

# I

## What is *Polis* Religion?

CHRISTIANE SOURVINOU-INWOOD

The attempt to reconstruct, and make sense of, a religious system to which we have extremely limited access, and which is very different from those which have conditioned our own understanding of the category 'religion', demands a methodology which, as far as possible, prevents our own—culturally determined—assumptions from intruding into, and thus corrupting, the investigation. We also need to discard the layers of earlier interpretations which form distorting filters structuring the data on the basis of the assumptions and expectations of scholars of earlier generations, when it was not fully realized that all reading and interpretation, and all 'common sense', are culturally determined. Here I present highly compressed versions of selected parts of my arguments, to define the parameters within which, on my analysis, *polis* religion operated in the Classical period.

The *polis* provided the fundamental framework in which Greek religion operated. Each *polis* was a religious system which formed part of the more complex world-of-the-*polis* system, interacting with the religious systems of the other *poleis* and with the Panhellenic religious dimension; thus direct and full participation in religion was reserved for citizens, that is, those who made up the community which articulated the religion. One belonged to the religious community of one's own *polis*, (or *ethnos*, tribal state);<sup>1</sup> in the *sacra* of others, even in Panhellenic sanctuaries, one could only participate as a *xenos* (foreigner). On at least some occasions a *xenos* could take part in cult only with the help of a citizen,

I am very grateful to Professor W. G. Forrest, Professor D. M. Lewis, and Dr R. Parker for discussing various aspects of this paper with me.

<sup>1</sup> I cannot consider *ethnos* religion here. The differences between *ethnos* and *polis* religion do not impinge on our investigation.

normally the *proxenos* (consul) of his city, who acted as 'intermediary'.<sup>2</sup>

It would seem that the transgression of these rules did not involve disrespect to the gods, that the prohibition was perceived to pertain to the human articulation of the divine world, which was not considered inviolable. For Kleomenes, disregarding the priest's ban on him as a *xenos*, had the priest removed and performed a sacrifice on the altar at the Argive Heraion.<sup>3</sup> Later, Kleomenes was believed by the Spartans—who took religious prohibitions and other prescriptions especially seriously even when at war<sup>4</sup>—when he claimed that he had obtained omens there; this suggests that his action was not seen as liable to offend the goddess and preclude her from sending him an omen. Furthermore, although Apollodoros in [Dem.] 59 states that it was impious for Phano who was allegedly not an Athenian citizen to have become *basilinna* (queen), his tone and arguments (94–107 and 110–11), and the fact that he also brings up (85–7, 110) the accusation of adultery (a woman taken in adultery was not allowed to attend the public rites), suggest that it was not quite as self-evident as one might have expected that the illegitimate officiating of a *xenos* in the most central and secret rites of the *polis* (59; 73) was a clear-cut, unambivalent, case of serious impiety—as opposed to being merely an offence against the *polis*.

The idea that the transgression of the rules excluding *xenoi* did not offend the gods is connected with another point (to which I shall return), that the ownership of sanctuaries was perceived as belonging to the human, not the divine, sphere, which is why sanctuaries could change hands without it being felt that any disrespect to the gods had been committed. This contrasts with the transgression of different types of exclusion which did offend the gods.<sup>5</sup> One such offence, the sacrilegious nature of which was confirmed by the Pythia, and which brought divine punishment, was Miltiades'

<sup>2</sup> On *proxenoi*: C. Marek, *Die Proxenie* (Frankfurt, etc., 1984); M.-F. Baslez, *L'Étranger dans la Grèce antique* (Paris, 1984), 39–40, 111–25; Ph. Gauthier, *Symbola: Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques* (Nancy, 1972), 17–61; cf. also M. B. Walbank, *Athenian Proxenes of the Fifth Century BC* (Toronto and Sarasota, 1978), *passim*, esp. p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Hdt. 6. 81–2. It is unclear whether *xenoi* were totally forbidden to sacrifice, or had to sacrifice elsewhere in the precinct, or through a *proxenos*.

<sup>4</sup> A. J. Holladay and M. D. Goodman, *CQ* 36 (1986), 151–60. The validity of the representations encoded in the story does not depend on its historicity.

<sup>5</sup> Of course, what counted as sacrilegious behaviour liable to attract divine punishment was variously perceived (cf. e.g. Andoc. 2. 15).

attempt to enter the *megaron* (chamber) of the Thesmophorion of Paros, from which men were excluded (Hdt. 6. 134–5). Another sacrilegious transgression was entering a sanctuary in one's *polis* while forbidden to do so after being deprived of citizen rights (e.g. Andoc. 1. 71; cf. 32–3; 72). The transgression of this exclusion, which was punishable with death (Andoc. 1. 33), constituted impiety and threatened the effectiveness of all the religious practices of the *polis*.

The *polis* anchored, legitimated, and mediated all religious activity. This is true even in the Panhellenic sanctuaries where the *polis* mediated the participation of its citizens in a variety of ways. At Delphi the *polis* schema articulated the operation of the oracle. The oracle's religious personnel consisted of Delphians, and the participation of non-Delphians was mediated by Delphians who acted as *proxenoi* and offered the preliminary sacrifice before consultation by non-Delphians. On regular consultation days this sacrifice was offered by the Delphic *polis* for all the enquirers; on other days it was offered on behalf of the enquirer by the *proxenos* of his city.<sup>6</sup> The non-Delphians, then, were treated on the model of *xenoi* worshipping at the sanctuary of another *polis*. The same dominance of the *polis* articulation occurred, it appears, in other Panhellenic sanctuaries. In the sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia *proxenoi* again played a role,<sup>7</sup> the judges of the Olympic Games were Eleans (Hdt. 2. 160; Paus. 5. 9. 5), and the Eleans made decisions as to who was allowed to participate in the Games and worship at the sanctuary (cf. e.g. Thuc. 5. 50).<sup>8</sup>

Another manifestation of the fact that the *polis* mediated the individual's participation in Panhellenic cult can be seen in the order of consultation of the Delphic oracle.<sup>9</sup> Greeks came before barbarians; among the Greeks, the Delphians before all other Greeks; after the Delphians and before the other Greeks came the other ethnic groups

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Eur. *Androm.* 1102–3. Cf. Marek, *Die Proxenie*, 168–70; G. Roux, *Delphes: Son oracle et ses dieux* (Paris, 1976), 75; G. Daux, in *Le Monde grec: Pensée, littérature, histoire, documents: Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels, 1975), 480–95; Baslez, *L'Étranger*, 40; L. Gernet and A. Boulanger, *Le Génie grec dans la religion* (Paris, 1970; first edn., 1932), 264; cf. also *CID* 5 (p. 17) and perhaps also nos. 4 (pp. 15–16) and 6 (pp. 18–19); cf. also p. 76.

<sup>7</sup> Gauthier, *Symbola*, 41–6; Marek, *Die Proxenie*, 169; cf. also Baslez, *L'Étranger*, 40.

<sup>8</sup> On Dodona see Hyp. 4. 24–6; cf. 19. 26; these passages suggest that it was arguable that expensive dedications to sanctuaries should not be made by outsiders without the permission of the *polis/ethnos* which owned the sanctuary, which (irrespective of the underlying 'political' reasons) confirms that even in Panhellenic cultic contexts the *polis* articulation was felt to be basic.

<sup>9</sup> Roux, *Delphes*, 76–9.

and *poleis* who were members of the Delphic Amphictiony. Consultation by the remaining Greeks was, apparently, arranged according to some geographical order. Within this basic articulation operated the *promanteia*, a privilege which the Delphic *polis* granted to individuals, *poleis*, or other collectivities. Here again, that is, the oracle is treated as a sanctuary of the Delphic *polis* in which the latter could grant special privileges to its benefactors. The *promanteia* did not transcend categories, it only involved priority over people belonging to the same category: given to a barbarian it meant he could consult the oracle before other barbarians, not before Greeks; an Athenian could consult before other Athenians, an Amphictionic *polis* before all other Amphictionic peoples, but after the Delphians.

