

© 2018

Aaron Beck-Schachter

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE GODDESS ON PARADE: MOBILE CULT STATUES IN ARCHAIC AND
CLASSICAL GREECE

By

AARON BECK-SCHACHTER

A Dissertation Submitted to the

Graduate School-New Brunswick

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfilment of the requirements

For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in Classics

Written under the direction of

Prof. Timothy Power

and Prof. Thomas Figueira

and approved by

New Brunswick, New Jersey

May 2018

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The Goddess on Parade: Mobile Cult Statues in Archaic and Classical Greece

By AARON BECK-SCHACHTER

Dissertation Directors:

Timothy Power,
Thomas Figueira

This dissertation investigates mobile cult statues and their reflection in Euripides' *Iphigeneia among the Taurians* and the *Helen*. Chapter One deals with the physical evidence for small, mobile cult images: their traditional settings, contexts, and histories of exchange and movement. Chapter Two is a survey of the literary terms used to refer to cult images. The first part of chapter Three treats the evidence for “arriving” cult images in ritual festivals and processions. Using the Athenian tradition of the theft of the Palladion as a case study, the second part of the chapter analyzes the different ways a community could characterize this “original arrival.” Chapter Four presents an analysis of the different modalities of exchange which characterized the movement of cult statues. These images were objects manipulated by humans, and thus, all possible activities associated with possessions (theft, exchange, permanent loss, or freely given gift) were capable of influencing their use.

Chapter Five analyzes how these human situations influenced Euripides' *IT* and the *Helen*. I argue that in the *IT*, Iphigeneia, just like the “Bears” of the Arkteia, is dedication herself. As priestess of Artemis, she is a gift given to the goddess, and her movement reflects the traditional sequence of a dedicatory journey: travel, gift, and

return. When Orestes steals her back from the Taurians his action reflects the traditional concerns surrounding a stolen cult object: the rights and comportment of marginalized strata of society. On the other hand, in the *Helen*, the existence of the ghostly *eidôlon* removes all authority and “truth” from the representation and locates it in Helen herself. The effect of this relocation results in a focus *not* on the dramatization of the exchange of cult images as in the *IT* (that is, dedication or theft), but on the “truth” of representation itself. This critique culminates in the escape of Menelaus and Helen from Egypt under cover of a false burial ceremony where the active participants are not dead but alive. The historical burial of Spartan kings involved – in certain circumstances – the use of processed images of the dead called *eidôla*. I argue that Menelaus’ status as a figure *outside* the Agiad and Eurypontid sphere of authority combined with the emphasis on the living authority of Helen implies a critique of the use of representation to create authority in Sparta.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank Thomas Figueira. Without his advice, stimulating discussion, and generous-minded criticism, not only would this dissertation have been much poorer, it is probable that it would not have existed at all. Second, I would like to thank Timothy Power whose low-key assumption that I was working on something interesting was invaluable (and only intermittently interrupted by reality). At many points, Emily Allen-Hornblower graciously provided criticism and feedback on my treatment of Euripides. I profited greatly from my conversations with Alan Shapiro on all aspects this project.

My research would not have been possible without the support of Rutgers' Department of Classics and the Fulbright foundation. Much of the work for this dissertation was undertaken during periods I spent at the American School for Classical Studies. In particular, Margie Miles' wide-ranging intelligence and energy was formative for the conception of my project. I also would like to thank Jim Wright, Jennifer Neils, and Syl Fachard for their roles in making the school such a welcoming and stimulating place to work.

The conversations and experiences I shared with my friends at Rutgers and the American School made the process of writing this dissertation not only a bracing challenge but a pleasure. At Rutgers, these included Lisa Whitlatch, Eleanor Jefferson, Michael Erb, Brian Mumper, Aaron Hershkowitz, Ella Wallace, Dave Wright, Brian Hill, Steve Brandwood, and Emmanuel Aprilakis. At Athens, Maggie Beeler, Hilary Boussein, Chelsea Gardner, Jennifer LaFleur, Colin Whiting, and Emily Wilson were

irreplaceable. During my Fulbright year, the company of Tori Bedingfield, Aimee Genova, Justin Holcomb, and Ruben Post provided an ideal atmosphere to finish my dissertation. Nicole and Althea inspirationally survived my tendency to argue incessantly.

Finally, I would like to thank Lowell Edmunds for sharing his insight, expertise, and scholarship. I owe much of my ideas on this topic to all that I learned in his graduate seminars and in conversation.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Introduction	1
Part I	
Chapter One – The Mobile Cult Statue	14
The Development of the Mobile Cult Statue	19
A Case Study in Multiplicity	30
Chapter Two – Literary Terminology	39
Chapter Three – Mobile Cult Statues in Ritual	69
Modalities of Movement: The Athenian Palladion	88
Chapter Four – Material Exchanges and the Divine Will	105
Gift and Theft	106
The Will of the Gods	110
The Samian Tonaia	113
Part II	
Chapter Five – Euripides	131
<i>Iphigenia among the Taurians</i>	138
The Structure of a Mobile Cult Statue	181
The <i>Helen</i>	189
Conclusion	234
Bibliography	241

Introduction

This dissertation is a study of the phenomenon of the portable cult statue in ancient Greek religion and its elaboration in Attic tragedy. The first half consists of four chapters surveying the material, linguistic, and contextual evidence for the movement of cult statues. The second half presents a structural reading of two plays of Euripides (*Iphigenia among the Taurians* and the *Helen*) in terms of the evidence presented in the four preceding chapters. The first half gathers evidence for the ritual activity; the second half uses this evidence to interpret the plays. While each body of evidence cannot be used to support the other without a degree of circularity, my aim in giving both kinds of presentation (a descriptive survey and literary interpretation) is to demonstrate in new dimensions an abiding truth concerning the necessary interconnectedness of Greek ritual and Greek literature (especially tragedy). Naturally, this is a road many have trod before, and like any such highway it has its own pitfalls and topographical challenges that will be discussed below.¹

When put under scrutiny, religious beliefs can be reasoned about with arguments or explained by precedent, but they can also often be revealed in habits. These habits or routines do not always directly relate to the literal subject of the action or even attract much attention at all. They are enmeshed in the expectations and world-views of the participant, and they can often be more revealing of the unexpressed feelings and emotions that prompt religious activity than any freely offered rational explanation. The starting point of this study is that a particular religious habit – the dedication of a votive

¹ An example of a similar exercise would be an analysis of the practice of sacrifice or initiatory ritual that then led into a critical reading of the tragedies of Euripides. See, *e.g.* Guépin 1968; Pucci 1977; 1980: 131–67; Seaford 1981; 1989; 1994: 281–301, 368–405; Foley 1985: 205–58.

to a god – was determinative for how the ancient Greeks understood the nature and function of their cult images. Every cult image began life as a portable votive: as a gift, dedicated and brought to a divinity.

This basic votive nature of a cult image was reflected in its significance and use on multiple levels: first, broadly, the festivals and processions that centered around the images – the actions of carrying them, escorting them, bringing gifts to them – were recapitulations of the original dedication; second, the specific circumstances of the original action, for example, the origin of the image, the identity of the dedicator, whether it was stolen or lost, or fell from the sky, were reflected in the individual dynamics of the ritual; finally, third, because of what the cult images often actually were – primary representations of divinities – the pattern of action of the dedication, that is, the movement of the divinity from its original location to its new home, was figured not only as the travel to a temple by a celebrant and the dedication of a votive but also the movement of the actual, living divinity to its dwelling place. The significance of a cult statue was described both by a kind of belief in its animated “life” as a subject – its ability to think, decide, move and depart – and by a functional emphasis on its everyday use as an object: its ability to be possessed, to be given, and to be stolen.²

This mixture of animistic and functionalist beliefs regarding the treatment of sacred objects is not unique to Greece and is found in a variety of comparative contexts. For example, among the aboriginal tribes of central Australia studied by Durkheim in his *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, a certain class of objects called *churinga* played a central role in the religious life of the community. A *churinga* was usually a plank or

² Cf. Aston 2011: 312–22 on the incommensurable status of “*mixanthropoi*” divinities.

small board but in practice it could be anything: a stone or a plank of wood; it might or might not be thought to “look like” or represent something. In the societies that used *churinga*, any object at all worth remarking on was assigned membership to a clan: the sun, the moon, the stars, the rivers, the grass, chickens, and rocks. Similarly, the *churinga* were inscribed with the sign of a totem and were considered literal members of their particular clan. Alongside this idea of clan membership, a *churinga* was also, of course, an object able to be manipulated, hidden, stolen, and lent. The dynamics of its manipulation – just like the totem animal’s functional ability to provide food – determined its role in ritual. A collection of these objects was taken care of assiduously and were hidden in a special place associated with protection and asylum. In special circumstances they were loaned out or given to other communities. Adolescent members of the clan would ritually seek and discover the *chirunga* in order to complete their entry into society. They were handled and touched for protection and healing.

However, ancient Greek cult images have most often been treated – rightly – from the perspective of detailing the development of anthropomorphic sculpture. An emphasis on the geographical and temporal spread of iconographies and styles as well as sculpture’s aesthetic appeal and importance for education is central to this approach.³ Whether it is termed explicitly art-historical formalism, or takes the form of a study of the dialectic between the work of art and the beholder, this is a very natural perspective to take on the development and significance of Greek cult images.⁴ Formalism looks at Greek statues from the point of view of their similarity with a single – albeit important –

³ The structure of the entry in *OCD*³ s.v. Sculpture, Greek, Stewart 1996, is a representative example. Cf. Hallett 1986; Elsner 1996. For a critique, see Donohue 2005: 20–145.

⁴ For the latter perspective in particular, see Neer 2010.

aspect of our own, modern interaction with statuary: the aesthetic experience of the observer of the formal characteristics of a work of art. As an interpretive lens, this perspective is extremely far from the use of a cult image as a “magical talisman” or “relic.”⁵

On the other hand, the ritual transfer or procession of cult images between different locations was a conspicuous element of the religion of Egypt and the ancient Near East – cultures with significant if not uncontroversial connections to the religious practice of archaic Greece. For example, during the annual festival of “The Beautiful Feast of the Valley” at Thebes, an image of Amun-rê would travel in a *naïskos* on a royal barque down the Nile to visit the tombs of his Pharaonic successors.⁶ A depiction of the festival and its celebration by Amenhotep III (c. fourteenth century BCE) exists on the third Pylon of the temple of Karnak, and iconographic images of the barque are found well into the Ptolemaic period.⁷ In 668 BCE, the Neo-Assyrian king Ashurbanipal commissioned the replacement of the statues of the gods Marduk and Ashur at Babylon after their earlier removal or destruction.⁸ The cuneiform text describes the entire process of replacement from an initial consultation of oracles, to the renewing and remaking of the cult images, and finally to the gods’ installation in their temple. The final step in the process was a procession along a festive way into the center of Babylon. In a general sense, all of these rituals presupposed that a cult image was not simply an inanimate object, but a being that possessed life and a sympathetic connection to everyday human activities such as eating, dressing, and moving. The distance between an experience of an

⁵ On this issue, see Elsner 1996.

⁶ Lorton 1999: 145n35.

⁷ Murnane 1979.

⁸ Walker and Dick 1999: 60–6.

object as an animated “subjective” being, imbued – like the *churinga* – with full presence in the world, and a sculpture with its characteristics absolutely limited by qualities such as material, shape, owner, and maker can be described both as separate points on a continuum or elements of a continuous historical development; both are accurate from a certain perspective.

There have been many excellent recent treatments of ancient Greek cult statues, such as the work of Bettinetti and Scheer,⁹ but none of them, in my view, sufficiently analyze the double-sided charge of a cult statue, nor do any of them attempt what I set out to do in this dissertation, which is to explore in depth the issue of portability and then take into account the evidence of Euripidean tragedy. The recent studies of Platt and Petridou present detailed and insightful presentations of elements of the conceptual interaction with religious sculpture, but do not treat fully the mobile nature of cult images.¹⁰ The lack of a full integration of the plays of Euripides and the archaeological and literary testimonia is exemplified by Bettinetti’s (otherwise excellent) book *La statua di culto nella pratica rituale greca*. Bettinetti’s work includes a chapter on the ancient terminology for cult statues, a chapter containing an overview of the place of statues within the religion of the *polis*, and chapters on the ritual care of the statues (*i.e.* their bathing and dressing) as well as their role in prayers, supplications, processions and *theoxenia* rituals. Her analysis of the Damasia and Auxesia episode in book five of Herodotus is an excellent example of the strengths of her book.¹¹ Bettinetti uses the story to illustrate the communal role that a cult statues plays in an extended geographical area

⁹ Scheer 2000 and Bettinetti 2001; cf. Mylonopoulos 2010b.

¹⁰ Platt 2011; Petridou 2016.

¹¹ Bettinetti 2001: 65–78 on Hdt. 5.82–5.

(the Athenians, Epidaureans and Aeginetans all maintained a claim to the goddesses), the specific benefits they provided to the community that possessed them (they were fertility goddesses, worshipped with the performance of female choruses to prevent a famine) and the anxiety over their possible departure or theft. However, despite the large amount of literary and mythological evidence compiled throughout her book, Bettinetti's lack of an in-depth treatment of a single, chronologically fixed context renders her survey less than useful when the mobility of Greek cult images is in question.

Romano's *Early Greek Cult Images* is the fullest catalogue of all of the evidence for cult statues of the archaic and classical periods of Greece. The main body of the book consists of four chapters on the cult images known from literary, epigraphical and archaeological evidence arranged into six different regions of Greece: Attica, Lakonia, Elis, Thrace, the Cyclades, and east Greece. Her analysis of the (non-extant) statue of Athena Polias on the Athenian acropolis may serve as a representative example of her approach and her results.¹² The various relevant testimonia are collected systematically, and the differing interpretations of scholars are weighed against each other. Starting from the mention of a "rich temple" in the catalogue of ships (*Il.* 2.547–50) and the Kylon *logos* in Herodotus (5.71) and moving immediately to modern syntheses of the vexed geometric and archaic temple architecture of the acropolis, Romano provides an indispensable and thorough catalogue of what we know about Athena Polias. Related scholarship is dealt with systematically: Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, Philostratus' and Pausanias' descriptions of the appearance of the statue, the extremely vexed evidence concerning the role of the statue in the Plynteria and the Panathenaia, the fourth century

¹² Romano 1980: 42–57.

inventory inscriptions, and the iconography of the Parthenon frieze. This list highlights both the strengths and weaknesses of Romano's approach. It is detailed and thorough, but all of the evidence is gathered without attempting to place the Athena Polias in its historical and religious context, (which was of course not the intent of the work). Again, this can only be done with a synthetic analysis of a single example focused on a single contextual point. This dissertation will answer this need with an in-depth look at two late fifth-century tragedies that involve the geographic exchange of religious statues and therefore the exchange of cult and religion: *Iphigenia among the Taurians* and the *Helen*.

There has been much recent work on both the *IT* and *Helen*. Both plays have been the recipients of excellent modern commentaries.¹³ Produced in (possibly) 414 BCE, the *IT* presents multiple *aitia* for the cult of Artemis at Halai and Brauron in northeastern Attica as well as the Athenian Anthesteria.¹⁴ The many studies of Sourvinou-Inwood concerning the cult practice at Brauron, the play itself, and the ritual and mythological context of the narrative, together form an important starting point – both methodologically and thematically – for our approach.¹⁵ Our contention that the movement of the *bretas* of Artemis recapitulated the individual act of dedication, should be placed alongside Sourvinou-Inwood's presentation of the “zooming and distancing effects” of the *IT*, which serve to mark the transition from a foreign, savage state to the civilized contemporary worship of Artemis.

¹³ For the *IT*, see Platnauer 1938; Sansone 1981; Cropp 2000; Kyriakou 2006; Parker 2016; for the *Helen*, see Kannicht 1964; Dale 1967; Burian 2007; Allan 2008.

¹⁴ See Pohlenz 1930; 417–28; Kitto 1956: 312–73; Conacher 1967: 303–13; Burnett 1971; Luschnig 1972; Hall 1987; O'Brien 1988; Sansone 1975; Hartigan 1986; 1991; Wolff 1992; Mirto 1994; Goff 1999; Tzanetou 2000; Zeitlin 2005; 2011; Wright 2005; Marshall 2009; Swift 2010: 197–217; Torrance 2011; Meniel 2015: 140–61; McClure 2017.

¹⁵ Sourvinou-Inwood 1988; 2003a; 2003b; 2004.

The *Helen*, starting from the influential study of Solmsen 1934, has been analyzed in terms of philosophical binary oppositions: fiction vs reality, word vs deed, and truth vs. fiction.¹⁶ In the studies of Swift and Zeitlin, these dichotomies have been further developed to encompass a debate over both the nature of anthropomorphic representation and the normative Greek religion *per se*. My position will be a development of these ideas, namely, that the play problematizes or critiques a crucial element of the context and manipulation of cult images: the literal identification of an individual divinity with an anthropomorphic image. It is this critique that primarily determines the use and characterization of the *eidōlon* in the *Helen*. Unlike the *IT*, in the *Helen*, it is the actual woman herself, and *not* the representational object (i.e. the *eidōlon*), who is transferred to Lakonia, thus inaugurating her cult presence.

Chapter one is a survey of the material evidence for cult statues, especially small, portable images. While there has been much emphasis in the scholarship (and rightly so) on the formal techniques for and characteristics of the emergence of monumental “primary” cult images in the fifth century, cult statues were primarily characterized not by size or number, but by rather specific factors related to their original deposition or dedication.¹⁷ In particular, the evidence for the use and exhibition of religious statues indicate that a statue’s previous owner and location are the most relevant characteristics to identify when attempting to interpret the significance not only of large “primary images” but of the numerous smaller images that crowded Greek temples. At Brauron,

¹⁶ See Pohlenz 1930: 407–16; Solmsen 1934; Golan 1945; Griffith 1953; Kitto 1956: 312–73; Zuntz 1960; Burnett 1960; 1971: 76–100; Post 1964; Jesi 1965; Conacher 1967: 286–302; Matthiessen 1968; Segal 1971; Wolff 1972; Eisner 1980; Galeotti Papi 1987; Sansone 1985; Vickers 1989; Downing 1990; Arnott 1990; Juffras 1993; Meltzer 1994; Holmberg 1995; Pucci 1997; Zweig 1999; Tzanetou 2002: 346–51; Wright 2005; Friedman 2007; Torrance 2009; Swift 2009a; 2010: 218–240; Zeitlin 1981; 2010; Steiner 2011; Murnaghan 2013; Marshall 2014; Boedeker 2017.

