

The financial relationship of 4th century Attic demes, gene, and the Athenian state.

Af James Artz



The sacrificial calendars from Erchia, Thorikos and the Marathonian Tetrapolis, as well as the 4th century decree of the *genos* Salaminioi, provide a large body of epigraphic evidence regarding the relationship between the Attic demes and the Athenian state, particularly in the area of cult finance.¹ The calendars all appear to have been inscribed around the 2nd quarter of the 4th century, and although this may limit our diachronic understanding of cult finance, it is beneficial in providing multiple perspectives within a relatively short period of time.² Although these calendars and decrees have added much to the understanding of cult finance, they have raised many questions in addition to providing answers to others. The calendars are far from uniform in their organization and content, and the ambiguities frequently prohibit more than tentative conclusions to specific aspects of cult finance, and attempts to define trends at anything higher than a deme by deme level. Using primarily the four sources listed above, this paper will explore the extent of state responsibility toward local cult finance, and will offer comments on the organization and content of the calendars, the extent of local participation in state cults, the financial relationship between the state, deme and *genos*, and recent scholarship on these issues. Although the calendars will be compared and contrasted where appropriate, the paper will move thematically through the four sources.

Erchia

The sacrificial calendar from Erchia is arranged in five columns, equally distributing the sacrificial expenses throughout – either to five individuals, or five groups. Dow believes that individuals paid the totals from each column, and these individuals would have been assigned by an allotment procedure.³ The total expenditure for two of the five columns is preserved at the bottom of the stele, and the remaining three totals can be deduced fairly certainly. The totals are all within the range of a few drachmas, each column reaching a sum around 110 drachmas. There are no names mentioned on the calendar, which could suggest that each of these five positions represented by the columns were held for a certain period of time, perhaps annually. The positions could have been public elected officials, such as those subject to *euthynai* in the Thorikos calendar (discussed below), or perhaps wealthy demesmen, who could afford to supply the sacrificial victims from their flocks, volunteered for the positions. Dow's hypothesis of an allotment assigning random payment to individuals seems unlikely, unless the allotment was restricted to demesmen who could afford such expenses. Regardless of whether these positions were voluntary or assigned, they would undoubtedly have brought benefits to those who held them.⁴

An interesting aspect of local cult practice in Erchia is the role of the demarch in carrying out the sacrifices. The Marathonian Tetrapolis calendar contains only one reference (Face A, col. 2, line 23) to a series of sacrifices carried out by the demarch, and the Thorikos calendar does not specify whether a priest or demarch carries out the sacrifices. However, at Erchia there is evidence that the demarch was responsible for the sacrifices listed on this calendar. One of the four sacrifices performed on Thargelion 4, from column E (lines 47-58, a sacrifice to Hermes in the Agora), contains the provision that the herald should perform the sacrifice and take the perquisites (*gera*) just as the demarch would. Since there are four other sacrifices on Thargelion 4, which do not contain this provision, it is likely that the demarch would have been at one or more of these sacrifices, and this provision is included to clarify a deviation from the normal situation

– that the demarch normally carried out the sacrifice. As Jameson notes, the heading of this calendar, the greater demarchia, could imply the existence of a separate calendar with the hypothetical title ‘the lesser demarchia’, and perhaps the role of the demarch as official priest of these sacrifices was a differentiating factor between the two calendars.⁵

The sacrificial calendar from Erchia also contains evidence regarding the relationship of this deme to state cult. Mikalson concluded that there is evidence throughout the calendars that the demes performed local versions of some state cults, particularly those that were celebrated by women, concerned with the family, or “when the character of the specific festival dictated deme participation.”⁶ He also believes that there is a tripartite structural similarity between the calendars: sacrifices involving only the local community, sacrifices to the Athenians on behalf of the demesmen, and sacrifices at the quadrennial festivals.⁷ The arrangement seems logical, although it does not account for groups that do not fit into this structure, such as the local leagues (such as the Marathonian Tetrapolis) and gentilitial groups (such as the *genos* Salaminoi), which also had sacrificial calendars. Although these groups do not fit neatly into the tripartite division suggested by Mikalson, the categories are useful when looking for overall trends regarding the relationship between demes and the state.