Another example of the mediation of the *polis* in Panhellenic religious activities is the *theōriai* (sacred embassies) sent by individual *poleis* to the Panhellenic sanctuaries and also to other *poleis*.<sup>10</sup> The *theōroi* (ambassadors) of each *polis* conducted ritual acts in the Panhellenic sanctuaries in the name of that *polis* (e.g. [Andoc.] 4. 29). The treasuries erected by individual *poleis* in the great Panhellenic sanctuaries are the physical expression of this mediation, the symbolic representation of the *polis* religious systems in those sanctuaries. They housed the offerings dedicated by their citizens and the ritual furnishings for the various cult activities, and were also a visual reminder of the cities which had built them, whose achievement and wealth they advertised and glorified.

A major context of inter-*polis* religious interaction, besides the Panhellenic, is that of the Amphictionies or Leagues, associations of *poleis* or *ethnē*, or a combination of the two, which celebrated one or more festivals together and were focused on one or, as in the case of the Delphic Amphictiony, two sanctuaries. They developed their own institutions, such as the amphictionic council of the Delphic Amphictiony, the duties of which included the conduct of the Panhellenic Pythian Games and the care of the finances of the sanctuary and upkeep of the temple. Even in the case of the Panhellenic Games the Delphic *polis* was the symbolic centre: it was the Delphic *polis* that sent *theōroi* to announce the Pythian Games;<sup>11</sup> and the laurel for the victors' crowns was brought from Tempe in the course of a ritual (of an initiatory type) involving male adolescents from the

<sup>10</sup> Nilsson, *GGR*, 549–52, 826–7; Baslez, *L'Étranger*, 59.

<sup>11</sup> e.g. *CID* 10. 45–6 (cf. pp. 118–19).

Delphic *polis*.<sup>12</sup> Thus the same articulation pertains in the Panhellenic Games as in the order of the oracular consultation: the Delphic *polis* at the centre, the Amphictiony forming the inner circle, the other Greeks the outer one. Here the barbarians were excluded from competing—for this was one of the rites defining membership of the group 'Greeks'. That it is the *polis* which mediates the participation of individuals in the cult activities of the Leagues is also illustrated by a story according to which the transgression of one individual during the games of Triopian Apollo was punished through the expulsion of his city, Halikarnassos, from the religious League of Dorian cities (Hdt. 1. 144). This reveals a mentality<sup>13</sup> in which the individual is perceived as participating in the ritual (including the agonistic) activities in the name of his *polis*, which mediates and guarantees that participation. This made the whole *polis* guilty of impiety.

Even in international contexts cult remained *polis*-based: at Naukratis, which down to the fourth century had the double character of *emporion* (trading station) and *polis*, some Greek cities singly set up sanctuaries that belonged to them and were 'their' *polis* shrines in a foreign land; others acting in combination set up a sanctuary called the Hellenion (Hdt. 2. 178). But (as is shown by Herodotus' insistence that only the *poleis* he names were involved in its foundation and had a share in it) this was not a supra-*polis* 'Greek' shrine, but the common sanctuary of an *ad hoc* combination of cities, in which the *polis* was the basic unit.

Greek religion, then, consists of a network of religious systems interacting with each other and with the Panhellenic religious dimension. The latter is articulated in, and through, Panhellenic poetry and the Panhellenic sanctuaries; it was created, in a dispersed and varied way, out of selected elements from certain local systems, at the interface between the (interacting) *polis* religious systems—which it then also helped to shape.<sup>14</sup> The Greeks saw themselves as part of one religious group; the fact that they had common sanctuaries and sacrifices—as well as the same language and the same blood, a perceived common ancestry, and the same way of life—was one of

<sup>12</sup> A. Brelich, *Paides e parthenoi* (Rome, 1969), 387–405; C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *CQ* 29 (1979), 233–4.

<sup>13</sup> The historicity of the story is irrelevant; truth or invention, it is an expression of the relevant Greek perceptions.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. e.g. on divine personalities C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *JHS* 98 (1978), 101–21.

the defining characteristics of Greekness (Hdt. 8. 144. 2). This identity was culturally expressed in, and reinforced through, ritual activities in which the participating group was 'all the Greeks' and from which foreigners were excluded, of which the most important was competing in the Olympic Games (Hdt. 2. 160; 5. 22). But each person was a member of this Panhellenic group in virtue of being a member of a *polis*. It is not simply that being a citizen of a particular *polis* guarantees one's Greekness; as we saw, the *polis* mediated participation in Panhellenic cult.

The gods who were worshipped in the different *poleis* were, of course, perceived to be the same gods (cf. also Hdt. 5. 92–3). What differed was the precise articulation of the cult, its history, its particular modalities, which aspect of each deity each city chose to emphasize, which deities were perceived to be more closely connected with, and so more important to, the city, and so on. Such differences were to a very large extent perceived as relating to the past, to a deity's relationships to particular places and to the heroic ancestors of the individual cities and the cults that these had founded—which were hallowed, both by tradition and because many of these founders belonged to the heroic past in which men had a closer connection with the divine, and thus mediated between man's limitations and the unknowability of the divine. The perception that different needs gave rise to different cults was most unambiguous in the case of cults articulating social groups. Common cult was the established mode for expressing communality in the Greek world, for giving social groups cohesion and identity; it would therefore have been perceived as inevitable that the particular social realities of the particular *poleis* would be reflected in the articulation of their cults. This was not a matter of a 'state' 'manipulating' religion; the unit which was both the religious body carrying the religious authority and the social body, acting through its political institutions, deployed cult in order to articulate itself in what was perceived to be the natural way.

All Greeks were bound to respect other cities' sanctuaries and cults if they did not wish to offend the gods. The 'law' of the Greeks as reported in Thucydides 4. 98. 2 (cf. 4. 97. 2–3) was that whichever *polis* had control over a land also owned its sanctuaries, and they should worship as far as possible according to the rites that were customary there before the change of ownership.<sup>15</sup> The underlying

<sup>15</sup> Malkin, RC, 149–50.

perceptions here are that since the gods were the same, and since *polis* religion (including its sanctuaries) was part of the wider *polis* system, possession of the land naturally entailed ownership of the sanctuary; and that, since the way the gods were worshipped in any particular *polis* and sanctuary was partly a result of its past history, traditional practices, hallowed by their connections with a heroic founder and/or by custom, should be respected as far as possible; but not absolutely, since those sanctuaries and cults could not but be affected by the different religious system which they entered, by the articulation of religion in the rest of the *polis*; thus the rites practised after the conquest would be the result of the interaction between those already established and—to a lesser, but varying degree—the religious system of the *polis* that now controlled it. In my view, underlying it all is the notion that the articulation of religion through the systems of particular *poleis* is a human construct, created by particular historical circumstances and open to change under changed circumstances (Thuc. 4. 98. 3–4).

Greek religion is, above all, a way of articulating the world, of structuring chaos and making it intelligible; it is a model articulating a cosmic order guaranteed by a divine order which also (in complex ways) grounds human order, perceived to be incarnated above all in the properly ordered and pious *polis*, and providing certain rules and prescriptions of behaviour, especially towards the divine through cult, but also towards the human world—prescribing, for example, that one must not break one's oaths (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 3. 276–80; 19. 259–60), or that one must respect strangers and suppliants who have the special protection of the gods, especially Zeus, precisely because they are most vulnerable.<sup>16</sup> The *polis* was the institutional authority that structured the universe and the divine world in a religious system, articulated a pantheon with certain particular configurations of divine personalities, and established a system of cults, particular rituals and sanctuaries, and a sacred calendar. In a religion without a canonical body of belief, without revelation, without scriptural texts (outside certain marginal sects which did have sacred books but are irrelevant to our present discussion), without a professional divinely anointed clergy claiming special knowledge or authority, without a church, it was the ordered community, the *polis*, which assumed the role played in Christianity by the Church

<sup>16</sup> Pl. *Leg.* 729e–730a. Cf. Nilsson, GGR, 419–21; J. Gould, *JHS* 93 (1973), 90–4.