¹⁷ Cf. Donohue 1997.

there was not one single cult image that embodied the divinity or identity of the goddess. Romano in her study listed *six* separate phrases that denoted the various images of Artemis: the *hedos* (τὸ ἕδος), the stone *hedos* (τὸ ἕδος λίθινον), the old *hedos* (τὸ ἕδος τὸ ἀρχαῖον), the *agalma* (τὸ ἄγαλμα), the upright *agalma* (τὸ ἄγαλμα τὸ ὀρθόν), and the standing *agalma* (τὸ ἄγαλμα ἐστηκός). At least in the Hellenistic period, even if there was a “primary” image of the goddess, all of these images of Artemis received cult worship – in this case dedications of clothing by women who were involved with childbirth. This situation is not unique; the *cellae* and porches of Greek temples were crowded with images and votives of all types. Some of these certainly would have a stronger claim to prestige and importance than others, but these claims did not exclude the existence of other images, and in fact, they depended on the existence of other the other dedications to put their qualities into relief. All cult images were dedicated at a point in the past; they had an origin and an original owner. This functional perspective – a focus on the “who” and “when,” not “what” – allows a much wider group of objects to be classed as “primary” and helps explain certain tendencies in the ancient terminology and in the ritual manipulation and transportation of the images. From this perspective, cult statue and votive dedication represent the same process and are best understood together.

Chapter two presents a synoptic analysis of all of the literary terms related to cult statues. The words span multiple contextual spheres and time periods and can affect and reference each other in surprising ways. These contextual spheres include: the psychology of dedication and cult, their role as valuable objects in a system of human exchange, and their role as literal representations or embodiments of divinities. The terms

fall into three groups. The first group contains words that belong primarily to functional religious or cultural situations. The second group contains those words that refer primarily to the materiality of the image or its antiquity *per se*, and the third group contains those words that refer primarily to concepts such as “representation,” “verisimilitude” or “likeness.” Taken as a whole, the three groups serve to define what and how the Greeks thought about their images. The historical development of Greek religious statuary, which we undertook in the preceding chapter, indicated that the group of objects considered to be “cult statues” was an extremely heterogeneous aggregate, and the literary terminology used to refer to the objects themselves confirms this. For example, parallel to the importance of the contextual human facts of “by whom” and “when” associated with a dedicated cult statue at a sanctuary, the term *agalma* refers fundamentally not to a physical object but to a contextual human relationship between the giver and the receiver of a precious gift. Historically, any sort of dedicated precious object could be termed an *agalma* and this flexibility was exploited by mythographers and poets who used the term to refer not to inanimate objects alone but also to young women who were exchanged and transported between *oikoi* in marriage agreements.¹⁸ An understanding of these intersecting semantic spheres is necessary for a full appreciation of literary treatments of the mobile cult statue.

Chapter three focuses on how the movement of cult statues was reflected in festival processions or *pompai*. The central focus of the discussion is the contention that every procession involving a statue recapitulated simultaneously two perspectives: a dedication and an arrival. We have many cases of mythological figures being given credit

¹⁸ See Blondell 2013: 12–13. For this dynamic expressed in tragedy, see Wohl 2009: xiii–xxxvii on Aesch. *Ag.*; Soph. *Trach.*; Eur. *Alc.*

for the first dedication of a cult image at a sanctuary; similarly, the common claim that a certain cult image fell from the sky hints at the importance of identifying the dedicator in the sanctioning and legitimizing of a cult image. Images were communally processed from temples to the countryside and then back again to the *asty* (city center) – a sequence that linked the private act of dedication and the public performance of cult. They were covered, uncovered, displayed, and moved on wagons or through the *polis* in the hands of celebrants. I argue that all of these ways of ritually moving a cult image can be understood fundamentally as analogues of a dedication of the original gift to the god and thus represent his arrival into the society or one of its meaningful components. The wide variety of processions in the festivals of ancient Greece indicate that this original moment could be interpreted in many different ways. Through an analysis of the Athenian reception of the Trojan Palladion, the second half of this chapter will explore how different communities manipulated and recapitulated their own original moments to fit each's own self-image.

Chapter four analyzes the series of interrelated factors that further determined the character of each community's interaction with a moving cult statue. First, the transfer or movement of a cult statue was a fundamentally two-sided action or process: there was an old locus of appropriation or ownership and a new one. Because a cult statue necessarily constituted a material possession exchanged between parties, when the community ritually reenacted the original arrival, the context of the exchange (*i.e.* whether the object was given, lost, stolen, or traded) was reflected in the festival performance. Second, this fundamentally two-sided dynamic was present in *both* aspects of a moving cult image: dedication and arrival. From the point of view of a human dedication, the movement of a

cult image was construed as an exchange: a gift or a theft; but from the point of view of an arrival, the movement was construed as a literal movement: exile, colonization, or abduction. We call these points of view respectively, objective, that is, with the human, process of a literal manipulation of an object foregrounded, or subjective, that is, with the subjective individuality of the divinity in question foregrounded. The fact that cult images, seen as representations of anthropomorphic divinities, were assigned anthropomorphic or “human” qualities underlies the use of subjective characteristics to understand their manipulation and use. For example, a pervasive idea surrounding ancient cult statues was that, if an image was stolen, the god(s) embodied by the images must have desired that outcome. This dynamic resulted in competing claims between communities to possession of cult statues and of related appurtenances (material and symbolic) being adjudicated by invoking or probing the “will of the gods.” Finally, the factors we have presented, including reciprocity between the divine and human spheres of existence, the psychology of dedication and cult, the nature of artefactual processing, aesthetic ideation, antiquity and inheritability, and monumentality with its cultural reception, are brought together in a case study of the treatment of the *bretas* of Hera at the Samian Tonaia.

Chapter five applies our understanding of the phenomenon of the mobile cult statue to Euripides’ *Helen* and *Iphigenia among the Taurians*. With each play we will focus on how the presentation of the image (the *bretas* of Artemis and the shadowy *eidôlon* of Helen, respectively) reflected the two-sided dynamic of cult images.¹⁹ In short, my contention will be that the *IT* recapitulates the objective or human-to-human

¹⁹ Propp 1968; Greimas 1983; Aarne and Thompson 1961; cf. Edmunds 2016.

dynamics of a mobile cult image while the *Helen* recapitulates the subjective ability of an image to successfully represent a divinity. Because of her prominent role in civic cult, a priestess could believably represent both the status of young women as *agalmata* or temporary possessions of divinities, as well as (more effectually than an inanimate object) a literal, subjective instance of a divinity. In the *IT*, this parallelism between statue, priestess, and goddess is close to the surface and reflected in the performance of the Arkteia at Brauron. In the *Helen*, the link between the return of the heroine and a sacred physical object is centered on the burials of the Agiad and Eurypontid kings at Sparta. In place of an actual object we have the shadowy, divinely manufactured *eidôlon*, and instead of a return or an arrival of a literal cult image, we see Helen herself – the living woman, and *not* the *eidôlon* – falsify her husband's burial, return to Sparta, and participate in local cult.

Part I

Chapter One – The Mobile Cult Statue

Romano, in her fundamental study, defined a cult image as “a sculptural image of a divinity” that serves as “a focus of worship for that divinity” or “evokes the presence of the divine.”²⁰ Romano further states that, archaeologically speaking, “what distinguishes cult images from other representations of deities is their special setting and their primary role in cult activities.” It is obvious that in many cases, identifying this “special” setting and “primary role in cult activities” is a very difficult exercise.²¹ Donohue has called into question the very concept of a “cult image,” arguing that it had no natural place in the language or thought of ancient Greece.²² Historically, size and monumentality of dedicatory setting has served as an important criterion for determining which objects have a “primary role” in cult. As Renfrew states: “a first criterion (*sc.* for identifying a cult image) will be scale (*i.e.* large) and number (*i.e.* single).²³

First, especially in the case of small-scale images, using monumentality, or more practically, placement in a temple, as the criterion for a “cult statue” has its drawbacks, as Renfrew knew well.²⁴ For example, in the Mycenaean period – a culture whose influence

²⁰ The definition is from Romano 1980: 2. Bettinetti 2001: 7–9 gives two defining criteria for a cult status: first, the statue has some kind of “miraculous” status, *i.e.* it becomes the object of veneration in an unforeseen and unexpected manner; second, the statue has a fundamental importance for the sanctuary or temple itself. Cf. the discussion of Mylonopoulos 2010b: 4–12.

²¹ See Renfrew 1981; 1985: 18–26; cf. Barrett 1991 on the “textual” reading of religion in an archaeological context. Whitehouse 1996 gives six distinctive categories: *sacra* (actual objects of worship), votaries (representations or stand-ins for offerings to deities or other supernatural beings), offerings (food items or objects intended for the deities’ use or glorification), objects used in rites, grave goods, and amulets (personal possessions used for ritual purposes). See Donohue 2005: 1–19 on this issue specifically regarding the identification of cult statues. On identifying non-anthropomorphic cult images, see Gaifman 2005: 150–5; 2012: 26–40.

²² Donohue 1997: 31.

²³ Renfrew 1985: 23.

²⁴ Cf. Nilsson’s 1950: 77 oft-cited definition of a temple: “a separate building set apart to be the abode of the deity and to shelter its image and paraphernalia.”

on Greece of the historical period is guaranteed linguistically and by documents – there is no evidence for formal temple structures, which are so common in the contemporary cultures of Egypt and Mesopotamia, nor is there evidence for large scale images of any sort, domestic, urban, or monumental.²⁵ This absence of traditional temples has led to interpretations of the religion of the Aegean civilizations as “aniconic” or representing a non-representational belief system. Accordingly, items such as the “goddess of the serpents,” were thus classed as votives and taken to represent priestesses or celebrants. This position has been challenged by, *e.g.* Rutkowski and Marinatos who, accordingly, include the “goddess of the serpents” in their discussions of Minoan religious iconography and cult images.²⁶

As far as number, it is important to note that even with the development of monumental sculpture and temple architecture in the seventh and sixth centuries BCE, small-scale spaces, which housed multiple small-scale images, were the rule, not the exception. The images of Athena in the Erechtheion and the Parthenon in late fifth-century Athens are the most well-known of the (beyond numerous) examples of a sanctuary complex with multiple cult images of the same divinity.²⁷ Votive images have a close relationship with “primary” representations of divinities, as the semantics of the term *agalma* will show.²⁸ This relationship is reflected in the capability of a Greek temple to be simultaneously a “dedication” itself as well as a “the dwelling of the god” and a

²⁵ On this topic, see Rutkowski 1986: 154–99. On Near Eastern temples in the prehistoric Aegean see, *e.g.* Bittel 1981; Albers 2001: 131–5; 135n17. For an overview of the question of Minoan palaces as temples *per se*, see Marinatos 1993: 38–48. For typologies of Mycenaean religious spaces, see Whittaker 1997: 8–46; Albers 2001: 131–5.

²⁶ See Marinatos and Hägg 1983. For Rutkowski 1973, the first Minoan cult statues are the stalactites and stalagmites in the sacred mountainous caves of Crete.

²⁷ See Donohue 1988: 58–9 on multiple cult images and pp. 28–35 below.

²⁸ See pp. 39–44 below.

“museum” where a large number of precious gifts (*agalmata*, *anathêmata*), including multiple images, were stored.²⁹ The evidence – both literary and archaeological – overwhelmingly displays a wide variety of dedicated or special objects, almost all being gifts from individuals or communal groups in thanksgiving for the past or in hope for the future.³⁰ At a basic level, the act of presenting a dedication attempted to ratify a relationship between the divine and human spheres. Some dedications or gifts might emphasize the attitude or accomplishment of the worshiper, while some might attempt to gratify or personify the gods – or, of course, both simultaneously.³¹ In Steiner’s formulation, votive images either functioned to demonstrate a gift of equal value for the help of the deity, or served as a visible reenactment of the original dedication.³² From the very earliest periods of Greek history, a prominent and important type of gift was an image of the patron deity.³³

Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ description of the installation of the cult images at the temple of Fortuna Muliebris (*tuchê gynaiôn*) provides a glimpse at the popular psychology behind these dedications, including those privately and publicly financed.³⁴ The episode is narrated by Dionysius at length to argue the (basic) point that the gods are indeed pleased with the honors they receive, and do indeed respond to the gifts of humans with their presence. According to Dionysius, after the defeat of Coriolanus and the Volsci

²⁹ See, generally, Linders 1987 with Arafat 1995 on the Heraion at Olympia and Hurwit 2004 on the Parthenon.

³⁰ On the religious mentality of votive offerings generally, see Rouse 1902; Van Straten 1981; Burkert 1987; Kyrieleis 1988: 215–17; Naiden 2013: 39–81; Jim 2014. On their relationship to cult images, see Alroth 1988; 1989.

³¹ See Van Straten 1981: 69–77; Burkert 1987; Keesling 2003: 199–200; Baumbach 2009; and Jim 2014: 59–96 for the mentality of Greek votive offerings.

³² Steiner 2001: 14.

³³ See Rouse 1976: 357–60; Van Straten 1981: 81.

³⁴ DH *AR* 8.56.1–4; Plut. *Coriol.* 37.3–38.2; Val. Max. 1.8.4; On the *agalmata* of Fortuna Muliebris, see Anguissola 2006.

in 493 BCE, the senate decreed the construction of a temple (*nêos*) and of a statue (*xoanon*) to Fortuna; however, the women involved in the victory wanted another statue (*agalma*) to be made with the money, which they themselves had contributed, and both statues (*agalmata*) were duly set up together on the first day of the dedication of the temple. It was this secondary statue, not the one decreed by the Senate, which was subsequently said to “come alive” and “speak” thus confirming the satisfaction of the goddess at her gift.

Accordingly, cult statues are often difficult to disentangle – at least formally – from other representations of divinities such as votives or “secondary,” secular use statues.³⁵ Nilsson differentiated three classes of sculpted images: idols found in graves and tombs, votive idols from sanctuaries and cult idols from shrines or temples.³⁶ While this classification scheme is obviously relevant in many contexts, all three categories contain examples of what we would consider consecrated, religious objects; further, all three contain objects that can be stolen, imported, or processed as a mobile portable statue. For example, an anthropomorphic funerary dedication in a society that worshipped the spirits of communal ancestors would approximate well some of the most important features of a cult statue.³⁷ In a broad sense, we can imagine that the image of the deceased would be processed to its tomb and installed with the quasi-magical language of voyages, transition, and arrival we find so often in the Greek *polis* religion centered on cult images.³⁸ Moreover, a large number of individual, small-scale votive dedications at a

³⁵ See Romano 1980: 3–4.

³⁶ Nilsson 1950: 295. For other (similar) categorizations of sculpted images, see Renfrew 1985: 22–3; Warren 1986: 33.

³⁷ See, e.g. Murphy 1998 on the function of the prepalatial *tholoi* and their relation to Minoan ancestor cult along with the (much later) royal *eidôla* of Sparta with Schaefer 1957; Cartledge 1988: 331–46.

³⁸ See Steiner 2001: 6–7, 11–14.

sanctuary or temple could function communally as a collection, from which any object – seen as an extension of the collection – once taken and transported – would be transformed into what we would traditionally call a “cult statue” and dedicated at its new location.³⁹

The issues of scale and number are related. From a practical or economic standpoint, huge statues (size) are presumably expensive and thus by definition, rare (number), but this does not imply that they “evoked the presence of the divine” any more (or less) than cheaper, small statues, which were obviously more likely to be numerous. The complexity of the multiple settings, contexts, and functions of cult statues in the late archaic and classical periods does not allow for a strict division between secular and religious or even primary and secondary images of divinities. This is not to say that the distinctions between cult statue and votive or between temple and treasury are irrelevant. It is obvious that at every point in time there were significant differences in the perceived antiquity, prestige, and importance of the representations of divinities that crowded the porches and *cellae* of Greek temples. Some had, in Romano’s terms, “a primary role in cult activities” and some did not. My aim in what follows is not to present an exhaustive survey but to highlight the varied settings and characteristics of all the objects that could be considered cult images.

³⁹ Cf. the treatment of the Panionion in DS 15.49; Strab. 8.7.2 C384, with Brunel 1953; Malkin 1991. For the term *aphidruma*, see pp. 48–53 below.

The Development of the Mobile Cult Statue

The thousands of votive figurines found at the cave and peak sanctuaries, which developed in tandem with the palace at Knossos during Middle Minoan IB (c. 1900–1800 BCE) are the first evidence for a large scale, communal expression of religious belief in the Aegean.⁴⁰ At Petsophas for example, thousands of individual small-scale (none larger than .2 m high) anthropomorphic figurines were found, many of them with either arms clasped at their breasts or arms upraised. The gestures of these figures (especially those with arms clasped) and their sheer number have led scholars to see them as representations of individual celebrants.⁴¹ Perhaps the pilgrim or worshipper would make the journey up to the peak sanctuary clutching a miniature clay figurine formed with a gesture of supplication or adoration, which would mimic his own role in the ritual and embody his own cast of mind.⁴² He or she would then deposit the votive image in the presence of the divinity as either his permanent bodily representative at the shrine or as a representation of the divinity itself. This emphasis on the identity of the dedicator or celebrant and his relationship to the sanctuary would become a durable characteristic of religious activity in the Aegean throughout the Bronze Age and into the classical period.

Consonant with the personal, private aspects of Bronze Age religious activity, the majority of Minoan and Mycenaean cult objects and paraphernalia have been found in either nondescript rooms within the palace complexes of Knossos, Phaistos, and Mallia,

⁴⁰ On Iuktas, see, *e.g.* Karetsou 1981: 138–53; Rutkowski 1986: 75–80. It is likely that sanctuary was already in use as a cult location in EM IIB (c. 2400–2200 BCE). For the number of peak sanctuaries (both on Crete and elsewhere), see Rutkowski 1986: 96–8 who counts thirty-seven and Peatfield 1990: 199 who counts twenty-five. Cf. Nowicki 2001; Briault 2007.

