, Berlin 2049, Erichthonius is the *apobates*, in the other Athena. Other renderings of Erichthonius as charioteer or *apobates* are moot, whether in red-figure painting or in the sculpture of the Parthenon and the Ionic temple; but a scholiast on Aristeides records a painting on the Acropolis which showed Erichthonius “behind” Athena, “driving a chariot” (Panath. 3.62 Dindorf). It is this event that gives Erichthonius his place among inventors, as the first charioteer (Marm. Par. FGrHist 239 A 10, etc.), and exalts him to the sky as the constellation Auriga (Eratosth. Cat. 13, etc.).

Thus the elements of the Panathenaea that are reflected in the original myth of Erichthonius are the fetching of new fire and the *apobates* event. The festival once consisted solely or chiefly of these elements, together with the procession and sacrifice. It need not have been an agonistic festival to begin with, for an officiant might bring new fire, and a charioteer and his passenger might display their skill, without a competition. The torch-race is surely a later refinement, since the myth of Prometheus as originally told does not suggest a race of any kind, least of all a relay-race of ephebes. And the *apobates* event was formerly a display of martial prowess, not a race or other form of contest, if we may trust the implications of another *aition*, the gigantomachy or rather Athena’s part in it. The scene of combat interwoven in Athena’s robe showed the goddess in her chariot (Eur. Hec. 466–471, etc.), and was therefore an *aition* of the *apobates* event. It is not surprising however that from this beginning the Panathenaea became a full-fledged agonistic festival, like most of the other festivals of Athena examined in II above.

The *aitia* attached to these other festivals disclose the same original elements. We can now recognize the fetching of new fire at Rhamnus, where Nemesis’ egg is warmed upon an altar; at Corinth, where an infant is consumed in a fire within Athena’s temple; and possibly at Tegea, where the infant Aeropus is miraculously suckled after his mother’s death⁷¹). And although in

71) In the light of this result a conjecture may be offered about the ritual nomenclature at Marathon, Corinth, and Tegea (cf. II above). The festival is called Ἐλλώτια, *Ἐλώτια, Ἀλώτια, and Athena bears a like epithet, sometimes thought to be the name of an earlier deity. The fire-god Hephaestus was called Ἐλωός (and his son Ἐλωρεύς) – among the Dorians, says Hesychius, and so no

these festivals as in the Panathenaea we usually find a full agonistic program, it is an equestrian feat, not visibly performed in competition, which forms the *aition* at Corinth, Tegea, and Cleitor – Bellerophon and Athena bridling Pegasus, Athena driving her chariot in the gigantomachy, and Athena inventing the chariot.

We have restricted comparison to festivals of Athena (and to one of Nemesis). But other city-protecting deities preside over other new-year's festivals, and it is worth noting that similar rites in the service of other deities give rise to similar stories⁷²). In V below we shall consider the Lemnian new-year's festival in which the means of fetching new fire so impressed the early Greeks that they spoke of Jason's arriving on the Argo and begetting a child Εὔνηος, "Fine ship". Other instances can be found at Rome and in Etruria, where the new fire was equated with the birth of a marvellous ancestor, either Romulus or Servius Tullius or Caeculus founder of Praeneste or even the god Mars.

By some accounts both Romulus and Servius Tullius were conceived when a male member appeared in the hearth-fire – it was the fire-god Vulcan, says Ovid (*Fasti* 6.627) – and impregnated a girl tending the hearth⁷³). Caeculus' mother was struck by a spark from the hearth; she exposed the infant near a temple of Jupiter, and being discovered beside a blazing fire, he was thought to be a son of Vulcan. Several scenes in Etruscan art – on a cista from Praeneste, and on two bronze mirrors from Chiusi and Bolsena – show an infant emerging from a jar to be embraced by "Minerva", armed and accoutred as the goddess of the citadel; the

doubt at Corinth. Have we not here a word for "fire"? It might be related to εἴλη, σέλας, about which linguists keep an open mind (cf. Frisk and Chantraine s. vv.). If this is right, Athena's epithet Ἡφαιστία (IG 2² 223 B 4; Hsch. s. Ἡφαιστία) is analogous to Ἐλλωτίς.

72) At Eleusis Δημοφῶν, "Light of the land", was nursed in the palace by Demeter in disguise, and part of her ministration was to thrust him in the hearth-fire at night; N. J. Richardson on Hom. H. Cer. 231–55 compares Demophon with Erichthonius, and on 265–7 compares the yearly honours for Demophon with the sacrifices for Erechtheus as described in the *Iliad* (The Homeric Hymn to Demeter, Oxford 1974). It is just conceivable that the βαλλητύς, a form of mock combat, belonged to a new-year's festival and that Demophon's nursing is partly inspired by rites of new fire; but on the whole the signs point elsewhere.

73) U. W. Scholz, Studien zum altitalischen und altrömischen Marskult und Marsmythos (Heidelberg 1970) 127–132, 141–157, gives the literary evidence for these stories and illustrations of the Etruscan scenes and a survey of modern opinion – in which rites of new fire have no place. For further comment, apropos of A. Alföldi's interpretation of the stories, see H. S. Versnel, *BibO* 33 (1976) 400–401.

caption by the infant is "Mars" or a compound name with "Mars" as the first element; on the cista flames appear to rise from the jar beneath the armed infant. The significance of the "hearth-phallus" and even more of the Etruscan scenes is disputed; yet the fetching of new fire, such as we hear of at Rome on March 1, appears to provide a simple and satisfactory explanation. On the first day of the year, as March 1 once was, the hearth-fire of Vesta's temple was rekindled (Ov. *Fasti* 3.143-144; Macrobius 1.12.6; Solin. 1.35); as at Athens the fire was brought to the temple from some other quarter, perhaps the *area Volcani*; for in cases of accidental extinction, says Festus, fire was produced by rubbing wood and "a Virgin carried it in a bronze sieve to the temple" (p. 92 Lindsay). Mars was worshipped on the same day (Lyd. *De Mens.* 3.22, 4.42), the first of the month named after him, and it is no surprise that the god or his offspring should be identified with the infant conceived in the fire. The role of Minerva in the Etruscan scenes, and also the term "Palladium" attached by some to the secret objects in the temple of Vesta⁷⁴), suggest that the Etruscans and the Romans saw the similarity between the Greek rites of new fire and their own.

V. Hephaestus and the sixth-century reform

In the *aition* of the Panathenaea Hephaestus plays a leading part which expresses the belief that he rather than Prometheus begets the new fire at the Academy. As remarked in I above, the belief is unexpected in so far as Hephaestus comes late to Athenian worship from a background of Ionian bawdry. Yet the belief must signify something real. Hephaestus' advent at the Academy and the story of Erichthonius' paternity go back to the sixth century and so roughly coincide with the elaboration of the Panathenaic festivals under the tyrants or just before, at the time when Athens first grew strong and prosperous. Hephaestus as a figure of worship and the story as a theme of literature and art are both very much to the fore throughout the fifth and fourth centuries, during the whole period in which the Panathenaea embody Athens' pride and aspirations as a great power. We must therefore ask what Hephaestus meant to the Athenians.

74) See G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*² (Munich 1912) 159 n. 5.

It is not so hard to see why Hephaestus, once arrived at the Academy and associated with Athena, should become a favourite. At Colonus-by-the-Agora the god of fire and forge presides over the industrial quarter of the city, including the foundries and smithies which have been uncovered at the foot of the hill; everyone agrees that the great temple and the statues by Alcamenes and the festival Hephaestia with a torch-race and other contests reflect the importance of Athens' craftsmen in the time of Pericles and during the Archidamian War⁷⁵). The temple is a close congener of three others in outlying parts of Attica – of Poseidon at Sunium, of Ares at Acharnae (as it seems), and of Nemesis at Rhamnus; all four are strategically placed and the deities in question – together with Demeter at Eleusis, whose shrine was likewise embellished – are emblematic of Athenian resources or achievements; they show the same tendency to allegorical “personification” as do contemporary tragedy and sculpture and vase-painting. Before the Periclean building program the cult of Hephaestus and Athena at Colonus was very modest, having left hardly any traces. In the days of Atlantis, says Plato, the Athenians were under the special tutelage of Athena and Hephaestus, and on the “Acropolis”, which then extended to the north as far as the Eridanus, the warrior class “dwelt round the shrine of Athena and Hephaestus” (Crit. 109C, 112A–B). This fanciful picture presupposes that the cult on Colonus antedates the mid fifth century and no doubt the Persian Wars; but it need not be much older. In the late sixth century Colonus lay at the north-western edge of the city, where the Panathenaic procession was marshalled (Thuc. 1.20.2, 6.57.1–3); very likely the cult began in connexion with the Panathenaea.

In the temple of Erechtheus on the Acropolis Pausanias records an altar of Hephaestus, as well as others of Poseidon and Erechtheus together and of Butes (1.26.5); a marble throne inscribed “of the priest of Hephaestus” (IG 2² 4982) was found on the Acropolis, as was another inscribed “of the priest of Butes”

75) For the furnishings of the cult at Colonus see H. A. Thompson and R. E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora* 14 (1972) 140–149; E. B. Harrison, *AJA* 81 (1977) 137–178, 265–287, 411–426; Brommer, *Hephaistos* 45–46, 75–90. The most plausible suppletion of [Arist.] *Ath.* 54.7 names the *Amphiaraea*, not the *Hephaestia*, as the fourth-yearly festival introduced in 330/29 B.C., and the *Hephaestia*, not the *Heraclia*, as a fourth-yearly festival of long standing, which can then be connected with the arrangements of 421/20 B.C. (IG 1² 84, 1³ 82); cf. D. M. Lewis *apud* J. K. Davies, *JHS* 87 (1967) 35 n. 36, and Wilhelm as cited in n. 19 above.