—to use one misleading comparison (for all metaphors derived from Christianity are inevitably misleading) to counteract and destroy alternative, implicit models. It assumed the responsibility and authority to set a religious system into place, to mediate human relationships with the divine world.<sup>17</sup> Connected with this is the fact that, as we shall see, *polis* religion embraces, contains, and mediates all religious discourse—with the ambiguous and uncertain exception of some sectarian discourse. Even festivals common to different *poleis*, such as the Thesmophoria, the most widespread Greek festival, were articulated by each *polis*, at *polis* level. Hence, the same festival could take different forms in different, even neighbouring, *poleis*. For example, the Agrionia at Orchomenos was celebrated differently from the festival of the same name at Chaironeia,<sup>18</sup> and at Eretria the Thesmophoria had certain unique features: Kalligeneia was not invoked, and the meats were grilled in the sun, not on the fire (Plut. *Mor.* 298b–c).

Connected with the absence of revelation, of scriptures, and of a professional divinely anointed priesthood is the fact that a central category of Greek religion is unknowability, the belief that human knowledge about the divine and about the right way of behaving towards it is limited and circumscribed. The perception that the articulation of religion through the particular *polis* systems is a human construct, created by particular historical circumstances and open to change under changed circumstances, is in my view connected with this awareness of the severe limitations of human access to the divine, of the ultimate unknowability of the divine world, and the uncertain nature of human relationships to it. The Greeks did not delude themselves that their religion incarnated the divine will.

The only anchoring for the *polis*' endeavour to ensure the optimum behaviour towards the gods was prophecy, which offered the only direct means of access to the divine world in Greek religion. But this access also was flawed, because, according to Greek ideas about divination, human fallibility interferes, and the word of the gods is often misinterpreted. Nevertheless, through the Delphic oracle (above all), the *polis* could ensure some, if ambiguous, assurance of the

<sup>17</sup> We can observe the *polis* putting into place its religious system, and through this creating itself, its own 'centre', in the foundation of colonies (on which cf. Malkin, *RC. passim*, esp. pp. 1–2).

<sup>18</sup> Orchomenos: A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*, 1 (London, 1981), 179–81. Chaironeia: *ibid.* 173–4; ii (1986), 146.

correctness of its religious discourse.<sup>19</sup> Thus cities consulted the oracle to ensure that the appropriate worship was offered to the appropriate deities either on a particular occasion such as that of a portent (e.g. [Dem.] 43. 66) or more generally for health and good fortune;<sup>20</sup> a vast number of cults and rites were established at the Delphic oracle's instigation and/or on its advice or with its simple approval (e.g. *LSCG* 5. 4–5, 25–6; *LSCG* 178. 2–3; *Hdt.* 4. 15).<sup>21</sup> The introduction of new cults<sup>22</sup> was connected with the awareness of the fallibility of human knowledge of the divine and the appropriate forms of worship, which entailed that potentially there was always room for improvement. Especially in times of crisis or difficulties, the question 'is there some god we have neglected?', or more generally 'how can we improve our relationship with the divine?' would have arisen, generating pressures towards innovation, especially the introduction of new cults (e.g. *Hdt.* 7. 178–9). The oracle provided the authority for such changes; but because prophecy is flawed, the danger of getting things wrong could not be eliminated.

It is in this context that we must place the tension between conservatism and innovation in *polis* religion, which is revealed and exploited in Lysias 30, on Nikomachos' codification of the Athenian sacred calendar.<sup>23</sup> The most important argument for religious conservatism in this speech<sup>24</sup> is that the ancestral rites have served the Athenians' ancestors and themselves well, and thus should not be changed. On the desirability of the new sacrifices the

<sup>19</sup> One safeguard against the flawed nature of the prophetic vehicle was to consult more than one oracle (cf. e.g. *Hyp.* 4. 14–15). But even this could not guarantee unflawed access to the gods. On the role of oracular divination cf. R. Parker, *Ch.* 4, below.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *Dem.* 21. 52; *P/W*, pp. 114–15, no. 282. Cf. Parker, *Ch.* 4, p. 83.

<sup>21</sup> The poets' mythological/theological articulations were not authoritative; for the Muses who inspired them often lied. Cf. *Hes. Theog.* 27–8; M. L. West (ed.), *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford, 1966), p. 163 on 28; K. J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford, 1974), 130. On Greek poetry and religion, P. E. Easterling, in P. E. Easterling and J. V. Muir (eds.), *Greek Religion and Society* (Cambridge, 1985), 34–49.

<sup>22</sup> See e.g. J. K. Davies, *Democracy and Classical Greece* (Glasgow, 1978), 180–1, and below, 28.

<sup>23</sup> See esp. S. Dow, *Proc. Massachusetts Historical Soc.* 71 (1953–7), 3–36; *id.*, *BCH* 92 (1968), 177–81; *id.*, *Historia*, 9 (1960), 270–93; K. Clinton, *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool, Hesperia*, Suppl. 19 (Princeton, 1982), 27–37.

<sup>24</sup> I am concerned with the rhetorical strategy, which operates within the parameters of collective assumptions; the speaker's 'real' beliefs and motivations are irrelevant.

speech is ambivalent—an attitude which certainly fits the rhetorical context. In classical Athens, the tension between conservatism and innovation tended to be 'resolved' with the former drifting towards the non-abandonment of old cults and the latter towards the introduction of new ones.

The Greek *polis* articulated religion and was itself articulated by it; religion became the *polis*' central ideology, structuring, and giving meaning to, all the elements that made up the identity of the *polis*, its past, its physical landscape, the relationship between its constituent parts. Ritual reinforces group solidarity, and this process is of fundamental importance in establishing and perpetuating civic and cultural, as well as religious, identities.<sup>25</sup> Its heroic cults in particular gave the religious system of each *polis* much of its individuality, its sense of identity and difference, which were connected with the mythical past and sanctified the connection of the citizens with that past to which they related through those cults. This is an important reason for the density of heroic cults (often for figures who appear to us insignificant) in Athenian deme religion: they helped define the deme's identity, both through the performance of distinctive rites and also through the fact that they related the deme to its territory and its mythical past. In the colonies the heroic cult offered to the founder played a similar role.<sup>26</sup> Religion continued to provide the one stable cohesive force in the Classical *polis*, even in Athens after the development of a new Athenian self-definition—whose focus was anyway very largely religious, namely the Acropolis, the Panathenaia, Theseus as Athenian hero par excellence and good democratic king, and the burial of the war dead.<sup>27</sup> This was especially true in a time of crisis, when there was the danger—and sometimes the reality—of sections of the *polis* preferring ideology over country and rupturing the *polis*. This is a prime reason why the profanation of the Mysteries and the mutilation of the Herms was taken by many to be part of an oligarchic or tyrannical conspiracy, an attempt to overthrow democracy (Thuc. 6. 28. 1, 6. 60–1; cf. also Diod. Sic. 13. 2. 3). Religion is the facet of *polis* ideology that all citizens should respect most; thus a

<sup>25</sup> I cannot discuss this complex notion; in the simplified form in which it is put here it goes back to Durkheim's work, but it does not depend on acceptance of the latter *in toto*. Cf. also the not-unrelated perception in Pl. *Leg.* 738d–e; 771b–772a.

<sup>26</sup> Malkin, *RC*, 189–266.

<sup>27</sup> See esp. N. Loraux, *The Invention of Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1986).

sign of disrespect towards religion is a sign of disloyalty towards the *polis* and the *politeia* (constitution).

The central place of religion in civic life<sup>28</sup> is an expression of the close relationship between the two. The perception that religion was the centre of the *polis* also explains, and is revealed in, a variety of stories<sup>29</sup> and practices.<sup>30</sup> It is also related to the perception that it is the relationship of the *polis* with its gods that ultimately guarantees its existence, that in the origins of the *polis* there is often (explicitly or implicitly) located a form of 'guarantee' by the gods, of a finite and relative protection, which the cultic relationships of the *polis* with the gods—above all with its principal deity—strives to maintain. Such a guarantee is surely perceived to be at the root of the oracular sanction for the foundation of colonies. Cities whose origin was perceived to lie in the mythical past expressed their divine guarantee through myth. In Athens the myths embodying, among other things, this 'guarantee' of protection are that of the earth-born king Erichthonios and, above all, that of the contest between Athena and Poseidon for Attica;<sup>31</sup> the gift of an olive tree by Athena brought about and was the sign sealing the relationship between Athena and Athens, and the olive-tree was thus the symbolic core of Athenian *polis* religion and the guarantee of Athens' existence.<sup>32</sup> This perception is expressed in the story (in *Hdt.* 8. 55) that this olive-tree which had been burnt by the Persians together with the rest of the Acropolis had by the next day miraculously germinated<sup>33</sup> a cubit-long shoot. (It is significant that Herodotus begins this story with the 'history' of the sacred olive-tree and the salt-water spring which were the tokens of the contest between Athena and Poseidon.) The fact that the olive-tree sprouted again immediately and miraculously signified that the

<sup>28</sup> Some instances in Athens: homicide trials were conducted in a sanctuary, *Ath. Pol.* 57. 4; sacred structures were situated in 'political' buildings, e.g. the altar in the Bouleuterion, *Xen. Hell.* 2. 3. 52, 53. 55; *Antiph.* 6. 45; political and social life functioned with the help of rites, prayers, oaths, and curses; the election for office by lot entailed selection by the gods.