⁴¹ See Rutkowski 1986: 71–99; Peatfield 2001: 52; C. Morris 2009: 182. Nilsson (1950: 75–9) interpreted the deity worshipped at Petsophas as belonging to the mistress-of-animals type.

⁴² For different characterizations of the activities at a peak sanctuary, see Marinatos 1999: 116–19; Morris 2009: 179–80. See, *e.g.* Van Straten 1981; Chaniotis 2009; Jim 2014: 60–96 on the religious mentality behind votive offerings to divinities.

or in what have been interpreted as separate, use-specific independent religious spaces away from palatial type buildings.⁴³ Only a small number of images have been found in what might be considered definitely a special or communally meaningful situation.⁴⁴ Despite this, it is conceivable that statues such as the “Snake Goddesses” and the image in the “Tomb of the Double Axes” had a role to play in displaying the “epiphany” of Minoan divinities in civic or state rituals.⁴⁵ There is some linguistic and iconographic evidence that images such as the snake goddesses could have taken part in a procession or “arrival” ceremony, where the image would have been revealed and then transported. Celebrants or priests carrying sacred objects in a communal procession is a not uncommon scene in Minoan wall painting.⁴⁶ Generally, the architecture of the palaces with their large stairways, long corridors, (restored) state rooms, courtyards with raised runways, and theatral seating arrangements strongly suggest a procession with the palace as its hub. In the Linear B tablets of Pylos and Knossos we find the terms “*thronohelkteria*” and “*theophoria*.”⁴⁷ Tablet Tn 316 most likely refers to a procession that transported numerous dedicated objects (including people) to various shrines to

⁴³ For the earlier position holding there were no temples, see, e.g. Nilsson 1950: 77. Gesell 1985: 2–3 differentiated six types of Minoan cult contexts; the terminology is controversial. For various distinctions between various Minoan religious spaces, see Van Leuven 1981: 11–26; Gesell 1985: 9–55; Rutkowski 1986: 154–67; Marinatos 1993: 87–111; Hallager 1999. For Mycenaean temple spaces, see Wright 1996: 37–78 and Albers 2001.

⁴⁴ All religion, even the most private, relies on publicly or communally held beliefs. For “official” or public cult as distinct from private cult in Mycenaean Greece, see, e.g. Hägg 1981a: 35–9.

⁴⁵ See generally, Marinatos 1993: 31–6; 51–75. On the Snake Goddesses, see, e.g. Gesell 1985: 34–6; 87–8; Panagiotaki 1999; Hatzaki 2009. On the “Tomb of the Double Axes,” see Gesell 1985: 26–9; 2004: 134; Marinatos 1993: 91–8; Hallager 2009; Alberti 2009; Rethemniotakis 1997. For epiphany in Minoan religion, see Marinatos 1993: 170–84; 2004, who suggests the iconography of two MM gold rings depict “floating” or “arriving” cult statues. See Burkert 1988a on a winged goddess riding on a cart from a Protogeometric grave outside Knossos.

⁴⁶ Marinatos 1993: 147–57; Shaw 2004.

⁴⁷ PY F 1222; KN Ga 1058 e-o-po-ri-ja/*θεοφόρια; see Weilharter 2013: 155.

divinities in the region of Pylos. There was also a tradition, preserved in Lactantius, that the Greek practice of sacrifice and processions began in Minoan Crete.⁴⁸

In the four hundred years from 1100 to 800 BCE, the production of both large and small-scale figurines in all materials had dwindled to practically nothing.⁴⁹ At the end of the eighth century, previously uninhabited panhellenic sites such as Delos and Olympia, and those connected to emerging *poleis* such as the Argive Heraion and the Athenian acropolis, began to receive dedications (*anathêmata*) of all types – especially bronze – on a huge scale.⁵⁰ This increase in metal dedications proceeded in parallel with the creation and gradual elaboration of monumental sanctuary complexes built to house both the gods and their belongings permanently. The contents of the sanctuaries came to include both “raw offerings,” or dedications from daily life (including jumping-weights, dress pins and weapons) and purpose-built or “converted” offerings, which included statues, many on inscribed bases.⁵¹ At the same time, sanctuary sites such as Perachora and Samos in the eighth century, and Isthmia and Corinth in the seventh, all obtained monumental stone temples in some form or another.⁵² A temple was the dwelling of a god to which either the divinity or the celebrant might arrive intermittently.⁵³ The felt dissonance between a material image of a divinity and the uncontrollable or inexplicable presence of divine aid

⁴⁸ Didymos Chalk. *ap. Lactant. Inst.* 1.22.19.

⁴⁹ Snodgrass 1980: 13–17. See also Burkert 1985: 51.

⁵⁰ Snodgrass 1980: 54–5; see also Langdon 1987 for the (tenuous) relationship of Geometric votive practice to Mycenaean cult.

⁵¹ For the distinction between “converted” and “raw,” see Snodgrass 1989; Keesling 2003: 11–12.

⁵² See Coldstream 1977: 280, 317–24; Morgan 1993: 19–20. For the classic elaboration of the Greek sanctuary complex, see Tomlinson 1976: 27–48; Fehr 1996.

⁵³ See Sourvinou-Inwood 2005: 150–2 on the cults of Dionysus; Naiden 2013: 44–5; 132–4 on the effects of a sometimes-present god who would need to occasionally “arrive” at his place of worship.

is the genesis of the (logical) modern view that cult images were temporary receptacles for gods.⁵⁴

In my view, the idea that Apollo did not inhabit his *nâos* permanently was not a reflection on the nature of cult images, but on the natural (and ironically static) unpredictability of divine presence in the world and the episodic character of human action. The difference is simply one of perspective. Just as in the ancient world, the choice likely reflected personal assumptions about religious practice and the location of unpredictability in the actions of the divine. In every case, unlike a mortal, Apollo could depart from his temple at Delphi and move to Olympus “quick as thought” but he still was thought of as having a destination and an origin.⁵⁵ In the *Odyssey*, Athena transports herself to “the well-built house of Erechtheus” while Aphrodite absconds to her *temenos* and altar at Paphos.⁵⁶

Greece was fundamentally a culture defined by the temple.⁵⁷ In Herodotus, the history and practice of Greek religion is characterized particularly by the use of images (*ἀγάλματα*), altars (*βωμούς*), and temples (*νηούς*).⁵⁸ The central activity at a Greek sanctuary was sacrifice, and regardless of size, its ubiquitous structure was an altar.

⁵⁴ Cf. Scheer 2000: 121; Steiner 2001: 80–95, 105–114; Aston 2011: 316–18; Chaniotis 2017. Cf. Edmunds 2016: 185–6 on Hdt. 1.31.4; 6.61.3.

⁵⁵ *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 184–6. Cf. *Hom. Il.* 15.78–9; *Hymn. Hom. Merc.* 43–6. Cf. Chaniotis 2017: 105–6.

⁵⁶ *Hom. Od.* 8.363–4: ἡ δ’ ἄρα Κύπρον ἵκανε φιλομμιειδῆς Ἀφροδίτη, ἐς Πάφον· ἔνθα δέ οἱ τέμενος βωμός τε θήεις. “Laughter-loving Aphrodite went to Cyprus, to Paphos where is her *temenos* and fragrant altar”; 7.81: ὣς ἄρα φωνήσασ’ ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη πόντον ἐπ’ ἀτρύγετον, λίπε δὲ Σχερίην ἐρατεινήν, ἵκετο δ’ ἐς Μαραθῶνα καὶ εὐρυάγυιαν Ἀθήνην, δῦνε δ’ Ἐρεχθίδος πυκινὸν δόμον. “So she spoke and grey-eyed Athena departed over the barren sea, and left lovely Scheria. She arrived at Marathon and broad-wayed Athens, and entered the well-built house of Erechtheus.” On these passages, see Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988: 325–6 (Athena) and 371–2 (Aphrodite). See also *Il.* 6.86–98, 270–8, 286–311 where the dedication and prayers of the Trojan women clearly presuppose both a temple and image of Athena. See Kirk 1990: 164–8, 198–201; Latacz and Bierl *BK IV* 2.37–42, 99–107; Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 99–101, 154–66.

⁵⁷ Burkert 1988b: 27.

⁵⁸ Hdt. 1.131.1. Cf. Gaifman 2012: 81–103.

Attendant to the altar, a Greek *sanctuary* often, but not always, contained a temple (*nâos*) that was usually built to house a certain “special” image of a divinity.⁵⁹ The temple consisted of a vestibule or porch (*pronâus*) in front of the inner room (*cella*) used to shelter the image, and sometimes a chamber in the rear used as a treasury, inner sanctum (*adyton*), or oracle chamber. A rear porch (*opisthodomos*) was also common. The image would usually be installed inside the *cella* facing the altar where the sacrificial animal would be led and killed before the “gaze” of the divinity.⁶⁰

Extant, securely identified, cult statues are rare. It has been long assumed – beginning from the ancients themselves – that the first Greek images, and thus the first cult statues, were carved from wood.⁶¹ Our lack of evidence makes this idea only an assumption, despite its inherent plausibility.⁶² Greeks of the historical period definitely worshiped small wooden images, which they believed to have been sculpted in ancient times by mythological figures such as Daedalus, or dedicated by heroes such as Danaus or Theseus.⁶³ Instead of a large-scale image standing alone in a *cella*, we are presented with evidence for a wide variety of settings, orientations, and contexts for small dedicated

⁵⁹ See generally, Miles 2016. There were multiple sanctuaries without a temple (*e.g.* Dodona, Amyclae; note the primacy of the ash altar at Olympia) or an image (*e.g.* Lykaion) but no sanctuaries without an altar; cf. Tomlinson 1976: 16–21; Romano 1980: 4–7; Burkert 1988b: 29–30. For the “empty space” aniconic Greek worship of Zeus, see Gaifman 2005: 173–95; 2012: 40–5.

⁶⁰ The eyes of the gods are lit by the rising sun in Aesch. *Ag.* 518–21. See Dinsmoor 1950: 49–50; Burkert 1985: 88–9; 1988b; Elsner 1996; Miles 2016: 212–3 with Vit. 4.5; Luc. *Syr. D.* 30.1 on the canonical orientation for a Greek temple.

⁶¹ Paus. 7.22.4; 8.17.2. See also, *e.g.* the discussion of Daedalus in DS 4.76.1–3 = Donohue 1988: T 59. For the sculptor Smilis, see Callim. *Aet.* fr. 100–100a with Dieg. IV.22–9 = 1, 105 Pfeiffer = Donohue 1988: T 108 and pp. 119–20 below.

⁶² On the history of theorizing the origins of Greek sculpture, see especially Donohue 1988: 175–235 and 2005: 20–56 on the history of the discovery and interpretation of Nikandre. See also Neer 2010: 33–6 on the “blocky” (*tetragonon*) effect of early Archaic stone *korai* and *kouroi*.

⁶³ For Danaus, who was considered to have dedicated images at the temple of Apollo Lykeios at Argos and Athena Lindia on Rhodes, see Zeno of Rhodes *FGrH* 523 F 1; DS 5.58.1; Paus. 2.19–20.3. For Daedalus, see especially Morris 1995 who posits an Eastern/Levantine “*daedalism*” in archaic Greek representational material culture.

images including integrated bases, pillars, benches, and columns.⁶⁴ The placement (and thus the identification) of a cult image was, and is still, determined primarily by its proximity to the ritual – that is, primarily animal sacrifice – performed in its honor.⁶⁵ This could occur either inside a temple before a hearth or outside before an altar. Public access to the cult image varied according to temple, god, and location.⁶⁶

The hollow, *sphyrêlaton* (hammer-beaten) statues of Apollo, Leto, and Artemis, found at Dreros on Crete, represent our earliest “cult images” of the historical period.⁶⁷ In 1935, three small, bronze images (the male was c. .80 M; the females .40 M) were found accidentally by farmers between two hilltops within the settlement. The excavator Marinatos later identified the location as a temple of either Apollo Delphinios or Pythios and postulated that it was constructed in the mid-eighth century, and was in use until the third century BCE.⁶⁸ Stylistically, the trio of images have been dated anywhere from the second half of the eighth century to the first half of the seventh century BCE.⁶⁹ Each statue was created from over thirty separate pieces, which were shaped back and front and then slightly overlapped and riveted together. Because of the disturbance of the temple prior to the excavation, there is much uncertainty about the position of the three figures at the time the temple was abandoned. Despite this, Romano, following

⁶⁴ For Attic statue bases as *anathêmata*, see Keesling 2003: 11–21.

⁶⁵ See Naiden 2013: 40–2 on the relationship of the image to animal sacrifice.

⁶⁶ Cf. Corbett 1970. See Mylonopoulos 2011 and Gawlinski 2015 on the low barriers sometimes erected in front of cult statues.

⁶⁷ Romano 1980: 283 has identified seven extant cult statues from the archaic and classical periods, six of which are monumental marble statues and include the archaic marble head on Keos. For discussion, see Romano 1980: 294–301; Gorgianni 2011. For the term *sphyrêlaton*, see Papadopolos 1980: 9–12.

⁶⁸ The evidence comes from an epebic oath (c. 300–200 BCE), on which, see Romano 1980: 284.

⁶⁹ The settlement was active from at least Late Minoan IIIC (c. 1100 BCE). Recent treatments of the temple at Dreros as well as deposition of the objects and their dating, include the excellent Romano 1980: 284–93; 2002; Bettinetti 2001: 13–16; Prent 2005: 283–93; Klein and Glowacki 2009. Boardman 2008: 2 dates the statues to the “early Orientalizing style of the eighth century.”

Marinatos, posits that the three images, identified as Apollo, Artemis, and Leto, were placed on a box conventionally called the “Keraton altar” (its name taken from the famous horned altar of Apollo on Delos) sitting on a dedicatory bench in the southwest corner of the temple.⁷⁰ The bench was installed behind an interior hearth at the base of a central supporting column and surrounded by material suggesting ritual: animal bones, burnt earth, and carbon.⁷¹

The sanctuary of Kalapodi, an important religious center of Phocis and Boeotia,⁷² was in continuous use from the Late Helladic (c. 1100 BCE) up until the Hellenistic period.⁷³ The portion of the site we are interested in consists of a pair of classical temples built on the foundations of a further pair of archaic temples. During the period between the destruction of the complex after the Persian wars and its subsequent reconstruction as a classical peripteral temple, cult activity on the site was concentrated in a small, temporary building erected on the ruins of the older archaic temple. Inside this building, was a large square limestone block (variously characterized as a base or altar) upon which were placed a terracotta mask, a bronze sacrificial spit, and a semi-circular cutting on the corner of the block.⁷⁴ Corresponding to this cutting was a votive-sized, small (c. 1.1 m) bronze male statue – identified as Apollo – found *in situ* with its feet sunk into the

⁷⁰ Plut. *Thes.* 21.1. For Apollo, Artemis, and Leto together, see Hom. *Il.* 5. 449–53 with Kirk 1990: 107.

⁷¹ On the location of the bench, see Romano 1980: 285. The raised bench located in an interior corner with its central hearth contrasts with what would become the usual orientation for a cult image in Greek Temples: at the rear of the *cella* on a raised base or podium and removed from the altar. For the relationship of altar to dedicated statue in early Greek temples, see, e.g. Dinsmoor 1950: 39–43; Tomlinson 1976: 27–29; Langdon 1987; Mazarakis-Ainian 1988; Burkert 1988b.

⁷² Felsch 1981; 1980: 38–40 believes that the sanctuary is dedicated to Artemis Elaphebolos. On the other hand, it is possible that Kalapodi is to be identified with the temple of Apollo Abai, a sanctuary nearby. On Apollo Abai see, e.g. Hdt. 1.46.2; 8.27, 33; Paus. 10.35.1–10; Strab. 9.3.13 C423; DS 16.58.3–6.

⁷³ Felsch 1981: 44–6.

⁷⁴ For an analogous dedicatory setting, see Keesling 2005.

rock up to its calves and fixed with lead.⁷⁵ The image is dated to around 500–490 BCE and holds its right leg forward. Its left arm is bent and hollowed out (possibly holding a lost bow).⁷⁶ Despite its small size, the *kouros*' placement directly in front of sacrificial equipment has been used to suggest that the image functioned as a cult statue, while its position and formal features simultaneously recall the posture of votive dedications.

Of course, cult images were often placed traditionally in a fixed temple setting. A good example is at Thessalian Metropolis, located immediately east of the Pindus Mountains and west of the Peneus river.⁷⁷ The peripteral temple of sandstone and mud brick was built sometime in the sixth century BCE and was in use until its final destruction in the second century BCE.⁷⁸ Inside the *cella*, a row of square stone bases supported wooden pillars on a central axis. Immediately to the east of the third column base, the lower half of a bronze figure was found on what the excavator interpreted as the statue base. The figure itself is one of the oldest and largest hollow cast bronze statues now extant and has been dated on stylistic grounds to around the third quarter of the sixth century BCE. Just as with the small bronze Apollo at Kalapodi, its right hand is raised holding a spear and left arm is lowered and bent. The hand is closed with a hole to receive an object – presumably a bow.⁷⁹

With the large-scale temple and statue projects inaugurated in the latter part of the sixth century and the beginning of the fifth, a new genre of huge images in precious

⁷⁵ Felsch 1980: 89–90.

⁷⁶ Cf. Richter 1960: 1–6; 26–9; Romano 1980: 163–81 on the cult image of Delian Apollo who holds a bow in his left hand. See Lapatin 2010: 133–4; Marconi 2011: 162–5 on similar images of Apollo on vases inhabiting his own temple.

⁷⁷ In 1994, a rescue excavation uncovered a sixth century Doric temple along with an archaic, hollow cast bronze image (c. .5 m tall) of a bearded, armored male. Cf. Intzésiloglou 2002a: 109. For other archaic hollow-cast statues, see Keesling 2003: 79–81.