(IG 2² 5166)⁷⁶). The lettering of the thrones is of the fourth or third century B.C., and to be noticed by Pausanias the altar was doubtless a venerable object; in any case it will go with one of the Acropolis festivals in which Hephaestus was honoured beside Athena, namely the Panathenaea and the Chalceia. One might therefore expect to find Hephaestus' altar closer to one or other of Athena's temples. The Chalceia however provided an occasion for associating Hephaestus and Erechtheus. Although this festival was officially addressed to Athena alone (IG 2² 674 lines 16–17, etc.), the craftsmen who celebrated the festival caused Hephaestus to be included and even to be exalted over Athena (Phanodemus FGrHist 325 F 18, etc.). The emblem of their handicraft that was solemnly carried in procession was an agricultural implement, the *liknon* or winnowing fan (Soph. fr. 760 Nauck², 844 Pearson/Radt; cf. Athens, Acr. 618, ARV² 553.31, a *liknon* carried as an offering by a male processioneer)⁷⁷). The *liknon* was used in the labours of Scirophorion which are personified by Erechtheus, the hero of the Scira, as we saw in I (and also III) above. It figured in the procession of the Chalceia as a masterpiece of handicraft (being woven of osiers to a difficult shape) that was essential to the livelihood of the whole community; here then is the moment when Hephaestus the craftsman and Erechtheus the "Thresher" deserve to be honoured side by side.

The cults at Colonus-by-the-Agora and on the Acropolis are plainly a consequence of the celebrity which Hephaestus first acquired at the Academy. The tyranny of Hippias, c. 527–510 B.C., saw rather extensive construction at the Academy – the costly circumferential gateway to the precinct of Athena, at any rate the altar of Eros beside the entrance, and the relief scene of Hephaestus and Prometheus (IV above). The last two works show that Hephaestus was already on hand; so does the torch-race that was accommodated by the altar of Eros and signaled by the relief; for torch-races were distinctive of

76) Brommer, *Hephaistos* pl. 40.3, gives a photograph of the thrones, which are now placed together near the "Erechtheium"; just where they were first seen is in doubt, and will signify little for their place of origin; cf. Jeppesen, *AJA* 83 (1979) 388–389, and also Brommer, *Hephaistos* 109. Perhaps an expert could date the lettering more closely; the thrones were wrongly separated by Kirchner as IG 2² 4982 and 5166, the first described as a "base", and dated "s. IV/III a." and "c. 350–300" respectively.

77) C. Bérard, *AK* 19 (1976) 101–114, pls. 26–27, adduces the vase-painting and explains the significance of the *liknon* in the Chalceia.

Hephaestus (Hdt. 8.98.2), but not of Prometheus, if the myth of the *pyrphoros* is any guide.

The story of Hephaestus' begetting Erichthonius was current in the same period. It is expressly cited from the *Danaïs* (Harp. s. αὐτόχθονες, cf. IG 14.1292 fr. II; Kinkel, EGF pp. 4, 78), an epic poem about the flight of the Danaïds from Egypt (Clem. Strom. 4.224; Kinkel, EGF p. 78); though nothing is known of the date or authorship of this poem, it cannot well be later than the sixth century⁷⁸).

Another notice indicates that the Erichthonius story was known at Sparta at about the time that the Academy was being refurbished. In one of the scenes which Bathycles of Magnesia worked in relief on the throne of Amyclaeon Apollo "Athena flees as Hephaestus pursues" (Paus. 3.18.13). Present opinion places Bathycles and his throne towards the end of the sixth century⁷⁹); and since the medley of mythical scenes includes several of Attic origin – Theseus fighting the Minotaur and also leading him captive, Cephalus abducted by Day and Helen by Peirithous and Theseus – we need not doubt that the pursuit was thought of as leading to the birth of Erichthonius⁸⁰). To be sure, from a broader point of view the pursuit is another wrinkle in the burlesque history which begins with the binding of Hera and continues as Hephaestus is cajoled by Dionysus and led back upon a donkey and married to Aphrodite and cuckolded by Ares. These episodes were relished at Sparta as everywhere else⁸¹); Bathycles also showed the binding of Hera and the performance of Demodocus

78) In IG 14.1292, the *tabula Borgiana*, the Erichthonius story is recounted (fr. II lines 1–4) just before a list of epic titles including the *Danaïs* or rather *Danaïdes* (fr. II line 10), presumably works which treated the points aforementioned. A. F. Garvie, *Aeschylus' Supplikes* (Cambridge 1969) 178, records several conjectures, all very tenuous, about the authorship of the *Danaïs*; if it originates in Cyrene (Wilamowitz) or dates from the seventh century (M. C. Astour), the mention of Erichthonius will be harder to explain.

79) So e.g. G. Lippold, *Die griechische Plastik* (Munich 1950) 55–56. The dating depends on excavated foundation blocks which are ascribed to the throne and bear graffiti; see Jeffery, *LSAG* p. 200 no. 32.

80) Wilamowitz supposed that in the original version Hephaestus' pursuit and discomfiture were related for their own sake, without a sequel, the birth of Erichthonius being a "late and feeble variation", a "nasty invention"; see *Kl. Schr.* 5.2.10–11, 18, 28; Glaube^{2/3} 2.140.

81) Hephaestus' return to Olympus is depicted on a Laconian vase of c. 560 B.C. (Rhodes 10.711); see C. M. Stibbe, *Lakonische Vasenmaler* (Amsterdam 1972) 1.279 no. 190, and Brommer, *Hephaistos* 203, pl. 11:1.

(Paus. 3.18.11, 16), and Gitiadas showed Hera's release (Paus. 3.17.3). But though the pre-existing story told how Hephaestus was offered a beautiful wife as a reward, and though it was natural to say that he accordingly fixed on Athena (as he does in Hyg. Fab. 166, at the instigation of Poseidon), the pursuit requires not only a motivation but even more a denouement – which can only be the birth of Erichthonius. The denouement, and therefore the ritual at the Academy, comes first. Possibly Athena's baffled lover was in the first instance Prometheus, not Hephaestus (IV above). But even if Hephaestus is the original and Prometheus the substitute, it is reasonable to suppose that the pursuit was inspired by the rites of new fire. For the main elements of the burlesque history grow out of ritual; Hephaestus' literary reputation spreads with his real-life worship.

Both the burlesque history and the cult background were reconstructed almost 90 years ago by Wilamowitz, who showed that the treatment of Hephaestus in Greek literature and art, from the lay of Demodocus in *Odyssey* 8 down to the end of the fifth century, drew largely on a lost Homeric Hymn; and that Hephaestus was worshipped in early days not only on Lemnos but also on the Greek islands of Naxos, Lesbos, Samos and perhaps Chios⁸²). Wilamowitz further saw that the episodes of the Hymn answer to the practices of cult: Hephaestus the homely outcast is conjoined with Hera the disdainful mother and with Dionysus the agreeable companion because Hera and Dionysus are the principal deities of Hephaestus' island milieu – Hera of Lesbos and Samos, Dionysus of Lesbos and Naxos (cf. schol. Theocr. 7.149, schol. Il. 23.92), other stories about Hephaestus and Dionysus on Naxos). It is also suggested that Hera was bound to her throne on Olym-

82) See Wilamowitz, *Kl. Schr.* 5.2.5–35, Glaube^{2/3} 1.314–315, 2.140–141. B. Snell, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Göttingen 1966) 102–104, shows that the derivative hymn of Alcaeus (fr. 349 Lobel-Page, cf. fr. 381) was probably addressed to Dionysus, not Hephaestus; but he need not have doubted the worship of Hephaestus on Lesbos, although the only direct evidence is the personal names Ἡφαιστῆς, Ἡφαιστίων (IG 12.2.535; SEG 27.486; both from Eresus); the month-names of IG 12 Suppl. 29, including Ἡφαιστῆς, belong not to Lesbos but to Dardanus on the mainland. The Homeric original has now been recognized by R. Merkelbach, *ZPE* 12 (1973) 212–215, in a hexameter poem in which Hera complains of her fetters and Ares (?) and Dionysus offer help (Pap. Oxy. 670, Powell, Coll. Alex. pp. 80–81, 245); it might be a hymn to either Hephaestus or Dionysus, but hardly an epic digression, as Snell suggested. The pictorial renderings are fully presented by Brommer, *Hephaistos*.

pus because her statue was bound with willow-branches at the Samian festival *Toneia*⁸³); but the correspondence is rather slight and imperfect and the suggestion is therefore dubious. At all events the story was elaborated as the Greeks came to worship Hephaestus beside the older deities of Olympus. When Athena enters the story, she too is a reflection of cult – and it can only be the cult at Athens, since the virginal armed goddess is of little account on the eastern Aegean islands.

Thus we see that both the *Danaïd* and Bathycles' relief scene presuppose the worship of Hephaestus at the Academy. Bathycles supplies a *terminus ante quem* near the end of the sixth century; yet Hephaestus will have arrived at Athens more than a day or two before the Erichthonius story reached an Ionian artist working at Sparta and an epic poet working at Argos or in some more distant quarter; a *terminus* round the mid century seems perfectly safe. This brings us rather close to 566 B.C., the well attested date for the institution of athletic contests at the Panathenaea, and to the earliest Panathenaic amphoras⁸⁴). Hephaestus may well have to do with the reform of the Panathenaea. Our question then becomes, what did Hephaestus mean to the Athenians towards the mid sixth century, when he first arrived among them?

Hephaestus was not a Greek god; the Greeks of the eastern Aegean adopted him from their non-Greek neighbours, and he always kept his alien associations⁸⁵). Lemnos is his first and

83) So Wilamowitz, *Kl. Schr.* 5.2.23–25; cf. K. Meuli, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Basel 1975) 2.1059–1064 (a sketch of unpublished material). Since the cult statue was a standing figure – cf. R. Fleischer, *Artemis von Ephesos und verwandte Kultstatuen aus Anatolien und Syrien* (Leyden 1973) 211–213, pl. 85a – an observer would hardly think of Hera bound to her throne. The Samian festival, be it noted, was called *Tóveia*, not **Tóvaia* (IvPriene 57 line 6, with Wilamowitz' observation *ibid.* p. 310). Apart from the binding of Hera, Hephaestus' ties with Samos are strengthened by new evidence, both early theophorous names and the torch-races at the Heraea for Hephaestus and Aphrodite, a Lemnian pair who are not otherwise found together in Greek cult. G. Dunst, *ZPE* 1 (1967) 226–227, and Brommer, *Hephaistos* 166, cite the evidence but rather inconsequently doubt the ties.