<sup>29</sup> e.g. *Hdt.* 7. 153 (cf. de Polignac, *Naissance*, 119–21).

<sup>30</sup> e.g. the important place of religion in the Athenian ephebic oath (on which cf. e.g. P. Siewert, *JHS* 97 (1977), 102–11; also the mirror-image of lines 8–9 of the oath, *Lycurgus, Leocr.* 2; the oath is cited in *Leocr.* 76–8).

<sup>31</sup> On Erichthonios, R. Parker, in J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London and Sydney, 1987), 193–7; on the contest, *ibid.* 198–200.

<sup>32</sup> See also M. Detienne, in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Problèmes de la terre en Grèce ancienne* (Paris and La Haye, 1973), 295.

<sup>33</sup> Detienne *ibid.*

burning of the Acropolis did not entail the end of the Athenian *polis*, for it was the sign that Athena's guarantee was still valid, and at the same time the act which renewed that guarantee and thus signalled Athens' continued existence.<sup>34</sup> The story of the Trojan Palladion which Odysseus and Diomedes stole from Troy because otherwise Troy could not be taken<sup>35</sup> is an expression of the same perception: it had been given to Dardanos, the ancestor of the Trojans, by his father Zeus and was thus a sign of the 'divine guarantee', of the benign relationship between Troy and the gods. Its loss was a sign that the guarantee had come to an end.

As will become clear, in the Classical period the *polis* had ultimate authority in, and control of, all cults, and *polis* religion encompassed all religious discourse within it.<sup>36</sup> *Polis* cults may be classified in broad categories on the basis of their worshipping group.<sup>37</sup>

One category is that in which the worshipping group encompasses the whole *polis*, the cults administered on behalf, and for the welfare, of the whole *polis*, which I shall call 'central *polis* cults'. They are varied in type. A first group of central *polis* cults is located at, and pertains symbolically to, the geographical, social, political, and symbolic centre of the *polis*. To this group belong the cults of the civic divinities who, above all, are explicitly concerned with the identity and the protection of the *polis* as one whole, and thus focus and express the *polis*-holding aspects of *polis* religion. In Athens the two main civic deities were Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus. Next to, and symbolically connected with, this pair was the pair Athena Polias and Poseidon Erechtheus. A poliad Athena was associated with Zeus Polieus elsewhere too (e.g. Kos: LSCG 151 A 55ff. for Athena; 156A

<sup>34</sup> Whether or not Herodotus believed this event had happened is irrelevant. What matters is the perception embodied in the story. The inferred departure of the sacred snake from the Acropolis at the time of the evacuation of Athens, which was taken to mean that Athena had abandoned the Acropolis (Hdt. 8. 41), did not entail that she was abandoning the *polis*; it could be seen as a sign of her approval of the evacuation.

<sup>35</sup> Nilsson, GGR, 435; Sir James Frazer (ed.), *Apollodorus: The Library* (London, 1921) ii. 226–9 n.2, with a list of the sources.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. below, *passim*, and also the discussion in 'Further Aspects of *Polis* Religion' (Ch. 2, below, 38–55). In my view, the *polis* had had this authority from its beginning, and the changes pertained only to who administered its authority and how. I hope to argue elsewhere against the prevailing model according to which 'the state' took over cults which had originally belonged to—as opposed to being administered on behalf of the *polis* by—the *genē* (clans) and other kinship groups.

<sup>37</sup> I concentrate on Athens, where the available evidence allows us to consider the system of *polis* religion as a whole; this is necessary in order to try to make sense of Greek religion.

19–20). Athena was Polias/Poliouchos in many cities.<sup>38</sup> In Troezen we find a pair reminiscent of the Athenian Athena Polias and Poseidon Erechtheus, Athena Polias and Sthenias and Poseidon Basileus, whose quarrel for the sovereignty of the land ended with an agreement to share it.<sup>39</sup> One set of cults in this group was generally centred on the Agora, the civic and social centre which also had a religious aspect.<sup>40</sup> In many *poleis*, the common hearth of the *polis*, the *koinē hestia*, which was also an altar-hearth for Hestia, was located in the *prytaneion*.<sup>41</sup> At Kos the hearth-altar of Hestia was in the Agora, clearly not in a building, and it was the focus of an important ritual during the festival of Zeus Polieus.<sup>42</sup> The common hearth in the Prytaneion, and Hestia's cult, was the symbolic centre of the *polis*. The common hearth of a colony was lit with fire from the *prytaneion* of the mother-city, and this was a significant act in the establishment of the new *polis*.<sup>43</sup> Among the cults situated in the centre were the cults of deities connected with, and presiding over, the central *polis* institutions: in Athens, Zeus Boulaios and Athena Boulaia (Antiph. 6. 45; Xen. *Hell.* 2. 3. 53, 55), Zeus Agoraios,<sup>44</sup> Artemis Boulaia.<sup>45</sup> Zeus Agoraios also occurs in other *poleis*,<sup>46</sup> as does Zeus Boulaios, sometimes paired with Hestia Boulaia.<sup>47</sup>

One of the gods often associated with the civic life of the *polis* is

<sup>38</sup> Graf, NK, 44 and n. 4; R. F. Willetts, *Cretan Cults and Festivals* (London, 1962), 280–1 (cf. also 207–8, 233); L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, i (Oxford, 1896), 299.

<sup>39</sup> Paus. 2. 30. 6; cf. C. M. Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* (London, 1976), 100.

<sup>40</sup> R. Martin, *Recherches sur l'Agora grecque* (Paris, 1951), 164–201, 229–48; R. E. Wycherley, *How the Greeks Built Cities*, 2nd edn. (London, 1962), 51–2; E. Kolb, *Agora und Theater, Volks- und Festversammlung* (Berlin, 1981), 5–15 and *passim*; cf. also G. Vallet, E. Villard, and P. Auberson, *Megara Hyblaea, I: Le quartier de l'Agora archaïque* (Rome, 1976), 412–13.

<sup>41</sup> S. G. Miller, *The Prytaneion: Its Function and Architectural Form* (Berkeley, 1978), 13–14; Vernant, MT, 147, 157; P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenion Politeia* (Oxford, 1981), p. 105 on 3. 5; Burkert, GR, 170.

<sup>42</sup> LSCG 151 A; S. M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos* (Göttingen, 1978), 322–3. Cf. also Nilsson, GGR, 153–4; Burkert, HN, 138 n. 10; Vernant, MT, 150. For Hestia, Zeus, and Athena at the centre of the *polis* cf. also Pl. *Leg.* 745b, 848d.

<sup>43</sup> Malkin, RC, 114–34.

<sup>44</sup> R. E. Wycherley, GRBS 5 (1964), 162, 176; Travlos, PD, 466; Kolb, *Agora und Theater*, 57.

<sup>45</sup> Travlos, PD, 553.

<sup>46</sup> Graf, NK, 197–8; Willetts, *Cretan Cults*, 233–4.

<sup>47</sup> Graf, NK, 176–7 and cf. 363.