⁷⁸ For the date, see Intzésiloglou 2002a: 110.

⁷⁹ On the identification of the temple and the (bearded) image as Apollo, see Intzésiloglou 2002b.

materials began to emerge.⁸⁰ Very often, these new images were part of a natural process of renovation and renewal. They were replacements for lost or destroyed small-scale “ancient” cult images of the archaic period. Pausanias reports that around 430 BCE, in the cave of Demeter “the black” (μέλαινα) near Arkadian Phigalia, an ancient image (*xoanon*) was lost, and the prominent sculptor Onatas of Aegina was hired to replace it.⁸¹ After acquiring a copy of the *xoanon*, Onatas created a bronze replica version for the Phigalians, which was itself subsequently lost in a landslide.⁸² The most prominent instance of this “renew and replace” policy was, of course, the Periklean building program, prompted by the destruction of the Athenian acropolis in 480 BCE.

In these cases, any pre-existing statues of the gods were not removed, but continued to be venerated as revered links to the past. Commonly this occurred in the same sanctuaries alongside the new, monumental images. For example, on Delos, we know of the existence of a (non-extant) monumental, gilded cult image of Apollo made by Tektaios and Angelion,⁸³ but also of an archaic *xoanon* of Apollo, which was supposedly first imported to the island by the Athenian Erysichthon.⁸⁴ On a fourth-century Delian inventory, multiple temples and images are enumerated, including “the

⁸⁰ On the formal aspects of the trend, see, e.g. Palagia 2008: 119–24. On chryselephantine images such as those at Delphi, see Lapatin 2001; 2010: 138–9.

⁸¹ Paus. 8.42.1–11. On this passage, see Burkert 1978: 125–9; Aston 2011: 99–100, 168–75 who treats the presence and absence of Demeter as significant elements of an expulsion and return to the community. On Onatas, see Paus. 5.25.12; 6.12.1; *AP* 9.238 with Dörig 1977. For the process of replacing divine statues, see Lapatin 2010.

⁸² See Linders 1989 on the repurposing of damaged votive offerings in Greek temples.

⁸³ Paus. 2.32.5. For the cult images of Delos in general, see Romano 1980: 162–210; Lapatin 2001: 105–6.

⁸⁴ The image of Tektaios and Angelion was most likely Peisistratean. For the *xoanon* of Erysichthon, see Phanodemus *FGrH* 325 F 2 *ap. Ath.* 9.392d; Paus. 1.18.5; 31.2; Plutarch *FGrH* 388 F 1 = Donohue 1988: T 108. In Paus. 1.2.5, we are told that Erysichthon brought an image in the opposite direction, from Delos to Athens. In Callim. *Hymn* 4.308–10, Theseus is responsible for the importation of the Delian image of Aphrodite from Crete.

temple where the *kolossos* is,” “the temple of Apollo,” and the “temple where the seven images are.”⁸⁵

Often these multiple images were not only housed in the same sanctuary but in the same temple. For example, Pausanias tells us that the Argive Heraion contained not only a monumental seated chryselephantine of Hera sculpted by Polycleitus, but also an “old” image of Hera displayed on a pillar, as well as a small, seated *xoanon* made of wild-pear wood.⁸⁶ Temple inventories at Samos and Brauron recorded dedications of multiple images, which were housed in the sanctuaries simultaneously.⁸⁷ At Brauron, a total of *six* separate phrases denoted the various images of Artemis at the sanctuary: the *hedos* (τὸ ἔδος), the stone *hedos* (τὸ ἔδος λίθινον), the old *hedos* (τὸ ἔδος τὸ ἀρχαῖον), the *agalma* (τὸ ἄγαλμα), the upright *agalma* (τὸ ἄγαλμα τὸ ὀρθὸν), and the standing *agalma* (τὸ ἄγαλμα ἐστηκὸς).⁸⁸ Pausanias tells us that the Lipari islanders dedicated twenty (!) large scale statues of Apollo at Delphi in commemoration of capturing twenty Tyrrhenian triremes.⁸⁹ This phenomenon has led to the characterization of Greek temples as “museums” or “storehouses.”⁹⁰

⁸⁵ *IG* XI.2 145.24: τοῦ ναοῦ οὗ ὁ κολοσσός; 145.40: εἰς τὸν νεῶ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. For discussion, see Romano 1980: 177–8.

⁸⁶ Paus. 2.17.4–5; cf. 8.46.3. *Xoanon* is Pausanias’ usual word for a cult image constructed of wood which he believed to be ancient. See Bennett 1917; Papadopoulos 1980: 1–4; Donohue 1988: 140–7 and pp. 54–6 below. On the statue of Polycleitus and its cuckoo, see Aristokles *FGrH* 436 F 1 with Lapatin 2001: 101–5. On the pear-wood *xoanon* of Argos (which originated in Tiryns), see Demetrius *FGrH* 304 F 1 *ap.* Clem. Al. *Protrep.* 4.47.5; Phoronis *EGF* fr. 3 *ap.* Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.164.1 with Donohue 1988: 34–6; T 44; 211; 340–1; Bettinetti 2010: 137–8.

⁸⁷ See Romano 1980: 172–81 (Delos); 86–97 (Brauron); 250–71 (Samos).

⁸⁸ See Romano 1980: 86–8.

⁸⁹ Paus. 10.16.7. None of these dedications have survived.

⁹⁰ See, e.g. Arafat 1995.

The temple of Hera at Olympia is a very well-known example of a Greek temple that housed a multiplicity of images.⁹¹ The Heraion was built at around 600 BCE on the site of an earlier, non-peripteral temple. Our earliest evidence for its contents comes from a notice that one of the Kypselids dedicated a large-scale golden image of Zeus to the goddess. The dedication is characterized as either as a tenth part tithe (*dekatê*) in the name of the Corinthians, or, less benevolently, as a ploy to keep his subjects destitute and occupied.⁹² The image, at least life size, was placed somewhere in the temple, perhaps in one of the niches between the interior columns of the *cella*.⁹³ Despite the fact that the famous statue did not survive into the Roman period, an amazing array of images was still standing in the temple to be seen by Pausanias.⁹⁴ These included the “simple” (ἔργα δέ ἐστὶν ἀπλᾶ) chryselephantine image of Hera with an accompanying standing Zeus, a group of seated *horai* by the Aeginetan Smilis, a Demeter and Kore, an Apollo and Artemis, a Leto, a Fortune, a Dionysus and a winged Victory.⁹⁵ Behind these images, that Pausanias described as “extremely ancient” (ἐς τὰ μάλιστα ἀρχαῖα), were even more statues: a marble Hermes holding Dionysus by Praxiteles and a bronze Aphrodite by the Kleon; still beyond these were figures of Hera, Zeus, the Magna Mater, Hermes, and Apollo with Artemis.⁹⁶

⁹¹ See Alroth 1989: 35–6. The earlier temple is tentatively dated to the end of the eighth century. See generally Dinsmoor 1950: 47; 52–4. Romano’s (1980: 140–1, 141n5) account builds on that of Mallwitz 1966.

⁹² The dedicator was either Kypselus or Periander. See, e.g. Pl. *Phaed.* 235a8–b4; Strab. 8.3.30 C354; 8.6.20 C378; Agaklytos *FGrH* 411 F 1 *ap. Suda s.v.* Κυψελιδῶν ἀνάθημα, κ 2804 Adler. For discussion, see Morgan 1994: 379–86; Papadopoulos 1980: 83–7; Gagné 2015: 64–78.

⁹³ Strab. 8.6.20 C378: σφυρήλατος χρυσοῦς ἀνδριᾶς εὐμεγέθης Διὸς. “A huge statue of Zeus made from beaten-gold.”

⁹⁴ Paus. 5.17.1–20.

⁹⁵ On Smilis (or Skelmis), son of Euclides of Aegina, (c. 600–500 BCE) see Plin. *HN* 36.90; Paus. 5.17.1; 7.4.4–7. The sculptor was credited with the *xoanon* of Hera at Samos, on which, see Romano 1980: 260–6; Donohue 1988: 202–5; Bettinetti 2001: 107–16. On dedications of pairs of goddesses such as Demeter and Kore, see Price 1971.

⁹⁶ On the (extant) statue by Praxiteles, see Ajootian 1996.

As far as extant remains, in 1897 the German excavators of the Heraion uncovered a large fragmentary limestone head of a woman.⁹⁷ Subsequently identified as a cult image of Hera and dated stylistically to around 590 BCE, the twice life-sized head (.5 m) was found to the south east of the Heraion, immediately next to the famous terracotta *acrotêrion* of the archaic temple.⁹⁸ The face has curls across the forehead, a band over the hair, and a *polos* or cap on the positioned on the center of her head. Based on the date of the sculpture and the description of Pausanias, the head was immediately identified as belonging to the “cult image” of Hera. However, as many scholars have noted, there are difficulties with this identification, and it is far from clear where exactly this head of Hera was originally installed or dedicated.⁹⁹

A Case Study in Multiplicity

If the Heraion at Olympia or the temple of Apollo on Delos contained multiple images of multiple deities, this did not mean that some of the images housed within were unimportant or disposable, while some were “cult images.” The picture is more complex and varied. The acropolis at Athens gives us a glimpse not only into the simultaneous existence of multiple images and temples of Athena, but also into the interrelated system of accreted histories that animated the origins of each dedication. These histories, in turn, give us access to each statue’s continually changing place in the religious life of the community.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷ Hill 1944 interprets the head as a sphinx. For further discussion, see Kardara 1960; Ridgeway 1977: 123–4; Romano 1980: 137–47; Arafat 1995: 463n17.

⁹⁸ The head was most likely built into the Byzantine wall; the stratigraphy suggests that the material surrounding the head was collected, harvested, or dumped sometime in in the second century CE. See, generally, Romano 1980: 9–10 citing Mallwitz 1966: 325–7.

⁹⁹ For the primary difficulties, see Romano 1980: 139–41; Ridgeway 1977: 124.

¹⁰⁰ On the multiple statues of Athens, see Shapiro 1989: 26.

The palace and fortifications on the Athenian acropolis date from the Bronze Age. In Late Helladic IIIB (c. 1300–1200 BCE) a monumental fortification wall was constructed, and until at least the seventh and sixth centuries, portions of this fortification structure were reused. The orientation of the wall was retained in the subsequent development of the sanctuary and original temple to Athena.¹⁰¹ During the geometric or early archaic periods (c. 875–600 BCE) the very first shrine to Athena emerged.¹⁰² Most likely in the last decades of the sixth century BCE, a great limestone peripteral temple to Athena was built on the central area of the acropolis, just south of where the Erechtheion stands today.¹⁰³

In the late archaic period, access to the temple was improved by construction of a huge approach ramp on the western side of the citadel, perhaps in response to a reorganization of the Panathenaia festival by the Peisistratids.¹⁰⁴ It was this Peisistratid temple, known as the *archaios naos* (old temple), that housed the ancient olive-wood statue of Athens: Athena Polias.¹⁰⁵ According to tradition, it was the Polias and her temple that sheltered Orestes after the murder of his mother and where the famous seventh-century athlete and would-be tyrant Kylon sought asylum.¹⁰⁶ Plutarch reports that after the sacred temple snake fled the acropolis in advance of Xerxes' approach,

¹⁰¹ See the reconstructions of Wright 1994: 341–9 and Shear 1999: 101–5.

¹⁰² It was this temple to which Kylon must have retired in Hdt. 5.71.1–2; cf. Σ Ar. *Lys.* 273. For the reuse of BA material in Athens, see, e.g. Mark 1993: 12–19; Mountjoy 1995: 40–7.

¹⁰³ The scholarship concerning the archaic temples to Athena on the acropolis is marked by strong controversies; see, e.g. Shapiro 1989: 21–4; Shear 1999: 105–10; Korres 1997: 218–43; Hurwit 2004: 67–71.

¹⁰⁴ For the ramp, see Shear 1999: 105–6.

¹⁰⁵ The statue was said to have been sculpted by Endoios: cf. Athenagoras, *Leg.* 17.3 = Donohue 1988: T 39. For the appellation *archaios*, see *IG I³* 7.6: [ὄπισθ]θεν τῷ νεῷ τῷ ἀρχ[αί]ο: “behind the ancient temple” (the inscription is dated to 460–450 BCE); Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.1. Cf. Kroll 1982; Ridgeway 1992; Lapatin 2010: 130–4. For sources concerning the Polias, see Romano 1980: 42–3.

¹⁰⁶ Hdt. 5.71.1–2; cf. Thuc. 1.126 (Kylon); Aesch. *Eum.* 79–80; Eur. *El.* 1245–50 (Orestes).

Themistokles persuaded the Athenians that Athena herself “had abandoned the city and was showing them the way to the sea.”¹⁰⁷ In the tumult of their flight, a gorgon head was dislodged from the goddesses’ aegis.¹⁰⁸

As Ridgeway notes, the original location of the cult image of Athena is a complex issue.¹⁰⁹ After the destruction of this *archaios nâos* by the Persians, and Themistokles’ flight with the image, the goddess was presumably restored to either a refurbished remnant of the destroyed temple or a temporary shrine to the north – the site of the Erechtheion, which was completed much later, in 406 BCE.¹¹⁰ It was here that Pausanias saw and recorded the position of the famous statue and christened it Athena Polias (at least, for the first time in our documentation).¹¹¹ One tradition held that the famous image fell from the sky (*diopetes*), while another held that Erichthonios dedicated it at the original institution of the Panathenaia.¹¹² Pausanias observed the image alongside spoil from the Persian wars including the scimitar of Mardonius and an ever-burning bronze lamp.¹¹³ It has been argued, most notably by Dinsmoor, that the image stood in an earlier, subsumed shrine or *naïskos* (little temple) in the east room of the *cella*, facing the altar outside where the Panathenaic procession would have concluded.¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁷ Plut. *Them.* 10.1: ὡς ἀπολέλοιπε τὴν πόλιν ἢ θεὸς ὑφηγουμένη πρὸς τὴν θάλατταν αὐτοῖς.

¹⁰⁸ Plut. *Them.* 10.4: ἀπολέσθαι τὸ Γοργόνειον ἀπὸ τῆς θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγάλματος.

¹⁰⁹ Ridgeway 1992: 124.

¹¹⁰ See *IG I³* 474.1: [ἐ]πιστάται τῷ νεῷ τῷ ἐμ πόλει ἐν ἡδὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἄγαλμα; “*epistatai* of the temple on the acropolis (in) which is the ancient *agalma*.” Dinsmoor 1932 and Hurwit 2004: 58; 71–4; 164–8 place the image in a temporary shrine on the building site of the Erechtheion. *Contra* Ferrari 2002 who posits that the setting for the image was a charred remnant of the *archaios nêos* used as a memorial. On the *opisthodomos*, a generally confirmed but different remnant of the *archaios nêos*, see, e.g. Linders 2007.

¹¹¹ Paus. 1.26.6.

¹¹² Paus. 1.26.6; Apollod. *Bib.* 3.14.6. Cf. also Plutarch *FGrH* 388 F 1 = Donohue 1988: T 108 who attributes the Polias’ presence to the “autochthonous inhabitants of Attica.”

¹¹³ Paus. 1.26.6–7.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Dinsmoor 1932: 307–26. On the relationship of the Erechtheion to the Panathenaian *pompê*, see Gerding 2006. On its relationship to the Plynteria, see Hollinshead 2015.

The wooden Athena Polias was, of course, not the only image of Athena on the Periklean acropolis.¹¹⁵ The monumental bronze Athena called the *promachos*, was constructed by Pheidias from the spoils of the Athenian victory at Eurymedon (c. 465 BCE) and towered over the western portion of the citadel.¹¹⁶ Another Pheidian work, the famous chryselephantine statue of Athena housed in the *cella* of the Parthenon was completed in 438 BCE.¹¹⁷

Perched on the southwest corner of the acropolis, the temple of Athena Nike also contained what we would call a cult image of the goddess. The temple and its supporting bastion were only completed in 422 BCE, but the location had long been a place of religious importance. Lying underneath the bastion that sheathed the Mycenaean fortification was a *naïskos* accompanied by an altar, which itself bore marks of previous cult structures.¹¹⁸ Included as a foundation deposit or repository for the *naïskos*, was a badly mangled statue base for a (non-extant) small-scale cult statue from the archaic period.¹¹⁹ In the mid-fifth century, the construction or refurbishment of a temple dedicated to Athena Nike was authorized by the *dêmos*.¹²⁰ A second, later, decree called for the refurbishment or replacement of the temple along with the care of a certain “ancient image” (*archaion agalma*).¹²¹ It is possible that this *archaion agalma* referred,

¹¹⁵ On the iconography of dedicatory Athenas on the acropolis, see Keesling 2003: 81–93. On the multiple images of Athena on the acropolis, see, e.g. Shapiro 1989: 24–9; Ridgeway 1992: 120–7; Platt 2011: 83–91.

¹¹⁶ See Paus. 1.28.2; Keesling 2003: 81–5; Hurwit 2004: 79–81. For the name *promachos*, see *IG* II² 4225.4 with Shapiro 1989: 32–8.

¹¹⁷ See Paus. 1.24.5–7; Hurwit 2004: 146–54.

¹¹⁸ The evidence for the previous cult structure derives from *IG* I³ 596, an inscription on an archaic (c. 580–550 BCE) altar. For the relationship of this altar to *naïskos*, see Mark 1993: 20–68.

¹¹⁹ See Shapiro 1989: 27; Mark 1993: 52–3; Lougovaya-Ast 2006.

¹²⁰ *IG* I³ 35 Cf. Gill 2001; Blok 2014.

¹²¹ *IG* I³ 64A 20–1: [κ]α[ῖ] τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἄγαλμα ἐπ[. 15 Νί]/κες ἡος κάλλιστα. Earlier editors identified the image as a reference to handlers of Athena Polias as in *IG* I³ 474.1. The current consensus is that the reference is to an image in the temple of Nike (the subject of the decree): Mark 1993: 108–14. For the image of Athena Nike, see Harp. s.v. Νίκη Ἀθηνῶν, v 17 Keaney; Paus. 3.15.7. See also *IG* II² 403 (cf.

not to a new creation, but to the refurbishment of the statue housed in the archaic base and included in the dedication of the *naïskos*. Perhaps after the Persian destruction, the statue needed to be temporarily housed and protected. It was this temporary situation that necessitated the construction of the *naïskos* and the promulgation of the first decree.¹²² The *naïskos* was then finally subsumed and replaced by the subsequent construction of the ionic temple and bastion in 422 BCE.

