Apostolos L. Pierris

On the Athenian Ἵεροποιοί

The unduly vexed subject of the Athenian ἴεροποιοί provides another minor but not negligible illustration of the embeddment of the poetic usage, here as always, on real facts. Given the opportunity let me briefly unravel the imagined knot. ἴεροποιοί, in Athens as elsewhere (cf. e.g. ἐν Δήλῳ, Inscr. Gr., Dittenberger1, 367, 1 sqq.; ἐν Καμίω, 305, 18; ἐν Μυκόλω, 373, 17 sqq.; ἐν Τέῳ, 234, 6; ἴεροποιοῖς ἐν Ἑρυθραίς, 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 ἄρχαι of a city-state: αἱ μὲν οὖν πολιτικαὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν σχεδόν τοσοῦτοι τινὲς εἰσὶ. ἀλλὰ δ’ εἶδος ἐπιμελείας ἤ περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς, οἷον ἱερείς τε καὶ ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν περὶ τὰ ἱερά, τοῦ σώζεσθαι ταῦτα ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ἀναφθούσθαι τὰ πίπτοντα τῶν οἰκοδομήματος 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 ἴεροποιοὺς καὶ ναοφύλακας καὶ ταμίας τῶν ἱερῶν χοιμάτων. ἐχομένης δὲ ταύτης (sc. of the overseeing magistracy) ἢ πρὸς τὰς θυσίας ἀφωρισμένη τὰς κοινὰς πάσας, ὡς ὅ τις ἱερεὺς ἀποδίδωσι ὁ νόμος, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς κοινῆς ἔστιας (sc. τῆς πόλεως) ἔχουσι τὴν τιμήν καλοῦσι δ’ οὐ μὲν ἄρχοντας τούτους, οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς, οἱ δὲ πρυτάνεις.

In Athens there were in Aristotle’s time two chief boards of ἴεροποιοί with extensive jurisdiction, the ten ἴεροποιοί οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκθύματα καλούμενοι and the ten ἴεροποιοὶ οἱ κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν καλούμενοι, v. Λθ. 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: ἵεροσποιοί. δέκα ὄντες οὕτω ἔθυνον θυσίας <τινὰς καὶ τὰς> πενταετηρίδας <διόκουν>, τὴν εἰς Δήλον, τὴν ἐν Βραυρόν, τὴν τῶν Ἡρακλείων, τὴν Ἑλευσίνην. (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 ἵεροσποιοί 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 literally 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: ἵεροσποιοὶ κληροτοί ἄρχοντες εἰς δέκα τῶν ἀριθμῶν, οἱ τα τε μαντευματα ἱεροθετοῦναι (this equals the Aristotelian τὰ μαντευτὰ ἱερὰ θύουσι meaning sacrifices divinationally ordained) κἂν τι καλλιερήσει δὲ καλλιεροῦσι 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 ἐπιτελοῦσί καὶ τὰς πενταετηρίδας ἀπάσας διοικοῦσι πλήν 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 ἵεροσποιοὶ 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) we have the ἵεροσποιοὶ 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 ἵεροσποιοὶ is evident at a glance from this inscription alone).¹ Again in Inscription 380, the same chief, single body must be meant by «ἱεροστοιοί» without any qualification. And the same must be true regarding the ἵεροσποιοὶ of Inscription 2 (probably datable at around 460 BC), where, however, we found them involved in the regulations concerning certain aspects of Μεγάλα Παναθηναία. (In fact, these

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

[ἐκ Παναθηναίων ἐκβάτομης παρὰ…

Ἐκατόμη Παναθηναίων can only refer to the Greater Panathenaea, and they would then have to be celebrated in a 4th Olympic year. The restoration must therefore be faulty. – Among the responsibilities of the ἵεροσποιοὶ, 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 4th 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’ ἐνιαυτὸν (ll. 6-7). From the expression there, Διύλλοι Ἐρχείει καὶ συναρχοῦσιν, we gather that there was one chief among the members of the board, perhaps (something frequent with such συναρχίαι) 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 ἱεροποιοὶ. First Philippic §26 (p. 47): οὐκ ἐξειροτονεῖτε δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν δέκα ταξιάρχους καὶ στρατηγοὺς καὶ φυλάρχους καὶ ἰππάρχους δύο; τί οὖν οὗτοι ποιοῦσι; πλὴν ἐνός ἄνδρός, ὅν ἀν ἐκπέμψατε ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον, οἱ λοιποὶ τὰς πομπᾶς 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 ἀγοντες 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): ἱεροποιοὶ τὸν ἐπισκοποῦντα τὰ θύματα μὴ αδόκιμαι καὶ πηρά. The Demostenic passage mentions Meidias as ἱεροποιός simpliciter: ύμείς γαρ, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τούτον ἐξειροτονήσατε τῆς Παράλου ταμίαν, ὅταν τοιούτων οἱς ἐστι, καὶ πάλιν ἰππάρχον, ὀχείσθαι διὰ τῆς ἄγοφας ταῖς πομπαίς οὐ δυνάμενον, καὶ μυστηριών ἐπιμελητήν καὶ ἱεροποιόν ποτε καὶ βοώνην καὶ τὰ τοιαύτα δή. If Demosthenes means to apply the initial ἐξειροτονήσατε 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 ἐπιχειροτονίαι (and the complementary, but rare, ἀποχειροτονίαι; cf. for an example, Demosthenes, Contra Theocrinem, p. 1330) rather than a proper elective operation; for Aristotle explicitly makes them κληρωτοὺς by the Boule, 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 ἄρχην, ἣν ἐκεῖνος ἄρχων ἐτελεύτησεν, ἱεροποιός
ων, παρά τούς νόμους, ἦχεν οὕτος, οὕτε λαχών οὕτε ἐπιλαχών. Notice here, too, the unqualified reference to an ἵεροσοιος as of a certain and determinate denotation.

