

Apostolos L. Pierris

## On the Athenian ἱεροποιοί

The unduly vexed subject of the Athenian *ἱεροποιοί* provides another minor but not negligible illustration of the embeddiment of the poetic usage, here as always, on real facts. Given the opportunity let me briefly unravel the imagined knot. Ἱεροποιοί, in Athens as elsewhere (cf. e.g. ἐν Δήλῳ, *Inscr. Gr.*, Dittenberger<sup>1</sup>, 367, 1 sqq.; ἐν Καμίρῳ, 305, 18; ἐν Μυκόνῳ, 373, 17 sqq.; ἐν Τέῳ, 234, 6; ἱεροποιὸς ἐν Ἐρυθραῖς, 159, 1 sqq.; 24; 172, 2 sqq.; 370, 14 sqq.) were public functionaries with religious duties, or duties referring to religious matters, overseers of various religious activities, or of activities involving religious affairs, and this from the public and not specifically priestly point of view. (But although, they would, e.g. typically superintend the financial aspects of religious transactions in which the state was somehow directly involved, they could in cases, act in a definitely priestly capacity, as we may learn from the Demosthenian and Aristotelian passages to be adduced infra). Aristotle gives the proper description of their nature from the ancient point of view in that chapter of his *Politics* (Z, 8) where he “divides” the ἀρχαί of a city-state: αἱ μὲν οὖν πολιτικάι τῶν ἀρχῶν σχεδὸν τοσαῦταί τινές εἰσι. ἄλλο δ’ εἶδος ἐπιμελείας ἢ περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς, οἷον ἱερεῖς τε καὶ ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν περὶ τὰ ἱερά, τοῦ σφίζεσθαι τε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ἀνορθοῦσθαι τὰ πίπτοντα τῶν οἰκοδομημάτων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσα τέτακται πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς. συμβαίνει δὲ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ταύτην ἐνιαχοῦ μὲν εἶναι μίαν, οἷον ἐν ταῖς μικραῖς πόλεσιν, ἐνιαχοῦ δὲ πολλὰς καὶ κεχωρισμένας τῆς ἱερωσύνης, οἷον ἱεροποιούς καὶ ναοφύλακας καὶ ταμίας τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων. ἔχομένης δὲ ταύτης (sc. of the overseeing magistracy) ἢ πρὸς τὰς θυσίας ἀφωρισμένη τὰς κοινὰς πάσας, ὅσας μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι ἀποδίδωσι ὁ νόμος, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τῆς κοινῆς ἐστίας (sc. τῆς πόλεως) ἔχουσι τὴν τιμὴν· καλοῦσι δ’ οἱ μὲν ἄρχοντας τούτους, οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς, οἱ δὲ πρυτάνεις.

In Athens there were in *Aristotle’s time* two chief boards of ἱεροποιοί with extensive jurisdiction, the ten ἱεροποιοὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκθύματα καλούμενοι and the ten ἱεροποιοὶ οἱ κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν καλούμενοι, v. *Ἀθ. Πολ.*, 54, 6-7. It is remarkably strange that the lexicographers, drawing on the state-structure of Athens chiefly from

Aristotle's work, represent the two as one; excepting Pollux VIII, 107 who confines himself in his brief and mangled notice to the second only, a passage to be corrected thus: ἱεροποιοί. δέκα ὄντες οὗτοι ἔθουον θυσίας <τινάς καὶ τὰς> πεντετηρίδας <διώκουν>, τὴν εἰς Δῆλον, τὴν ἐν Βραυρῶνι, τὴν τῶν Ἡρακλείων, τὴν Ἐλευσῖνι. (Rose, in his *Aristoteles Pseudepigr.*, Fr. 397, saw the need of correction according to the Aristotelian passage, but his proposal, followed by Kenyon in his ed. of *Αθ. Πολ.* note in p. 136, is illicit). We ought to keep in mind that the ἱεροποιοί were not normally acting in a priestly, sacrificial capacity, but as public superintendents of state sacrifices, sacred rites and festivities, as is amply and conclusively evidenced literarily and epigraphically. –

But, to return to the apparent joining of the two chief Aristotelian boards in one, *Et. M.* and *Lex. Seguer.* p. 265, 22 and Photius s.v., have: ἱεροποιοί: κληρωτοὶ ἄρχοντες εἰσι δέκα τὸν ἀριθμόν, οἱ τὰ τε μαντεύματα ἱεροθετοῦσι (this equals the Aristotelian τὰ μαντεντὰ ἱερά θύουσι meaning sacrifices divinationally ordained) καὶ τι καλλιερῆσαι δέη καλλιερῶσι μετὰ τῶν μάντεων (i.e. if, with reference to a *state-action*, propitious omens have to signal the starting of the enterprise, they perform the divinational sacrifices together with the religiously proper persons), καὶ (here comes the combination of the functions of the two boards in one) θυσίας τὰς νομιζομένας ἐπιτελοῦσι καὶ τὰς πενταετηρίδας ἀπάσας διοικοῦσι πλὴν Παναθηναίων.