Thorikos

In addition to sacrifices offered to local heroes and heroines, there are entries throughout the Thorikos calendar that are related to larger state cults, which demonstrate that at least some deme calendars were concerned with cult sacrifices above the level of local heroes. The Diasia festival is mentioned in lines 34-35, which was celebrated in Agrai outside of Athens. The categorization of this festival as either state or local is complex. Thucydides mentions the Diasia as a pandemic festival of great importance to all Athenians, but it occurs outside the city and is not specifically mentioned as a state-sponsored festival.⁸ Jameson et al. note that throughout the Greek world the Diasia is usually celebrated by individuals or groups rather than by the state, and thus the size of the pandemic Attic festival may have been uncommon in relation to Diasia in other *poleis*.⁹ This festival is also mentioned in the Erchian calendar (col. A, lines 38-43), proving that demesmen from both these demes participated in the Diasia festival. The Erchian calendar specifies Agrai as the location for the offering, but Thorikos leaves the location unmentioned. Despite its local character outside Attica, the entries regarding the Diasia in the deme calendars support Thucydides’ assertion of its pandemic nature, although the Thorikos calendar does not verify that the demesmen traveled to Agrai. The entries do reinforce the view that these calendars were designed to account for local participation in state festivals, as well as the celebration of various local heroes, heroines, and chthonic deities.

Just as it remains unclear whether the Thorikos demesmen celebrated the Diasia locally at Thorikos or in Agrai, the calendar entries associated with the Pyanopsion (lines 25-27) likewise provide ambiguous evidence regarding local participation in state cults. The poor state of preservation of this section of the stone complicates its intelligibility, but Parker believes that the Thorikos demesmen may be celebrating the Pyanopsia locally, rather than in the city.¹⁰ Parker also interprets the Thorikos calendar as strong evidence for the local celebration, and argues for local observance of the Hieros Gamos festival (line 32), since

the entry for this festival at Erchia (col. B, 37-39) specifies that this festival take place within the deme, and likewise the Plynteria (line 13) and Prerosia festivals (lines 52-53).¹¹ The lack of clear terminology regarding the location of these sacrifices leaves this interpretation open to debate, but it is interesting to note that the high number of references to state festivals, which may be taking place locally, make this calendar unique. The discrepancy between the numbers of state references in the calendars implies that the same set of clearly defined rules must not have applied to all demes. Some demes, such as Thorikos, may have chosen to celebrate more state festivals locally, while others may have chosen to take part in the festivals at Athens.

Another remarkable feature of the Thorikos calendar is the lack of prices for the sacrificial animals. Economic references are mostly absent from the entries, with the exception of the qualification *praton*, ‘to be sold’. The meaning of this qualification is not immediately clear, but seems to logically imply that if an animal was not *praton*, the official conducting the sacrifice must have provided it from his own supply. It is thus conceivable that *praton* is implying that the animal could be bought, presumably from someone within the deme, although the victim may have come from outside of the deme as well. It is also possible that a *praton* animal came from sacred land, although there is no mention of sacred land in this calendar.¹² The calendar, which is almost completely preserved, has roughly 54 animals sacrificed throughout the year.¹³ Of these animals, five are designated as *praton*, and no pattern is immediately apparent between the five animals. Three are *telea*, which Lupu leaves unspecified as ‘a full-grown victim’, and the others are sheep.¹⁴

One possible correlation between the *praton* animals could be their purchase at festivals outside of Thorikos. One is a sheep for Zeus Meilichios at the Diasia, which appears to be an extra-deme festival. The others are less clear: the line 9 entry is unspecified, the lines 11-12 entry appears to be local although the location rubric is heavily restored, the line 23 entry is erased, and the line 24 entry is similar to that of lines 11-12. Both the *prata* from lines 11-12 and 23 are for Zeus Kataibates, which honor places struck by lightning. These could feasibly be locations outside of the deme, where it would be easier to purchase the animal from a resident in the area, rather than escort it from the deme center. Whether the *praton* specification has economic significance is unclear, but it could possibly support an interpretation of this calendar as more focused on the location of sacrifice: in the deme itself, in the countryside outside of the deme, or in Athens.