84) See Davison, *From Arch. to Pindar* 35–43, 54–61, 64–69.

85) In his essay of 1895 Wilamowitz chose a different emphasis, comparing Hephaestus with the dwarfish smiths and enchanters of Greek belief, and describing him as a north-Aegean counterpart of the south-Aegean Telchines. But at *Glaube*^{2/3} 1.314 n. 1 he insisted upon a foreign origin, and this is now the common opinion; see Nilsson, *Gesch. der gr. Rel.*^{2/3} 1.528–529; B. Hemberg, *Die Kabiren* (Uppsala 1950) 164–166, 265; Burkert, *Gr. Rel.* 260; Brommer, *Hephaistos* 1–3. For Malten's view of the place of origin see n. 90 below.

favourite abode in literature (Il. 1.593, Od. 8.283–284; [Hes.] fr. 148 Merkelbach–West); its chief city is Hephaestia, and a leading citizen is priest of Hephaestus (IG 12.8.27, one of the Philostrati) and another is *agonothetes* of the festival Hephaesteia (SEG 28.718). Though Lemnos is occupied by Sintians in Homer, it is Pelasgian thereafter, and Hephaestus is closely linked with the Pelasgian cult of the Cabeiri (Str. 10.3.21, C473, citing Acusilaus FGrHist 2 F 20 and Pherecydes FGrHist 3 F 48), of which Lemnos was the centre in early days, before the advancement of Samothrace (PMG fr. adesp. 985; Aesch. *Cabiri*)⁸⁶). All this is well known, but it is not sufficiently appreciated that Hephaestus is also at home on the coast of the mainland opposite Lemnos, beside Troy and the mouth of the Hellespont. The Trojans whom Diomedes encounters first are two sons of Dares priest of Hephaestus, and the god rescues one of them (Il. 5.9–10, 23–24); if Hephaestus does not figure elsewhere as a partisan of Troy, it is perhaps because the fire-god is needed for another purpose in Il. 21⁸⁷). The Homeric priest is supported by the month-name Ἡφαίστιος occurring in an inscription of Roman date which probably derives from the town Dardanus near Ilium (IG 12 Suppl. 29)⁸⁸); the festival Ἡφαίστια here implied and the Ἡφαίστεια of Lemnos (SEG 28.718) are almost the only festivals of Hephaestus that we hear of, outside of Athens⁸⁹). Troy is further aligned with the Pelasgian cults of Hephaestus and the Cabeiri by the myth of Dardanus, the eponymous ancestor who comes from Samothrace during a great flood (Lycophron, Alex. 72–85, etc.); in Homer this eponym begets Erichthonius, the very first embodiment of the fabulous wealth of Troy (Il. 20.219, 230). The mythical and ritual affinities of Lemnos and the Troad are not unexpected in the light of the Bronze-Age culture of Poliochni, Thermi, and Troy I–V.

86) See Preller–Robert, Gr. Myth. 1⁴ 857–858; Hemberg, Kabiren 160–170.

87) So Wilamowitz, Glaube ^{2/3} 1.314.

88) For the provenance of IG 12 Suppl. 29 see L. Robert, Monnaies antiques en Troade (Geneva/Paris 1966) 31–32; REG 86 (1973) 72.

89) The festival name might be restored at IG 4.1² 66 line 34, an Epidaurian decree of 74 B.C.; but this will be a late development, like other traces of Hephaestus in the vicinity, for which see Wilamowitz, Kl. Schr. 5.2.19, L. Malten, RE 8.1 (1912) 313–314 s. Hephaistos, and Brommer, Hephaistos 160, 164, 251. At Olympus in Lycia Hephaestus was honoured with a festival as the principal deity of the city (TAM 2.905 XIII D, XIV F, XIX A, s. II p.).

Lemnos and the Troad were Hephaestus' homeland⁹⁰), and his worship continued here long after he was taken up on the Greek islands of Lesbos, Naxos and Samos. By the mid sixth century Hephaestus was a familiar figure in Greek poetry and art; and Athenians who went abroad, Peisistratus among them, will have known the cult of Hephaestus among Aeolian and Ionian Greeks. It is likely nonetheless that the Athenians like other Greeks found the fire-god most impressive in his homeland. Moreover, in the course of the sixth century Athenians thrust themselves upon this homeland, first at Sigeum, then elsewhere along the Hellespontine coast, and finally upon Lemnos itself. The chronology of this advance is obscure and disputed, but need not detain us here. Long before they proceeded to invasion and conquest, Athenians must have been interested and busy in these regions. Even if Lemnos was not occupied until the beginning of the fifth century⁹¹), the island and its people and customs and resources were undoubtedly well known at Athens for many years before. And the pattern of worship on Lemnos probably obtained in the area of Sigeum as well. At any rate, it is Lemnos that will show us why Hephaestus appealed to the Athenians.

At the new-year's festival of Lemnos new fire was brought by ship from Delos, and was taken ashore after the island had been purified, and was then distributed to households and shops as "the beginning of new life" (Philostr. Her. 53.5-7, p. 67 Lannoy = 207-208 Kayser)⁹²). The festival is described from first-hand knowledge by a native of Lemnos, one of the Philostrati; and since it commemorates "the deed once wrought against the men by the

90) That Hephaestus belongs rather to Caria and Lycia, and that Lemnos is a way-station, was argued by Malten, *JdI* 27 (1912) 232-264, and *RE* 8.1 (1912) 342-347 s. Hephaistos; this view is endorsed by Hemberg and mooted by Nilsson (n. 85 above) and taken as gospel by many others (cf. Brommer, *Hephaistos* 1-2). It will not do. The evidence adduced by Malten, abundant though it is for the time of the Empire, only shows that Hephaestus was then the *interpretatio Graeca* of a native deity, conformably with a process which takes place throughout Asia Minor at this period. A native deity of Caria and Lycia would hardly be familiar to the early Greeks (Nilsson thought of the Mycenaean), nor would he leave the trail which we find in Greek literature.

91) For this dating see A. J. Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece* (Manchester 1964) 175 n. 3. H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (Munich 1967) 1.83, 2.568, prefers the years 510-506.

92) "New-year's festival" seems the proper term, even though Philostratus' mss. do not agree on the phrase marking the periodicity of the rite. καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος is defended by L. de Lannoy, *AntCl* 42 (1973) 526-531, and is printed in his text of 1977.

women of Lemnos at the instance of Aphrodite⁹³ – i.e. the rite gives rise to the myth, which is already known to Homer (Il. 7.467–469, 21.41, 23.746–747) – the festival goes back long before the Athenian occupation of Lemnos, and we may supplement Philostratus' description with details deducible from the myth⁹³). The ship of the Argonauts plainly stands for the ship bearing new fire, and the mating of the Argonauts and the Lemnian women stands for the renewal of life through the new fire; the theme of sexual congress is the same as in the Erichthonius story. The Lemnian festival resembles the Panathenaea in outline. Although the fire is brought to Lemnos by ship, it is carried to its destination in the city (whether Hephaestia or Myrina) by a runner; for Αἰθαλίδης, "Son of smoke", a herald remarkable for his swiftness, is sent at nightfall from the ship to Hypsipyle to announce the arrival of the Argonauts and to obtain permission for them to stay (Ap. Rhod. Argon. 1.641–651). Athletic contests follow, in which the prize is a robe, ἔσθῆς, φᾶρος, πέπλος (Pind. Ol. 4.19–27, Pyth. 4.253; Sim. fr. 547 Page; Call. fr. 688 Pfeiffer; cf. Ap. Rhod. Argon. 2.30–32, 3.1204–1206, 4.423–434). Apollonius omits the games and represents the robes as parting gifts for Polydeuces and Jason, and some spoke of funeral games for Thoas (schol. Pind. Ol. 4.32c, citing Call.) – for every agonistic festival was traced to a funeral; but there is no doubt that the same occasion is in view throughout. Jason's robe is described as dark-hued, κνάνεος, πορφύρεος (Ap. Rhod. Argon. 3.1205, 4.424), and perfumed (*ibid.* 4.430–434).

The new fire points to Hephaestus, but it is wrong to suppose that the new-year's festival was mainly concerned with the fire-god⁹⁴). To be sure, we now know of a festival Hephaestia on Lemnos, which was moreover agonistic, like the new-year's festival (SEG 28.718, from Myrina, c. 200 A.D.). But we should expect Hephaestus to have his own festival, at whatever season, and games are nothing out of the ordinary; the Hephaestia at

93) The congruence of the ritual and the myth is emphasized by Burkert, CQ² 20 (1970) 1–16; Homo Necans 212–218.

94) So Burkert, CQ² 20 (1970) 3, reproving Nilsson's agnostic approach at Gr. Feste 470–471. The coins of Hephaestia bearing emblems of Hephaestus prove only that Hephaestus was worshipped there, as is obvious from the city-name; not that "the festival belongs to Hephaestia" or that it honours Hephaestus. The festival Hephaestia mentioned in a decree of Myrina may have been celebrated at either Myrina or Hephaestia or at both, but is not to be identified in any case with the new-year's festival, as we shall see.

Athens were agonistic (IG 1³ 82 [= 1² 84]; IG 2² 1138 line 11, 3201 lines 7–11; [Xen.] Ath. 3.4; And. 1 Myst. 132)⁹⁵, and it may well be that this Athenian festival was modelled on the Hephaesteia of Lemnos, or else on the Hephaestia of the area of Sigeum, or on both together.