There was thus one chief board of ἵεροσοιοι in the 5th and 4th centuries and this consisted of Aristotle’s ἵεροσοιοι 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 inscriptive evidence) with severely limited, albeit important, duties. - I mean the ἵεροσοιοι ἐπί 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: Αὕτα μὲν οὖν αἱ ἀρχαι κληροταί τε καὶ κύραι τῶν εἰσημένων 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 ἵεροσοιοι, regional or of a specific circumscribed jurisdiction, permanent or of limited duration. Thus we have four ἵεροσοιοι in the Marathonian Tetrapolis (Inscription 304); which fact clearly illustrates their normal numerical equivalence to some significant tribal or religious multiplicity. There were also ἵεροσοιοι τῆς Ἑλεονόθεν, Inscription 13 (belonging to the 3rd quarter of the 5th century B.C.); to which the ἵεροσοιοι τοῖς θεοῖν (according to the probable restitution in Inscription 384.116) may be identified. –

That Inscription 334.40 (ἐπανέσαι τοὺς ἵεροσοιοὺς τοὺς τὰ μνημεία ἵεροποιήσαντας Ἑλεονόθι) supports Dittenberger’s postulation of ἵεροσοιοι 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 φυλήται 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 by the people and the council on account of their virtue and justice (Ἀγηγηδος πρυτάνεως ἀνέθεσαν οἱ ἐπί Νικομάχου ἄρχοντος (Ol. 109, 4 = 341/0 B.C.) στεφαναζάντες ύπό τῆς Βουλής καὶ τοῦ Δήμου ἀρετῆς ἐνεκα καὶ δικαιουσύνης. 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 φυλήτας 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: Ῥαφρίας Ἐρχιεύς (one of the Aegidean Prytaneis) εἶπεν:
ἐπαινέσαι τοὺς ἱεροποιοὺς τοὺς τὰ μυστήρια ἱεροποιοῦσαντας Ἑλευξίνι καὶ
στεφανώσαι αὐτῶν ἐκαστὸν θαλλοῦ στεφάνω ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης τῆς
eis τοὺς φυλήτας – the ten names follow. As the decrees externalized on this stone
clearly proceed from a phyletic basis, the subscriptions ὁ δήμος 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/ποιὰ 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 τάλλα ἱερὰ
πάντα εἰσίν τα ὁ τῆς Βουλῆς καὶ θύων καὶ εὐχόμενοι ύπέρ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης,
kai πρὸς τοῦτο διευκολύνεσαι τὴν πρώτην πραγματείαν ἄπασαν πλὴν δυνὸν
ημέραν, καὶ ἱεροποιῶν καὶ θύων ύπέρ τῆς δημοκρατίας (as prytanis) etc. Similarly,
Demosthenes, Contra Meidiam §114 (p. 552): ...ἀπέτασασάμενος με φόνου και
τοιοῦτο πραγματείας ἐπαγαγόν, εἴσασε μὲν εἰς ἐστίν τοῦ υπὲρ τῆς Βουλῆς ἱεροποιοῦσαι,
καὶ θύσαι, καὶ κατάραξασθαι τῶν ἱερῶν ύπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ ὄλης τῆς πόλεως etc.