Unlike the calendars from Erchia and the Marathonian Tetrapolis, there is little indication in the Thorikos calendar regarding who is financially responsible for these sacrifices. Lupu believes that the back of the stone may have been inscribed, as the fragmentary entries on the sides show emendations to the main texts that would have been present on the originally opisthographic stele.¹⁵ However, the side entries, which seem to contain emendations to the text on the front and back, show that at least part of the back side would have contained more sacrifices in a manner similar to the preserved entries on the front. Although the emendations on the side leave a large portion of the (supposed) text on the back open to interpretation, there is no way to ascertain its content. Thus the evidence regarding who is responsible for supplying these animals is scarce. A priest is mentioned in line 16, as providing a lunch for an attendant, but this seems more likely to be an exceptional entry rather than evidence regarding who is responsible for these sacrifices. Without reason to postulate a list of demesmen such as in the Marathonian Tetrapolis calendar, or the careful

division of the sacrifices in the Erchian calendar, the structure of payment regarding these sacrifices remains unclear.

The end of the Thorikos calendar contains an interesting oath for the *euthynos* (scrutinizer) and his assistants (lines 57-65). The oath does not state that it is referring to the sacrificial calendar preceding it, but its presence on this stele, which is devoted to the codification of deme cult activity, does suggest a relationship between *euthyna* (a scrutiny) and the administration of sacrifices. The last line of the oath states, “all offices for which officials are elected shall be subjected to scrutiny”, which seems to imply that the person or people supplying these sacrifices were elected from the demesmen of Thorikos. While the Thorikos calendar does not contain the type of arrangement present in the Erchian calendar, which shows that five individuals or groups of individuals were sharing the monetary responsibility for the sacrifices equally, it does seem clear from this *euthynos* oath that the administration of sacrifices was a public matter that was subject to the same type of scrutiny as a demarch, choregos, or other public deme official.

There is epigraphic evidence from other Attic demes regarding the position and duties of the *euthynos*, specifically from Eleusis, Halai Aixonides, and Hagnous.¹⁶ Most of these inscriptions do not relate directly to religious affairs, but do provide evidence regarding the *euthynai* procedures in other demes. The inscription from Hagnous details the scrutiny of the demarch, and could reflect the general nature of *euthyna* procedures such as that of Thorikos. Lines 7-16 begin with the end of an oath and self-cursing clause that is quite similar to the *euthynos* oath from the Thorikos calendar, and the subsequent content of the Hagnous inscription favors its interpretation as an *euthynos* oath. Lines 16-27 then describe how the *euthynos* supervises the examination of the demarch at a deme assembly, upon completion of the demarch’s year in office. The actual scrutinizing is performed by assistants (*synegroi*) and the decision of whether to fine the demarch is anonymously voted upon by a group of ten elected officials. The *euthynos* appears to act as an overseer of the proceedings, rather than physically carrying out the procedure or making a judgement. Rhodes and Osborne remark that this procedure has close parallels with the state *euthynai* procedures,¹⁷ and although it is logical to assume that *euthynai* procedures varied from deme to deme, the *euthyna* at Thorikos, if it does indeed refer to the scrutiny of religious procedures, may have taken place in a somewhat similar manner.

Marathonian Tetrapolis

The sacrificial calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis represents an organizational unit somewhat larger than the deme. Parker defines the Tetrapolis as a local league uniting several demes, and although these demes were politically independent, their religious relationship must have been close enough to warrant the inscription of their sacrifices on a common stele.¹⁸ Although this calendar differs from those of Erchia and Thorikos because it is designed for a somewhat larger and more regional group, its organization and content demonstrate many similarities with the deme calendars of Erchia and Thorikos. The structure of the calendar is unique: it is clearly opisthographic, with an extensive list of deities, offerings, and prices on the well-preserved face A, and a list of names and numerals on the mostly illegible face B.¹⁹ Although the information on Face B is mostly illegible, if the restoration of demesmen’s names is correct, it represents an important organizational difference between the Marathonian Tetrapolis calendar and others.²⁰ The financial

responsibility for sacrifices at Erchia and Thorikos remains a subject of debate, but the Tetrapolis calendar seems to define clearly who was paying for its sacrifices: the demesmen whose names were inscribed on Face B.