The gods who presided at the new-year's festival are not in doubt. In most accounts of the murderous Lemnian women Aphrodite's anger is to the fore, and so it is in Philostratus' formulation of the festival *aition*, as quoted above; a detail added by Asclepiades, that the Lemnian men failed to render the accustomed sacrifices to Aphrodite (FGrHist 12 F 14), is surely drawn from the actual rites; at a certain stage the women sacrificed to Aphrodite, whereas the men did not. In the festivities which greeted the arrival of the ship and of the new fire, Hephaestus and Aphrodite were honoured together, to judge from Apollonius' account (Argon. 1.849–860); for the Argonauts and the women fill the city with dancing and song and sacrifice and feasting, at which "above the rest of the immortals they entreated Hera's glorious son and Cypris herself"; "Cypris" has already caused the women to desire the Argonauts "for the sake of wise Hephaestus", so that Lemnos may be repopulated. From these indications it follows that the chief deity of the festival was a goddess whom the Greeks equated with Aphrodite.

A temple of Aphrodite happens to be attested for Lemnos (schol. Stat. Theb. 5.59), but an excavated find is more revealing: a dedication to "Thracian Aphrodite", Ἀ]φροδίτει Θρα[κίαι, came to light at the Cabeirium, which lay on a headland just north of Hephaestia (ASAtene 3/4 [1941/43] 91 no. 12)⁹⁶. The goddess associated with the Cabeiri is elsewhere called either Cabeiro (Str. 10.3.21, C473, citing Acusilaus FGrHist 2 F 20 and Pherecydes FGrHist 3 F 48) or, as an eponym, "Lemnos" (PMG fr. adesp. 985; cf. Steph. Byz. s. Λήμνος); another name of "Lemnos" was

95) The contests at the Athenian festival are discussed by Davies, JHS 87 (1967) 35–36; but he was wrong to argue against the existence of musical contests, which are attested not only by the transmitted text of [Xen.] Ath. 3.4 and by the *prima facie* interpretation of IG 2² 1138 lines 4–11, but also by "the basic document" concerning the Hephaestia, IG 1³ 82, line 14 (= 1² 84 l. 16): τ]ξ μουσιξς καθάπερ[...]

96) For the evidence bearing on "the Great Goddess" of Lemnos see Hemberg, Kabiren 165, and Burkert, CQ² 20 (1970) 3 n. 5, 4 n. 2. She is probably represented in pre-Greek terracottas and on coins of Roman date. Malten, RE 8.1 (1912) 354–355 s. Hephaistos, insists on dissociating Hephaestus and the Great Goddess to suit his own preconceptions of both.

“the Great Goddess” (Steph. Byz.), and she in turn was identified with the Thracian Bendis (Ar. Λήμνιαι fr. 368 Kock; cf. fr. 365), a notice which agrees with the epithet of Aphrodite in the dedication, and suggests that Homer’s Sintians added something to the features of this Pelasgian goddess. At any rate “Lemnos” produced Cabeirus from the earth (so the lyric passage as transcribed by Hippolytus), or else Cabeiro and Hephaestus begot the Cabeiri or Camillus father of the Cabeiri (Pherecydes and Acusilaus respectively). Here then is the goddess of the new-year’s festival; here too is the original cult association of Hephaestus and “Aphrodite”, which in Greek poetry became another conjugal disaster on Olympus.

Other deities too had a part in the festival. During the purification of the island, says Philostratus, while the ship and the new fire were still at sea, the Lemnians invoked “secret gods of the nether earth”, θεοὺς . . . χθονίους καὶ ἀπορρήτους. This description fits the Cabeiri, who are “secret” and “of the nether earth” in virtue of their mysteries and their genealogy respectively. Thus the new-year’s festival of Lemnos was addressed first of all to the Great Goddess, *alias* Aphrodite or “Lemnos” or Cabeiro or even Bendis, but also to her consort Hephaestus and to their offspring the Cabeiri.

One other aspect of the Lemnian festival requires comment here. The new fire, says Philostratus, was brought by ship from Delos: θεωρίς δὲ ναῦς ἐκ Δήλου πυρφορεῖ. This is often discounted as a later innovation, reflecting Athenian interests and the celebrity of the Delphic and Delian Apollo; the Athenian Pythais, after all, was a sacred delegation which brought fire from Delphi to Athens, and the source of new fire in Philostratus’ rite might be an ever-burning hearth in the Pythium on Delos; in early days, it is suggested, the Lemnians resorted to the mysterious flame on their own Mount Mosychlus⁹⁷). Such speculations are gratuitous and even perverse. Apollo could hardly assume a leading role in an ancient festival of Lemnos; fire fetched from another point on the island would not satisfy the intent of the drastic purification de-

97) The Pythium on Delos used large supplies of fire-wood and so presumably contained an ever-burning hearth; that Philostratus looks to this Pythium, of which the latest epigraphic mention is of the mid second century B.C., was suggested by R. Vallois, and is approved by P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l’époque hellénistique et à l’époque impériale* (Paris 1970) 115, 121. Burkert, *CQ*² 20 (1970) 4–6, thinks of Mosychlus as the source and interprets Soph. Phil. 800–801 as an evocation of new fire.

scribed by Philostratus; nothing we hear of the reputed volcano on Mosychlus suggests a source of new fire. Above all, the story of the Argonauts proves that the renewal of life which the festival enacts always came by ship from overseas; the son of Jason and Hypsipyle already known to Homer is Εὐνης, "Fine ship" – another name for the θεωρίς ναῦς.

Since the festival has much to do with Cabeiro and the Cabeiri, it is natural to identify the Delian source as the local cult of the Cabeiri, to which Pythagoras once looked for inspiration, as we learn from Iamblichus, who brackets Delos with Imbros and Samothrace as also with Eleusis and other ancient seats of mystic lore (Vit. Pyth. 28.151). Although this cult is expressly mentioned only once in Delian inscriptions, under the form "the Cabeirium looking towards Cynthus", seemingly distinguished from a second Cabeirium (IG 11.2.144 A 90, of c. 304 B.C.), the building in question appears to be one with the later "Samothrakeion" or "sanctuary of the Great Gods", and has been recognized on the ground in remains dating from c. 400 B.C.⁹⁸). A prominent feature of the excavated Cabeirium, standing in the courtyard in front of the temple, is a circular construction of marble which has been interpreted as a hearth-altar or *eschara* – and which might well serve as a source of new fire. Moreover, the cult included torch-races for the three age-classes of boys, ephebes, and men, for victories in these events are recorded on a column in the sanctuary (IDelos 6.2597, of 126/5 B.C.). Conceivably the Cabeirium on Delos was installed by the Athenians in the fifth or fourth century, at a time when they possessed both Lemnos and Delos; but if so, the native Lemnians of an earlier day will have drawn on some other overseas source. On this score the festival *aition* permits no doubt or cavil; and the new dispensation which Dardanus brings to Troy from overseas is evidently a parallel *aition*. We may suspect that Dardanus' brother Iasion is the original saviour of Lemnos, who came to be identified with a Thessalian hero bearing the same transparent name. But however the myth developed, and whatever the external relations of Lemnos in early days, it is certain that their custom was always to fetch new fire from some other island.

With these details in mind we come back to our question. What did Hephaestus mean to the Athenians in the mid sixth century? What forms of ritual did Hephaestus bring with him

98) See Bruneau, Recherches 379–399.

from the Pelasgian domain? When the Athenians came to Lemnos, and perhaps when they came to Sigeum, they encountered a rite of new fire that was like their own but far more picturesque and far more celebrated in the Greek world. On Lemnos the rite had long been attached to the story which all men knew, the voyage of Argo (Od. 12.70); the Homeric fire-god was at home both on Lemnos and in the Troad. The ritual business was impressive in itself. A sacred ship, prefigured by the Argo, brought the new fire from overseas, and put in to shore only after the whole island was purified. A runner brought the fire to the city, doubtless to the altar of the Great Goddess; for the Lemnian principal is Ὑψιπύλη, "High-gate", a name evoking a monumental shrine. Then came the procession to the shrine, prefigured by the Argonauts advancing from the port to the town; then hymns, sacrifice, and feasting; finally games, with fine robes as prizes.

This exotic festival nonetheless resembled the Panathenaea, at least in outline. The early Panathenaea, as reconstructed in IV above, consisted in the fetching of new fire from the Academy to light the altar of Athena, in a procession and sacrifice, and in a display or a contest of charioteers. In the sixth century this festival was greatly elaborated, and Hephaestus was part of the elaboration. The Athenians borrowed Hephaestus from Lemnos or thereabouts; but assuredly they did not borrow the name alone. The other features of the Panathenaea which are most striking and most nearly unique, and which are often mooted as innovations, are the torch-race (in later times a common event), and, at the fourth-yearly celebration, the offering of the huge robe and its conveyance on the ship-wagon. It is reasonable to suppose that all these features were inspired by the example of the Lemnian new year's festival.

VI. *The ritual innovations: torch-race, peplos, ship-wagon*

1) Consider first the torch-race⁹⁹). Prometheus preceded Hephaestus at the Academy, and his myth does not suggest that he raced or even ran; he "stole" the fire in a stalk of fennel (Hes.