This curious fusion and consequent divergence from Aristotle's meaning is neither as inexplicable or as serious as might appear. For our sources do refer to ἱεροποιοί without any qualification, thus implying *one* major office only; and this of such a character as would fit Aristotle's description of the second general board. Thus in the famous «δερματικά» - inscription (374 *Sylloge*<sup>1</sup>) we have the ἱεροποιοί as functionaries with financial responsibilities for specific feasts and rites by the side of other officers with the same jurisdiction over different state-religious festivities. (The true nature of ἱεροποιοί is evident at a glance from this inscription alone).<sup>1</sup> Again in Inscription 380, the same chief, single body must be meant by «ἱεροποιοί» without any qualification. And the same must be true regarding the ἱεροποιοί of *Inscription 2* (probably datable at around 460 BC), where, however, we found them involved in the regulations concerning certain aspects of *Μεγάλα Παναθήναια*. (In fact, these

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a serious problem here, unnoticed I presume, regarding the year of the Great Panathenaea. For in Nicocrates' archonship (333/2 B.C.) there is supposed to be included this line (36):

[ἔκ Παναθηναίων ἐκ[ατόμβης παρὰ...

Ἐκατόμβη Παναθηναίων can only refer to the Greater Panathenaea, and they would then have to be celebrated in a 4<sup>th</sup> Olympic year. The restoration must therefore be faulty. – Among the responsibilities of the ἱεροποιοί, superintendence of (the sacrifice for) the Lesser Panathenaea was included, vv. 35, 65. Cf. also, Inscription 380 (probably about the same time as the previous one), esp. vv. 32-33.

“aspects” may well be the chief ones, as the large amount of money specified in l. 3 would rather relate to the *ἐκατόμβη*). Indeed, the exclusion of this great pentaeteric festival from their jurisdiction must be ascribed to the 4<sup>th</sup> century, as we find another inscription (No 44), of 410/9 BC, explicitly entrusting the financial management of the Panathenaic *ἐκατόμβη* to this very board of *ἱεροποιοὶ κατ’ ἐνιαυτόν* (ll. 6-7). From the expression there, *Διύλλοι Ἐρχιεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν*, we gather that there was *one chief* among the members of the board, perhaps (something frequent with such *συναρχία*) on a monthly or prytanic basis; we may thus explain *Hesychius’* incomplete lemma *ἱεροποιοὶ ἐπιμήνιοι*, as this very word *ἐπιμήνιος* was used to signify such rotating presidents of boards.

Turning now to literary sources, we meet the same board, clearly indicated as the main and important one, by its unqualified appellation. Demosthenes chastising the Athenians for their unprofessional conduct of the war with Philip, mentions the many boards of military officers, whose actual primal duty is the direction of state-festivals in conjunction with *the ἱεροποιοί*. *First Philippic* §26 (p. 47): οὐκ ἐχειροτονεῖτε δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν δέκα ταξιάρχους καὶ στρατηγούς καὶ φυλάρχους καὶ ἱππάρχους δύο; τί οὖν οὗτοι ποιοῦσι; πλήν ἑνὸς ἀνδρός, ὃν ἂν ἐκπέμψητε ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον, οἱ λοιποὶ τὰς πομπὰς πέμπουσιν ὑμῖν μετὰ τῶν ἱεροποιῶν. The definite article, makes it certain that a definite, single board is meant – and the chief one, as there is no qualification added. The scholiast *ad loc.* refers to one of their functions: *ἱεροποιοὶ δὲ οἱ τὰ θύματα ἄγοντες εἰς τὴν πανήγυριν ἀπὸ τόπου εἰς τόπον*. The investigation of the victims as to their religious wholeness and appropriateness in the sacrifices falling within their jurisdiction was another of their responsibilities, as *Ulpianus* relates in his comment on Demosthenes, *Contra Meidiam* §171 (p. 570): *ἱεροποιόν· τὸν ἐπισκοποῦντα τὰ θύματα μὴ ἀδόκιμα καὶ πηρά*. The Demosthenic passage mentions Meidias as *ἱεροποιός simpliciter*: ὑμεῖς γάρ, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τοῦτον ἐχειροτονήσατε τῆς Παράλου ταμίαν, ὄντα τοιοῦτον οἴός ἐστι, καὶ πάλιν ἱππάρχον, ὀχεῖσθαι διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ταῖς πομπαῖς οὐ δυνάμενον, καὶ μυστηρίων ἐπιμελητὴν καὶ ἱεροποιόν ποτε καὶ βοώνην καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα δή. If Demosthenes means to apply the initial *ἐχειροτονήσατε* to all following offices, then this, in the case of an *ἱεροποιός* belonging to the principal board, must refer to the, normally, matter of course public assembly confirmational *ἐπιχειροτονία* (and the complementary, but rare, *ἀποχειροτονία*; cf. for an example, Demosthenes, *Contra Theocrinem*, p. 1330) rather than a proper *elective* operation; for Aristotle explicitly makes them *κληρωτούς* by the Βουλῆ, and the chronological distance makes it unsafe to postulate an (unnecessary) change in the mode of nomination. The *sortial* appointment is confirmed by Demosthenes, *Contra Theocrinem* p. 1331: καὶ τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν, ἣν ἐκεῖνος ἄρχων ἐτελεύτησεν, ἱεροποιός

ᾶν, παρὰ τοὺς νόμους, ἤρχεν οὗτος, οὔτε λαχῶν οὔτ' ἐπιλαχῶν. Notice here, too, the unqualified reference to an ἱεροποιός as of a certain and determinate denotation.