Like the calendars from Thorikos and Erchia, the Tetrapolis calendar contains many entries for various local heroes, heroines, and chthonic deities. Lambert notes that they are archaic and very localized, and there are many correlations between these deities and those present on other deme calendars.²¹ For example, Zeus Horios receives an offering in both the Tetrapolis (A1, 11-12) and Erchian (E 28-29) calendars, although the time of year and offering are different. In the Tetrapolis, Zeus Horios receives a sheep, worth 12 drachmas, in the month Skirophorion; in Erchia he receives a piglet, worth 3 drachmas, in Posideon. While both the Tetrapolis and Erchia offered a sacrifice for Zeus Horios, the different time of year and animal show that the local celebration of his cult could vary throughout the demes. Although their worship varied, the presence of common deities in the deme calendars demonstrates that there could have been some level of commonality in the local religious customs of the demes. Common entries such as Zeus Horios could also imply that although this deity may have been worshipped throughout the demes, this did not imply that his worship was funded by the state. This distinction is important, and argues against a strict dichotomy between locally focused deme religion and Olympian-focused state religion.

The organization of the Tetrapolis calendar is difficult to comprehend, and clearly distinct from Erchia and Thorikos. Lambert suggests that the three locations mentioned in the prose section of Face A (A1 17-19) reveal three sources of authority where specific sets of sacrifices were designated: the Eleusinion, Kynosoura, and the Heraklion.²² The Kynosoura and Heraklion are known locations within the geographical confines of the Marathonian Tetrapolis, but the Eleusinion has not yet been identified. The following section, A1 20-37, then details deities, animals and prices for sacrifices at the three locations specified above. Although the incomplete state of the stone makes such a division difficult to state with certainty, Lambert's theory is attractive as evidence supporting Mikalson's tripartite division of sacrifices in the deme calendars,²³ although the super-deme organization of the Tetrapolis could be seen as a different type of local community than Erchia or Thorikos. The sacrifices at these locations presumably involved demesmen from all four branches of the Tetrapolis, and its inclusion on this stele along with the poorly preserved list of demesmen on Face B supports the idea that this calendar may have recorded ceremonies that were 'tetrapolis-wide', and supported financially by demesmen from all four branches of the Tetrapolis.

In addition to the geographic division, Face A of the calendar is divided into two columns, separated by a substantial space. The reason for this division is not given in the calendar, but one difference between the two columns, as noted by Lambert, is the lack of *hierosynai* in column 1.²⁴ *Hierosynai* are present in many of the sacrifices in column 2, and their absence from column 1 is conspicuous.²⁵ Lambert believes this represents an institutional difference between the two columns, and he offers two possible explanations: either the authority performing the sacrifices in column 1 did not receive *hierosynai*, or the *hierosynai* for column 1 came from a different source. In the former case, column 1 would represent newer sacrifices, perhaps instituted after the Cleisthenic reforms of 508 BCE. In the latter case, the *hierosynai* in column 2 would come from the funds contributed by the demesmen on Face B, and the *hierosynai* in column 1 would either come from a local *gene* or the state. However, if the column 1 sacrifices were receiving *hierosynai*

from a different source (*gene* or state), would this necessarily explain their absence on this calendar? The incomplete state of the stone leaves unclear whether their absence was explained on the stele, but given the detailed accounts of *hierosynai* in column 2 it seems likely that they were purposefully excluded from column 1.

Although the significance is unclear, it is interesting to note that almost four fifths (19 of 25) of the monetary amounts in column 1 are 12 drachmas, while there is much less uniformity in the monetary amounts of column 2 (approximately 12 of 57 monetary amounts are 12 drachmas). These statistics include restored figures, and are also skewed by the incomplete state of the stone. However, roughly equal amounts of columns 1 and 2 are preserved, which could support the supposition that these fragmentary figures are representative of the whole. The discrepancy in uniformity of monetary amounts between the two columns could be seen as evidence supporting Lambert's theory that there is some sort of institutional difference represented by the two columns. When considered with the lack of *hierosynai* in column 1, one possibility is that a demarch was the authority performing the sacrifices in column 1, as Lambert notes that the sacrifices lacking *hierosynai* in column 2 are explicitly designated as performed by the demarch. However, this would seem to contradict the presence of demarch-supervised sacrifices in column 2. A second explanation could be that the column 1 sacrifices are contributions to sacrifices outside the deme, although the few deity names preserved seem to be more local in character. While the fragmentary state of the calendar has stifled the understanding of the difference between the two columns, the super-deme structure of the Tetrapolis may somehow relate to the unique organization of its calendar.