⁹⁹) For torch-races in general see J. Jüthner, RE 12.1 (1924) 569–577 s. λαμπραδρομία, and Die athletischen Leibesübungen der Griechen 2.1 (SBWien 249.2, 1968) 134–156; Dunst, ZPE 1 (1967) 231–239; L. Koenen, Eine agonistische Inschrift aus Ägypten und frühptolemäische Königsfeste (Meisenheim am Glan 1977) 10–12; for pictorial renderings, P. E. Corbett, Hesperia 18 (1949) 346–351,

Theog. 566–567, Op. 51–52), a furtive act, not a headlong defiant gesture; it is only in the fifth century that he acquires a torch instead of a fennel stalk and becomes the prototype of Athens' racers (Eur. Phoen. 1121–1122; cf. Crinagoras, A.P. 6.100.2, a dedication at Athens; Hyg. Astr. 2.15). The epithet πυρφόρος which Sophocles applies to Prometheus as worshipped at the Academy (Oed. Col. 55) is drawn from ritual; the πυρφόροι of other cults, as of Asclepius at Athens and Epidaurus, were not racers but officiants who brought fire from a hearth to an altar as a measured and stately proceeding – like other ritual proceedings which give rise to -φορος compounds, and like the fire-bringing which issues in the name Φορωνεύς, the Argive counterpart of Prometheus (Paus. 2.19.5)¹⁰⁰). Such a stately fire-bringing is attested for the Apaturia, a phratry festival conducted on a more modest scale than the civic celebrations that featured torch-races; lighted torches were brought from a hearth to an altar by processions “wearing the finest robes” and singing hymns (Ister FGrHist 334 F 2a)¹⁰¹). The Late Archaic relief at the entrance to the

pls. 78–79, and Metzger as cited in n. 104 below; for the Panathenaic torch-race, Brelich, *Paides e parth.* 326–337. I take it that all torch-races in the ancient world, on foot and on horseback, made use of relay teams, and that such teams are an unspoken assumption of Paus. 1.30.2, who mentions only single runners at the close of the race. Dunst, after showing that the epigraphic record uniformly refers to relay teams, should not have returned to an interpretation of Pausanias which is now all the more isolated and unnecessary.

¹⁰⁰) The role of the πυρφόρος (or πυροφόρος) is illustrated from inscriptions by L. Robert, REG 79 (1966) 746–748. That Prometheus' epithet and conduct derive from ritual was observed long ago by E. Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften* 2 (Berlin 1956) 55–56. West on Hes. Op. 567, following Pohlenz, doubts the ritual background; but the cult at the Academy is then left unexplained. Hesiod probably knew of Prometheus not from Athens but from Boeotia, since the name was given to one of the Cabeiri at Thebes (Paus. 9.25.6); Prometheus the Cabeirus was father of “Aetnaeus” and therefore concerned with fire, whether or not this was the secret gift imparted by Demeter.

¹⁰¹) About the fire-bringing of the Apaturia a conjecture may be worthwhile. The *aition* associates the rite with the occasion when the use of fire was first communicated to men at large (Ister F 2a–b). On this showing the fire was brought from some common source to a number of outlying points – from the hearth of Athens' Prytaneum, surely, to the altars of all the phratries of Attica. No doubt one might also think of a hearth inside the lodge, οἶκος, of a given phratry (Vit. Hom. Herod. 31, pp. 211–212 Allen; Suda s. “Ὀμηρος, p. 262 Allen); but to fetch fire from this indoor hearth to an altar standing just outside (like the altar of Zeus Phratrius in the regulations of the Deceleans, SIG³ 921) would not account for the *aition*. It was natural to replenish the civic hearth-fire just before it was drawn upon by the phratries; perhaps then this was the business of the festival Promethia, which included a torch-race over the course from the Academy, and which fell in

Academy, as described by Apollodorus, showed ὁ μὲν Προμηθεὺς πρῶτος καὶ πρεσβύτερος ἐν δεξιᾷ σκῆπτρον ἔχων, ὁ δὲ Ἥφαιστος νέος καὶ δεύτερος (FGrHist 244 F 147). Prometheus and Hephaestus are of different ages because they belong to different generations of the divine family; but perhaps the relief also indicated the transition from a processional fire-bringing to the torch-race.

The torch-race of the Panathenaea is first heard of in the late fifth century, as are also the torch-races of the Promethia and the Hephaestia; but it goes back to the Peisistratids, if, as we inferred in IV above, the altar of Eros was installed at the entrance to the Academy, where Athena's precinct gave on the broad road leading almost straight to the Acropolis, for the very purpose of the torch-race. We may now add that a corresponding *terminus* was needed at the other end, for whatever the final destination of the earlier form of fire-bringing, the torch-racers would hardly dash up to the Acropolis and into Athena's precinct; apart from decorum, the spectators and judges wanted a clear view of the finish. This *terminus* is obviously the altar of Anteros, noticed by Pausanias in connexion with the altar of Eros at the Academy (1.30.1), and located at the foot of the Acropolis by a rather humdrum *aition* about the suicide of a mismatched pair of lovers (Paus. *loc. cit.*; Aelian fr. 69 Hercher = Suda s. Μέλητος). The original sense of Ἀντέρωσ was no doubt "the opposite desire", i.e. the desire (emblematic of the procreation of new fire) placed at the opposite end of the race-course. Of course this altar like the other was bound to conjure up a romantic tale; but evidently it bore no inscription corresponding to Charmus' at the Academy, and to judge from Aelian, the tale of the lovers' leap was inspired by a votive statue which stood on the Acropolis above the altar¹⁰²).

Pyanopsion or thereabouts, if the list of festivals at [Xen.] Ath. 3.4 (Dionysia, Thargelia, Panathenaea, Promethia, Hephaestia) and at IG 2² 1138 lines 9–11 (Dionysia, Thargelia, Promethia, Hephaestia) is in chronological order; the Hephaestia probably came at the end of Pyanopsion or in Maemacterion (see n. 103 below). A rite of replenishing the civic hearth-fire for general use would give a very plausible explanation of the myth of Prometheus the fire-bringer. It should also be noted that in some versions it was Prometheus who clove Zeus' head to produce Athena (Eur. Ion 455–457; Apollod. Bibl. 1 [20] 3.6; schol. Il. 1.195; schol. Pind. Ol. 7.66a–b), and that this myth is likely, for reasons which cannot be gone into here, to be the *aition* of the phratry cults of Zeus and Athena. It is of course no surprise, and no objection to this accounting, that in Ister's time the officiants of the Attic Apaturia invoked the fire-god Hephaestus.

102) The statue, representing a boy with a brace of cocks, is mentioned only by Aelian, and is said to mark the spot on the Acropolis from which the pair threw themselves; the altar is mentioned only by Pausanias, and presumably marks the

This race-course, running along the Academy road and the Panathenaic Way between the complementary altars of Eros and Anteros, was very likely the only course that was ever used for torch-races at Athens (excepting the mounted torch-race of the Bendideia). The three premier torch-races were those of the Panathenaea, the Promethia, and the Hephaestia (Harp. s. λαμπάς, citing Polemon fr. 6 Preller; etc.). For the Promethia as for the Panathenaea the primary source of fire must have been the altar of Prometheus, from which the flame was transferred to the nearby altar of Eros for the starting of the race; the ultimate destination may have been the hearth of the Prytaneum, not far from the altar of Anteros. The torch-race at the Hephaestia appears to be modelled on those of the Panathenaea and the Promethia (IG 1³ 82, lines 30–36 [= 1² 84, l. 32–38]); at any rate Hephaestus too was concerned with the source of fire at the Academy, and his altar at Colonus, the ultimate destination of the fire (cf. *ibid.* line 36), was again not so far from the altar of Anteros. One might perhaps suppose that the torch-races of the Panathenaea and the Promethia were coeval, if the theme of “desire” expressed in the altars of Eros and Anteros was as appropriate to the Promethia as it was to the Panathenaea. But since the Erichthonius story is so distinctive, it is more natural to infer that the torch-race of the Panathenaea was the very first. As a civic new-year’s festival the Panathenaea were the most important occasion for fetching new fire, but other occasions came later in the year. The Promethia are plausibly regarded as the civic rite which provided a common source of fire for the phratry celebrations of the Apaturia, and the Hephaestia as a festival of craftsmen, and especially of smiths, which provided fire for the busy winter season¹⁰³). The torch-race was suited to these occasions too.

spot on the ground below where they perished. Some, e.g. W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen*² (Munich 1932) 284, place the altar as well as the statue on the Acropolis.

103) For the Promethia see no. 101 above. The Hephaestia have often been assigned to Pyanopsion or even to Pyanopson 28 (so Wilhelm’s suppletion of IG 1³ 82 [= 1² 84], line 8), but only on the supposition that this festival was ancillary to either the Apaturia or the Chalceia; see e.g. Mommsen, *Feste* 339–349; E. Reisch, *Öjh* 1 (1898) 60; Malten, *RE* 8.1 (1912) 362 s. Hephaistos; P. Stengel, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*³ (Munich 1920) 234 n. 5, 251. Yet the Hephaestia are an important agonistic festival belonging to the important cult of Hephaestus at Colonus-by-the-Agora, and no such connexion with other cults and festivals can be entertained. It is likely nonetheless that the Hephaestia fell in late autumn, in late Pyanopsion or in Maemacterion, as the last agonistic festival of the season; for

Other torch-races were run at the Theseia, the Epitaphia, and the festival of Pan¹⁰⁴). The last does not antedate 490 (Hdt. 6.105.3), and the others will be later still. There is no reason why any of them would require a different race-course or a different source of new fire. The rites of the Epitaphia were conducted at the *polyandrion* graves near the Academy ([Arist.] Ath. 58.1; Helioid. Aeth. 1.17.5; etc.), and the games too were held on this stretch of road. The cave of Pan was close to the altar of Anteros, and the Theseum was not so far away. So the Panathenaic race-course could be conveniently used at these festivals, and perhaps it was mainly the convenience that caused the torch-race to be added to the program.