There was thus one chief board of ἱεροποιοί in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> centuries and this consisted of Aristotle's ἱεροποιοὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, ten in number, probably one from each tribe, chosen by lot on the responsibility of the Council which appoints them. This pre-eminence and universality of such a standing committee (renewable each year) would, I submit, account for the lexicographer's allocating to it the functions of a little known board (to judge from the complete absence of textual or inscriptional evidence) with severely limited, albeit important, duties, - I mean the ἱεροποιοὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκθύματα. Aristotle's mention of it alongside the chief board being sufficiently explained by his purpose of giving a full list of all functionaries appointed by the Council. Cf. 55§1: Αὐταὶ μὲν οὖν αἱ ἀρχαὶ κληρωταὶ τε καὶ κύρια τῶν εἰρημῶν πράξεων εἰσιν. - However, it cannot be absolutely excluded the possibility of Aristotle's referring to a specific bifurcational arrangement restricted to his own time.

Beside these one or two (one major, one minor) standing committees, there were other boards of ἱεροποιοί, *regional* or of a specific *circumscribed jurisdiction*, *permanent* or of *limited* duration. Thus we have *four* ἱεροποιοί in the Marathonian *Tetrapolis* (*Inscription* 304); which fact clearly illustrates their normal numerical equivalence to some significant tribal or religious multiplicity. There were also ἱεροποιοὶ Ἐλευσινόθεν, *Inscription* 13 (belonging to the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C.); to which the ἱεροποιοὶ τοῖς θεοῖν (according to the probable restitution in *Inscription* 384.116) may be identified. -

That *Inscription* 334.40 (ἐπαινέσαι τοὺς ἱεροποιοὺς τοὺς τὰ μυστήρια ἱεροποιήσαντας Ἐλευσῖνι) supports Dittenberger's postulation of ἱεροποιοὶ κατὰ πρυτανείαν, I consider unlikely. True, we find here a board of *ten members*, *nominatim*, of the *Aegeid* tribe - all inscriptions on this stone relating to matters of interest to that tribe and proceeding from it. But although some of these testimonies memorize individuals for services done to the φυλέται specifically (as the second inscription in the front of the stone, A and inscription C on its side); the main one bears the names of the Aegidean prytaneis glorified with crowns by the people and the council on account of their virtue and justice (Αἰγιήϊδος πρυτάνεις ἀνέθεσαν οἱ ἐπὶ Νικομάχου ἄρχοντος (Ol. 109, 4 = 341/0 B.C.) στεφανωθέντες ὑπὸ τῆς Βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ Δήμου ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης. They are Aegides, but they performed a public function, and in such a prudent and equitable way as to be officially honoured by the people and its council. *Such interpenetration of part and whole is of the essence of the Greek body politic*, and of Hellenic Life and Culture in general. In between Aegidean men being publicly honoured by the entire people for the distinguished performance of their public duties, and Aegides honouring private

or official individual members of their tribe for good services towards their co-tribesmen, there lies the honour proceeding from the tribe, conferred upon Aegides, but in their extra-tribal, state activity, with, however, the recognition of a special concern for their φυλέται in the delivery of their public responsibilities. And this is what we meet in the first inscription on B-side; and thus I interpret the second one, which concerns us here: Θαρρίας Ἐρχιεύς (one of the Aegidean Prytaneis) εἶπεν ἐπαινεῖσαι τοὺς ἱεροποιοὺς τοὺς τὰ μυστήρια ἱεροποιήσαντας Ἐλευσῖνι καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτῶν ἕκαστον θαλλοῦ στεφάνῳ ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης τῆς εἰς τοὺς φυλέτας – the ten names follow. As the decrees eternalized on this stone clearly proceed from a phyletic basis, the subscriptions ὁ δῆμος and ἡ βουλή in our particular inscription can only mean official state concurrence to a tribal decision – natural, as the honoured activity relates to such an eminent state-occasion as the performance of the sacrificial rites in the Mysteries of Eleusis.

*Ἱερο/ποιῶ, ἱερο/ποιῖα* is, of course, precisely equivalent to *sacrificio*; and thus, although it naturally acquired the more general meaning of *tending sacred rites*, being responsible, superintending and, in part, actually performing them; yet it always kept its original association with what, after all, is the primal rite, the sacrifice. (Just as much we may call the entire Christian Liturgy *the bloodless sacrifice*). And thus we find the word strictly conjoined with θύω in *Antipho*, 6, 45: ... καὶ εἰς τᾶλλα ἱερά πάντα εἰσιῶν μετὰ τῆς Βουλῆς καὶ θύων καὶ εὐχόμενος ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης, καὶ πρὸς τούτοις πρυτανεύσας τὴν πρώτην πρυτανείαν ἄπασαν πλὴν δυοῖν ἡμέραιν, καὶ ἱεροποιῶν καὶ θύων ὑπὲρ τῆς δημοκρατίας (as prytanis) etc. Similarly, Demosthenes, *Contra Meidiam* §114 (p. 552): ... ὥστ' ἐπαιτιασάμενός με φόνου καὶ τοιοῦτο πρᾶγμα ἔπαγαγών, εἶασε μὲν με εἰσιτήρια ὑπὲρ τῆς βουλῆς ἱεροποιῆσαι, καὶ θῦσαι, καὶ κατάρξασθαι τῶν ἱερῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ ὅλης τῆς πόλεως etc. –