The Genos Salaminioi

The Salaminioi are the most epigraphically documented Attic *genos*, and although the present evidence leaves the role of *gene* in Athenian society open to interpretation, the Salaminioi Decree does contain information relevant to the relationship between state and local cult.²⁶ Although the deme calendars contain no specific references to the state financing local cult sacrifices, the Salaminioi Decree shows that the state shared the responsibility of cult finance within this *genos* in the 4th century. Lines 20-24 discuss the distribution of 'all things' (*hosa*) which the *polis* provides, and Rhodes and Osborne supply sacrificial victims as the reference implied by *hosa*, presumably from the context of raw meat being divided later in the sentence.²⁷ The purpose of this decree is the resolution of a dispute between the two branches of the Salaminioi, and thus information regarding the exact nature of the state contribution to the cult practices of the Salaminioi is not completely clear. The decree does not specify which festivals or cults the state provides sacrifices for. The clause, "or that the Salaminioi happen to receive from the *oschophoroi* or *deipnophoroi*" (lines 21-22) could imply that the state is providing sacrificial animals at the Oschophoria, since the wording on the stone seems to imply that the *oschophoroi* and *deipnophoroi* were not obligated to provide the sacrifices.

The Oschophoria, as part of the larger festival celebrating the return of Theseus after slaying the Minotaur, was a state cult, which the Salaminioi were clearly involved in operating.²⁸ Lines 48-50 show that the *oschophoroi* and *deipnophoroi* were appointed (presumably) from members of the *gene*, and since the *oschophoroi* and *deipnophoroi* could supply victims, the exact nature of financial obligation for this cult thus

remains ambiguous. The state appears to be obligated to insure the presence of sacrificial victims, although members of the *genos* could contribute victims as well. One possible interpretation of this clause is that the *genos* provided the victims unless financial hardship prohibited them, in which case the state would insure that the proper victims were supplied for the ceremony. The blurring of financial responsibility in this clause could reflect a relationship between the Athenian state and the *genos* Salaminioi that did not always fit neatly into a clearly defined financial schema. Although the relationships of *gene* and demes to the Athenian state were different, it is possible that the financial relationship between deme and state religion could likewise have been blurred.

Income from sacred land, and the leases, loans and other financial transactions dealing with sacred land, is present in both the Salaminioi Decree and deme inscriptions, such as the deme decree from Hagnous and a decree discussing cult financing from the deme Plotheia.²⁹ The Salaminioi Decree shows that this *genos* owned land in a variety of places throughout Attica: lines 16-19 discuss *genos*-owned land such as the temple of Herakles at Porthmos, an unidentified area known as the saltpan, and an agora in Koile, and other references in the decree associate *genos* ownership with land in the city of Athens at the Eurysacium and the temple of Athena Skiras in Phaleron.³⁰ Lines 58-59 and 84 refer to income obtained from renting land, which is used to fund the sacrifices listed later in the decree. The ability of the *genos* Salaminioi to own land in various demes throughout Attica adds a further complication to the financial relationship between state and deme, as *gene* were present in the financial matters of both: A *genos*, which was responsible for funding some state cults as well as its own private cult activities, owned land in both city and rural demes, and could raise the funds for these cults by leasing out deme land. The complex interwoven relationship between these three entities is clearly difficult to define with our limited body of evidence.

The deme decrees from Plotheia and Hagnous also contain information regarding the leasing of land. Lines 27-30 from the deme decree from Hagnous state that the priests may lend money, although the source of the priests' money is left unstated. It is likely that such money came from the rental of sacred land, in a manner similar to the land rental in the Salaminioi Decree. The priest keeps track of his debts on boundary stones (*horoi*), which record the name of the god to whom the debtor owes money, and presumably the name of the debtor. Lines 15-25 of the decree from Plotheia likewise confirm that deme sacrifices can be funded by revenue from the leasing of land. The Plotheia decree further distinguishes between income from interest and leasing (lines 22-23, *tokos* and *misthosis*), showing that cult finance could come from a variety of sources. Whitehead discusses the various sources of cult finance within a chapter devoted more broadly to deme income and expenditure, and notes that the cult activity "surely represented, for any deme, the major object of regular expenditure, and indeed the fundamental *raison d'être* of the budget as a whole."³¹ In addition to rents and interest, which are present in the Plotheia decree, taxes were levied on non-residents living or owning property in the demes, and liturgies also were a source of income for cult finance in the demes.³²