In Athens then the first torch-race was that of the Panathenaea, and can be traced back to the period c. 527–510 B.C. Outside of Athens and Attica torch-races are mainly known from Hellenistic or Imperial inscriptions, or inferred from coins which are no earlier (save those of Amphipolis, from the early fourth century). The fetching of new fire at the Hellotia of Corinth was doubtless age-old (cf. II above), but here as in Athens, and as at

at [Xen.] Ath. 3.4 and at IG 2² 1138 lines 9–11 it comes last in the chronological series (as it seems) of choregic events. Moreover, one would suppose that a festival of craftsmen, like festivals signaling other activities, was associated with a certain time of year; and although the comparative material is confined to the Chalceia at Athens and to the month-name *Μαχανεύς* or *Μαχάνειος* occurring at a few Dorian cities, all indications point to late autumn or early winter. *Μαχάνειος* is attested at Chalcedon (SIG³ 1009 line 22, 1011 lines 7–8) and at Byzantium (cf. Samuel, Gr. and Rom. Chron. 88, citing the *Liber Glossarum* as interpreted by Mountford and Hanell; but “Machanos” implies *Μαχάνειος*, not *Μαχανεύς*), *Μαχανεύς* at Corcyra (IG 9.1.694 line 48) and at Issa (SIG³ 141 line 1); a festival *Μαχάνεια* in honour of Zeus or Athena or both is presupposed, and both festival and month-name will go back to the mother-cities of Megara and Corinth, where handicrafts flourished. At Byzantium the month is equivalent to December, at Corcyra it comes at about this time of year, and probably at Chalcedon too; cf. Bischoff, RE 10.2 (1919) 1592–1594 s. Kalender. Smiths were constantly at work in the winter (Hes. Op. 493–495), when it was less disagreeable to tend the forge, and when there was leisure to repair or manufacture farm implements, weapons, and the like. So the smiths will have obtained new fire for the winter at the torch-race of the Hephaestia.

104) Cf. Deubner, Att. Feste index s. Fackellauf; Jüthner, Leibesub. 2.1.136. The torch-race of the Anthesteria is shown to be illusory by H. Metzger, Recherches sur l'imagerie athénienne (Paris 1965) 74–75. That of the Aiantia was run on Salamis, as we see from ephebic inscriptions. A torch-race is attested for an Attic festival Hermaea by a single dedication (IG 2² 2980, *init.* s. II a.); this is probably the Hermaea of Salamis (IG 2² 1227 line 7, of 131 B.C. – archon Epicles as dated by Meritt).

the Nemesia of Rhamnus, the torch-race will be secondary. Much the earliest evidence comes from Naples, where a torch-race for Parthenope was instituted by the Athenian commander Diotimus (PA 4386) shortly before the Peloponnesian War (Lyc. Alex. 732–735; schol. ad loc., citing Timaeus FGrHist 566 F 98). This is a patent transposition of the Athenian custom, and many of the later torch-races throughout the Greek world will be inspired by the famous examples at Athens. It would be wrong however to imagine that it all began with the Panathenaea.

Herodotus compares the Persian royal post to the torch-race which Greeks “perform for Hephaestus” (8.98.2). In this brief comparison Herodotus would not specify Hephaestus as the deity honoured by the torch-race unless the name were the surest means of bringing the race into the minds of his readers; it is not that he thought of Hephaestus as a mere metonymy for fire. Athens is not exclusively or even chiefly in view; for although the torch-race of the Hephaestia probably antedates both the decree of 421/0 and the close of Herodotus’ working life (whenever that was), Athens in his day also staged torch-races at the Panathenaea, the Promethia, and the festival of Pan, the last singled out by Herodotus elsewhere; and possibly at other festivals. As already said, the evidence outside of Athens is mostly late, and at first glance it neither confirms nor belies Herodotus’ statement. Various gods, heroes and potentates were honoured by torch-races; Hephaestus only at Methone/Mothone in Messenia (Imhoof-Blumer and Gardner, *Num. Comm. on Paus.* pl. P no. 9; Head, *Hist. Num.*² 433; Brommer, *Hephaistos* pl. 35 no. 1; coins of Roman date showing Hephaestus, naked, running with a torch), on Samos (Michel, *Recueil* 901, *ZPE* 1 [1967] 230, lines 4–5; victors in the torch-race for Hephaestus at the festival Heraea), and at Hephaestia on Lemnos (Head, *Hist. Num.*² 263; Brommer, *Hephaistos* pl. 35 nos. 15–16; coins of Roman date showing a torch on the reverse).

Yet the Lemnian instance is suggestive, and the Samian doubly so, because the worship of Hephaestus here was early and probably gave rise to his mythical association with Hera, and because the victory list cited above contains a further detail which points to Lemnos: a second torch-race at the Heraea honoured Aphrodite (lines 7–8), Hephaestus’ consort in myth and at the new-year’s festival on Lemnos, but nowhere else, so far as the record shows up to now. An inventory of the Samian Heraeum refers to a temple of Aphrodite (*AthMitt* 68 [1953/56] 46–50 line

33); this is identified with an excavated temple of some magnificence on the south side of the sanctuary, which was built in the third quarter of the sixth century; since the excavated temple is divided into two equal naves with separate entrances, Hephaestus was likely worshipped here as well¹⁰⁵). Furthermore, because of the ties already noticed between Hephaestus and the Cabeiri, and between Lemnos and the Cabeirium on Delos, we should not forget the torch-races at this Delian sanctuary.

So although the evidence is fragmentary and scattered, Lemnos is the common ground¹⁰⁶). Hephaestus comes from Lemnos, and the earliest torch-race that we know of, at the Panathenaea, is bound up with the advent of Hephaestus at the Academy; according to Herodotus, the Greeks at large – by which he doubtless means the Greeks of the eastern Aegean – conduct the torch-race for Hephaestus; the torch-races attested later at the Samian Heraea honour both Hephaestus and Aphrodite and so disclose a Lemnian origin more plainly still; torch-races were run at the Cabeirium on Delos, the source of new fire at the Lemnian new-year's festival; in Roman times there is the torch-race for Hephaestus on Lemnos itself. We should also note that the Thracians on the opposite mainland, who are linked with Lemnian worship by Homer and by Aphrodite's epithet at the Cabeirium, gave the Greeks the other form of torch-race, in which the relay teams were mounted (Pl. Resp. 1, 328A; etc.). Finally, in the *aition* of the Lemnian new-year's festival Αἰθαλίδης, "Son of smoke", runs from the port to the city to announce the arrival of the Argo, i.e. of the ship bearing the new fire. There are signs that Aethalides once had a far more important role in the story than appears from later versions¹⁰⁷); he has various associations, but both his father Hermes

105) So Dunst, ZPE 1 (1967) 228–229. Brommer, Hephaistos 166, is inclined to disagree, for the very reason that Aphrodite and Hephaestus are not otherwise conjoined in cult. J.-P. Michaud, BCH 94 (1970) 973, 976, reports that at Psophis in Arcadia an excavated sanctuary of Aphrodite is thought to have been shared by Hephaestus because the votive objects include bronze tongs and an axe; but Aphrodite alone may preside over metal-working.

106) It might be mentioned as supporting evidence, which points to Lemnos and Athens together, that the great majority of known torch-races belong to the Aegean islands and the northern and eastern coasts of the Aegean. See Jüthner's list at RE 12.1 (1924) 570–571 s. λαμπαδηδρομία.

107) See C. Robert, Die griechische Heldensage (Berlin 1920–26) 778–779, 851. Aethalides is the earliest and most constant of Pythagoras' prior incarnations; for the evidence see Burkert, Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism (Cambridge, Mass. 1972) 138. It was surely Aethalides' Cabeirus-like transitions between the upper and the lower worlds which made him a useful *persona* for the

and his gift of sojourning now in the lower world and now in the upper suit the Lemnian cult of the Cabeiri. Aethalides is perhaps the only mythical figure who can be interpreted as a torch-racer. On this showing the Greek torch-race originates on Lemnos.

2) The *peplos* displayed on the ship-wagon at the fourth-yearly celebration was famous for its splendour¹⁰⁸), but the offering of a garment is in itself much less original and striking than the torch-race, and the antecedents are therefore harder to trace. Yet there is some reason to think that the *peplos* too was inspired by the Lemnian new-year's festival, in which fine robes were awarded as prizes. At any rate some modern misunderstandings can be dispelled straightway. It is disputed whether the offering was age-old or an innovation of the sixth century¹⁰⁹). But there is no room for dispute. The Athenians themselves did not take the *peplos* back to the mythical beginnings; Erichthonius, credited with the first temple, the first statue, the first bearing of boughs and baskets, the first chariot, even the first money prizes, is never said to have offered the first *peplos*. Instead the manufacture of the very first *peplos* was ascribed to Acesas and Helicon, master weavers of Patara and Carystus (Zen. 1.56; cf. Diogenian. 2.7; Diogenian. epit. 1.26; Apost. 1.99; Paroemiogr. Gr. 1.22, 197, 2.5, 265 Leutsch-Schneidewin). These weavers left other works, it was said – a robe presented by the Rhodians to Alexander (Plut. Alex.

Greek sage, and which explains why Pythagoras was held to be “a Tyrrhenian from one of the islands which the Athenians occupied after expelling the Tyrrhenians” (Aristoxenus fr. 11a Wehrli; etc.) and to have derived his knowledge from the Cabeiric cults of Imbros, Samothrace and Delos (Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 28.151). A. Henrichs, *Die Phoinikika des Lollianos* (Bonn 1972) 66, thinks of Aethalides apropos of the ritual practice of blackening the face with soot, but this practice does not agree very well with Aethalides' role as a swift herald.

108) It is perfectly clear that in the Classical period the *peplos* was offered only at the fourth-yearly celebration, and since the late sources who say otherwise are untrustworthy in themselves and do not hint at any change, they can be dismissed out of hand. Ziehen, *RE* 18.3 (1949) 460, 486–487, s. Panathenaia 1, gives the fullest treatment; T. L. Shear, *Kallias of Sphettos* (Princeton 1978) 36 n. 89, again reviews the contradictory evidence.

109) Dümmler, *RE* 2.2 (1896) 1966, s. Athena; Deubner, *Att. Feste* 29–30; and Davison, *From Arch. to Pindar* 33–34, think of an innovation; Mommsen, *Feste* 112–114; Brelich, *Paidés e parth.* 321–322; and Burkert, *Homo Necans* 175 n. 92, of an older custom that may have been somehow transformed. Mikalson, *AJP* 97 (1976) 148–151, regards the offering of a garment as an ancient rite which links the Panathenaea and the Hyacinthia; his thesis appears to require that the garment should be offered originally to Erechtheus and Hyacinthus, not to Athena and Apollo, but he stops short of saying so.