[Eisitēria 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 εἰσίν εἰς τῆς Βουλῆς εἰς τὸ
Βουλευτήριον ὡστε κατὰ γνώμην ἀπαντήσαι τῶν πραγμάτων τῆς 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
αὐτῶ τῶ βουλευτήριοι Διός Βουλαίου καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς Βουλαίας ἱερὸν ἔστι [to be
distinguished from the ἐστιαν, altar in the Convocation Hall itself, called sometimes
Βουλαία ἐστία as being of the Βουλή (Council) and of βουλή (deliberation). Cf.
Xenophon, Hist. Gr., II, 3, 52; Andocides, de Mysteriis, §44; de reeditu 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. Δεξίος (the famous Theramenes affair), καὶ εἰσιόντες οἱ βουλευταὶ προσεύχονται, ὁν κἀγὼ εἰς ἐν, ὡς ταύτα πράττων, καὶ εἰς τὰλλα ἱερὰ πάντα εἰσιόν μετὰ τῆς Βουλῆς καὶ θύων καὶ εὐχόμενος ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης (clearly extraordinary or rarer events are here meant on specific occasions), καὶ πρὸς τούτους προτανεύσας τὴν πρώτην πρυτανίαν ἅπασαν πλὴν δυὸν ἥμεραν, καὶ ιεροποιῶν 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: προσηγεῖται γάρ εἰσιώνυσι τῆς βουλῆς ὁ τάς 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 Βουλὴ ταύτα ταύτα, εἰσιτήρια ἐθύσε, συνειστιάθη σπονδών, ἵππων ἐκοινώνησαν οἱ στρατηγοὶ, σχεδὸν ὡς εἰπεῖν αἱ ἀρχαι πάσαι. Where notice the contrast between the arōist of the verbs referring to the council’s acts and the present of the corresponding previous remarks on the prytaneis: ἐγὼ δ’ οἴδ’ ὅτι πάντες οἱ πρυτάνεις θύουσιν ἐκάστοτε κοινή, καὶ συνδεσμοῦν τὰ ἀλλήλους καὶ συσπενδοῦσι, καὶ οὐ διὰ τούτο οἱ χρηστοὶ τούς 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 ἢ οἱ ἐν τῇ ἁρχῇ πάντες προίσι (whether this would include other dignitaries as well as 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 ἐτούς Αθηναίων νεομίκασι. (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’ ἄρχοντα and κατὰ θεόν, sc. god primarily Σελήνην and also Ἅλιον). –

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 ιεροποιῶ in Plato, Lysis, 207D: the Ἐμμαία 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 ιεροποιῶν τυχάνειν ἐκεῖνος μὲν οὖν ὄχετο etc.—
Ἰεροποιεῖν τὰ μυστήρια Ἐλευθόνι 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 Ἀγκυλήθεν (l. c. 28) is corruptly read and should be a name of a Διομείευς 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: ἱεροποιοὶ 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 προτανείαν» 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 θιάσοι – v. Inscription 427 (2nd and 3rd inscription of the θιασώται Αφροδίτης). –

Finally, boards of hieropoioi were attached to particular temples with clearly financial superintendness. 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. 15sqq.). 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 (I. 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 (I. 19), to the acropolis in the presence of the Council (II. 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 (II. 22 sqq.). 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 5th 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 4th century from official literary lips:
ἱεροποιοί ταῖς Σεμναῖς θεαῖς. Our first source is Demosthenes, Contra Meidiam, §115
(p. 552): ...περιείδε δὲ (sc. Meidias Demosthenem) ταῖς Σεμναῖς θεαῖς ἱεροποιοῦν
ἀφεθέντα ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων τρίτον αὐτῶν (so there were three members to
this board), καὶ καταραξάμενον τῶν ἱερῶν. The second witness is Deinarchus, Κατὰ
Αυκοῦργον Ἐυθυνῶν, Fr. 31 (Muller): καὶ τὰς Σεμνὰς θεὰς αῖς ἕκεινος ἱεροποιῶς
καταστάς δέκατος αὐτῶς (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 ἱεροποιῶς (which is also found inscriptionally depending on the
corresponding verb, cf., e.g., ἱεροποίῳ τῇ Αθηνᾷ, IG 11.2.1257 (Delos, ~4th B.C.); τῷ
Απόλλωνι, SIG 1037 (Miletus, ~4th or 3rd B.C.) well suits the former expression
(ἱεροποιοί 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 hieropoioi’s responsibility was
to perform the initial acts of the sacrifice to the August Deesses, the κατάρχεσθαι
tῶν ἱερῶν.²

Now the number of these functionaries was three around the middle of the 4th
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 ἅγνωσμεν δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσὶν
ἱεροποιοὶ τῶν Σεμνῶν θεῶν (very appropriately differentiating them from the
principal board of ἱεροποιοί κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν, par excellence, i.e. οἱ κατ᾽ ἕναιντον) τῶν
ἀριθμῶν δέκα. Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μείδιον (the adduced passage): «περιείδε
ταῖς Σεμναῖς θεαῖς ἱεροποιοῦν ἀφεθέντα ἐξ Αθηναίων ἀπάντων καὶ περὶ τῶν
αὐτῶν καταράξαμεν». Δείναρχος δὲ ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λυκοῦργον εὐθυνῶν φησί
«καὶ τὰς Σεμνὰς θεὰς αἰς ἕκεινος ἱεροποιῶς καταστὰς δέκατος αὐτῶς». - Καὶ περὶ
tῶν αὐτῶν καταράξαμεν is certainly corrupt. It is weak, to say the least, in meaning
and deficient in style. In its place, the τρίτον αὐτῶν καὶ of our Demosthenic text is
unanimously supported by the manuscript tradition; and it is confirmed by Ulpianus,