[Εἰσιτήρια were the ceremonies and sacred rites performed upon a new Council's entering to office, and were centered, as always, round a sacrifice. *Ulpianus ad loc.*: εἰσιτήρια δὲ ἐγίγνετο θυσία, μελλούσης εἰσιέναι τῆς Βουλῆς εἰς τὸ Βουλευτήριον ὥστε κατὰ γνώμην ἀπαντῆσαι τῶν πραγμάτων τὴν σκέψιν ταύτην ἐκάλουν εἰσιτήρια. We ought not to accept this as if referring to some common sacrifices on each day of deliberation. For, *firstly*, we do not hear about them from elsewhere; when Antipho enumerates the official activities of a councilor and is interested to specify all those particularly of a grave religious nature, he mentions only *prayers* in connection with common sessions, *de Choreuta* §45: καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ Διὸς Βουλαίου καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς Βουλαίας ἱερόν ἐστι {to be distinguished from the *ἑστία*, *altar* in the Convocation Hall itself, called sometimes Βουλαία ἑστία as being of the Βουλή (Council) and of βουλή (deliberation). Cf. Xenophon, *Hist. Gr.*, II, 3, 52; Andocides, *de Mysteriis*, §44; *de reditu suo*, §15; Aeschines, *de Falsa Legatione*, p. 255 Taylor = 34.9 Steph.; Diodorus (relating the

Theramenes incident as Xenophon), XIV, Ch. 5 (VI, 20 Bipontina); Plutarchus, *X-Oratorum Vitae*, Δ' *Isocrates*, 836F (again the Theramenes incident); Deinarchus fr. 69 Mullach (apud Harpocratio s.v. Βουλαία); Suda s.v. Δεξιός (the famous Theramenes affair)}, καὶ εἰσιόντες οἱ βουλευταὶ προσεύχονται, ὧν καὶ γὰρ εἷς ἦν, ὅς ταῦτα πράττων, καὶ εἰς τᾶλλα ἱερὰ πάντα εἰσιῶν μετὰ τῆς Βουλῆς καὶ θύων καὶ εὐχόμενος ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης (clearly extraordinary or rarer events are here meant on specific occasions), καὶ πρὸς τούτοις πρυτανεύσας τὴν πρώτην πρυτανίαν ἄπασαν πλὴν δυοῖν ἡμέραιν, καὶ ἱεροποιῶν καὶ θύων ὑπὲρ τῆς δημοκρατίας (here would belong the εἰσιτήρια), καὶ ἐπιψηφίζων etc. – Then, *secondly*, if anything more ritualistic than a prayer happened at each session, that should be of a cathartic, lustrative nature, on the analogy of the pig-sacrifices at the Assembly meetings. – Nonetheless the trend of Ulpian's meaning both in the above quoted passage and in his comment on Demosthenes, *de Falsa Legatione*, p. 281: εἰσιτήρια· προηγεῖται γὰρ εἰσιούσης τῆς βουλῆς ὁ τὰς θυσίας ποιούμενος, might weight in the opposite direction. Nonetheless, we should resist such tendency, and interpret him, which is possible, with the correct view in mind. Cf. Demosthenes, *de Falsa Legatione*, §190 (p. 400): ἡ Βουλή ταῦτά ταῦτα, εἰσιτήρια ἔθυσσε, συνεισιτάθη σπονδῶν, ἱερῶν ἐκοινώνησαν οἱ στρατηγοί, σχεδὸν ὡς εἰπεῖν αἱ ἀρχαὶ πᾶσαι. Where notice the contrast between the *aorist* of the verbs referring to the council's acts and the present of the corresponding previous remarks on the prytaneis: ἐγὼ δ' οἶδ' ὅτι πάντες οἱ πρυτάνεις θύουσιν ἐκάστοτε κοινῇ, καὶ συνδειπνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις καὶ συσπένδουσι, καὶ οὐ διὰ τοῦτο οἱ χρηστοὶ τοὺς πονηροὺς μιμοῦνται etc. According to Suda, s.v., the ceremonies were taking place at the first day of each new year: εἰσιτήρια· ἡμέρα ἐορτῆς, ἐν ἣ οἱ ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ πάντες προΐασι (whether this would include other dignitaries as well than the Councillors, say, the nine Archons, I shall not resolve; the likelihood lies in the positive answer, regarding the chiefest magistracies at least), οὕτως ἐκαλεῖτο. ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἡμέραν πρώτην τοῦ ἔτους Ἀθηναῖοι νενομίκασι. (Would this imply a distinction between the *civil* and the *religious* year? We meet frequently in the more ancient inscriptions the distinction between dates κατ' ἀρχοντα and κατὰ θεόν, sc. god primarily Σελήνην and also Ἥλιον)]. –