The practice of erecting small-scale settings or *naïskoi* for cult statues, which were then incorporated into monumental temples, is reflected not only in the Nike bastion and (possibly) the Erechtheion, but also in the structure of the Parthenon itself. In the floor of the Parthenon's north colonnade there is evidence for a preexisting small temple (*naïskos*) and a round altar.¹²³ The small shrine is older than the aborted early Parthenon (a structure begun in 490 and abandoned in 480 BCE) and probably belongs to the sixth century. Korres posited that the goddess of the shrine was Athena *erganê*, and indeed, the setting of the *naïskos* at the center of the iconographic program of the Parthenon facing the Erechtheion to the north, suggests that the image was intended to be understood in terms of the simultaneous presence of multiple of images of Athena on the acropolis.¹²⁴

The metopes from both the north (directly above the *naïskos*) and south sides of the Parthenon depict mythological scenes involving some particular small-scale, portable images. North metope 25 is usually identified as the Trojan Palladion and most likely

Thuc. 3.106–12), an order (c. 336–330 BCE) for the repair of a statue of Athena Nike dedicated from the spoils of victories in the 420s BCE.

¹²² So Mark 1993: 115–21; *contra* Shear 1999: 122–3.

¹²³ Hurwit 2004: 25; 74–6.

¹²⁴ Ridgeway 1992: 125–6; Korres 1997: 218–29 with Paus. 1.24.3. This allows a possible differentiation between “spheres” of influence” for Athena as in, *e.g.* Athena Parthenos and Polias, see Herington 1955.

shows a woman (either Helen or Cassandra) seeking refuge at the Palladion in Troy.¹²⁵ South metope 21 (known only from Carrey's drawings from 1687 CE) shows perhaps the disrobing of a small, archaic cult statue.¹²⁶ The setting of the *naiskos* and statue on the north porch perhaps evoked either the home of the ancient Athena Polias in the Erechtheion directly opposite, or the mythical Palladion depicted above it, or both simultaneously. Similarly, the statue depicted in south metope 21 could have evoked still *another* Athena statue, that corresponded to a different episode in the history of the famous Trojan image of Athena: the arrival of the Palladion in Athens and its installation at the Palladion court.¹²⁷ This court, one of four homicide tribunals in classical Athens, tried involuntary homicide and was likely located in the complex of early Athenian sanctuaries near the Olympeion, directly south east of the acropolis and the Parthenon.¹²⁸ Again, the existence of the monumental chryselephantine Athena of Pheidias did not prevent the Parthenon from referencing, by means of its topographical orientation and iconography, the simultaneous presence of the multiple cult images of Athena.

All archaic and classical Greek images of divinities share a single basic characteristic: they are gifts or votives (*agalmata*, *anathêmata*) to a god.¹²⁹ From the foregoing, we have sought to show that certain features of the history and development of

¹²⁵ See Schwab 2002; 2005: 183–90; Gaifman 2015: 272–9, 86 suggests Helen encountering Eros and Aphrodite.

¹²⁶ Cf. Robertson 1984; Hurwit 2004: 127n38; n39; Schwab 2005: 173–8; Sourvinou-Inwood 2011: 135n2. Metopes 13–21 were destroyed in 1687 CE. There is no consensus about their content, meaning, or relationship to the centaurs and Lapiths who surround them. Interpretive possibilities include: Daedalus, the Plynteria and Athena Polias, and the *aition* of the Palladion law court. For the Palladion, see pp. 86–103 below.

¹²⁷ For the Palladion court in general, see Ar. fr. 602 *PCG*; [Aris.] *Ath. Pol.* 57.3; *IG I³* 369.73; Paus. 1.28.8–11; Poll. *Onom.* 8.117–121; ΣAeschin. 2.87 with Travlos 1974; MacDowell 1963: 58–69; Boegehold *et al.* 1995: 47–8; 139–46; Burkert 2001: 85–96 and pp. 99–103 below.

¹²⁸ See Travlos 1974; Boegehold *et al.* 1995: 47–8.

¹²⁹ Cf. Lapatin 2010; Scheer 2000: 143–6 and Pirenne-Delforge 2010: 127–30 who advocates for the status of an *anathêma* as a cult object in a “loose sense.”

cult statues are relevant for our issues of transportability, substitution, surrogacy, and appropriation. That religious observance was fundamentally conservative entailed that older statues and those characterized by heterogeneity were altered, reshaped, and reimagined, all of which comprised normal processes that were fundamental to the aspects of motility that form my subject. The psychological effects of a Pheidian classical statue (to take a single example), which were generated by fixity, encapsulation, permanence, and monumentality, could be balanced by equally potent impressions elicited by mobility, lability, metamorphosis, and agency in appropriation.¹³⁰

At an abstract level, it made no significant difference whether the dedicator of the votive was a single individual bringing a miniature statuette to an Asklepieion, or the Alkmeonids retrofitting the temple at Delphi in Parian marble, or a democratic *polis* such as Athens voting to construct the *Parthenon*. All represented the same process: the dedication of a *agalma* to a divinity.¹³¹ According to Demosthenes, the entire acropolis, including the Propylaea and the Parthenon are *anathêmata* dedicated to Athena.¹³² The installation (*hidrusis*) of Monumental cult statues made of expensive rare materials and purchased by a unified city-state are not so much signals of a change in religious ideas, but rather a change in the organization and distribution of wealth and ideological power

¹³⁰ For archaic gift exchange in terms of religious commodities (*agalmata*), see Morris 1986.

¹³¹ Cf. Burkert 1988b: 43.

¹³² Dem. 22.76: τεκμήριον δέ: χρήματα μὲν γὰρ πλεῖστα τῶν Ἑλλήνων ποτὲ σχῶν ἅπανθ' ὑπὲρ φιλοτιμίας ἀνήλωσεν, εἰσφέρων δ' ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων οὐδένα πώποτε κίνδυνον ὑπὲρ δόξης ἐξέστη. ἀφ' ὧν κτήματ' ἀθάνατ' αὐτῷ περίεστιν, τὰ μὲν τῶν ἔργων ἢ μνήμη, τὰ δὲ τῶν ἀναθημάτων τῶν ἐπ' ἐκείνοις σταθέντων τὸ κάλλος, προπύλαια ταῦτα, ὁ παρθενῶν, στοαί, νεώσοικοι “This is the proof: once they (sc. the Athenians) possessed greater wealth than any other of the Greeks, they spent it all because of honor; tithing their private money for the sake of reputation, they avoided no peril. Because of these things, immortal possessions will survive for the *dêmos*: on the one hand, the memory of their deeds, on the other, the beauty of the *anathêmata* set up in their honor, the Propylaea, the Parthenon, the *stoae*, the docks.” Cf. Plut. *Per.* 12, 14.

of Greece.¹³³ The lonely, huge, gold and ivory *Parthenos* who stands alone in her *cella* dedicated by the democratic *polis* of Athens is a reflection of historical economic and social factors, not necessarily a revelation of changed religious factors.

Thus, the creation and dedication of the Pheidian *agalma* took part in a continuous religious tradition shared by every new generation of *anathêmata*, but it also was individually conditioned by its own specific, historical circumstances: a monumental statue purchased by an egalitarian *polis*. The Parthenos embodied the historical growth and power of the Athenian citizen body. While cognate with the deposition of a terracotta votive of a farmer, it is the fact that the *value* of the image was highly concentrated into a single object of immense value (ivory, gold, marble), and the identity of the dedicator that mark its unique status within Athenian society.¹³⁴ In a social or religious context, the identity of dedicator (who) and time of arrival (when), are the characteristics that best differentiate the images housed in Greek sanctuaries.

Applying this perspective to the Greek practice of transporting cult statues will allow the functional similarity between the dedication of very large collection containing very disparate contents – the group of objects considered to be cult images – to emerge. A line of connection may be drawn between the Bronze Age pilgrim making the journey up to Petsophas clutching a miniature clay figurine and the communal act of the Periklean *dêmos* dedicating the true cult image of Athena Parthenos. If the continuity of both the action and the role of the object is insisted upon, facts such as the identity of the individual or community who brought the object, the time when it arrived and the

¹³³ For the cost of the Parthenos see Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 121 with Lapatin 2001: 64–5; 2010: 142–4. On monetary exchange through *anathêmata* in Greek sanctuaries, see Davies 2001. On the ideological components of *hidrusis*, see Burkert 1988b; on the term, see pp. 47–9 below.

¹³⁴ On the status of the Parthenos after the fifth century, see Stewart 1998; Lapatin 2001; 2010.

location where it was brought from gain in importance. These were the main factors in determining the characteristics of cult images and we shall see that this individual, two-sided act of dedication was determinative for the festivals that recapitulated the acquisition or “arrival” of divinities and their images.

Chapter Two – Literary Terminology

Like any group of words that collectively refer to an important aspect of life, the terms used by the Greeks to mean “cult image”¹³⁵ are not uniform or taken from a single cultural context. Indeed, Donohue has argued that the umbrella concept of “cult statue” is a creation manufactured by post-iconoclastic and Christian thought.¹³⁶ The words usually classed as referring to “cult statues” fall into three semantic groups.¹³⁷ The first group contains terms that belong primarily to functional religious or cultural situations: ἄγαλμα, which refers to the enjoyment of the divinity in his or her worship, ἔδος, which refers to the spatial, geographical context of the sanctuary, and the pair ἱδρυμα/ἀφίδρυμα, which both refer to the choice of the worshipper to dedicate an offering. The second group contains words that refer primarily to the materiality of the image or its antiquity *per se*: βρέτας, which serves as an archaizing marker for antiquity, ξόανον, which derives from the idea that ancient Greek cult images were made from polished wood, and κολοσσός, which – despite the uncertainty of its derivation and original meaning – most likely stemmed from Greek contact with a type of (large) Egyptian dedicated religious image. Finally, the third group contains those words that refer primarily to concepts such as “representation,” “verisimilitude” or “likeness.” The term εἰκών derives from the verb

¹³⁵ There have since been many excellent individual studies on the terminology of cult images such as the comprehensive work on *xoana* by Donohue 1988, and the introductory chapters of Bettinetti 2001, Scheer 2000, and Mylonopoulos 2010b: 4–12.

¹³⁶ Donohue 1997: 31–45.

¹³⁷ Benveniste 1932: 132 organized all the terms under two headings. First, βρέτας, ξόανον, ἄγαλμα, and ἔδος were placed under the “semantic” heading and denoted “inanimate” objects, while κολοσσός, ἀνδριάς, εἰκών denoted “animate” or “animated” resemblances. Second, under the “etymological” heading, βρέτας and κολοσσός were classed as prehellenic while ξόανον, ἀνδριάς, εἰκών, ἔδος, ἄγαλμα were classed as Greek. For Benveniste, only the prehellenic words βρέτας and κολοσσός were specifically and uniquely connected to sculpture. Thus, the Greeks borrowed not only the technical expertise and models for representational sculpture from Egypt and the east, but they borrowed the concept of “double” and “representation” inherent in the “animate” terms from the prehellenic or autochthonous population of mainland Greece. For a critique of this perspective, see Vernant 1990.

εικάζω (“to make like”), the term εἶδωλον derives from εἶδος (shape, form), and ἀνδριάς derives from the diminutive of man (ἀνδριόν).¹³⁸

We said in the preceding chapter that the functional context for the dedication of a cult statue (by whom and when) is the most significant criterion for determining the role a cult image plays in a community. We will thus discuss fully terms that refer – either directly or indirectly – to the psychology of dedication and cult and the nature of artefactual processing. However, all the words that can denote “cult image” have a role to play in outlining the semantic field available for a mobile cult image and thus will repay full investigation.

ἄγαλμα

The noun ἄγαλμα¹³⁹ belongs to a group of substantives with the suffix *-ma*, that tend to be derived from verbs, in this case ἀγάλλω (to delight). The noun indicates the result of the action of the verb.¹⁴⁰ According to Hesychius, an ἄγαλμα signifies “everything in which one glories” (πάν ἐφ’ ᾧ τις ἀγάλλεται). It is a “showpiece,” that is, a precious object.¹⁴¹ The term occurs once in the *Iliad* and eight times in the *Odyssey*, where it is always a possession of a king, queen, or a god.¹⁴² In the *Iliad* it refers to a stained ivory cheek-piece of a horse’s armor fabricated by Karian workwomen.¹⁴³ In the

¹³⁸ Those terms that refer transparently to physical objects in an aniconic religious sense are not included, e.g. κίων (column); πρέμνον (stump), *sanis* (beam). For a treatment of these terms, see Gaifman 2005: 47–57; 2012: 22. Those terms that have an overly specific reference (e.g. δόκανα or βαίτυλος) are also not included. On the βαίτυλος, see *Etym. Magn.* s.v. βαίτυλος, 192–3.55–60 Gaisford, with Donohue 1997: 35; Gaifman 2005: 47–57. On the Spartan δόκανα, see Sanders 1992.

¹³⁹ Treatments of ἄγαλμα include Bloesch 1943; Gernet 1981; Morris 1986; Sheer 2000: 8–19; Bettinetti 2001: 27–37; Day 2010: 85–129.

¹⁴⁰ See Chantraine 1968: 6–7. Cf. also, pp. 47–9 below on ἴδρυμα.

¹⁴¹ Hesych. s.v. ἄγαλμα, α 261 Latte; ΣAr. *Thesm.* 773; *Anecd. Bekk.* s.v. ἄγαλμα, α 82 Nauck. The derivation from ἀγάλλω or ἀγάλλομαι was understood in ancient times; cf. Plat. *Leg.* 931a–e. For ἀγάλλομαι in Homer, see *LfggrE* s.v. ἀγάλλομαι B 1, 2, Mette.

¹⁴² See *LfggrE* s.v. ἄγαλμα B 1, Struck.

¹⁴³ Hom. *Il.* 4.144.

Odyssey, it is applied to the Trojan Horse, tapestries hung up as votive offerings, a sacrificial bull, horses, and personal adornments.¹⁴⁴ Bettinetti defines the word as “the sign of a certain force, which procures splendor, prestige, and therefore glory.”¹⁴⁵

In lyric poetry, the items that are described as *agalmata* are similarly varied. Pindar and Bacchylides call their own musical compositions *agalmata* as well as the city of Thebes and a (presumably sculptural) funeral *stêlē* of the Apharetidai.¹⁴⁶ In *Nemean 5*, Pindar tells us that he does not “fashion stationary *agalmata* that stand on their same base,” and indeed, because a primary way to please the gods in the late archaic period was to purchase or fashion an anthropomorphic image, the word is used very often to mean “statue.”¹⁴⁷ During the archaic and classical periods a wide variety of dedicatory inscriptions describe the objects on which they are inscribed (that is, themselves) as ἄγαλματα.¹⁴⁸ The capacity of such a pleasing gift or dedication to be simultaneously a precious, crafted “showpiece,” a gift to a divinity, and a visual representation of said divinity, all combine to underpin Hesychius’ definition (πᾶν ἐφ’ ᾧ τις ἀγάλλεται), and tend to center the meaning of ἄγαλμα on sculpted images of anthropomorphic gods or worshippers.¹⁴⁹ In his narration of the rape of Cassandra by the lesser Ajax, ἄγαλμα is Alcaeus’ word for the statue of Athena at Troy – the Palladion.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁴ Hom. *Il.* 3.274; 12.347 (votives); 8.509 (Trojan Horse); 3.438 (sacrifice); 4.602 (horses); 18.300 (necklace); 19.257 (garment).

¹⁴⁵ Bettinetti 2001: 29.

¹⁴⁶ Pin. *Nem.* 3.13; 8.16 (a song of praise); F 195 S/M (the city of Thebes); *Nem.* 10.69 (a *stêlē*). Cf. Alcm. fr. 1.69 *PMGF* with Tsantsanoglou 2012: 70–2 where the ἄγαλμα is an eastern headband.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Power 2011 on Pin. *Nem.* 5.1–8.

¹⁴⁸ Day 2010: 124–5, counts 17 examples of archaic and classical non-statuary inscriptions self-identifying as ἄγαλμα and 48 referring to statues, herms and statuettes.

¹⁴⁹ Cf., e.g. the statue of Zeus dedicated by the Spartans at Olympia after the second Messenian war as in Paus. 5.24.3; *CEG* 302, an inscription on a columnar statue base at the Ptoion in Boiotia claiming status as Apollo; cf. Day 2010: 127n198.

¹⁵⁰ Alcaeus fr. 298 *PMG*.

By the fifth century, ἄγαλμα was one of the most common ways to say statue. Both the chryselephantine image of Pheidias and the olive-wood Athena Polias were called ἄγαλματα.¹⁵¹ The word is Herodotus' preferred term for what we would consider a cult image and is used to describe both the image of Argive Hera and Athena Polias on the acropolis. However, it also retains its important application to votive dedications.¹⁵² In the *Histories*, ἄγαλμα carries the specific meaning of anthropomorphic image of a divinity when discussing the religious practices of the Greeks and the Egyptians, while in the context of discussing the practices of the Scythians, it can even approach the meaning “relic.”¹⁵³ The reference to anthropomorphic images is made clear by Herodotus' usual method of differentiating between the belief systems of the barbarians and Hellenes. The Greeks use images (ἄγάλματα), altars (βωμούς) and temples (νηούς) (a practice that they learned from the Egyptians) while the Persians and the Scythians do not.¹⁵⁴ The semantic combination of ἄγαλμα as a divine representation, and as a dedication or holy gift, partly explains the communal history that accreted around the large number of anthropomorphic images housed in classical temples: they were usually considered – however old – to be deposited and dedicated as gifts by

¹⁵¹ For the Parthenos, see *IG* I³ 458.2–3 (c. 445–438 BCE); for the Polias see *IG* I³ 474.1.