² When just before the quoted passage Demosthenes speaks in succession of ἱεροποιοῖσαί καὶ θύναι καὶ καταράξαοντων 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 (εἰσιτήριον) of the Council was offered ὑπὲρ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ ὅλης τῆς πόλεως (Contra
Meidiam, §114 (p. 552)).
who read thus without variants. Finally τρίτον αὐτὸν can easily be taken as περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν; and after the following καὶ became καὶρὸν, the sense required the addition of the initial καὶ. 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 ἱεροποιοι: εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι ἱεροποιοὶ τῶν Σεμνῶν θεῶν οί τὸν ἄριστον 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 incontexual 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 ἱεροποιοι for the August Godesses. As to the significance of their *triplicity*, Ulpianus appositely remarks *ad loc.*: τρίτον δὲ αὐτὸν εἰσώ, τὸ ἄξιωμα αὐτοῦ δηλοὶ διὸ καὶ ἐκρυψε τῶν ἄλλων τὰς προσφηγορίας (a fair formulation of the force of the expression τοσοστος αὐτός, when it implies presidency of the board). Τρεῖς δὲ ἰῶς ύπεστησαν (perhaps ύπεστησαν, ἐπέστησαν in Mueller’s ed.), ἐπεὶ καὶ τρεῖς δοκοῦσις εἰναι (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 ἐλαχῶν ἱεροποιος, ἀλλ’ ἤρέθη, ἵνα μὴ τῆς τύχης ἀλλὰ γνώμης φανῆ 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 ἢ ἐξ Αρείου Πάγου Βουλῆ εἰλετό με ἱεροποιον. And further below: ἢ δ’ ἢ Αρείου Πάγου βουλῆ τὸν ἱεροποιον ἤρετο, ἢ τὰ τῶν Εὐμενίδων ἐπετέτραπτο, ὅν καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν πλησίον ἰδρυτο 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: ἐπειδῆ γάρ ἐν Αρείῳ Πάγῳ τὰ τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν Εὐμενίδων ἐπετέτραπτο καὶ πλησίον ἰδρυτο τῆς Βουλῆς, which is evidently inferior text].

About the ἱερὸν by Areopagus we shall have more to say infra. The numerical correspondence of the ἱεροποιοὶ to the Godesses 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 4th centuries. Let no one be so naive as to believe that, given an initial significant triplicity of ἱεροποιός, 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 4th 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 severe 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 ἱεροποιός in the present context, specifies a feature assimilating his function with that of Aristotle’s ἱεροποιοὶ οἵ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκθύματα; for he says: ἱεροποιόν δὲ καλούσαι τὸν ἐποπτεύοντα τοὺς μάντεις, ὅτε θύουσι, μή 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 hieropoioi offices; for there is no smoothly conceivable other reason why Ulpianus would fix his attention on one aspect only of a hieropoioi’s 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 ἱεροποιοὶ 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, ἱερεύς πεντεκαιδέκανδρος ἐπὶ τῶν ἱεροποιῶν is an exact trans-lation of XV vir sacris faciundis. 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 Ἑλληνικὰ ἱερονυμία in question. (Cf. I, 80 and IX, 40 for the expressions ἱεροποιῶς νεανίσκος and ἱεροποιῶς 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 κατάχρεσθαι 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.
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3 There are, of course, other renderings as well of the Latin phrase, as τὸν δείνα, τῶν ἐπιτελουµένων ἱερῶν τῶν πεντεκαιδεκάνδρων (sc. ἐνα), Dessau, Inscr. Lat., 8830; τευμηθέντα ἱερωσύνη τῶν εἰ ἄνδρων, id. 8834b; and a transliteration: τοῦ δείνα, κυνίδεκεμοῦριον, id. 8841. Οἱ πεντεκαιδέκα or οἱ δεκαπέντε ἄνδρες simply, were a common formula to signify the collegium, cf. e.g. Dio Cassius LIII, 1. Also ἱερομνηµενες 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 Kulthe 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 ἐπισφανεῖς δύο προχειρισµένος, καὶ δηµοσίος αὐτοῦς θεράποντας δύο παραξεύεσαι, ἐκείνοις ἀπέδοκε τὴν τῶν βιβλίων φύλαξ; XIV, 11 <οἱ> ἐπὶ τῶν Σιβύλλειων χρηµῶν ἐπισκεψάµενοι τα βιβλία εἶπον etc.