The general surveillance and tendence over ceremonial activities of a sacred character in a festive day, is well illustrated by the use of the word ἱεροποιῶ in Plato, *Lysis*, 207D: the Ἐρμαῖα are celebrated in the Gymnasium, the sacrifices have been performed (206E), Socrates has begun his dialectical exercises with the gloriously beautiful Lysis (207A) and his friend Menexenos when: μεταξὺ οὖν τις προσελθὼν ἀνέστησε τὸν Μενέξενον, φάσκων καλεῖν τὸν παιδοτρίβην· ἐδόκει γὰρ μοι ἱεροποιῶν τυγχάνειν· ἐκεῖνος μὲν οὖν ᾤχετο etc. –

Ἱεροποιεῖν τὰ μυστήρια Ἐλευσῖνι means thus exercise supervisory, administrative, managerial direction of sacred rites (esp. sacrificial ones) in connection with the Eleusinian mysteries. The particular aspect of the ceremonial activities cared for by the hieropoioi in general was, we saw, chiefly the *financial* one (though this does not exclude examining the religious propriety of the victims to be supplied or offering the sacrifices as chief direct participants in the holy rite, or even participating under a hieratic capacity in it, as, for instance, *κατάρχεσθαι*). This specific responsibility would adequately differentiate their function both from that of the Eleusinian Priesthood and from the highest overseeing inspectorateship belonging to the board of the Four *Ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν Μυστηρίων* who, in conjunction with, and under the authority of the, King, exercise the supreme superintendence of the Mysteries in general on behalf of the State (cf. Aristotle, *Αθ. Πολ.*, 57 §1). –

All this, runs fluently. And now the crux of the difficulty, - which being equally naturally resolved, teaches us something interesting about additional prytanic functions. [Concerning the commentators' wreathing anxiety (v. the miserable Dittenberger's note) as to the one missing Πρύτανις from the initial list, comprising as it stands only 49 namely instead of 50 members, either the second *Ἀγκυλῆθεν* (l. c. 28) is corruptly read and should be a name of a Διομειεὺς Πρύτανις; or a name, partly effaced, should exist either in l. a.25 or b.27] . For we notice that *all members of the board of ἱεροποιοὶ are πρυτάνεις* (as indeed are all persons mentioned on the stone as either honoured or proposing the honours). Should Aegeis' prytaneia had fallen at the time of the Mysteries, this tribe's prytaneis may have constituted (by lot presumably) a committee out of themselves to superintend on behalf so to speak of the Council certain aspects of the festivities (as e.g. supply and appropriateness of the victims, financial accounts, distribution of sacrificial meals – cf. e.g. *Inscription 2, sub.in;* and *esp. 380 –*, in which context their functions might have even involved some, maybe, little or great participation in the actual sacred rites).

This is the likelier among a number of possible hypotheses on the supposition that the board in question is distinct from the *ἱεροποιοὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν*. For the formulation tends rather to suggest the specific connection of our hieropoioi with the Mysteries. And although the *ἱεροποιοὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν* were exercising relevant jurisdiction on the *penteteric* feast and sacrifice called *Eleusinia*; yet, by contradistinction to the very specificity of this information, we shall probably have to conclude that other, and lesser, authority was in charge of, presumably, the corresponding aspects of the yearly festival; unless indeed we were to suppose that the *ἱεροποιοὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν* were changing on a *prytanic* basis; which is a virtual contradiction; despite the fact that the sacrifices mentioned in our inscription are covered by the Aristotelian formulation «οἱ θυσίας τέ τινας θύουσι»; and that the

Hesychian lemma: *ἱεροποιοί ἐπιμήνιοι*, could be perhaps forced by extension to refer to officers changing by the prytany instead of by the calendar month; which, after all, with the *twelve* later tribes would be thoroughly exact. But although the «κατ' ἐνιαυτόν» excludes the «κατὰ πρυτανείαν» or the «ἐπιμήνιοι»; yet I cannot dissemble my uneasiness at a state of affairs where *both* the Council appoints on a yearly basis a Board in some eminent enough sort of charge over certain sacrifices (including most of the important penteteric ones) *and* a part or the entirety of the Council constitutes some of its members as a Committee with analogous functions on a prytanically rotating basis - the two groups of officers being co-numerous. The likelihood is therefore that from the prytaneis *in actu* ten members are appointed and entrusted with the appropriate authority, when a need exists to conduct certain sacred rites by the Council, as the standing Committee of State, on behalf and for the benefit of the State. -

There existed also hieropoioi of θίασοι - v. *Inscription 427* (2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> inscription of the *θιασῶται Ἀφροδίτης*). -

