

AN[T]IBOYΣ

Lines 62–65 in the first column of the Erchia sacrificial calendar record the following offering to Athena Polias on the third of Skirophorion:

Ἀθηνάαι Πολι-
άδι ἐμ Πόλει Ἐ-
ρχιάσι οἷς ἀν-
[.]ίβους Δ

The restoration was Daux's, who prepared the editio princeps, and has been accepted by other scholars such as Jameson and Dow¹). The expression clearly means that a sheep was to be substituted for an ox in this sacrifice. Daux cited Hesychius, s. v. ἀντίβοιον to instance a similar locution: ἀντίβοιον ἰσόβοιον, ἀντί βοὸς καθαγιαζόμενον. Σοφοκλῆς Μελεάγρω.

The question is, why was a sheep substituted for an ox in this particular sacrifice. Dow observed: „On the face of it, this looks like a substitution; but one must be wary, for it occurs only here. More occurrences should be expected if numerous reductions had been made”²). To this we may add Jameson's statement: „... it seems unlikely that the term at Erchia represents a recent economy measure. Possibly the *ois* at Erchia (and at other demes?) was meant to correspond to the *bous* for Athena at Athens”³). But Jameson's cautious suggestion is unsatisfactory, for it hardly explains the practice or the locution, which (in line with Hesychius' entry) clearly implies a *substitution*, not a correspondence. One might be tempted to conjecture that the provision was due to a shortage of oxen, by referring to Philochorus (FGrHist 328 F 169), who wrote that at one time the Athenians passed a law,

1) Editio princeps: G. Daux, La Grande Démarchie; un nouveau calendrier sacrificiel d'Attique (Erchia), BCH 87 (1963) 603–34; M. Jameson, Notes on the Sacrificial Calendar from Erchia, BCH 89 (1965) 154–172; S. Dow, The Greater Demarchia of Erchia, BCH 89 (1965) 180–213. F. Sokolowski, Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques (Paris 1969) 43, suggested ἀν(α)[β]εβ̄ οὐσ(α), a very improbable reading with nothing to recommend it.

2) Dow (above, n. 1) 211.

3) Jameson (above, n. 1) 158.

because of a lack of oxen, to refrain from these animals and replenish their supply by not sacrificing them [all] up: *καὶ κατὰ χρόνον δέ τινα ἐκλιπόντων τῶν βοῶν . . . νομοθετηθῆναι διὰ τὴν σπάνιν ἀπέχεσθαι αὐτοὺς τῶν ζώων, συνάγειν βουλομένους καὶ πληθῦσαι τῷ μὴ καταθῦεσθαι*. But this restriction hardly seems applicable to the Erchia calendar, for a number of other local sacrificial calendars from Attika (those of the Salaminioi, Tetrapolis, and Thorikos), coming from approximately the same period (just before the mid-fourth century) list βόες as victims⁴). The prices range from 40 to 150 dr. and scarcely imply a shortage of oxen at this time. In fact, if the legislation Philochorus mentioned is to be connected with a similar law that Androtion (FGrHist 324 F 55) called a *παλαιὸς νόμος*, the restriction was probably set in mythological times. Hence, it had nothing to do with the practice considered here.

Another tack, hinted at but not followed up by Dow, appears more fruitful. One of the most striking aspects of the Erchia calendar (and it has many) is the modest size of the sacrifices to be offered. None exceeds 12 dr.; none is a βούς; and the great majority are piglets and sheep (with an occasional goat thrown in) at prices between 3 and 12 dr. All of our other surviving calendars are much more lavish than this. Such economy suggests that the inscription published a scaled-down version of a more elaborate forerunner. That an earlier version existed is proven by Healey's observation that the sacrifice to Semele on 16 Ἐλαφελιὼν ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ βωμοῦ in column A has as its referent the sacrifice to Dionysus on the same day, recorded subsequently in column D⁵). There was thus an earlier list of sacrifices on which the inscription was based, with at the least significant differences between the two in format. There could well have been also changes in the type, number, and cost of victims to be offered. Accordingly, *pace* Jameson, the οἷς ἀν[τ]ίβους likely was a recent economy measure, for if the substitution had been a long-standing tradition, it would have been superfluous to make a special note of it when the calendar underwent substantial revision.

But if the inscription presents a reduced series of sacrifices, why is there mention of only one substitution, of a sheep for an ox? As Dow said, "more occurrences should be expected if numerous reductions had been made." We believe the calendar does

4) Salaminioi: W. S. Ferguson, *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 1-68; Tetrapolis: IG 2² 1358; Thorikos: SEG 26.136.