Recent Scholarship

As the evidence discussed above shows, the financial relationship of the demes and state is far from clear, and scholars have come to different conclusions regarding the level of state support for local cult. Linders

believes that the Athenian state supported local cult in a variety of ways. Her argument for a high degree of state involvement in local cult practice is part of a larger work relating to Athenian financial operations during the Peloponnesian War, and thus most of her discussion is based on 5th century evidence. Linders acknowledges the 4th century deme calendars, which are logically more focused on deme cult activity, but points out that there are state-supported cults located throughout Attica, and it is important to remember their presence when considering the overall picture of cult finance in Athenian society. Linders' book is primarily focused on arguing against the view that during the Peloponnesian War the Athenian state directly controlled the financial resources of the "Other Gods", which she believes were supported by the state, by moving them up to the Acropolis.³³ Her discussion of local cult finance is thus largely focused around the cults mentioned in IG I³ 369 and 383, which are 5th century treasury accounts of inventories and loans.³⁴ The cults mentioned in these inscriptions include Artemis at Brauron, Poseidon at Sounion, Ge Olympia and Zeus Olympios, Meter at Agrai, and Athena at the Palladion. Linders tentatively mentions hero cults such as Herakles of Kynosarges and the Anakes, but does not state confidently that these can be counted as state-supported cults.³⁵

Linders does provide evidence that the Athenian state contributed to cults outside of the city, but most of the cults mentioned from her sources seem to be 'pan-Attic' deities that one would expect to be funded by the state, rather than the heroes, heroines and chthonic deities common in local cult. According to Aristotle, the cult of Artemis at Brauron was a penteteric festival organized by the state *hieropoioi*,³⁶ and the other festivals of Olympian deities likewise do not seem to be local in character. Linders uses mostly literary evidence to support her claims, such as Herodotus' mention of the Athenian dedication of a Phoenician trireme at Sounion,³⁷ and does not have epigraphic evidence of state support for deme cult activities. However she is correct to stress that state cult activities were not restricted within the city walls of Athens.

Whitehead reviewed the evidence for local cult finance as part of a larger work on the purpose and place of the deme in Athenian society. Because his work is more focused on Attic demes, he considers the financial relationship between deme and state cult more thoroughly. In his discussion of cult financing, Whitehead argues that demes did contribute to some state cult activities, but by the 4th century the Athenian state had no financial responsibilities to deme cults. Whitehead does not directly engage Linders' point that the Athenian state maintained cult activity in some demes, but rather concentrates on the epigraphic evidence such as the deme sacrificial calendars and decrees that discuss local cult finance, and naturally he limits his discussion to Attica. The deme calendars and decrees do support his theory, but he is correct to add the caveat that the significant degree of separation between state and local finance that is apparent in the 4th century was the end of a gradual and piecemeal process, which began in the 5th century and was largely finished in the 4th. The local celebration of certain state festivals is evidence of a certain degree of deme financial obligation to larger state festivals, but Whitehead firmly asserts that by the 4th century this was a unidirectional relationship: "the demes contribute- at times- towards the state cults, but the state does not reciprocate."³⁸

Whitehead's view of a unidirectional financial relationship between the demes and state is difficult to argue against based on the current epigraphic evidence. The deme calendars show a fair degree of

ambiguity regarding the extent of deme contribution and participation in some state festivals, but there are no clear examples of the Athenian state supporting a clearly local cult. Nevertheless, the Salaminioi Decree demonstrates that not all Attic religious activity can be neatly organized into a strict dichotomy of state and deme. The finance of the Salaminioi cult activity seems to be shared by state and *genos* during the 4th century, and the rental and ownership of deme land by the *genos* shows that demes played a role in the financial affairs of the *genos* Salaminioi as well. Furthermore, Linders' point that the Athenian state did own and maintain various cults in the Attic demes, such as the temples of Poseidon at Sounion and Artemis at Brauron, is important when considering the overall picture of cult finance in Attica. However, since these were state cults they do not contradict Whitehead's argument that the state did not monetarily support local cult.