Apollo Delphinios.<sup>48</sup> In some cities, as at Miletos and Olbia, his cult was at the centre of civic life; in others, as in Athens, it was less central, but also associated with important institutions. At Miletos the cult of Apollo Delphinios and the Delphinion, his sanctuary,<sup>49</sup> were intimately connected with the civic life of the *polis*. The Delphinion was the main sanctuary with which were associated the Molpoi, a college with religious functions which was also closely connected with the civic life of the *polis*: their leader was the annual chief magistrate of the city, and the college had responsibilities pertaining to civic law; in the Delphinion were set up the sacred laws of the Molpoi and also state treaties, proxeny decrees, and the like. At Miletos Apollo Delphinios was associated with Hekate (*LSAM* 50. 25ff.) who apparently had a civic aspect in that city. In Athens Apollo Delphinios and his sanctuary were again associated with civic law;<sup>50</sup> he also had a shrine in at least some demes, certainly at Erchia (*LSCG* 18 A 23–30) and almost certainly also at Thorikos.<sup>51</sup>

Heroic cults, involving both the alleged graves of mythical heroes and those of the heroized historical founders of new cities, are an important category of cult located in the Agora.<sup>52</sup> Since the Athenians claimed to be autochthonous, Athens did not have a founder, but it did have founder-like figures: Theseus the synoecist, Erichthonios/Erechtheus, and Kekrops. In, or associated with, the Athenian Agora—conceivably in the Old Agora<sup>53</sup>—lay the shrine of Theseus, which housed Theseus' alleged bones brought back by Kimon and

<sup>48</sup> F. Graf, 'Apollon Delphinios', *Mus. Helv.* 36 (1979), 2–22.

<sup>49</sup> G. Kleiner, *Die Ruinen von Milet* (Berlin, 1968), 33–5; W. Koenigs, in W. Müller-Wiener (ed.), *Milet 1899–1980: Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung: Kolloquium Frankfurt-am-Main 1980* (Tübingen, 1986), 115–16; Graf, 'Apollon Delphinios', 7–8. In the Archaic period the Delphinion appears to have been outside the walls (F. Graf, *Mus. Helv.* 31 (1974), 215 n. 26). After the Persian Wars the centre of the city shifted to this area (G. Kleiner, in R. Stillwell (ed.), *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* (Princeton, 1976), 578).

<sup>50</sup> Graf, 'Apollon Delphinios', 9–10; Travlos, *PD*, 83–90.

<sup>51</sup> G. Daux, *Ant. Class.* 52 (1983), 150–74 (cf. R. Parker in *Gifts*, 144–7 and *passim*), text of the deme Thorikos (hereafter *Thorikos*), 6, 63–5, cf. 11.

<sup>52</sup> Martin, *Recherches*, 194–201; Kolb, *Agora und Theater*, 5–8, 19, 24–5, and esp. 47–52; W. Leschhorn, 'Gründer der Stadt' (Stuttgart, 1984), 67–72, 98–105, 176–80; Malkin, *RC*, 187–260; de Polignac, *Naissance*, 132–52; C. Bérard, in G. Gnoli and J.-P. Vernant (eds.), *La Mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes* (Cambridge and Paris, 1982), 89–105.

<sup>53</sup> The location is controversial. Cf. Travlos, *PD*, 1–2, and now esp. G. S. Dantas, *Hesperia*, 52 (1983), 62–3.

which played a small role in the civic life of the *polis*.<sup>54</sup> The shrines-and-graves of Erechtheus and Kekrops are situated on the Acropolis, at the Erechtheion, and are intimately connected with the cult of Athena Polias and Poseidon.

Central *polis* festivals connected with the poliad divinities and/or the constitution of the *polis* are, for example, the Panathenaia, the Synoikia, the Dipoleia in Athens, the festival of Zeus Polieus in Kos. There are very many other central *polis* cults of different kinds in the different *poleis*, some located in the *polis* centre and others not. Many were centred on shrines located within the city but not in its central core (for example, in Athens the Lykeion), others on peri-urban or extra-urban shrines. Processions connected the *polis* centre with some of these shrines. The most important sanctuaries outside the Athenian city, ritually connected with its centre, were those of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis and of Artemis at Brauron. Eleusinian cult was intimately intertwined with the other central *polis* cults; its symbolic place in the centre of Athenian religion was given material expression in the Eleusinion in the centre of Athens, whence began the procession to Eleusis and in which took place rites and acts pertaining to the relationship between the Eleusinian nexus and the Athenian *polis* (e.g. *Andoc.* 1. 111). In Argos a very important central *polis* rite was the procession to the extra-urban Heraion. In Sparta the major procession was at the Hyakinthia, linking Sparta with the sanctuary of Apollo at Amyklai.<sup>55</sup>

Each significant grouping within the *polis* was articulated and given identity through cult. In Greece all relationships and bonds, including social and political ones, were expressed, and so defined, through cult (cf. also *Pl. Leg.* 738d). This is why the creation of new *polis* subdivisions entailed cultic changes. Thus Kleisthenes' reforms did not involve the subordination of cult to politics, but the ordinary creation of group identity. The *polis* had set in place a particular organization of *polis* religion; now it was changing it because the

<sup>54</sup> J. P. Barron, *JHS* 92 (1972), 20–2; cf. Dantas, *Hesperia*, 52 (1983), 60–3 *passim*; Travlos, *PD*, 578–9; cf. *Plut. Thes.* 36. 2; *Paus.* 1. 17. 2. 6. On other *hērōa* in the Athenian Agora, H. A. Thompson, in *Athens Comes of Age: From Solon to Salamis* (Princeton, 1978), 96–108.

<sup>55</sup> [I have now discussed the place of the Eleusinian cult in Athenian religion in 'Reconstructing Change: Ideology and Ritual at Eleusis', in M. Golden and P. Toohey (eds.), *Inventing Ancient Culture: Historicism, Periodization and the Ancient World* (London, 1997), 132–64.] Argos: Burkert, *HN*, 162–8; de Polignac, *Naissance*, 41–92 *passim*, esp. 88. Sparta: Brelich, *Paidēs*, 141–7.

*polis* organization as a whole was changing. This change was sanctioned by the Delphic oracle: the Pythia selected the eponymous heroes for the ten tribes out of a hundred names submitted to her, and since the tribes were the new major subdivisions of the *polis*, this selection was a symbolic *pars pro toto* for all the cultic changes connected with the reorganization of the *polis*. In Classical Athens the deme was the most important religious subdivision after the *polis*. The cults and rites that went into the making of the cult of these demes were undoubtedly not new; most would have been local rituals, now brought under the administration of the demes. Some may have been significantly reshaped, others not.<sup>56</sup> Cultic innovation, we saw, was accepted without problems; Kleisthenes' reforms were clearly not perceived to have involved the abandonment of long-established practices for which there was a much greater reluctance;<sup>57</sup> they seem similar to the course recommended by Plato (*Leg.* 738b-c). Moreover, articulations of this type were not, we saw, perceived as sacred and unchangeable—not surprisingly, given the role of religion in the definition of sociopolitical units which themselves changed considerably over the years.

In so far as we can judge, the *polis* subdivisions had, first, cults in which only their members could participate, which helped define those groups through the exclusion of non-members; second, some at least also had cults to which outsiders could be admitted; finally, they had cults which pertained to their interaction with the other *polis* groupings: for example, the demes participated in festivals which were primarily central *polis* festivals, either by celebrating

<sup>56</sup> At least some may have been phratry cults before (cf. Humphreys, cited by R. Parker in *Gifts*, 138 n. 13; D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica* (Princeton, 1986), 177). If, as I believe, phratries began as local units, perhaps by the late 6th cent. phratry membership had become radically dissociated from locality, and there had been in any case a need for a new locality-bound articulation.

Some classical demes formed cultic units which appear to reflect older groupings articulated through cult, whether or not they had been exclusively cultic, variable associations of three or four demes, focused (in different ways) on religious practice: the Marathonian Tetrapolis (D. M. Lewis, *Historia*, 12 (1963), 31-2; *LSCG* 20; Dow, *BCH* 92 (1968), 174-5, 181-2; Whitehead, 190-4; Parke, *FA*, 181-2; J. D. Mikalson, *A. J. Phil.* 98 (1977), 425, 427); the Tetrakomoi (Lewis, 33); the League of Athena Pallenis (Lewis, 33-4; R. Schlaifer, *HSCP* 54 (1943), 35-67; S. Solders, *Die ausser-städtischen Kulte und die Einigung Attikas* (Lund, 1931), 13-14); and the Trikomoi (Lewis, 34). On these associations cf. also P. Siewert, *Die Trittyen Attikas und die Heeresreform des Kleisthenes* (Munich, 1982), 118-20.