Finally, boards of hieropoioi were attached to particular temples with clearly financial superintendence. Indeed the office fell into disuse after the reorganization of the management of the temples' treasures effected through the decree inscribed in *Inscription 14*. In charge of Athena's financial affairs were already the known *ταμίαι* (v. ll. 15sq.). The treasures of the other gods and goddesses, both the existing and the part of them given to the state previously as shown by the relevant documents, will be carried by the *ἱερεῖς* (l. 13), the *ἱεροποιοὶ οἱ ἐν τοῖς ναοῖς* and any other authorities with jurisdiction over the divine finances as at the time of the new regulations (l. 19), to the acropolis in the presence of the Council (ll. 20-21), where the newly appointed *board of the Ταμίαι* will receive them, deposit them at the opisthodomos of Parthenon, and manage and account for them in the future collectively (ll. 22 sq.). In fact the treasure of Athens was located on the right side of the opisthodomos, the accumulated treasure of the other divinities occupying the left side, as we learn from B ll. 23-24, which is really not another inscription (contra Dittenberger *ad loc.*, insufficiently), but a continuation of the same decree begun in A. The date of the decree must be early, certainly not later than the third quarter of the 5<sup>th</sup> century. The major significance of the event consisting, evidently, in the direct state control of the sacred treasures of the Gods.

With the reorganization of the financial management of the Temples' wealth, the chief function of the *ἱεροποιοὶ ἐν τοῖς ναοῖς* (cf. the *ἐπίτροποι* of a Greek orthodox church) was transferred to the newly instituted *ταμίαι*. We may assume that, consequently, many, probably by far most, of those bodies were effectively abolished or at least gradually disappeared for lack of pointed employment. The few that continued in existence, would have suffered a rearrangement of their activities



on the lines already circumscribed, and with a financial responsibility restricted to the supply, on behalf of the state, of the requisites and to the covering of the exigencies arising from the performance of certain ceremonies, esp. sacrificial. We hear twice of one such Athenian board in the 4<sup>th</sup> century from official literary lips: *ἱεροποιοὶ ταῖς Σεμναῖς Θεαῖς*. Our first source is Demosthenes, *Contra Meidiam*, §115 (p. 552): ...περιεῖδε δὲ (sc. Meidias Demosthenem) *ταῖς Σεμναῖς θεαῖς ἱεροποιὸν αἰρεθέντα ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων τρίτον αὐτόν* (so there were three members to this board), *καὶ καταρξάμενον τῶν ἱερῶν*. The second witness is Deinarchus, *Κατὰ Λυκούργου Εὐθυωνῶν*, Fr. 31 (Muller): *καὶ τὰς Σεμνάς θεὰς αἷς ἐκεῖνος ἱεροποιὸς καταστάς δέκατος αὐτός* (here the board has ten members). The reverential offering up and dedication contained in the “charistic” meaning (= on behalf, for the benefit and to the gracious acceptance of) of the “ethical” dative associated in both passages to the *ἱεροποιός* (which is also found inscriptionally depending on the corresponding verb, cf., e.g., *ἱεροποιῶ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ*, IG 11.2<sup>2</sup>.1257 (Delos, ~4<sup>th</sup> B.C.); *τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι*, SIG 1037 (Miletus, ~4<sup>th</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> B.C.)) well suits the former expression (*ἱεροποιοὶ οἱ ἐν τοῖς ναοῖς*) in view of the fundamental conception of a given Temple as the House of a specific God. We see that part of the hieropoios’ responsibility was to perform the initial acts of the sacrifice to the August Deesses, the *κατάρχεσθαι τῶν ἱερῶν*.<sup>2</sup>

Now the number of these functionaries was *three* around the middle of the 4<sup>th</sup> century; and, apparently, *ten*, say, a quarter of a century afterwards. A divergence, indeed, implicitly negated by *Etym. Magnum*, s.v. *ἱεροποιοί*, where, after the explanations quoted above it is added: *μὴ ἀγνοῶμεν δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσιν ἱεροποιοὶ τῶν Σεμνῶν θεῶν* (very appropriately differentiating them from the principal board of *ἱεροποιοὶ κατ’ ἔξοχήν*, par excellence, i.e. *οἱ κατ’ ἐνιαυτόν*) *τὸν ἀριθμὸν δέκα*. Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μειδίου (the adduced passage): «περιεῖδε ταῖς Σεμναῖς θεαῖς ἱεροποιὸν αἰρεθέντα ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων καὶ περὶ τὸν αὐτόν καιρὸν καταρξάμενον». Δείναρχος δὲ ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λυκούργου εὐθυωνῶν φησὶ «καὶ τὰς Σεμνάς θεὰς αἷς ἐκεῖνος ἱεροποιὸς καταστάς δέκατος αὐτός». - *Καὶ περὶ τὸν αὐτόν καιρὸν* is certainly corrupt. It is weak, to say the least, in meaning and deficient in style. In its place, the *τρίτον αὐτόν καί* of our Demosthenic text is *unanimously* supported by the manuscript tradition; and it is confirmed by *Ulpianus*,