The epigraphic evidence from the Salaminioi Decree and the calendars from Erchia, Thorikos and the Marathonian Tetrapolis thus seems to favor the view that the Athenian state was largely uninvolved in the finance of local cult in the 4th century. However, the lack of uniformity in organization and content shows that the state did not enforce a rigidly defined code for local cult activities, and the degree of deme obligation and participation in state cults seems to have varied: the Marathonian Tetrapolis does not explicitly refer to any clearly state run cults in its list of sacrifices, although its organization is unclear and could reflect some sort of division between state and local sacrifices. Thorikos seems to carry out local versions of some state cults, although some of these interpretations are tentative. Erchia clearly defines its obligations to state cults. If the restoration of demesmen's names on Face B of the Tetrapolis calendar is accepted, the financial responsibility for the cults on this calendar clearly rests on the deme. Erchia and Thorikos are not clear, but observations such as the five column structure of Erchia's calendar and the *euthynos* oath at the end of the Thorikos calendar seem to suggest local support for these demes as well. The Salaminioi Decree shows that there are other factors to consider besides a simple dichotomy between deme and state, such as the rental of sacred land and the willingness of the Athenian state to fund certain cult activities of this *genos*. Clearly there is still much to be understood regarding cult finance in classical Athens, and new epigraphic evidence may hopefully aid our ability to further unravel this complex system in the future.³⁹

James Artz

Doctoral Candidate

The State University of New York at Buffalo

338 M. Fillmore Academic Complex

Buffalo, NY 14261

USA

artz@buffalo.edu

www.classics.buffalo.edu

Literature

- Dow, S., 1968. *Six Athenian Sacrificial Calendars*. BCH 92, 170-86.
- Jameson, M., 1965. *Notes on the Sacrificial Calendar from Erchia*. BCH 89, 154-172.
- Jameson, M., Jordan, D. R., and Kotanski, R. D., 1993. *A Lex Sacra from Selinous*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Lambert, S., 2000. *Sacrificial Calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis: A Revised Text*. ZPE 130, 43-70.
- Lewis, D., Jeffrey, L., Erxleben, E., and Hallof, K., 1994. *Inscriptiones Graecae F: Atticae Euclidis anno anteriores*. Berlin. For details of other volumes of IG see LSJ, p. xlii.
- Linders, T., 1975. *The Treasurers of the Other Gods in Athens and their Functions*. Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain.
- Linders, T., 1992. *Sacred Finances: Some Observations*, in Linders, T., and Alroth, B. (eds), *Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1990 (Boreas 21)*, 9-13.
- Loomis, W., 1998. *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lupu, E., 2005. *Greek Sacred Law: A Collection of New Documents (NGSL)*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Mikalson, J., 1977. *Religion in the Attic Demes*. AJP 98, 424-435.
- Parke, H., 1977. *Festivals of the Athenians*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Parker, R., 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Parker, R., 2005. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, R., 1987. *Festivals of the Attic Demes*, in Linders, T., and Nordquist, G. (eds), *Gifts to the Gods: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1985 (Boreas 15)*, 137-147.
- Peek, W., 1942. *Attische Inschriften*. Athenische Mitteilungen 67, 12-13, no. 10.
- Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.
- Rhodes, P. J., and Osborne, R., (eds.), 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404-323 B.C.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trail, J. S., 1986. *Demos and Trittys: Epigraphical and Topographical Studies in the Organization of Attica*. Toronto: Athenians.
- Whitehead, D., 1986. *The D*