<sup>57</sup> *Ath. Pol.* 21. 6; cf. Rhodes, *Commentary on Ath. Pol.*, ad loc. (pp. 258-9); cf. E. Kearns in *Crux*, 190.

them also in the deme, or by taking part in the central *polis* rites as a deme. The cults of the *genos* (clan) are a category of *polis* cult which separately defined the members of each group, of each *genos*, who had exclusive right to one or more priesthoods specific to the *genos*. There were also in the various cities 'private' cultic associations, based on personal choice (e.g. Isaeus 9. 30). The cult of private associations often became part of *polis* religion. Thus, for example, the cult of a god, almost certainly Apollo Delios, who had hitherto had an informal cult to which shipowners contributed a voluntary levy, became a *polis* cult shortly before 429/8.<sup>58</sup>

We shall now consider the cults of the subdivisions of the *polis*. In Athens the new Kleisthenic tribes had their own tribal cults;<sup>59</sup> in addition, the Athenians were tribally articulated in many activities, including cultic ones such as chorus competitions and the *ephebeia* (military training with initiatory overtones). The connection of the old tribe G[e]leontes and the *phylobasileis* (tribal kings) with the Synoikia, the festival celebrating the birth of the Athenian *polis*, in Nikomachos' calendar,<sup>60</sup> shows the continuing involvement of the old Ionian tribes in cult and suggests an early, certainly pre-Kleisthenic, intertwining of *polis* subdivisions and *polis* formation. Tribes had a cultic role also in the other cities.<sup>61</sup> In the college of the Molpoi at Miletos one representative from each tribe was acting as a college official (*LSAM* 50. 1-3). In the rites for Zeus Polieus and Hestia in Kos it was the tribes which provided the primary articulation of the worshipping group *polis*.<sup>62</sup> The tribes' participation in the cults of the civic deities is comparable to their connection with the formation of the Athenian *polis* through the Synoikia: they and other *polis* subdivisions participated in the cults symbolizing the unity of the *polis* because this reinforced that unity and defined the subdivisions as parts of a symbolically potent whole. The Kleisthenic *trittyes*

<sup>58</sup> D. M. Lewis, *BSA* 55 (1960), 190-4.

<sup>59</sup> U. Kron, *Die zehn Phylenheroen* (Berlin, 1976), *passim*; R. Schlaifer, *HSCP* 51 (1940), 253-7; Gernet and Boulanger, *Le Génie grec*, 255; Kearns in *Crux*, 192-9.

<sup>60</sup> *LSS* 10. 35 ff.; cf. Dow, *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.* 71 (1953-7), 15-21, 25-7; also Rhodes, *Commentary on Ath. Pol.*, 151; Dow, *BCH* 92 (1968), 174; J. D. Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton, 1975), 29-30. Cf. also Deubner, *AF*, 36-8; Parke, *FA*, 31-2; E. Simon, *Festivals of Attica* (Madison, Wisc., 1983), 50.

<sup>61</sup> Gernet and Boulanger, *Le Génie grec*, 255; D. Roussel, *Tribu et cité* (Paris, 1976), 207 n. 38, 216.

<sup>62</sup> *LSCG* 151 A 5-15, on which see Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos*, 322-3. Cf. also Roussel, *Tribu et cité*, 207 n. 38, 261.

(subdivisions of the tribes) also had a cultic role,<sup>63</sup> and so did the old pre-Kleisthenic ones, even after Nikomachos' reforms.<sup>64</sup>

In terms of cult the deme was the most important *polis* subdivision in Classical Athens. A few deme calendars have survived.<sup>65</sup> The first category of deme rites consists of rites performed in the deme. It includes: (a) local celebrations of central *polis* festivals and cults which were also—and sometimes predominantly—*polis* cults such as that of the poliad deities; (b) cults and rites which were specific to the specific demes, above all of local heroes and heroines, including that of the eponymous hero; and (c) major festivals celebrated only in the demes, of which the most important was the Rural Dionysia. The second main category of deme ritual activity involved the participation of the demes as demes in the central *polis* cults. This second category and the type (a) of the first category represent the two main ways in which deme and central *polis* cults were interwoven.

The Erchia calendar offers an example of type (a), that is, of a deme cult involving rites and offerings in the deme to deities which functionally above all pertained to the central *polis* nucleus, on days which were ritually significant in the central *polis* calendar. Zeus Polieus, Athena Polias, Kourotrophos, Aglauros, and Poseidon (and perhaps also Pandrosos) received sacrifices on the Erchia Acropolis on the third Skirophorion, which was almost certainly the day of the Arrhephoria in Athens.<sup>66</sup> Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus were concerned with the *polis* as a whole; their local worship in the demes expressed ritually the interdependence between demes and *polis*; another symbolic strand in this complex interweaving of the whole

<sup>63</sup> Lewis, *Historia*, 12 (1956), 35; cf. esp. IG I<sup>3</sup> 255. In IG I<sup>3</sup> 258 the deme of the Plotheians makes contributions to the festivals of the Epakreis, probably the *trittys* to which they belonged—though we cannot exclude that it may have been a religious association of neighbouring demes. (Cf. Lewis, 27–8; Siewert, *Die Trittyen*, 15 n. 67, 102 n. 91, 112–13 n. 140; Parker in *Gifts*, 140; cf. also R. J. Hopper, *BSA* 56 (1961), 217–19.) Epakria may also have been the name of a pre-Kleisthenic *trittys* (cf. Siewert, 15 n. 67, 112–13 n. 140).

<sup>64</sup> The Leukotainioi, one of the *trittyes* of the Geleontes (*LSS* 10 A 35ff.; cf. Dow, *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.* 71 (1953–7), 26; Siewert, *Die Trittyen*, 15 n. 67; Rhodes, *Commentary on Ath. Pol.*, 68; W. S. Ferguson, in *Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps on his Seventieth Birthday* (Princeton, 1936), 151–8, esp. 154–7), are involved in a sacrifice associated with the Synoikia (cf. Mikalson, *Sacred and Civil Calendar*, 29).

<sup>65</sup> On deme religion, Whitehead, *Demes*, 176–222; Parker in *Gifts*, 137–47; R. Osborne, *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika* (Cambridge, 1985), 178–81; Kolb, *Agora und Theater*, 62ff.

<sup>66</sup> *LSCG* 18 A 57–65; B 55–9; Γ 59–64; Δ 55–60. Cf. M. Jameson, *BCH* 89 (1965), 156–8; Whitehead, *Demes*, 179.

*polis* (symbolized through its centre) and the subdivisions that constitute it and their cults was the Erchia deme's sacrifices to Zeus Polieus (*LSCG* 18 Γ 15–18) and to Athena Polias (*LSCG* 18 Δ 13–17) in the acropolis in the *asty* (city). Poseidon was associated with Athena Polias at the cultic centre of the city and the two represent an alternative poliad pair. Aglauros and Pandrosos were part of the same central *polis* cultic nexus and were also associated with the Arrhephoria<sup>67</sup>—in which Athena was the main deity. The cults of Aglauros and Pandrosos were associated with that of Kourotrophos: all three were served by the same priestess.<sup>68</sup> Kourotrophos, who was concerned with the *polis* in so far as she was concerned with the growth of the children that will make up the *polis*, also received many other offerings at Erchia. Her cult was important in other demes too<sup>69</sup> and was thus an important common element between the demes and the centre. The celebration of the central *polis* nexus in the demes helped articulate the cohesion of the *polis*.

Another form of interconnection of type (a) involved local celebration of central *polis* festivals. The Hieros Gamos/Theogamia was celebrated in Athens on 27 Gamelion, and on this date the Erchia calendar lists sacrifices to Hera, Zeus Teleios, Kourotrophos, and Poseidon in the sanctuary of Hera at Erchia, which indicate a local celebration of the same rite.<sup>70</sup> At Thorikos there were sacrifices for Athena and Aglauros at the Plynteria (*Thorikos* 52–4), celebrated on a different date from that of the central *polis* festival.<sup>71</sup> This may have allowed the demesmen to participate in both local and central *polis* celebration if they so wished, and suggests that the local rite and the central one were seen as complementary, the purifications and washing of the local statue of Athena being a counterpart to (and perhaps also symbolically dependent on) that of the ancient image of Athena Polias. The cult of Zeus Herkeios was practised in the demes<sup>72</sup>

<sup>67</sup> Burkert, *GR*, 228–9; Simon, *Festivals of Attica*, 45–6. On the cult of Aglauros cf. also Dontas, *Hesperia*, 52 (1983), 48–63.