32.11), and something or other at Delphi, accompanied by an epigram which identified the maker, Helicon, as son of Acesas and as a native of Cyprian Salamis (Hieron. Rhod. fr. 48 Wehrli). Whatever the value of these conflicting traditions¹¹⁰), the weavers in question can hardly be earlier (or later) than the sixth century. Moreover, the interwoven scene which always remained traditional, Athena's role in the Gigantomachy, appears to originate in the sixth century, being a favourite of black-figure painting, and forming the pedimental decoration of the Peisistratid temple of Athena¹¹¹).

The sense of the offering has also been missed. The *peplos* of the ship-wagon was not used for dressing a statue of Athena, whether the Polias or the Parthenos, or for hanging as a curtain in the "Erechtheion", or for any other end. The Polias was indeed dressed in some garment, most likely a *peplos*, which was removed once a year for laundering at the Plynteria; but the regular laundering of the garment makes a regular replacement unnecessary, even at a four-year interval; the garment would be replaced at need, or when the worshippers felt an impulse, like the Trojans in Il. 6. Our *peplos* was in any case far too big for the Polias, being displayed on the ship's mast like a sail, and being woven, at least in the Late Hellenistic period, by more than 100 *ergastinai* – who may indeed have taken turns, but not in weaving a *peplos* of normal size. Surely it was offered to Athena as a gift without any ulterior destination, to be laid up in her temple like other offerings, like the treasures of the Parthenon which were inventoried year by year. The *peplos* was an article of practical use, as were many other offerings in every cult; but the worshippers did not expect to see the deity make use of these articles before their very eyes.

It follows that the Panathenaic *peplos* has no close analogy with the *chiton* which women of Sparta wove yearly for Apollo at

110) As Wehrli says, Hieronymus meant to impugn other traditions by quoting the Delphic epigram; but the truth of the matter is beyond conjecture.

111) See Beazley, ABV index 2 s. "Athena, in chariot, wheeling round, in Gigantomachy", and "Athena and Giants", and "Gigantomachy". The association of *peplos* and Gigantomachy was so close and familiar that the *Meropis*, a late Archaic epic dealing with Cos, spoke of Athena's slaying a giant to make a figurative *peplos* (Pap. Col. 5604 III 80 = Mer. fr. 6); see L. Koenen and R. Merkelbach in *Collectanea Papyrologica. Texts publ. in honor of H. C. Youtie* (Bonn 1976) 14–15, 17, and Henrichs, ZPE 27 (1977) 74–75. Nonnus' mention of Attic women weaving the rape of Oreithyia (Dion. 39.188–189) does not justify Mommsen's inference, at Feste 111 n. 5, that this too was a traditional scene in the *peplos*.

Amyclae, nor yet with the *peplos* which women of Elis wove every fourth year for Hera at Olympia – if in fact this *chiton* and this *peplos* were used for dressing the cult statues¹¹²). If they were not, then these garments like the *peplos* were offerings of the season, *aparchai*, representative of the worshipper's resources. The great *peplos* was woven of wool (Ar. Av. 827; IG 2² 1034; etc.). Sheep-rearing and wool-working were not so important at Athens as at some other places – at Pellene and on Lemnos, for example, where the woollen garments which figured in the local festivals, not indeed as offerings but as prizes, were renowned for their quality¹¹³). Wool was a staple product of Lemnos; witness the ram on the coins of Hephaestia (Head, Hist. Num.² 262–263), witness above all the epitaph of Nicomachus, an Athenian resident on Lemnos who died at Athens in the early fourth century and who was remembered chiefly as “a man who loved his flocks”, ἄνδρα φιλοπρόβατον (IG 2² 7180, Peek, Grab-Epigramme 490). Wool among other things drew the Athenians to Lemnos, first to trade and then to conquer. Now when Hephaestus assaults Athena in the mythical projection of the Panathenaea, she wipes away the spilth with wool, ἔριον, and throws it on the ground, χθών; whence the name of the marvellous creature who springs up, Ἐριχθόνιος. Was this bizarre etymology, which is invariable in ancient sources¹¹⁴), suggested solely by the name? Perhaps. But the weaving of the great *peplos* was introduced sometime in the sixth century, and if it came from Lemnos with Hephaestus, it would be natural for the Erichthonius story to take account of it.

3) We come to the ship-wagon, the means both of displaying the *peplos* in the procession and of conveying it as far as the

112) “The custom of dressing images in real clothes” is illustrated at length by Frazer, Paus. Descr. of Gr. 2.574–576, 3.592–593. Yet unless we rely on the instances at Amyclae and at Olympia, both supplied by Pausanias (3.16.2, 5.16.2), we do not find that the clothes so worn were punctually replaced at festivals, at least in Greece. Conversely there are undoubted instances of clothes laid up in temple stores.

113) For the *chlainai* of Pellene see Ernst Meyer, RE 19.1 (1937) 365–366 s. Pellene 1, and Gow and Page, Hellenistic Epigrams 2.495.

114) The act of ἐρίωι ἀπομάξαι is taken back to Callimachus' *Hecale* by schol. Il. 2.547 (quoted by Pfeiffer on fr. 260 line 19); but “dew of Hephaestus” as a reading of the papyrus traces is disowned by Lloyd-Jones and Rea, HSCP 72 (1967) 128, 136. Callimachus is thought to have drawn on Amelesagoras FGrHist 330 F 1, and it is likely in any case that the story stood in one or more of the Attic chroniclers.

Eleusinium¹¹⁵). It is only from the fourth century onward that we hear of the ship-wagon and its mast and of the *peplos* suspended as a sail; yet we may safely assume that it goes back to the sixth century – like the Dionysiac ship-wagon, which is never mentioned in any literary or documentary source¹¹⁶). In later days the ship-wagon seemingly started its journey at the marshalling place beside the Dipylon (cf. *Him. Or.* 3.12), but in the sixth century it may have come from somewhat further off, even from the Academy, for whereas part of the procession was then marshalled at the Leocoreum (*Thuc.* 1.20.2, 6.57.3), a point corresponding to the Dipylon when the city spread further out, another part was marshalled “outside in the district called Cerameicus” (*id.* 6.57.1), which extended to the Academy.

However this may be, the ship-wagon of the Panathenaea is unparalleled in other festivals of Athena and indeed in any sort of ritual – except for the ship-wagon of Dionysus, which is well attested in Ionia and is inferred for Athens by analogy and on the strength of three black-figure *skyphoi* of the period 500–480 B.C., all depicting Dionysus seated between two flute-playing satyrs in a wagon fitted out like a ship (Bologna 130; *Ath. Acrop.* 1281; *Brit. Mus.* B 79; *Pickard-Cambridge, Dram. Fest.*² figs. 11–13). We are therefore told that the Panathenaic ship-wagon is

115) Philostratus brings the ship-wagon from the Cerameicus to the Eleusinium (*Vit. Soph.* 2.1.7); when the *peplos* was taken down from the mast, the ship-wagon was of course removed from the scene, in this case (the celebration staged by Herodes Atticus) along a further route past the Pelasgicum and up to the Pythium, “where it is now moored”. The Pythium in south-east Athens was a large precinct suited to display; perhaps it superseded the site near the Areopagus where Pausanias saw the ship (1.29.1). The hypothesis of a Pythium on the north slope of the Acropolis has been sufficiently refuted by R. E. Wycherley, *AJA* 67 (1963) 75–79, and by Ernst Meyer, *RE* 24 (1963) 554–558 s. *Pythion* 2; it is advanced again by K. Clinton, *AJP* 94 (1973) 282–288, but with no further warrant. An epigram of the early fifth century after Christ, *IG* 2² 3818, praises Plutarch, perhaps the Neoplatonist philosopher, for thrice bringing the sacred ship to the temple of Athena at great expense; if this means that he dragged the ship up to the Acropolis, the custom, and possibly the form of the ship, had changed.

116) For this assumption see Ziehen, *RE* 18.3 (1949) 461–463 s. *Panathenaea* 1, as against Mommsen, *Feste* 112–116, who held that down to c. 400 B.C. the presentation of the new *peplos* was a separate rite performed by Athena’s servitors on the Acropolis at a certain interval before the Panathenaea proper; that the presentation next became a public ceremony in order to exhibit interwoven portraits of public figures; and that the ship was borrowed from Isis and Alexandria in the time of Alexander’s successors. We should not expect the ship-wagon or even the mast alone to appear in the marshalling of the procession on the Parthenon frieze, for Classical sculptors had an aversion to rendering mechanical devices.

modelled on Dionysus' ship-wagon. Since this view was put forth by Dümmler in 1896, it has been very widely adopted and never, I think, contradicted – a rare consensus in studies of the Panathenaea¹¹⁷). Yet it seems most improbable. In the actual construction of the Panathenaic ship-wagon (which doubtless grew more elaborate with the passing centuries), we may readily believe that Athens borrowed at first from the Dionysiac ship-wagon of the Ionians, practiced as they were. But it was not the ritual of Dionysus that prompted the Athenians to add a seeming ship to the Panathenaea; for the ships of Dionysus and Athena have entirely different purposes and associations.

The Dionysiac ship or ship-wagon exhibits the god's advent in the spring, when he returns from overseas to the coastal cities of Ionia¹¹⁸). At Smyrna, as we know from Imperial literature and coins, a wagon in the form of a trireme served to transport a statue of the god at the spring Dionysia; elsewhere, as at Magnesia-on-the-Maeander, processioners carried a model ship on their shoulders. Since the Athenian evidence is of the slightest, it can be doubted whether the ship-wagon belongs to the Anthesteria or to the Dionysia, or indeed whether it was ever adopted at all¹¹⁹). On

117) See Dümmler, RE 2. 2 (1896) 1966 s. Athena; E. Pfuhl, *De Atheniensium pompis sacris* (Berlin 1900) 10–11; A. Frickenhaus, JdI 27 (1912) 73; Deubner, *Att. Feste* 33–34; Ziehen, RE 18.3 (1949) 462; Parke, *Fest.* 39. It should perhaps be mentioned that the 45 pages which M. Detienne has devoted to "le navire d' Athéna" contain no mention of the Panathenaic ship or indeed of any ship of Athena: RHR 178 (1970) 133–177, repeated under different headings in Detienne and J.-P. Vernant, *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society* (Sussex 1978; French ed. 1974) 177–179, 183–184, 215–258.