Notes

- 1 Erchia: LSCG 18; Thorikos: SEG xxxiii 147; Marathonian Tetrapolis: IG II² 1358; Decree of the *Genos Salaminioi*: SEG xxxi 527.
- 2 Although there is general agreement regarding the dates of the *Genos Salaminioi* Decree and the Erchia and Tetrapolis calendars, there is some debate regarding the date of the Thorikos calendar. Lewis (1985) suggested the possibility of a late 5th century date suggested on epigraphic grounds. I follow Lupu (NGSL 124-125) in accepting the 4th century date, seeing the creation of these deme calendars as a response to the revisions of the state calendar.
- 3 Dow, *Six Athenian Sacrificial Calendars*, 182.
- 4 Lambert, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, 66 n. 62, provides notes and sources regarding the rewards for liturgists in demes.
- 5 Jameson, *Sacrificial Calendar from Erchia*, 154-55.
- 6 Mikalson, *Religion in the Attic Demes*, 431. Mikalson cites the Erchian celebration of the Arrephoria as an example of his argument.
- 7 Mikalson, *Religion*, 426.
- 8 Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, 1.126.6
- 9 Jameson et al., *A Lex Sacra from Selinous*, 92.
- 10 Parker, *Festivals of the Attic Demes*, 142. The restored date (Pyanopsion 16) would place the festival roughly a week after the state Pyanopsia, and there seems to be a location specification within the entry that is local in nature (Lupu tentatively translates *em [Philom]elidon* as ‘on the land of the Philomelidae’). The standard calendar formula of deity, animal, price is also absent here, complicating the interpretation. For information regarding the state Pyanopsia, see Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians*, 73-80.
- 11 Parker, *Polytheism*, 76.
- 12 The role of sacred land in local cult finance is discussed below in the Salaminioi Decree section.
- 13 This number counts 2 sacrifices for the month of Hecatombaion, and is probably a bit low, but not drastically inaccurate.
- 14 *Praton* victims occur at lines 9, 11-12, 23 (with *rasura*), 26, and 35.
- 15 Lupu, *NGSL*, 125.
- 16 Eleusis, SEG 28.103, decree II, lines 41-43. Halai Aixonides, IG II² 1174, 15-18. Hagnous, IG II² 1183, 8-27 (= Rhodes and Osborne 63). Whitehead (119) identifies IG II² 1183 with the deme Myrhinnous, but Rhodes and Osborne, following Traill, identify Hagnous based on the findspot.
- 17 Rhodes and Osborne, *GHI*, 315.
- 18 Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 111, 331-32. In the post-Cleisthenic period this type of league was an extra level of organization, different from deme, genos, phyle, and tritty.
- 19 Lambert, *Sacrificial Calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis: A Revised Text*, 47.
- 20 W. Peek first suggested the restoration of demesmen’s names on Face B. Dow and Lambert have supported this restoration.
- 21 Lambert, *Sacrificial Calendar*, 54.
- 22 Lambert, *Sacrificial Calendar*, 53.

- 23 Mikalson, *Religion in the Attic Demes*, 426.
- 24 Lambert, *Sacrificial Calendar*, 65-66.
- 25 Loomis, *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens*, 76-86 compiled a list of all Attic epigraphic and literary evidence relating to *hierosynai* and *apometra*. The ubiquity of *hierosyna* support the importance of its absence in column 1 of the Tetrapolis calendar.
- 26 The role of *gene* in Athenian society changed throughout the archaic and classical periods. Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 56-66, 308-316 reviews the literary and epigraphic evidence regarding the *genos* Salaminioi, particularly regarding their role in the Archaic period (56-66).
- 27 Rhodes and Osborne, *GHI*, pg. 185.
- 28 Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians*, 77-80. The procession ended at the shrine of Athena Skiras in Phaleron, which is also mentioned in the Salaminioi Decree as their property.
- 29 Deme decree from Hagnous: IG II² 1183; deme decree from Plotheia: IG II² 1172.
- 30 Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 311. The shrine of the hero Eurysakes is in the city deme Melite.
- 31 Whitehead, *Demes of Attica*, 163-64.
- 32 Whitehead, *Demes of Attica*, 150-152.
- 33 Linders, *Other Gods*, 2.
- 34 Linders elaborates her views on cult finance in *Sacred Finance: Some Observations*, but mainly considers evidence outside of Attica, such as the maintenance of the Apollo Aktios in Anaktorion, and the Delos temple accounts. In these situations she continues to emphasize the primacy of the *polis* in cult finance.
- 35 Linders, *Other Gods*, 12-16.
- 36 Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 54.7.
- 37 Herodotus, *Histories*, 8.121.
- 38 Whitehead, *Demes of Attica*, 178-180.
- 39 Constraints of time and space have prohibited the discussion of certain inscriptions and subjects that pertain to cult finance. The sacred calendar fragments from Teithras and Eleusis were unfortunately omitted, and a full account of local cult is incomplete without an examination of the Rural Dionysia (curiously absent from most of these calendars, except Thorikos) and the relationship of rural state cults to their demes (e.g., Artemis at Brauron, Poseidon at Sounion).