¹⁵² *E.g.* Hdt. 1.31.4 (Hera at Argos); 1.181.5 (Bel at Babylon); 5.71.1 (Athena at Athens); 5.82.1 (Damia and Auxesia at Aegina). For the word as dedication in the *Histories*, see, *e.g.* the dedicatory epigrams at Thebes in 5.60–1.1.

¹⁵³ Examples include the gilded skull in Hdt. 4.26.2; the iron scimitar of the Scythians in Hdt. 4.62.2; the small *agalмата* of the Mother of the gods worn on the breast of her adherents in Hdt. 4.76.4.

¹⁵⁴ Hdt. 1.131.1. Cf. Hdt. 2.4.2: δώδεκά τε θεῶν ἐπωνυμίας ἔλεγον πρώτους Αἰγυπτίους νομίσει καὶ Ἕλληνας παρὰ σφέων ἀναλαβεῖν, βωμούς τε καὶ ἀγάλματα καὶ νηούς θεοῖσι ἀπονείμει σφέας πρώτους καὶ ζῶα ἐν λίθοισι ἐγγλύψαι. “They said that the Egyptians were first to use the names of the twelve gods and the Greeks took them up from them; and they were the first to assign to the gods their altars and images and temples, and first carved living beings in stone.” See further, Lloyd 1988: 2.28–30. For θεῶν ἐπωνυμίας, see Parker 2017: 37–40. In Hdt. 4.59.2, the Scythians worship no gods but Ares (ἄγάλματα δὲ καὶ βωμούς καὶ νηούς οὐ νομίζουσι ποιέειν πλὴν Ἄρει). For these traditions and especially their relationship to aniconic worship, see Gaifman 2005: 105–116; 2012: 81–103.

individuals.¹⁵⁵ The Egyptian king Amasis dedicated a gilded image (ἄγαλμα) of Athena in the god's temenos in Cyrene, while the Persian general Datis, having run across a stolen ἄγαλμα of Apollo in his retreat from Marathon, was told in a prophetic dream to rededicate it at the temple on Delos whence it would be returned to (presumably) its owners at Boeotian Delion.¹⁵⁶

In tragedy, an ἄγαλμα can refer to a wide variety of high-prestige objects, but as a poetic word, its range of meaning was extended metaphorically to cover an even greater number of objects. These objects could connote some combination of anthropomorphic cult statue, beautiful, gratifying possession, and gift to a divinity. Sophocles used the word to refer to the reciprocal glory that a famous father bestows on his children and a noble child on his parents.¹⁵⁷ Similarly, Aeschylus calls Iphigenia the ἄγαλμα of the house of Atreus.¹⁵⁸ Euripides uses the word fifty-six times. Nineteen of those instances, spread across the *Andromache*, *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, and *Hippolytus*, are literal references to physical statues. These include the on-stage images of Thetis, Artemis, and the paired Aphrodite and Artemis respectively.¹⁵⁹ The other thirty-seven instances give a sense of the metaphorical flexibility of the term and especially the variation that its accompanying descriptive genitive allows. Euripidean ἀγάλματα include: the adornment of Alcestis, the woman Alcestis herself as she is led to her death (νερτέρων ἀγάλματα),

¹⁵⁵ Cf. the ancient dedications of Danaus in Paus. 2.19.2–3; Zeno of Rhodes *FGrH* 523 F 1; Lind. Chron. *FGrH* 532 F 3. In the Lindian inscription, dedications from the Telchines and Kadmos are listed alongside historical figures such as Darius and Ptolemy. Those dedications (or cult images) not associated with actual people could be described as arriving from the heavens or from the sea, on which phenomenon see Bettinetti 2001: 90–1 and pp. 105–6 below.

¹⁵⁶ See Hdt. 2.181–2 with Lloyd 1988: 3.233–41 for the *anathēmata* of Amasis; Hdt. 6.118 on Datis.

¹⁵⁷ Soph. *Ant.* 704.

¹⁵⁸ Aesch. *Ag.* 208.

¹⁵⁹ Eur. *And.* 115, 246, 859; *IT* 87, 112, 978, 997, 1000, 1014, 1038, 1158, 1176, 1316, 1385, 1441, 1448, 1480; *Hipp.* 116, 1399.

the altar of Zeus Soter that Herakles founded in Thebes (καλλινίκου δορὸς ἄγαλμ'), the famous palm tree marking Artemis' birth on Delos (ὠδῖνος ἄγαλμα Δίας),¹⁶⁰ and Kastor and Polydeukes in their homeland of Lakônîkê (ἄγαλμα πατρίδος).¹⁶¹

As is made clear in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, people, especially young women, are often described as ἀγάματα.¹⁶² While in late fifth-century Athens, to imagine a young woman as a “dedication” or “gift” was perhaps an affected usage, it has its roots in social practice.¹⁶³ For Gernet, an ἄγαλμα is fundamentally a religious object that is in current use and circulation.¹⁶⁴ In societies centered (in part) on gift exchange economies, a young *parthenos* was perhaps the highest prestige object available for exchange among aristocratic peer lineages.¹⁶⁵ For Finley, the gifts of marriage (ἔδνα) were one of the three fundamental contexts for gift exchange alongside restitution (ἄποινα) and guest friendship (ξενία).¹⁶⁶ A reference to the giving and receiving of marriage gifts is clearly present in contexts that involve physical images of young women. In a discussion of the Attic *korê* Phrasykleia, who offers a lotus bud to her viewer, Neer states, “*korai* are themselves tokens of exchange; they depict tokens of exchange (gifts of fruit, birds or flowers) and they narrate scenes of exchange.”¹⁶⁷ In classical Athens, the terms for the conveyance of a bride to her new household (ἔκδοσις) and the pledge or surety of

¹⁶⁰ For bronze votive palms (which were common) see, e.g. Plut. *Nic.* 3.6 with Palagia 1984: 518–21.

¹⁶¹ Eur. *Alc.* 613; *Heracl.* 49; *Hec.* 461; *Hel.* 206; for Eur. *Supp.* 632, see Stieber 2011: 115–45 and pp. 66–7 below.

¹⁶² Scodel 1996 who associates the fetishized body of a *parthenos* with the conspicuous renunciation of sacrifice.

¹⁶³ On this dynamic, see Wohl 2009: xxix–xxxvii; 60–82.

¹⁶⁴ Gernet 1981: 143.

¹⁶⁵ See Rabinowitz 1993: 38–54 on Iphigenia and the marriage economy *viz.* self-sacrifice and death; Scodel 1996: 114 on the ephemeral and thus high value of a *parthenos*.

¹⁶⁶ Finley 1982: 240–1; Seaford 1994: 16–25. For the term ἄγαλμα as part of the technical vocabulary of gift exchange, see Gernet 1981; Morris 1986.

¹⁶⁷ Neer 2010: 53; cf. Steiner 2001: 13–19; 238–50. See also Keesling 2003: 97–161 on *korai* generally.

ownership by her new possessor (ἐγγύη) has the unmistakable tenor of an economic transaction.¹⁶⁸

The wide metaphorical flexibility of the term ἄγαλμα is an aspect of a culture where statues were tokens of a two-sided relationship. Understood as a physical statue in a temple or a young woman about to be married, an ἄγαλμα almost always had an origin and a previous possessor as well as a destination and a new home. We will see that in the literary world of Euripides' *Helen*, all of the multiple meanings of the word ἄγαλμα converge on the character of the heroine herself who, in her role as the most beautiful woman in Greek myth, is figured as a beautiful, deceptive, fabricated object, wrongfully stolen from and then restored to her husband Menelaus.¹⁶⁹ It is partially the inherent semantic force of ἄγαλμα as an object in a gift-exchange that connects her return to Sparta with the return of a literal, physical object of religious import. Moreover, an ἄγαλμα is necessarily an object valorized by the shared psychological charge engendered in the parties to the interchange by their mutual joy in giving and receiving.

ἔδος

The term ἔδος is the fixed, geographical “seat” of a god. The term is a nominal form of the verb ἕζομαι (“to sit”) and means quite literally “seat.”¹⁷⁰ In Homer, it can refer to the seat of Achilles when he rises to welcome Odysseus, or the seats of the

¹⁶⁸ On these terms, see Redfield 1982. Compare Ferrari 2003 who connects the term ἐγγύη with a deposit of treasure in a vault, and Gernet 1981: 139–141 who underlines the tendency of *agalmata* to be hoarded and collected in a vault or *thēsauros*. For the literal *thēsauroi* in temples used for monetary deposits, cf. Hurwit 2004: 55–6; Gawlinski 2015: 71.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Wohl 2009: 83–99, who characterizes the Helen of the *Oresteia* as a “pure commodity.” The Aeschylean Helen thus functions as a fetishized *agalma* that symbolizes the process of exchange, while the Euripidean Helen is the agent that collapses the difference between that process and the commodity *per se*.

¹⁷⁰ See *LSJ s.v.* ἔδος I; *LfggrE s.v.* ἔδος, Norheider; Chantraine 1968: 313–14 with the related terms ἔδαφος, ἔδρα, ἐδώλιον, ἔδεθλον. Treatments of the term include Scheer 2000: 21–3; Bettinetti 2001: 52–4. Cf. *LSJ s.v.* ἕζω A I 2 with, e.g. Pin. *Pyth.* 4.204; *IG II²* 1514; 3177. In prose, καθίζω and καθέζομαι are used.

individual gods as they sit in assembly,¹⁷¹ but the extended meaning of “dwelling place” is present in the earliest uses of the word. In epic generally, the word refers most often to Mt. Olympus, as the abode or dwelling place of the gods, but could also describe other cities and geographical areas.¹⁷² Diomedes boasts that his father Tydeus captured “the ἔδος of Thebes of the seven gates.” Similarly, Amphion and Zethus are those who “first founded the ἔδος of Thebes”¹⁷³ and Athena displays to Odysseus “the ἔδος of Ithaka” upon his return.¹⁷⁴

Just as Mt. Olympus is simultaneously the physical “seat” of Zeus as well as his topographical “abode,” the primary significance of ἔδος is the settled, geographical position of a god’s sanctuary and its sphere of influence. In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, Leto wanders throughout the Aegean until she selects the island Delos as a suitable ἔδος for her son Apollo.¹⁷⁵ In Pindar, Sicilian Ortygia is the ἔδος of Artemis, while Aegina is the ἔδος of the Aeacidai.¹⁷⁶ In later poetry, especially tragedy, the connection to a specific divinity is often partially elided and a ἔδος can refer to the “seat” of an ethnic or geographical group. Thus, in Euripides’ *Orestes*, the citizens of Mycenae are addressed as “first of those close to the Pelasgian ἔδος of the Argives” while in Aeschylus’ *Prometheus Bound*, Prometheus’ suffering is bewailed by “all those who dwell in the ἔδος of Asia.”¹⁷⁷

Despite its relationship to a fixed, geographical “dwelling place” of a divinity, a ἔδος could refer to any aspect of the material elements of the sanctuary. The temple itself,

¹⁷¹ Hom. *Il.* 1.534, 581; 9.194; Cf. *Il.* 11.648; 23.205.

¹⁷² For the “seat of the Olympians,” see, e.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.360, 367; 8.456; 24.544; *Od.* 6.42.

¹⁷³ Hom. *Il.* 4.406; *Od.* 11.263; cf. *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 225; Aesch. *Sep.* 165, 241.

¹⁷⁴ *Od.* 13.344.

¹⁷⁵ *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 51.

¹⁷⁶ Pin. *Pyth.* 2.7; 12.2; Nem. 6.3. Cf. *Pyth.* 12.2 where Akragas is the ἔδος of Persephone.

¹⁷⁷ Eur. *Or.* 1247; Aesch. *PV* 412.

the altar, or any of the images of the divinities installed in the temple could all equally be termed ἔδη. For example, the humble domestic altar of the goddess Hestia could be called a ἔδος, while in Sophocles' *OT*, Oedipus is chastised for not respecting the “δαϊμόνων ἔδη” of Thebes.¹⁷⁸ In Apollonius' *Argonautika*, we are told that the Argonauts built (ἔδειμαν) a ἔδος to Hekate by the river Halys, a structure that must be an open-air altar.¹⁷⁹ In his discussion of the religious buildings destroyed by Xerxes during the invasion in 480 BCE, Isocrates refers to the “seats” of the gods in direct contradistinction to temples (καὶ τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἔδη καὶ τοὺς νεώς).¹⁸⁰ A funerary epitaph for Myrrhine, the priestess of Athena Nike, states that she “served the ἔδος of Athena.”¹⁸¹

In a number of cases ἔδος is used unequivocally to refer to an statue or statue of a divinity.¹⁸² In Callimachus, the statue that the legendary Danaus dedicated in the temple of Athena Lindia on Rhodes was a ἔδος,¹⁸³ while Isocrates calls the standing chryselephantine Parthenos of Pheidias a ἔδος.¹⁸⁴ According to Xenophon, Alkibiades returned to Athens, “on the same day that the Plynteria festival was being celebrated, the day when the ἔδος of Athena was covered.”¹⁸⁵ Despite the connection with the settled,

¹⁷⁸ Soph. *OT* 886; Eur. *Phaethon TrGF* fr. 781.35.

¹⁷⁹ Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* 4.250. Cf. Pin. *Pyth.* 4.204.

¹⁸⁰ Isoc. 4.155.6. For other phrases denoting the same situation, see Lycurg. 2.6; 143.5.

¹⁸¹ *IG* I³ 1330.11–13 = *CEG* 93: πρώτε Ἀθηναί/ας Νίκης ἔδος ἀ/μπεπόλευσεν (c. 430–400 BCE). Cf. Turner 1983: 85–96; Lougovaya-Ast 2006; Osborne and Rhodes 2017: 470–4 and pp. 145 below.

¹⁸² Cf. Hesych. s.v. ἔδος, ε 498 Latte: ἔδαφος, γῆ, ἱερόν, ἄγαλμα, θρόνος, λόγος, φρόντισμα, ὄρα, ἡ βάσις, βρέτας, βάθρον, τέμενος, ἀσφάλισμα, ἔδρασμα, καθέδρα.

¹⁸³ Callim. *Aet.* fr. 100–100a with Dieg. IV.22–9 = 1, 105 Pfeiffer: καὶ γὰρ Ἀθήνης/ἐν Λίνδῳι Δαναὸς ἴλιθον ἔθηκεν ἔδος. The fragment is found in a discussion of Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 3.8.1 quoting Plutarch on the topic of wooden *xoana*. For discussion, see Donohue 1988: 314–15, T 108. On the posture of Athena Lindia, see Romano 1980: 213–20.

¹⁸⁴ Isoc. 15.2.5: ὡσπερ ἂν εἴ τις Φειδίαν τὸν τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἔδος ἐργασάμενον τολμῶη καλεῖν κοροπλάθον. “just as if one might dare to call Pheidias, who created the ἔδος of Athena, a doll-maker (κοροπλάθον).”

¹⁸⁵ Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.12: κατέπλευσεν εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ ἡμέρα ἣ Πλυντήρια ἦγεν ἡ πόλις, τοῦ ἔδους κατακεκαλυμμένου τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. “They sailed into the Peiraeus on the day the city held the festival of the Plynteria; the statue of the goddess was covered up.” The date of the episode is 408 BCE. Most commentators have associated this ἔδος with the olive-wood statue of Athena Polias; cf. Plut. *Alc.* 34.1 with, e.g. Scheer 2000: 21n112; Bettinetti 2001: 54; Sourvinou-Inwood 2011: 136–40.

geographic “seat” of a divinity, small, portable images were often called *hedê*. A late fifth-century inventory inscription from the temple of Athena Aphaia on Aegina includes “complete planks (or platforms) for τὸ ἔδος and a chariot.” The collection likely represents supplies for a festival viewing or procession of a statue.¹⁸⁶ A third-century inscription concerning Aphrodite Pandemos on the southwest corner of the acropolis required *astynomoi* to whitewash the altars and wash the images (λοῦσαι τὰ ἔδη) of the goddesses whenever a procession was held.¹⁸⁷

ἴδρυμα/ ἀφίδρυμα

Similar to ἔδος, the term ἴδρυμα is a nominal form related to the verb to situate; in this case the verb is ἰδρύω (“to make sit down” or “place”).¹⁸⁸ An ἴδρυμα is thus a “thing placed” or a “thing set down.” The verb ἰδρύω, especially in the middle, very commonly means to “set down,” “place” or “establish” a temple, altar, or religious precinct of any kind; thus, an ἴδρυμα (like a ἔδος), can refer to any element of a sanctuary, including a cult statue.¹⁸⁹ The word is often found in the plural. In Herodotus, ἴδρυμα occurs once: on the eve of Xerxes’ invasion of Greece, the Athenians declare that they will not betray either the *hidrumata* of the gods or the “common practices and rites of the Greeks.”¹⁹⁰ In Aeschylus, respect for the *hidrumata* of the gods is invoked concerning both the sack of Troy and the invasion of Xerxes.¹⁹¹ In the *Choepheroi*, after the murder of Clytemnestra,

¹⁸⁶ *IG* I³ 1456.5–6 (c. 431–404 BCE): ἴκρια περὶ τὸ ἔδος ἐντελεῖ, θρόνος ... δίφρος.

¹⁸⁷ *IG* II² 659.26 (c. 283–82 BCE). In Pausanias’ time there were statues of Aphrodite Pandemos and Peitho in the sanctuary; see Paus. 1.22.3.

¹⁸⁸ On ἴδρυμα/ἀφίδρυμα, see Chantraine 1968: 456, who notes that the link between ἰδρύω and ἔζομαι (ἔδος) is not currently understood. Discussions include Malkin 1991; Bettinetti 2001: 54–63.

¹⁸⁹ See *LSJ* s.v. ἰδρύω 5 II. Examples include Eur. *IT* 1481; Hdt. 1.105.3; 6.105.3; *IG* II² 4961.1; cf. *IG* II² 4960–2 = *SEG* 47 232 (the Athenian cult of Asclepius).