<sup>68</sup> On Kourotrophos, *Salaminiot.* II, 12, 45–6 and p. 21; *Suda* s.v. *kourotrophos, paidotrophos*, cf. e.g. *LSS* 10 A 24. Cf. Th. Hadzisteliou-Price, *Kourotrophos* (Leiden, 1978); Nilsson, *GGR*, 457.

<sup>69</sup> *Thorikos*, 20–3, 42–3; Tetrapolis calendar: *LSCG* 20 B 6; B 14; B 31; B 37; B 42; B 46; A 56. Cf. also Parker in *Gifts*, 146.

<sup>70</sup> 18 B 32–9; Γ 38–41; Δ 28–32. Cf. F. Salviat, *BCH* 88 (1964), 647–54; Mikalson, *A.J. Phil.* 98 (1977), 429; Parker in *Gifts*, 142–3.

<sup>71</sup> Deubner, *AF*, 17–22; Parker in *Gifts*, 152–5; R. Parker, *Miasma* (Oxford, 1983), 26–8.

<sup>72</sup> *Thorikos*, 22 and left and right side (cf. Daux, 157–60).

and in the central *polis* cult nexus, as well as in the *oikos* with which it is symbolically associated.<sup>73</sup>

The participation of the demes as demes in the central *polis* cults (e.g. IG I<sup>3</sup> 258. 25–7; cf. 30–1), in the *asty* and elsewhere, is the second main way in which the relationship between the central *polis* cults which pertain to the whole *polis* and those of the *polis* subdivisions is expressed. Among the central *polis* festivals in which the demes participated as demes was the Panathenaia, in which the meat of the sacrificial victims was distributed deme by deme, among the participants sent by each deme.<sup>74</sup> The deme of Skambonidai at least is known to have participated in the Synoikia (LSCG 10 C 16–19), which, as we saw, celebrated the formation of the *polis* and with which the old tribes and the old *trittyes* were also associated. The absence of religious activities in Erchia during some major *polis* festivals may be indicative of a general tendency, suggesting that the demesmen attended the rites at Athens (or Eleusis).<sup>75</sup> This 'complementarity' is another sort of interconnection between the Athenian central *polis* cult and those of the demes. Another category of festival was celebrated both in Athens and in some at least of the demes. The Thesmophoria and a group of closely related women's rites, particularly the Skira, probably belong to this class.<sup>76</sup> The Plotheia decree suggests that there may have been also a third category of cult, participation in the cult of the *trittys*.<sup>77</sup>

In so far as we can judge, in other *poleis* too there was similar participation of the subdivisions in central *polis* cults. We glanced at tribal participation above, and we shall consider some aspects

<sup>73</sup> I discuss the significance of this fact in 'Further Aspects of *Polis* Religion' (Ch. 2, below, 52–3).

<sup>74</sup> LSCG 33 B 25–7; cf. 10 A 19–21; Mikalson, *A. J. Phil.* 98 (1977), 428; Parke, *FA*, 48; Osborne, *Demos*, 180; Parker in *Gifts*, 140–1.

<sup>75</sup> Mikalson, *A. J. Phil.* 98 (1977), 428.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Parker in *Gifts*, 142. The deme Eleusinia are, in my view, comparable to the deme Thesmophoria. The central *polis* nexus pertaining to the Eleusinian cult was focused above all on Eleusis and the *asty* Eleusinion. I hope to discuss this cult elsewhere.

<sup>77</sup> Unless the Epakreis were a religious association comparable to the Tetrapolis (above n. 56). Guarducci (*Historia*, 9 (1935), 211) suggested that the *pentetērides* (festivals celebrated every fifth year), the third category of sacrifices to which the Plotheians contribute in ll. 25–8, besides deme and central *polis* cults, may have been celebrated by the Epakreis, for they correspond to the Epakreis category in the tripartite articulation of ll. 30–1; Mikalson, *A. J. Phil.* 98 (1977), 427, believes they are analogous to the Marathonians' biennial sacrifices. Parker in *Gifts*, 140 n. 32, noted that the central *polis* *pentetērides* are another possibility.

pertaining to phratries below. Here I shall say something very briefly about the Spartan religious system. The same type of cultic interconnections between the *polis* and its subdivisions is also seen in Sparta. In the celebration of the extremely important festival of the Karneia an articulation by phratries came into play (Demetrius of Skepsis *ap. Ath.* 141e–f), while another articulation was involved in the selection of the Karneatai for the liturgy of Apollo Karneios.<sup>78</sup> There is also unambiguous, if fragmentary, evidence showing that girls' choruses were organized according to the *polis* subdivisions, by tribe and/or by *ōbē* (village).<sup>79</sup> Cults associated with the subdivisions of the Spartan *polis* are not attested in the Classical period, but given the paucity of evidence that is perhaps due to chance.<sup>80</sup>

Phratries<sup>81</sup> everywhere appear to have had cults common to all the phratries of the *polis*, of the gods who were the protectors of the phratries in that city and were also worshipped at the central *polis* level, and also to have all celebrated, each phratry separately, certain *polis* festivals. One of these was the main festival of the phratries at which new members were admitted; this was known as the Apatouria in most Ionian cities and was, in Athens at least, celebrated by each phratry in its own local centre (cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1237. 52 ff.)—and as the Apellai in the Dorian–North-West Greek world.<sup>82</sup> These were central *polis* festivals.<sup>83</sup> Another group of phratry cults were cults which were distinctive and exclusive to each phratry, which thus helped define it as a group.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>78</sup> Hesychius s.v. *Karneatai* tells us that five unmarried youths were selected from each [= tribe? obe?] for this *leitourgia* (cf. Brelich, *Paides*, 149–50).

<sup>79</sup> C. Calame, *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece* (Lanham, Md., 1997), 154–6, 219–21.

<sup>80</sup> R. Parker, 'Spartan Religion', in A. Powell (ed.), *Classical Sparta: Techniques behind her Success* (London, 1989), 142–72.

<sup>81</sup> On phratries see esp. A. Andrewes, *JHS* 81 (1961), 1–15; S. C. Humphreys, *Anthropology and the Greeks* (London, 1978), 194–8, cf. 206–8; Roussel, *Tribu et cité*, 93–157; most recently, M. A. Flower, *CQ* 35 (1985), 232–5. On phratry cults and ceremonies, J. Labarbe, *Bull. de l'Académie royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres*, 5th ser., 39 (1953), 358–94; C. Rolley, *BCH* 89 (1965), 441–83; Roussel, 133–5; Nilsson, *Cults*, 162–70; cf. Graf, *NK*, 32–7; cf. *CID*, pp. 28–88 *passim*; also Latte in *RE* s.v. *Phratrioi theoi*.

<sup>82</sup> Rougemont in *CID*, pp. 46–7, suggests that only the *apellaia*, the sacrifice at a male's achievement of majority, had to be offered on the day of the Apellai, and that the sacrifices for infants and weddings did not have a fixed date. In Athens, in special circumstances, one could be presented to the phratry at another festival, such as the Thargelia (cf. Isaeus 7. 15).

<sup>83</sup> According to schol. *Ar. Ach.* 146 the Apatouria is a 'dēmotelēs' festival.

<sup>84</sup> Nilsson, *Cults*, 162–4.