<sup>2</sup> When just before the quoted passage Demosthenes speaks in succession of *ἱεροποιεῖσαι καὶ θῦσαι καὶ κατάρξασθαι τῶν ἱερῶν*, the verbal series denotes a gradual corresponding specification and concretization of the activities concerned from the more general supervision of things pertaining to a certain, sacred celebration, through the general idea of offering the sacrifice involved in those rites (to be distinguished from the actual hieratic killing of the animal), to the particular actions included in actually and directly effecting the first part of that sacrifice. – We conclude therefore that the inaugural sacrifice (*εἰσιτήρια*) of the Council was offered *ὑπὲρ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ ὅλης τῆς πόλεως* (*Contra Meidiam*, §114 (p. 552)).

who read thus without variants. Finally *τρίτον αὐτόν* can easily be taken as *περὶ τὸν αὐτόν*; and after the following *καί* became *καιρόν*, the sense required the addition of the initial *καί*. Which explains the corruption. Besides, the *Etym. Magnum* is often loose, if not inexact, in quoting; as this very entry amply indicates by the form of the Demosthenic passage in its former part above given. – Photius, on the contrary, testifies to the numerical discrepancy, by concisely informing us s.v., after supplying the same verbal account with the *Etym. M.* about the main body of *ἱεροποιοί*: εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι ἱεροποιοὶ τῶν Σεμνῶν θεῶν οἱ τὸν ἀριθμὸν εἰσὶ ἀόριστοι. - Now *indefinite* their number could not have been in the sense of an arbitrarily and continuously fluctuating membership, if we have to do with a *permanent* office, and not some *ad hoc* arrangement to satisfy temporal needs or occasional interests. The definiteness of the Demosthenic reference in its context, and the *similar* givenness of the incontextual Deinarchic passage, exclude the latter possibility. We must assume, therefore, a change in the number of serving members of the Board in question, effected sometime between about 350 and 323 BC. The reasons of the alteration we probably cannot now fathom. –

But the *older* arrangement specified a *three*-membered committee of *ἱεροποιοί* for the August Goddesses. As to the significance of their *triplicity*, Ulpianus appositely remarks *ad loc.*: τρίτον δὲ αὐτόν εἰπὼν, τὸ ἀξίωμα αὐτοῦ δηλοῖ διὸ καὶ ἔκρουσε τῶν ἄλλων τὰς προσηγορίας (a fair formulation of the force of the expression *τοσοστός αὐτός*, *when it implies presidency of the board*). Τρεῖς δὲ ἴσως ὑπέστησαν (perhaps *ὑπέστησαν*, *ἐπέστησαν* in Mueller's ed.), ἐπεὶ καὶ τρεῖς δοκοῦσιν εἶναι (perhaps <αί>) *θεαί*. Ulpianus testifies also to another fact of eminent importance. While correctly emphasizing the properly *elective*, and not merely *lotial*, appointment of this Board (καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν ὅτι ἔλαχον ἱεροποιός, ἀλλ' ἠρέθην, ἵνα μὴ τῆς τύχης ἀλλὰ γνώμης φανῇ τὸ ἔργον); he informs us that the nomination of its members, as well as the superintendence of the nearby located shrine of the Eumenides, was in the hands of *Areopagus*: (paraphrasing) ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου Πάγου Βουλὴ εἴλετό με ἱεροποιόν. And further below: ἡ δ' ἐξ Ἀρείου Πάγου βουλή τὸν ἱεροποιὸν ἠρεῖτο, ἣ τὰ τῶν Εὐμενίδων ἐπετέτραπτο, ὧν καὶ τὸ ἱερόν πλησίον ἴδρυτο τῆς Βουλῆς. [This is Wolff's text, as given by Dobson, the result of his laborious treatment of a corrupt and mutilated ms. as he says p. 2 of his *Praefatio* (Dobson's ed.): Quibus antem difficultatibus corruptissimi et mutilati codicis interpretatio me fatigavit, is fortasse credit, qui Graeca legerit, etc. In the *Aldina*, *Parisina* 1570 and *Mueller* it is read: ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν Ἀρείῳ Πάγῳ τὰ τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν Εὐμενίδων ἐπετέτραπτο καὶ πλησίον ἴδρυτο τῆς Βουλῆς, which is evidently inferior text].

About the *ἱερόν* by *Areopagus* we shall have more to say *infra*. The numerical correspondence of the *ἱεροποιοί* to the Goddesses as well as the essential involvement of the *Areopagitic* awesome Council in the former's appointment to the service of the

latter and in the administration of the shrine's affairs more generally, are strong evidences for the antiquity of their institution. It is a singular circumstance that such ordinances, having survived the tumultuous upheaval of the State-order during the Ephialto-Periclean reforms of the 460's, should be, partly at least, abolished in the second half of the 4<sup>th</sup> centuries. Let no one be so naïve as to believe that, given an initial significant triplicity of *ἱεροποιοίς*, a change in their number could be a mere question of formal analogy or practical convenience. Nothing can more efficiently enervate a powerful Institution than its uprooting and dissociation from age-long traditions, esp. of an essentially religious nature or reference. Are we, then, to intimate a novel anti-areopagitic tendency later in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, in reaction to the clearly and purposefully worked out "rehabilitation" of the Institution by the new Democracy after Euclides by the beginning of the century? Should we even postulate a discontinuance of the arrangements in question in the post-Ephialtic years and a re-introduction during the frustrating uneasiness in the last phase of the Peloponnesian War or the painful self-awareness of the first post-war years? In view of the total absence of any supporting evidence for the more daring hypothesis, we shall opt for the milder one entailing the less number of reversals, particularly in view of the fact that the function of Areopagus as a (one of many) criminal Court with cognizance of specific crimes, chief among which were man-slaughter and murder, would make it extremely difficult (especially after the virtual restriction of its authority to this area alone) to sever any existing connections with the divinities that religiously control this very field. –