¹⁹⁰ Hdt. 8.144.2: αὐτίς δὲ τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐὼν ὁμαμίον τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον καὶ θεῶν ἰδρύματά τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἡθεῖά τε ὁμότροπα. “and Greek culture, being of the same blood and speech, and the common seats (ἰδρύματα) of the gods and our sacrifices and common customs.” Cf. 8.109.3, 143.2.

¹⁹¹ Aesch. *Pers.* 881; *Ag.* 339, 527.

Orestes describes Delphi as “the ἴδρυμα, set square on the womb of the earth, the plain of Loxias.”¹⁹² The chorus of Euripides’ *Supplikes* invoke Zeus and describe the Argive dead as the “delight” and “foundation” of Athens (τὸ σὸν ἄγαλμα, τὸ σὸν ἴδρυμα πόλεος); this locution likely refers to their familial ties to Zeus.¹⁹³

Unlike ἔδος, which refers ultimately to geography, the word ἴδρυμα retains the active force of its derivative verb ἰδρύω and signifies primarily the result of a human *act* of foundation or establishment. In a discussion in Plato’s *Laws* comparing the religious respect paid to parents to that paid to cult images, we are told that “if a living parent is present in the home, there can be no better possession (ἄγαλμα) than such an image (ἴδρυμα) (sc. the parent) installed upon his hearth (ἐφέστιον) in his home (ἐν οἰκίᾳ).”¹⁹⁴ The emphasis of the comparison rests on the *decision* (and thus the action) of the worshipper to place an image of a domestic divinity at his hearth. This act of placement is contrasted with paying one’s full respects to one’s parents who are, of course, in the same space. The act of placing itself – as distinct from the tangible *result* of the action (ἴδρυμα) – is an ἴδρυσις.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹² Aesch. *Cho.* 1036: προσίζομαι μεσόμφαλόν θ’ ἴδρυμα, Λοξίου πέδον.

¹⁹³ Eur. *Supp.* 631–3: τὸ σὸν ἄγαλμα, τὸ σὸν ἴδρυμα πόλεος, ἐκκομίζομαι πρὸς πυρὰν ὑβρισθέν. Kovacs translates: “The delight of your city, its foundation, insulted by the Thebans, bring him back, I pray for burial!” Cf. Stieber 2011: 136–7.

¹⁹⁴ Pl. *Leg.* 931a: τῶν θεῶν ὀρῶντες σαφῶς τιμῶμεν, τῶν δ’ εἰκόνας ἀγάλματα ἰδρυσάμενοι, οὓς ἡμῖν ἀγάλλουσι καίπερ ἀψύχους ὄντας, ἐκείνους ἠγοῦμεθα τοὺς ἐμψύχους θεοὺς πολλὴν διὰ ταῦτ’ εὐνοίαν καὶ χάριν ἔχειν. πατὴρ οὖν ὅτω καὶ μήτηρ ἢ τούτων πατέρες ἢ μητέρες ἐν οἰκίᾳ κείνται κειμήλιοι ἀπειρηκότες γήρα, μηδεὶς διανοηθῆτω ποτὲ ἄγαλμα αὐτῶ, τοιοῦτον ἐφέστιον ἴδρυμα ἐν οἰκίᾳ ἔχων, μᾶλλον κύριον ἔσεσθαι, ἐὰν δὲ κατὰ τρόπον γε ὀρθῶς αὐτὸ θεραπεύῃ ὁ κεκτημένος. “Some of the gods whom we honor we see clearly, but of others we set up (ἰδρυσάμενοι) statues (εἰκόνας) as gifts (ἀγάλματα), and we believe that when we worship these, lifeless though they be, the living gods beyond feel great good-will towards us and gratitude. So, if any man has a father or a mother, or one of their fathers or mothers, in his house laid up bed-ridden with age, let him never suppose that, while he has such a figure (ἴδρυμα) as this upon his hearth, any statue could be more potent, if so be that its owner tends it duly and rightly.” Trans. adapted from Bury.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Pirenne-Delforge 2010: 126–7 on Ar. *Pax.* 922–4.

In an earlier discussion of public and private cult in the *Laws*, the interlocutor deplores the tendency to dedicate possessions and promise sacrifices and “installations” (θυσίας εὔχεσθαι καὶ ἰδρύσεις) on the spur of the moment.¹⁹⁶ The term ἰδρύσεις is also found in religious decrees. On a fourth-century inscription granting merchants from Cyprus the right to found a sanctuary of Aphrodite Ourania in the Piraeus we find that “concerning the foundation of the sanctuary of Aphrodite (περὶ τῆς ἰδρύσειως τῆς Ἀφροδίτη τοῦ ἱεροῦ) the Kitians are to operate the property of the sanctuary in the same manner as the Egyptians who have founded a sanctuary of Isis” (καθάπερ καὶ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τὸ τῆς Ἰσιδος ἱερὸν ἰδρύνται).¹⁹⁷

Alongside ἰδρυμα, we also find the term ἀφίδρυμα, meaning literally, a “thing having been (or to be) set up away.”¹⁹⁸ According to Malkin, an ἀφίδρυμα is a sacred object – any sacred object – that gains its significance and status by virtue of its *removal* from its original location and presence at the new location. As Malkin notes, “the ἀφίδρυμα is a sacred object, the transfer of which ensures the continuity of cult for the one departing.”¹⁹⁹ The only classical attestation of the underlying verb ἀφιδρύω (“to set up away”) is in Euripides *Helen* where the subtext of a cult transfer is likely (and will be discussed below).²⁰⁰

The noun ἀφίδρυμα is found no earlier than the first century BCE and represents the process by which implicit, commonplace concepts gained their own specialized

¹⁹⁶ Pl. *Leg.* 909e–910a.

¹⁹⁷ *IG* II² 1 337.21–2; 42–5 (c. 332–3 BCE). On foreign gods in the Piraeus, see Garland 1987: 108–10; von Reden 1995.

¹⁹⁸ See especially Malkin 1991, with Brunel 1953: 21–33; Robert 1965: 122–3; Gras 1987; Bettinetti 2001: 58–63; Anguissola 2006a; 2006b.

¹⁹⁹ Malkin 199: 89.

²⁰⁰ Eur. *Hel.* 273: πατρίδος θεοί μ’ ἀφιδρύσαντο γῆς ἐς βάρβαρ’ ἦθη. “The gods have transferred (ἀφιδρύσαντο) me from my home country into a barbarian culture.” See pp. 203–13 below.

vocabulary over time.²⁰¹ This term is often found in situations where traditions of historical and religious links between communities were already extremely old and had to be explained after the fact.²⁰² For example, according to Strabo, members of the fourth-century Panionion (an ethnic sanctuary sacred to Poseidon Helikonios) requested an ἀφίδρυμα from their mother city, the Achaean *polis* of Helikê.²⁰³ The colonists asked for “the image of Poseidon” (τὸ βρέτας τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος) or, if people of Helikê were unwilling, then they would accept an ἀφίδρυσις – that is, a “transport-relic” (τὴν ἀφίδρυσιν τοῖς Ἴωσιν) – to take with them back to Ionia. The Achaeans refused and in 373 BCE, Helikê was destroyed by an earthquake and a tidal wave. Here the ἀφίδρυμα (ἀφίδρυσις) is clearly not the “cult statue” of the sanctuary (which is instead represented by τὸ βρέτας) but instead, some other holy item (*hiera*) from the shrine of Poseidon, which presumably would (re)solidify the shared cultural tradition of the Ionian colonists and the Achaeans.²⁰⁴ According to Diodorus, after the legendary king Minos founded a colony called Minoa in the area of Sicily around Akragas, his bones were installed in a two-tiered sanctuary dedicated to both Minos and Aphrodite.²⁰⁵ Centuries later, after

²⁰¹ See Platt 2011: 213–93 for the development of the concept of representation in the second sophistic.

²⁰² Strabo’s “colonial” *aphidrumata* include: the Taurian image of Artemis of Diana Nemorensis (5.3.12 C239), the image of Venus Erycina in Rome (6.2.5 C272) on which, see Anguissola (2006b), an image of Triccaen Asclepius in Gerenia (8.4.4 C360), Cataonian Apollo in Cappadocia (12.2.6 C537), the Roman Magna Mater and the Athenian Asclepius (12.5.3 C568) and Egyptian images dedicated on the Arabian peninsula (16.4.4 C769). The examples of Diodorus include the Rhodian statues made by the legendary Telchines (DS 5.55.2) and Carthaginian holy items sent to their mother city Tyre (DS 20.14.3; cf. 33.5), on which, see Malkin 1991: 88–9; O’Byrhim 2000. Note also the “pillars of Gadiz” erected by Herakles on his travels (Strab. 3.5.6 C171) and the statues confiscated by Pompey in DS 40.4.1. On the Magna Mater and Asclepius in Athens, see pp. 84–6 and the scholarship cited there.

²⁰³ Strab. 8.7.2 C384. On this episode, see Malkin 1991. On the Panionion, see Hdt. 1.142–8; DS 15.49.

²⁰⁴ Brunel 1953: 25 suggested ash or bone from sacrifice.

²⁰⁵ DS. 4.79.4, with Dunbabin 1948: 312. For Minoa, see Hdt. 5.46.1–2; Polyb. 1.25.9; Lind. Chron. *FGrH* 532 F 3.30.

Theron's refounding of Akragas, the bones were given back (ἀφιδρυθῆναι) to Crete as an marker of the (presumed) shared heritage between the two cities.²⁰⁶

In Strabo and Diodorus, an ἀφίδρυμα, just like an ἄγαλμα, a ἔδος, or a ἴδρυμα, could be, but did not have to be, a cult statue. Unlike the ἀφίδρυμα of Helikê, in the detailed narrative of the transfer of the cult of Artemis to Massalia, the ἀφίδρυμα in question was clearly a statue, namely the famous *xoanon* of Ephesian Artemis.²⁰⁷

According to Strabo, when the Phokaian settlers were leaving Ionia for the west, an oracle directed them to take a certain ἀφίδρυμα from among the *hiera* of the Artemision in Ephesus (ἀφίδρυμά τι τῶν ἱερῶν λαβούση) along with a female priestess of the temple.²⁰⁸ Strabo goes on to note that the new devotees of Artemis in Massalia maintained the exact same disposition of their cult statue (τοῦ ξοάνου τὴν διάθεσιν) as was customary in their mother city. As is shown by Malkin, the ἀφίδρυμα of the Phokaian colonists did not – strictly speaking – *need* to be a replica of the *xoanon* of the Ephesian Artemision, though in this case it probably was.²⁰⁹ What was requested by the oracle was simply “one of the *hiera*” of the temple. It was only when the ἀφίδρυμα reached Sicily that it was termed a *xoanon*. Because of the plethora of “votive” images dedicated at sanctuaries, it must have seemed axiomatic to authors such as Strabo and Diodorus that an ἀφίδρυμα or “transport relic” was likely to be an anthropomorphic statue or cult statue.

²⁰⁶ See pp. 106–7 below.

²⁰⁷ On the appearance of the *xoanon*, see, e.g. Xen. *Anab.* 5.3.12; Plin. *NH* 16.213–14; Vitruv. 58.13, with Romano 1980: 245.

²⁰⁸ Cf. DH *AR* 2.22: τῆς Ἐφεσίας Ἀρτέμιδος ἀφιδρύματα. For the role of the female priestess in the transfer of statues, see pp. 150–4 below.

²⁰⁹ Cf. Robert 1965. For formal correspondences between votives and “cult statues” at sanctuaries, especially Ephesus, see Alroth 1989: 25–6. For the image of Artemis at Ephesus, see Fleischer 1973: 1–116; Romano 1980: 236–49;

In later sources, the connection of an ἀφίδρυμα with transfer and movement is elided, and the word simply comes to mean “statue” *tout court*.²¹⁰ Despite the loss of differentiated meaning, the term still had the capacity to connote the historical or “ethnic” links between communities embodied by the historical movement of cult objects. A late second-century CE dedicatory inscription from the Argive agora purports to describe a “renewal of the ancient kinship between the Argives and Cilician Aegae.”²¹¹ The inscribed *stêlē* (supposedly placed in the temple of Lycian Apollo) narrated how a certain Antiochus of Aegae told the story of Perseus’ ancient wanderings in the east, and how “he arrived in Cilicia, which is the boundary to [the east of Asia]; and that there carrying the ἀφίδρυμα of his national goddess he...”²¹² The importance of the Argive Perseus’ travel to Cilicia, and the role of the ἀφίδρυμα of his “national goddess” (Athena? Hera?) is corroborated by imperial Roman coinage from Tarsus that depict Perseus carrying a small, standing statue of a god in his outstretched hand.²¹³

βρέτας

The term βρέτας is a relatively rare and (perhaps) non-Indo European word of unknown origin and is one of a group of words that tends to refer primarily to the antiquity or the materiality of a ritual image *per se*.²¹⁴ As a substantive ending in *-as*, βρέτας should logically form part of the group of nouns including *geras* (gift), *gêras* (old age), *demas* (shape, body), *sebas* (holiness), which – unlike βρέτας – are present in

²¹⁰ E.g. DH AR 8.56.2 where the statues of *Fortuna Muliebris* are *aphidrumata*. See also the examples noted in Malkin 1991: 89–93.

²¹¹ Antiochus of Aegae *FGrH* 747 T 2, on which, see Robert 1977: 116–32; Curty 1995: 13–15.

²¹² Text: τε ἀφικ]έσθαι Κιλικίαν, ἧτις ἐστὶν τέρμα τᾶς πρὸς [ἀνατολᾶς Ἀσίας], κάκει τὸ τᾶς πατρίου κομίζοντα θεᾶς ἀφεί[δρυμα]. . . . See further Robert 1977: 118.

²¹³ The principal divinities of Tarsus were Herakles, Perseus, Apollo, and Athena. On Tarsus generally see Dio Chrys. 33.45; Amm. Marc. 14.8, with Robert 1977: 110–32.

²¹⁴ For the etymology of βρέτας, see Benveniste 1932: 128–30; Donohue 1988: 17–25; 25n62; Bettinetti 2001: 42–3.

Homer, and often have a religious sphere of reference. Because the olive-wood image of Athena Polias and the “*sanis*” of Samian Hera were very often referred to as *bretê* in our sources,²¹⁵ the term has been since ancient times (probably incorrectly) derived from the word βροτός (man)²¹⁶ and interpreted alongside *xoanon* to mean “ancient wood statue.”²¹⁷ For Vernant, the term was “the first archaism” of the Greek conception of representation – that is, the first term that, by nature, denoted not a literal sculptural technique or cultural activity, but rather, an idea about the past.²¹⁸ Despite its connection with age and antiquity, βρέτας is not found in Homer or Hesiod, the lyric poets, or Herodotus. The first instances of the term are found in tragedy, specifically Aeschylus and Euripides, in whose works it is relatively common.²¹⁹ The chorus of Aeschylus’ *Septem* takes refuge at the *archaia bretê* of Thebes, while the gods of the city themselves are encouraged to take hold and protect not only their citizens, but also the images as well – their own personal representations.²²⁰ In the *Eumenides*, βρέτας is Aeschylus’ term for the image of Athena to which Orestes clings as a suppliant after the murder of Clytemnestra.²²¹ In the *Lysistrata*, the word is used to refer to the treasure captured during the female occupation of the Athenian acropolis.²²²

²¹⁵ E.g. Aesch. *Eum.* 80 (Athena) and Callim. *Aet.* fr. 100–100a with *Dieg.* IV.22–9 = 1, 105 Pfeiffer = Donohue 1988: T 108 (Hera). Cf. Eur. *IT* 112: ξεστὸν ἐκ ναοῦ λαβεῖν ἄγαλμα. “... to take the polished ἄγαλμα from the temple.” Here, the use of the adjective ξεστὸν to describe the image of Artemis, combined with the other twelve Euripidean uses of βρέτας (see n219 below), implies a wooden image.

²¹⁶ See especially Aethlius *FGrH* 536 F 3 *ap.* Clem. Al. *Protrep.* 4.46.3 = Donohue 1988: T 42 with 7, 12, 76–7.

²¹⁷ E.g. Merkelbach 1972; Vernant 1990: 227.

²¹⁸ Vernant 1990: 227; cf. Donohue 1988: 24.

²¹⁹ Aesch. *Sep.* 96, 98, 185, 212; *Supp.* 429–30, 463; *Pers.* 809; *Eum.* 80, 259, 242, 409, 439, 446, 1024; Eur. *Alc.* 974; *Heraklid.* 936; *And.* 311; *El.* 1254; *IT* 980, 986, 1040, 1044, 1165, 1179, 1199, 1291, 1453, 1477, 1481, 1489; *Phoen.* 1250, 1473; Eur. *Danae TrGF* fr. 328; cf. Ar. *Eq.* 31.

²²⁰ Aesch. *Sep.* 96; 98.

²²¹ E.g. Aesch. *Eum.* 80; Ar. *Lys.* 262.

²²² Ar. *Lys.* 262 with scholia.

In Euripides, a βρέτας usually means a visible image of a god. In *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, the word is used twelve times to refer to the image of Artemis brought back to Attica by Iphigenia and Orestes. However – just like Herodotus’ use of *agalma* – there are instances where, instead of figured image, the word approximates the meaning of religious relic.²²³ *Tropaia*, because of their anthropomorphic shape and ritual character could be classed as *bretê*.²²⁴ In the *Heraclidae*, Iolaus and Hyllus erect a βρέτας as a “*tropaion* in honor of Zeus, god of the rout”; similarly, in the *Phoenissae*, Polyneices is urged to set up a βρέτας to Zeus in honor of a victory.²²⁵ In the *Troades*, the word is used of the Trojan Horse.²²⁶ After the classical period the term comes to be understood very generally as any kind of “divine image.” An inscribed Hellenistic statue base from Thessaly (c. 250–200 BCE) described its bronze image of Ino-Leukothea as a βρέτας.²²⁷ For Callimachus, the chryselephantine statue of Zeus at Olympia was a βρέτας, while for Pausanias it was an ἄγαλμα, and for Strabo a ξόανον.²²⁸

ξόανον

The word ξόανον likely derives from the verb ξέω (to scrape) and thus means in essence “anything scraped.”²²⁹ It was often associated (especially in later authors such as

²²³ E.g. the image of Thetis in Eur. *And.* 311 and Athena Polias in Eur. *El.* 1254.