118) For the Dionysiac ship and ship-wagon see Burkert, *Technikgeschichte* 34 (1967) 295–296, *Homo Necans* 223–224, *Gr. Rel.* 257–258; for the Ionian *katagogia* A. Henrichs, ZPE 4 (1969) 237–238; for pictorial renderings of Dionysus on shipboard M. I. Davies in *Athens Comes of Age: From Solon to Salamis* (Princeton 1978) 72–95. In his first contribution Burkert treats the ship and ship-wagon as relics of a time when gods came by ship or sled because the wheel had not yet been invented; this seems unnecessary and even at odds with the natural feeling which Burkert illustrates from Advent hymns.

119) At Athens the ship-wagon is usually assigned to the Anthesteria, as by Deubner, *Att. Feste* 102–111; Nilsson, *Gesch. der gr. Rel.*^{2/3} 1.583; Parke, *Fest.* 109. Frickenhaus, JdI 27 (1912) 61–69, argued for the Dionysia, as now Burkert, *Homo Necans* 223 n. 26, 263 n. 31, *Gr. Rel.* 166, 254, and, much less cogently, K. Kerényi, *Dionysos* (Princeton 1976) 160–175; yet these scholars seem to me to have missed the significance of the *eisagoge*. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dram. Fest.*² (ed. Gould and Lewis) 12 n. 2, suggests that the black-figure painters "are representing a popular subject, without direct dependence on any festival or ritual"; but a ship-wagon as distinct from a ship would not be a popular subject unless suggested by ritual, and the ritual does not appear anywhere else in the Greek homeland.

the likeliest reconstruction it was used in the late sixth and early fifth centuries at the Dionysia, in order to bring the statue of Dionysus from the Academy to the temple at the south foot of the Acropolis – the rite of *eisagoge* which corresponds to the Ionian *katagogia*, a term attested at Ephesus, Priene and Miletus. The same term occurs once at Athens, in the regulations of the Iobacchi from the time of Herodes Atticus, and appears to be linked with the celebration of the Dionysia (IG 2² 1368 = LSCG 51, lines 113–115, 117–121). Before the *eisagoge* Dionysus was summoned to his worshippers at the Academy by the singing of dithyrambs, the hymn traditionally sung for this purpose; the rest of the festival program, including all the choregic events except the men's dithyramb, took place in Athens after the *eisagoge* (Dem. 21.10, citing "Euegorus' law"). The god himself was visible in the festival conveyance, as he is in the vase-paintings, in the form of a seated wooden statue (Paus. 1.38.8; Philostr. Vit. Soph. 2.1.3); the seated posture is deduced from the chryselephantine statue of Alcámenes, a later version of the cult statue. Thus at Athens as in Ionia the Dionysiac ship-wagon is the means by which the god enters the city in triumph after a winter's absence.

The consequences for the Panathenaic ship-wagon are obvious. No one supposed that Athena was now arriving in the city after a sojourn abroad¹²⁰); a ship evoking this idea would be pointless or worse. And of course the statue of Athena Polias, unlike the statue of Dionysus Eleuthereus, never left its temple and was never put aboard the ship-wagon¹²¹). The respective ship-wagons

120) Fehrlé, *Kult. Keuschheit* 181, asserts that "the goddess came on a ship across the sea", and vainly cites some modern studies of Dionysiac and other sea-born epiphanies.

121) On the strength of IG 2² 2245 line 299, "charioteer of Pallas" as the title of an ephebic officer, and of IG 2² 3198, Herennius Dexippus as *agonothetes* of the Great Panathenaea who restored both the mast of the Panathenaic ship and the statue of Athena, it has been held that Dexippus caused the new or refurbished statue to be transported to the Acropolis in the ship-wagon; see Kirchner on 2245 and on SIG³ 894. The "charioteer of Pallas", however, drove not the Panathenaic ship-wagon but the chariot in which the Palladium was conveyed to Phalerum; cf. Burkert, *ZRGG* 22 (1970) 358 n. 8. Moreover, on the true computation of the Panathenaic era, as expounded by Moretti, *Iscr. Ag. Gr.* 202–203, IG 2² 2245 falls in 254/5 A.D., not 262/3, and so it is much less likely that this is the year of Dexippus' *agonothesia*, for which (among other things) he was honoured in c. 269 (IG 2² 3669). Nor, let it be said in passing, was the statue of Athena Polias removed from the Acropolis for a ritual bath; see e.g. Ziehen, *RE* 21.1 (1951) 1060–1065 s. Πλυντήρια; Herington, *Ath. Parth. and Ath. Pol.* 30 n. 2; Burkert, *ZRGG* 22 (1970) 358–359.

were probably quite different in appearance; at any rate the tall mast which carried the *peplos* has no counterpart in the vase-paintings of the Dionysiac ship-wagon¹²²). It may still be said that two ship-wagons used concurrently in two public festivals could not fail to be associated in the minds of the Athenians; and this is reasonable. Yet it is certain that from an Athenian point of view the Panathenaic ship supplied the pattern; it had been instituted first, and the route from the Academy to the Acropolis was proper to the worship of Athena.

Taken by itself, the question of priority cannot be settled with assurance; that the Panathenaic ship-wagon goes back to c. 566 B.C., and the Dionysiac ship-wagon to the tyranny of Peisistratus, c. 546–527, is merely plausible conjecture¹²³). But there can be little doubt that the route and the *termini*, which are virtually the same for both, were dictated by the worship of Athena; for unlike Athena Dionysus has no very ancient ties with either the Academy or the Acropolis. In Ionia the ship-wagon was surely conducted in procession from the port to the upper city; although direct evidence is lacking, the weight of probability is not, and there are such indications as the Dionysiac welcome accorded Antony at the moment of his arrival in Ephesus, εἰς γοῦν Ἐφεσον εἰσιόντος αὐτοῦ (Plut. Ant. 24.4). Why then did Dionysus come by ship not from Phalerum, but from the Academy? To be sure, the cult of Dionysus Eleuthereus was imported from Eleutherae, a border town at the north-west with Boeotian traditions; yet this was only because the date chosen for the new festival, the second quarter of Elaphebolion, was later than any Attic festival of Dionysus, but conformed with the colder climate of Boeotia, witness the month Agrionius = Elaphebolion; it is naive to sup-

122) According to Deubner, Att. Feste 33–34, 105–106, the so-called *stylis* or “standard” of the Dionysiac ship-wagon gave the inspiration for hanging the *peplos* on a T-shaped mast and spar; but K. Friis Johansen, Eine Dithyrambos-Aufführung (Arkaeol.-kunsthist. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 4.2, 1959) 16–23, and A. Rumpf, BonnJbb 161 (1961) 212, have shown that the Dionysiac item is a may-pole that has nothing to do with the ship-wagon. This is a fatal blow to Deubner’s exposition, and if the vase-paintings can be relied on, one might conjecture rather that the Athenian version of the Dionysiac ship-wagon was left without a mast so as to avoid any resemblance to the Panathenaic ship-wagon.

123) For the evidence associating Peisistratus with the city Dionysia or with Dionysus Eleuthereus see Berve, Tyrannis 1.60–61, 2.552, and especially F. Kolb, JdI 92 (1977) 124–133. I do not know the evidence or the argument which enables Burkert, Homo Necans 224, to speak of “the Dionysiac reform round 560” as the occasion when the city Dionysia were founded.

pose that the procession from the Academy to the Acropolis somehow commemorates the migration of the cult from Eleutherae. The *eisagoge* of the Dionysia is modelled on the procession of the Panathenaea, not the reverse.

With the Dionysiac ship removed we see the Panathenaic ship much more clearly. Its function is not to bring the goddess to her worshippers, but to bring a new-year's gift to the goddess. In this it resembles the *theoris naus* of the Lemnian new-year's festival, a ship so famous that it was equated with the Argo. The Lemnian ship brought new fire to the Great Goddess, the fire being transmitted at the last by torch-racers. Fire-bringing was equally the business of the Athenian new-year's festival, but here the fire was fetched from close at hand, so that ship and torch-race could not be used successively. We have already seen that the torch-race was borrowed from Lemnos; the ship was not omitted, but was turned to a related purpose, the conveyance of the *peplos* as another emblem of renewal.

In sum, the ancient ritual of the Panathenaea was greatly amplified and embroidered in the sixth century. Hephaestus came to Athens and jostled Prometheus at the altar in the Academy and in the story of Erichthonius; a torch-race took the place of a more stately fire-bringing; the *peplos* and the ship-wagon gave a startling new appearance to the procession; the precinct at the Academy was embellished, the road to the Acropolis was widened, and altars of Desire were installed at either end. These last improvements belong to the period c. 527–510 and are a consequence of the changes in the program. The changes can hardly be later than the mid century, in view of the currency of the Erichthonius story; so they may hang together with the enlargement of the agonistic program in 566 B.C. The model for these changes was the new-year's festival of Lemnos, already widely known in the Greek world, though possibly the Athenians had closer experience of similar rites in the area of Sigeum¹²⁴).

Ontario/Canada

Noel Robertson

124) We need not look for any correlation with political vicissitudes at Athens. Public festivities were not transformed by manifesto, and Peisistratus and his sons had no economic or sectarian policy of promoting certain deities over others, but followed the usual pattern of aristocratic patronage and display, as Kolb, *JdI* 92 (1977) 99–138, has demonstrated at length.