I shall take leave of this matter with a final observation. It is remarkable that Ulpianus, explaining the *ἱεροποιοίς* in the present context, specifies a feature assimilating his function with that of Aristotle's *ἱεροποιοὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκθύματα*; for he says: *ἱεροποίων δὲ καλοῦσι τὸν ἐποπτεύοντα τοὺς μάντεις, ὅτε θύουσι, μὴ που τι κακουργῶσι ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις*. I take this as evidence of the existence and currency in Ulpianus' time of the Aristotelian division of the chief hieropoic offices; for there is no smoothly conceivable other reason why Ulpianus would fix his attention on one aspect only of a hieropoios' functional activity than that being presented with the alternative should judge the second option inapplicable as referring to a Board with a specifically restricted jurisdiction, the required service to the Eumenides lying without its compass (so far at least as this latter is given) and, at any rate, being incapable of providing that (fundamental if not exclusive) axis for the work of the hieropoioi concerned, which their appellation "*ἱεροποιοὶ ταῖς Σεμναῖς θεαῖς*" necessitates. Of course, the difficulty is, objectively, as great to identify our *ἱεροποιοί* with the former set of the Aristotelian magistrates; but it is not as explicit and manifest. –

Naturally I offer this very tentatively, as some sort of explanation for what can be simply an insufficiently clear idea of what an ἱεροποιός is, lost as the meaning of the expression may easily be between the *initial signification* and the *subsequent technical developments*.

For to repeat in conclusion briefly what I have analysed above: *Ἱεροποιῶ* is, at root, *sacri-ficio*. Thus in *Inscr. Gr. ad res Rom. Spec.*, 3.172 (from Ancyra) = Dessau, *Inscr. Lat. Sel.*, 8829 = CIGr. 4029, ἱερεὺς πεντεκαίδεκανδρος ἐπὶ τῶν ἱεροποιῶν is an exact trans-lation of *XV vir sacris faciundis*<sup>3</sup>. This initial and fundamental sense of the word is preserved, e.g., in Dionysius Hal., *Antiqu. Rom.*, I, 40 where ἀλλαγὴ ἱεροποιῶν means change of *sacrificators*, of those performing the Ἑλληνικαὶ ἱερουργίαι in question. (Cf. I, 80 and IX, 40 for the expressions ἱεροποιός νεανίσκος and ἱεροποιός παρθένος respectively in the same strict sense). From this basic signification, all the rest follows either by way of *distancing* (from actual performance to general overseeing and direction), or *restriction* (from conducting the entire sacrifice to κατάρχεσθαι alone) or *specialization* (from responsibility over any kind of sacrifice to relevance only to those connected with divination or to any specifically stated ones), or *generalization* (as from specific care of the sacrifice to broad superintendence in the relevant aspects of the entire ceremony or feast), or *addition* of associated duties and activities (as the financial management of the sacred rites) – or by any compounded modification out of these. -

[ Spring 1986]

---

<sup>3</sup> There are, of course, other renderings as well of the Latin phrase, as τόν δεῖνα, τῶν ἐπιτελουμένων ἱερῶν τῶν πεντεκαίδεκα ἀνδρῶν (sc. ἕνα), Dessau, *Inscr. Lat.*, 8830 ; τειμηθέντα ἱερωσύνῃ τῶν ἱε' ἀνδρῶν, *id.* 8834b; and a transliteration : τοῦ δεῖνα, κυνδεκεμουρίου, *id.* 8841. Οἱ πεντεκαίδεκα or οἱ δεκαπέντε ἄνδρες simply, were a common formula to signify the collegium, cf. e.g. *Dio Cassius* LIII, 1. Also «ἱερομνήμονες» is being used, Phlego, *Mirabilia*, 10. But very frequent in Latin is their appellation by their principal function, the guardianship and consultation of the Sibylline books (v. references in Wissowa, *Religion und Kultes der Römer*, p. 534, n. 3). And so in Greek, οἱ τὰ Σιβύλλεια ἐπισκεπτόμενοι δέκα ἄνδρες, Appianus, *Hannibalica*, (VII) 56; Dionysius Hal., *Antiqu. Rom.*, IV, §62: Ταρκύνιος δὲ τῶν ἀστῶν ἄνδρας ἐπιφανεῖς δύο προχειρισάμενος, καὶ δημοσίους αὐτοῖς θεράποντας δύο παραζεύξας, ἐκείνοις ἀπέδωκε τὴν τῶν βιβλίων φύλαξιν ; XIV, 11 <οἱ> ἐπὶ τῶν Σιβυλλείων χρησμῶν ἐπισκεψάμενοι τὰ βιβλία εἶπον etc.