5) Cf. Dow (above, n. 1) 193.

represent substantial reductions from an earlier version, in which there were more substitutions for oxen made than the one the inscription shows. We offer two possible explanations for the singular occurrence. The first is cultic and is premised on Jameson's conjectural restoration of column E 65–70, that on 3 Skirophorion, the same day as Athena's sacrifice, Pandrosos was also offered an οἶς⁶). Philochorus stated such an offering was mandatory whenever Athena was given an ox, terming the ewe to Pandrosos as ἐπίβοιον that is, 'in addition to the ox': ἐὰν δέ τις τῇ Ἀθηνᾶ θύῃ βοῦν ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι καὶ τῇ Πανδρόσῳ θύειν οἶν καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο τὸ θῦμα ἐπίβοιον (FGrHist 328 F 10). Perhaps it was a πρόθυμα just as the χοῖρος to Kourotrophos often served as a preliminary to sacrifices to Athena⁷). If so, when the ox to Athena was replaced with a ewe on the Erchians' revised calendar, it was important to indicate this particular ewe was ἀντίβους, that it stood for an original ox, in order to justify and explain the additional sacrifice of the ewe to Pandrosos, which was properly after all an ἐπίβοιον⁸). What weakens this conjecture is the fact that *none* of our inscriptional evidence records an actual instance of a sheep for Pandrosos following the sacrifice of a βοῦς to Athena⁹). It is conceivable that Philochoros was commenting on a specific cult practice, and his reference only appears to be a general statement because Harporation, who cited him, excerpted away its particular context. The

6) Jameson (above, n. 1) 157; accepted by Dow (above, n. 1) 186 as "more likely" than his own suggestion, Demeter. Jameson's conjecture was motivated by the association of Pandrosos, her Kekropid sister Aglauros, Athena, and the cult of Poseidon (-Erechtheus), of which the latter three received offerings from the Erchians on 3 Skirophorion: B55–59; A57–65; D56–60. He further points out their connection in the myth of Erichthonios' birth, which he takes as an *aition* for the Arrephoria.

7) E. g., in the Erchia calendar, A57–65; IG 2² 1358.14–22 (Tetrapolis); LSS 10.22–24 (Athenian state calendar). Cf. Suid. s. v. Κουρότροφος γῆ . . . καταστήσαι δὲ νόμιμον τοὺς θύοντας [τινι] τῇ θεῶ ταύτῃ προθύειν: A. Mommsen suggested τῇ for τινι (Feste der Stadt Athen [Leipzig 1898] 116, n. 4); cf. J. H. Oliver, *Hesperia* 4 (1935) 28; P. Stengel, *Opferbräuche der Griechen* (Leipzig and Berlin 1910) 31, n. 5, doubted the similarity but gave no reasons for his view.

8) Jameson unfortunately and inexplicably seems to confuse the two: "We would have then an *ois* **epibous* in the Athenian version of the cult for which at Erchia we have an *ois antibous*" (157). But *epiboion* is *not* to be equated with *antiboion/antibous*, as a comparison with Lex. rhet. p. 254, 11 Bekker makes clear: ἐπίβοιον: τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ θυομένῃ βοῖ θυόμενον.

9) The evidence Jameson cites (above, n. 1) 156, n. 5, is misleading: these are only joint dedications to Athena and Pandrosos, not a record of sacrificial offerings.

second possibility, which rests on the chance of human error and is accordingly more mundane, we believe more probable. When the earlier version of the Erchia calendar was being revised, it involved, as Dow has suggested, a considerable reworking, with very careful alignment of sacrifices, in order to produce equality of cost, number and type of victim, as well as type of recipient deity (olympian or epichoric) among the columns. This implies an intermediary draft and a (clean) copy from which the mason was to work. We conjecture that those who revised the original calendar noted in their draft copy the substitution of victims they made, as an aid in constructing the new version. It would not, however, have been politic to publish on stone notation of these substitutions for the celebrants to see – and regret. These were then notes for the revisers, to be expunged when a cleaner and final copy was made from which the mason was to work. Inadvertently, however, one instance of ἀντίβους was left in the mason's copy, much in the same way that the inconcinnity of ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ βωμοῦ escaped correction in column A for the sacrifice to Semele. The dutiful stone-cutter, of course, inscribed what he had before him.

Wayne State University
Detroit

K. R. Walters
W. Jordan

THE MANUSCRIPT SOURCES FOR THE ARISTIDES QUINTILIANUS AND BRYENNIUS INTERPOLATIONS IN CLEONIDES' ΕΙΣΑΓΩΓΗ ΑΡΜΟΝΙΚΗ

In his standard edition of Cleonides εἰσαγωγή ἁρμονική¹), Carl von Jan cites as authority for the interpolations from Aristides Quintilianus and Manuel Bryennius two manuscripts designated as 'Vulcanius' and 'Possevinus'. The former of these two

1) *Musici scriptores graeci* (Leipzig 1895) 179–207; (reprint: Hildesheim 1962). The text is reissued with several printing errors corrected in Heinrich Menge, *Euclidis Phaenomena et scripta musica*, vol. VIII of J.L. Heiberg and