In Athens the main deities of all the phratries were Zeus Phratrios and Athena Phratria, who had a temple in the Agora and also another shrine with an altar but no temple.<sup>85</sup> Apollo Patroos may conceivably also have been worshipped by all the phratries; he also had a temple in the Agora.<sup>86</sup> Andrewes suggested that his cult was in the custody of the *genē* but all members of the phratry were perceived as sharing in it. This may well be right. The fact that, as *Ath. Pol.* 55. 3 shows, having a cult of Apollo Patroos was a prerequisite of archonship<sup>87</sup> does indeed suggest that by that time at least there was a direct connection with (citizenship through) the phratries. In my view, it was perceived as a cult of the phratries which was administered by the *genē* at the centre of each phratry—and also a cult of the *polis* as a whole. This was perhaps not seen as radically different from the priesthood of Zeus Phratrios being held by the *genos* at the centre of the phratry.<sup>88</sup>

The fact that all the phratries in Athens had the same main deities suggests that their most important cults resulted from a central articulation of cult, an articulation of the *polis* given symbolic expression and cohesion through cult. The cults of Zeus Phratrios and Athena Phratria, a central *polis*, cultic nexus almost certainly created at the formation of the *polis*, expressed the phratries' communality and their identity as constituent elements of the city. The latter was signalled especially strongly because the two Phratrioi deities were also the two poliad deities. Thus the protection of the *polis* includes the protection of the phratries that make it up; and the protection of the phratries contributes to the protection of the *polis*. The hypothesis

<sup>85</sup> X. de Schutter, *L'Antiquité classique*, 56 (1987), 116; Nilsson, *Cults*, 165–7; Kearns in *Crux*, 204–5; Travlos, *PD*, 96, 572–5.

<sup>86</sup> de Schutter (n. 85), 104, cf. 108; Roussel, *Tribu et cité*, 73; Kearns in *Crux*, 205; Travlos, *PD*, 96.

<sup>87</sup> Rhodes, *Commentary on Ath. Pol.*, ad loc. (pp. 617–18); Andrewes, *JHS* 81 (1961), 7–8.

<sup>88</sup> As e.g. it is surely implied in *Andoc.* 1. 126 that Kallias did. A comparable custodianship may have been the background to the move of the common *hiera* from private houses to a common house of the Chiot phratry Klytidai (cf. *LSCG* 118; Graf, *NK*, 428–9 (*I. Ch.* 3), and cf. also 32–7; Forrest, *BSA* 55 (1960), 179–81)—if they are indeed a phratry and if the private individuals in whose houses the *hiera* had been kept before were *gennētai* holding the priesthoods. The fact that annually elected priests in central *polis* cults sometimes also kept the statue of the god in their house (cf. Paus. 4. 33. 2; 7. 24. 4) suggests that 'keeping the statue/other *hiera* in one's house' is symbolically correlative with 'being in charge of the administration of' and does not necessitate possession through a hereditary connection. The privileged position of the *genos* within the classical phratry cannot be doubted (cf. Andrewes, *JHS* 81 (1961), 3–9).

that there was a connection between this cultic nexus, the phratries, and the act of constitution of the *polis* is supported by the fact that a sacrifice was made to Zeus Phratrios and Athena Phratria at the Synoikia.<sup>89</sup> Again, the fact that this sacrifice was made on the authority of the law of the *phylobasileis* and was associated with the old Ionian tribe Geleontes suggests that this cultic connection with the formation of the *polis* was old, certainly pre-Kleisthenic. In Kos also Athena and Zeus were both Phratrioi and Polieis.<sup>90</sup>

But of course the situation was not as tidy everywhere—as is to be expected when the pantheon of each city was a different system which could vary considerably in each case. At Erythrai it was Poseidon who was worshipped as Phratrios while Athena was Polias; the epithet of Zeus more directly connected to the *polis* as a central unit was Agoraios.<sup>91</sup> Zeus Patroos seems to be the—or at least one of the—phratry god[s] also at Chios (*LSCG* 118) where Athena is *poliouchos* (city-protecting) and where we lack evidence for Zeus in the type of 'polis-holding' persona considered in this connection.<sup>92</sup> Despite the variety between the *phratrioi* gods of the different *poleis*, the forms of the relationship between phratry and central *polis* cults seem constant.

Another manifestation of this close relationship between the two, and of the fact that the phratries' cult is dependent on, and derives its authority from, the central *polis* religion, is seen in Thasos, where the altars of the *patrai* (here equivalent to the phratries) were set up in what is almost certainly the Thesmophorion.<sup>93</sup> This arrangement also expresses the links between the different phratries, especially since some of them may have shared an altar—with each group who sacrificed there having a boundary stone of their own. Each of the *patrai* had a different divinity whom they called Patroos/Patroa. Several have Zeus, some Athena, some the Nymphs, some other divinities without the epithet Patroos, and one Demeter Patroa Eleusinia. In this case—though not usually—'Patroos' seems equivalent to 'Phratrios' in other *poleis*.<sup>94</sup> The fact that these altars

<sup>89</sup> *LSS* 10; cf. Nilsson, *Cults*, 166; Mikalson, *Sacred and Civil Calendar*, 29–30.

<sup>90</sup> Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos*, 158, 293, 295, 298–9.

<sup>91</sup> Graf, *NK*, 207, 209ff., 197–9.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Graf, *NK*, 141.

<sup>93</sup> Rolley, *BCH* 89 (1965), 441–83; id., 'Le Sanctuaire d'Évraïokastro: Mise à jour du dossier', in *Μνήμη Δ. Λαζαρίδη. Πόλις και χώρα στην αρχαία Μακεδονία και Θράκη* (Salonica, 1990), 405–8.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Rolley, *BCH* 89 (1965), 458 f; id., *Μνήμη*.

were situated in the sanctuary of Demeter may perhaps suggest that Demeter was a major protector of the *patrai*, as well as being a goddess who, in the same sanctuary, was closely connected with the centre, and with the foundation, of the *polis*.<sup>95</sup>

The oath of the commanders (*tagoi*) of the Delphic phratry of the Labyadai invokes Zeus Patroos (CID 9 A 21–2), while the oath taken by the assembly of all the Labyadai before voting—that they will vote fairly, according to the laws of the Delphians—invokes Apollo,<sup>96</sup> Poseidon Phratrios, and Zeus Patroos (B 10–17). Side D of the Labyadai inscription deals with festivals and other cultic matters. First the regulations specify that in a series of central *polis* festivals (D 3–11) all the Labyadai had to participate in the common banquet of the phratry.<sup>97</sup> Then the inscription lists certain contributions made to the Labyadai by others who consulted the Delphic oracle—that is, by those participating in the Panhellenic cult, here treated on the model of *xenoi* participating in a *polis* cult.<sup>98</sup> The ‘sacrifices of the Labyadai’ listed in ll. 43–9<sup>99</sup> are clearly phratry rites. Dionysos receives a sacrifice in the month Apellaios, Zeus Patroos receives a sacrifice at the Boukatia, and on the same occasion Apollo receives the first fruits. The phratry of the Labyadai was a subdivision of the Delphic *polis*. It regulated admissions to the phratry, participation in the central *polis* festivals, and all interactions with the *polis*, including the Panhellenic sanctuary. It also issued funerary regulations (CID 9 C 19 ff.). It functioned like a mini-*polis*—though interacting with, and under the authority of (e.g. B 15–17), the Delphic *polis*. It can be argued that it combines functions similar to those of both the Athenian phratry and the Athenian deme. No village-like subdivisions comparable to the Athenian demes are known in the *polis* of Delphi, which was of course very much smaller than Athens. (The coexistence of phratries and village-like subdivisions was not limited to Athens; there were, for example, phratries and obes in Sparta, and phratries and demes at Locri Epizephyrii.)

I hope to have shown in this chapter that, and how, the *polis*

<sup>95</sup> Rolley, *BCH* 89 (1965), 483; id., *Μνήμη*.

<sup>96</sup> The most important Delphic god, and also especially concerned (W. Burkert, *Rhein. Mus.* 118 (1975), 1–21) with the Apellai and the youths’ initiation and achievement of maturity, and thus of full phratry membership.

<sup>97</sup> CID, ad loc., esp. p. 64.

<sup>98</sup> CID, ad loc., esp. p. 80; Ch. Kritzas, *BCH* 110 (1986), 611–17.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. CID, pp. 59, 62, 82–5.

provided the fundamental, basic framework in which Greek religion operated. I also set out the complex ways in which the Greek *polis* articulated, and was articulated by, religion, and I proposed certain reconstructions of ancient religious perceptions pertaining especially to the articulation of *polis* religion. The role of the *polis* in the articulation of Greek religion was matched by the role of religion in the articulation of the *polis*: religion provided the framework and the symbolic focus of the *polis*. Religion was the very centre of the Greek *polis*.