²²⁴ For the anthropomorphic *tropaion* in terms of a movable cult image, see Figueira 2012 and his discussion of the lending, movement, and use of the images of the Aiakidai in Hdt. 5.79–81.

²²⁵ Eur. *Heraklid.* 936: “Υλλος μὲν οὖν ὃ τ’ ἐσθλὸς Ἰόλεως βρέτας Διὸς τροπαίου καλλίνικον ἴστασα. “Hyllus and good Iolaos were erecting a victory-statue (καλλίνικον βρέτας) in honor of Zeus, god of the rout”; *Phoen.* 1250: Πολύνεικες, ἐν σοὶ Ζητὸς ὀρθῶσαι βρέτας τρόπαιον Ἄργει τ’ εὐκλεῆ δοῦναι λόγον. “Polyneices, it lies in your power to raise aloft the trophy (βρέτας τρόπαιον) of Zeus and to give glory to Argos.” Cf. also *Phoen.* 1473.

²²⁶ Eur. *Tro.* 12.

²²⁷ SEG 26 683; see Henrichs 1978: 131–40.

²²⁸ Callim. *Ia.* VI F 196.29 Pfeiffer; Paus. 5.10.2; Strab. 8.3.30 C353.

²²⁹ Donohue 1988. See also Benveniste 1932: 130–1; Bettinetti 2001: 48–52; Scheer 2000: 19–21. On etymology, see Chantraine 1968: 765; Donohue 1988: 9–12. In Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* 1.1119, Argos (the individual who builds the Argo with Athena’s help) is said to have “shaped” (ἔξεσεν) an ancient vine stock into a *bretas* of Rhea on Mt. Dindymon in Thrace.

Strabo, Pausanias, and Plutarch) with the term βρέτας and thus was used to mean “ancient image carved of wood.”²³⁰ As Donohue notes in her comprehensive study, the word seems to “directly reflect the process of hewing images from wood. The technique lives on, as it were, in the name of the statues that have themselves vanished.”²³¹ The word is an important piece of evidence for the (likely) theory, which was believed by the Greeks themselves, that the first cult statues were rough, aniconic creations hewn or carved from wood.²³²

In the classical period, while the word ξόανov could denote a sculpted image, it could also refer to other worked, wooden “special” objects. The term first appears (in our extant sources) in a fragment from Sophocles’ *Thamyras* where it referred most likely to wooden pipes.²³³ In Euripides’ *Ion*, Creusa leaped from the altar of Apollo away from the “*xoana* of the god.” It is here unclear whether generic religious *anathēmata* of Delphi or multiple (unidentified) cult images are referred to.²³⁴ In the *Troades*, the Trojan horse is a “*hieron xoanon*” while the chorus declare that, along with sacrifices and the festivals of the gods, the “*tupoi* of golden *xoana* have vanished from Troy.”²³⁵ In Aeschylus’ *Septem*, the chorus warn Eteokles that, “the gods of a conquered city abandon it.” By way of explanation, the scholiast cites the (non-extant) Sophoclean *Xoanephoroi* (*xoana* carriers) where we find that “the gods carry out from Troy on their shoulders their own *xoana*,

²³⁰ See *LSJ* s.v. ξόανov I.

²³¹ Donohue 1988: 2–3.

²³² For the Greek belief in the antiquity of wooden cult statues, see Donohue 1988: 175–235 and pp. 23–4 above.

²³³ Soph. *Thamyras* TrGF fr. 238.

²³⁴ Eur. *Ion* 1403.

²³⁵ Eur. *Tro.* 525, 1174. On the expression, see Donohue 1988: 22–3.

seeing their city is to be captured.”²³⁶ In Euripides’ *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, the cult image of Artemis is once referred to as a ξόανον.²³⁷

In inscriptions, *xoana* are found both in votive contexts and as the primary focus of worship in temples as cult statues. An inscription from Magnesia on the Meander concerns the installation of a *xoanon* of Artemis Leukophryene in a temple called the “Parthenon.”²³⁸ On the other hand, a second-century BCE Attic inscription lists private gifts presented to Dionysus, including a temple, a *temenos*, and *xoana*, which are “similar to you” (*eikela soi*).²³⁹ A very well-known instance of the use of *xoana* in public ritual is found in the decree inscribed on the Rosetta stone for Ptolemy V Epiphanes (196 BCE). The inscription states that, “for Ptolemy, the god Epiphanes, Eucharistos, a golden *nâos* and a ξόανον are to be set up in the *adyta*, and in the great festivals, in which there are processions with the *nâoi*, the *nâos* is to be carried in procession with them.”²⁴⁰

According to Donohue, by the end of the first century BCE the words ξόανον and βρέτας had become identified with “old-style” wooden images of the gods, that is, cult statues.²⁴¹ Pausanias uses the word over ninety times, usually with the specific meaning “ancient statue constructed of wood” and often connected to famous mythological sculptors such as Daedalus.²⁴²

κολοσσός

²³⁶ Soph. *TrGF* fr. 452 *ap.* Aesch. *Sep.* 202–3 with scholia = Donohue 1988: T 1–5.

²³⁷ Eur. *IT* 1359. The image is also called an *agalma* fourteen times and a *bretas* twelve times.

²³⁸ Donohue 1988: 63, T 393 with pp. 75–7 below.

²³⁹ *IG* II² 2948 on which, see Donohue 1988: 61–2; T 399.

²⁴⁰ Donohue 1988: 61 T 402 = *BMusInscr* IV 1065.

²⁴¹ Donohue 1988: 82.

²⁴² The *xoana* in Pausanias are collected in Donohue 1988: T 187–282.

The etymology of κολοσσός is uncertain, but the term likely stems from a non-Indo-European root word, perhaps imported from the Levant or the eastern Aegean.²⁴³ Benveniste hypothesized that the term and its ritual context were introduced to Greece by the Dorians and meant, in origin, “erected object.”²⁴⁴ For Benveniste, the word did not refer to a large-sized material object, but rather to a ritual double or representation (a religious idea that was imported from abroad) and it was not until the construction of the Colossus at Rhodes (c. 280 BCE) when the term began to connote monumentality exclusively.²⁴⁵ In Herodotus, the word κολοσσός is used primarily in reference to Egyptian images, especially the famous monumental stone statues at Memphis and Lake Moeris.²⁴⁶ At the great hypostyle hall of the temple of Amun-rê at Karnak, there were over three hundred wooden images of *hieroi*, which Herodotus called *kolossoi* and *eikones* synonymously.²⁴⁷ As Benveniste and others have noted, Herodotus’ tendency to add the adjective *megalos* (large), or a specific size (*i.e.* twenty-five feet tall) to some but not all descriptions of *kolossoi* must imply that size was not the prime criterion for designating a κολοσσός.²⁴⁸ Indeed, some of the Egyptian *kolossoi* in Herodotus, such as the images of *hieroi* at Karnak, were life size, while other representations, such as the

²⁴³ Benveniste 1932: 118–22; cf. Chantraine 1968: 558. Treatments of the term κολοσσός include Roux 1960; Ducat 1976: 246–51; Romano 1980: 172–5; Donohue 1988: 27n65; Dickie 2011.

²⁴⁴ Benveniste 1932: 122; cf. Roux 1960: 16–17 who characterizes a κολοσσός tentatively as a statue with its legs tightly pressed together thus resembling a pillar (*stylos*).

²⁴⁵ Benveniste 1932: 134–5; the idea is further developed in Vernant 1990 and Steiner 2001: 1–78. *Contra* Romano 1980: 172–3 and Dickie 2011 with earlier bibliography.

²⁴⁶ Hdt. 2.153; 175–6 (Hephaistos’ temple at Memphis and the dedications of Amasis); Hdt. 149 (lake Moeris). For Lloyd 1988: 3.136, 215 the *kolossoi* at Memphis were large statues that fronted columns, not caryatids. For lake Moeris, cf. DS. 1.51–2; Strab. 15.1.4 C789 with Lloyd 1988: 3.124–8. Herodotus’ sole non-Egyptian *kolossoi* are the kneeling bronze images on a Samian *kratêr* in Hdt. 4.152.4, but these could be Egyptianizing or Orientalizing.

²⁴⁷ Hdt. 2.143.2 = Hecataeus *FGrH* 1 F 300; see Lloyd 1988: 3.109. Cf. Hdt. 2.130–1 with Lloyd 1988: 3.80 (Myrcinus’ concubines).

²⁴⁸ *E.g.* Hdt. 2.175.1–4.

thirty-eight foot high *andriantes* at the temple of Hephaistos, were monumental, but not termed *kolossoi*.²⁴⁹

Apart from the second book of Herodotus, the word is rare. In the *parodos* of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, the chorus laments on behalf of Menelaus over the loss of his wife Helen: "a *phasma* seems to rule the house. The grace of well-formed *kolossoi* is hateful to the husband; ... everything to do with love is gone."²⁵⁰ It has been argued that these "well-formed *kolossoi*" were literal, life-size stone statues, installed in the citadel of Mycenae and meant to fulfill some specific function, perhaps mnemonic, ritual, or aesthetic for the husband.²⁵¹ A main support for Benveniste's position on the variable size and religious meaning of the word *kolossos* was the fourth-century Cyrenean "pact of the settlers."²⁵² The concluding lines of the pact included a series of *arai* that bound the Theran immigrants to not abandon their settlement on Cyrene. The signatories would throw wax *kolossoi* into a fire with the words: "may he who does not abide by this agreement, but contravenes it, melt always and dissolve like the images, himself, his progeny and his property." While there are, of course, significant differences between the Egyptian life-size and over life-size *kolossoi* in Herodotus, and the wax, (presumably) smaller scale Cyrenean *kolossoi*, there are similarities as well. As Faraone notes, the public, performative manipulation of wax "cult images" of divinities was a longstanding and widespread practice across Egypt and the Near East. Nor was it restricted to private,

²⁴⁹ Hdt. 2.121: ἀντίους δὲ τῶν προφυλαίων ἔστησε ἀνδριάντας δύο, ἕοντας τὸ μέγαθος πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι πήχεων. "He set two statues (ἀνδριάντας) next to the forecourt; they were twenty-five cubits (about 42 feet) high." Rhampsinitius has been identified with various famous pharaohs named Ramses of the XIX and XX dynasties; cf. Lloyd 1988: 1.107–10, 3.52–3.

²⁵⁰ Aesch. *Ag.* 416–17.

²⁵¹ See Stieber 1994: 104–14; 1999; Steiner 2001: 191–4; Griffith 2002: 247–9.

²⁵² *SEG* 9 4 = *ML* 5.44–51. For analysis, see Faraone 1992: 81–4; 1993; Steiner 2001: 49–50.

asocial ceremonies or magical procedures with smallscale images (perhaps resembling “voodoo dolls”).²⁵³

To wit, we know from an inventory inscription that a certain temple of Apollo on Delos, most likely to be identified with the poros temple constructed in the mid-sixth century BCE, held a κολοσσός.²⁵⁴ Whatever the exact size of this image – which Romano identified with the famous archaic gold image of Apollo constructed by Tektaios and Angelion – it was unequivocally considered a Greek cult statue.²⁵⁵

ἀνδριάς

The word ἀνδριάς is derived from the diminutive of man and unequivocally means “likeness of a person.”²⁵⁶ The suffix –ιον, often occurs in cases where the noun is transformed into its representation, such as παλλάδιον (image of Pallas Athena) and δρακόντιον (image of a serpent).²⁵⁷ The word is not used by Homer and its earliest occurrence is in Pindar. In *Nemean* 5 (discussed above), the poet declares that he is “not a sculptor (ἀνδριαντοποιός) so as to fashion stationary statues on their same base (ἀγάλαματ’ ἐπ’ αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος).”²⁵⁸ In *Pythian* 5, the charioteer of the *laudandus* dedicates his reins at Delphi alongside a Cretan “statue (ἄμφ’ ἀνδριάντι σχεδόν) hewn from a single trunk of wood (μονόδροπον φυτόν).”²⁵⁹

In Herodotus, despite its derivation from ἀνήρ, an ἀνδριάς can refer to an image of a man or a god. In Egypt, it refers to images of king Sestrostis and his family as well as

²⁵³ See Faraone 1993: 62n8.

²⁵⁴ *IG* XI.2 145.24: τοῦ ναοῦ οἷο ὁ κολοσσός. For the identification of the *porinos* temple referred to in, e.g. *IG* XI.2 185: τὸν νεὸ τὸμ Πώ[ρινον] (c. 300–275 BCE), see Romano 1980: 177–81.

²⁵⁵ Romano 1980: 172–6.

²⁵⁶ E.g. ἀνδριόν from ἀνήρ. See Chantraine 1968: 88; Bettinetti 2001: 37–42.

²⁵⁷ See Bettinetti 2001: 37 with Kretschmer 1925: 100–1.

²⁵⁸ *Pin. Nem.* 5.1–2.

²⁵⁹ *Pin. Pyth.* 5.40–2.

the forty-foot high statues of “Winter” and “Summer” erected by king Rhampsinitus in the forecourt of Hephaistos.²⁶⁰ Ἀνδριάς never carries in Herodotus the meaning “relic” or “cult statue,” which is specifically reserved for ἄγαλμα, but in contexts involving anthropomorphic dedications at temples (especially those made by the historian’s relative contemporaries) the terms ἀνδριάς and ἄγαλμα can be interchangeable.²⁶¹ In the ancient temple of Bel in Babylon, the golden image of the god is an ἄγαλμα and the statue standing in the *temenos* is an ἀνδριάς,²⁶² while in his story of Datis and the return of the image of Apollo (c. 490 BCE), the statue is both an ἀνδριάς and an ἄγαλμα.²⁶³ In the first-fruits (ἀκροθίνια) or tithe (δεκάτη) from the spoils of Artemisium and Salamis, Alexander I of Macedonia dedicated at Delphi a golden statue of himself along with an ἀνδριάς holding the figurehead (ἀκρωτήριον) of a ship, which from other sources (much later than Herodotus) we know to be of Apollo.²⁶⁴

As we have stated above, even broadly contemporaneous authors could use the same word very differently. Herodotus’ (by no means universal) tendency to use ἀνδριάς

²⁶⁰ Hdt. 2.110; 2.121. See n249 above.

²⁶¹ See Pin. *Nem.* 5.1 above. Cf. Gorg. *Hel.* fr. 11.115 DK: ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀνδριάντων ποίησις καὶ ἡ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων ἐργασία θεῶν ἠδεῖαν παρέσχετο τοῖς ὄμμασιν. “And the creation of statues and the work of images provides the eyes a beautiful sight.”

²⁶² Hdt. 1.183; cf. 2.91: ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτοῖσι ἀνδριάντες δύο ἐστῶσι λίθινοι μεγάλοι. ἐν δὲ τῷ περιβεβλημένῳ τούτῳ νηὸς τε ἔνι καὶ ἄγαλμα ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνέστηκε τοῦ Περσέος. “Before these (sc. large stone columns) stand great stone two great stone statues (ἀνδριάντες). In the outer court there is a temple with an image (ἄγαλμα) of Perseus standing in it.”

²⁶³ Hdt. 6.118.2–3: ... κατατίθεται τε ἐς τὸ ἱρὸν τὸ ἄγαλμα καὶ ἐντέλλεται τοῖσι Δηλίοισι ἀπαγαγεῖν τὸ ἄγαλμα ἐς Δήλιον τὸ Θηβαίων: τὸ δ’ ἔστι ἐπὶ θαλάσσει Χαλκίδος καταντίον. Δᾶτις μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἐντειλάμενος ἀπέπλεε, τὸν δὲ ἀνδριάντα τοῦτον Δήλιοι οὐκ ἀπήγαγον, ἀλλὰ μιν δι’ ἐτέων εἴκοσι Θηβαῖοι αὐτοὶ ἐκ θεοπροπίου ἐκομίσαντο ἐπὶ Δήλιον. “... and Datis set the image (ἄγαλμα) in the temple, instructing the Delians to carry it (ἄγαλμα) away to Delion of the Thebans, on the coast opposite Chalcis. Datis, having given this order, sailed away, but the Delians never brought back the statue (ἀνδριάντα); twenty years later the Thebans themselves brought it to Delion because of an oracle.”

²⁶⁴ Hdt. 8.121 with Paus. 10.14.5; Dem. 12.21: ... Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ προγόνου πρώτου κατασχόντος τὸν τόπον ὅθεν καὶ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων Μήδων ἀπαρχὴν ἀνδριάντα χρυσοῦν ἀνέστησεν εἰς Δελφούς. “... my ancestor, Alexander, having occupied the site (sc. Amphipolis) which was the origin of the first-fruits (ἀπαρχὴν) of the Persian captives, he set up a golden statue (ἀνδριάντα) at Delphi.” For military first-fruit offerings, see Jim 2014: 176–202.

to mean a contemporary dedicated image contrasts sharply with the “single hewn trunk” we find in *Pythian* 5. Pindar’s term by its material connotes venerability and by its production technique recalls the “Orientalizing” style of the seventh century. It is probable that Herodotus, if pressed, would have called the ancient image at Delphi an *agalma* – and certainly later authors such as Pausanias would have used a different term, such as *bretas* or *xoanon*.

εἰκών/εἶδωλον

The word εἰκών is derived from the Homeric perfect ἔοικα (to be like), whence the factitive verbs ἔϊσκω and εἰκάζω (to make similar, compare) and the noun εἰκών (image, representation).²⁶⁵ Thus, the term can be used naturally to refer to a physical statue of a human, but it also could also connote an “image” or “representation,” and even more generally, a “metaphor” or “comparison.”²⁶⁶ Perhaps because of this inherent connection with verisimilitude or likeness,²⁶⁷ an εἰκών rarely – and indeed never in the classical period – denoted a cult image, that is, a sculptural image of a divinity that served as a focus of worship.²⁶⁸ Alongside this unwillingness to connect the concept “likeness” to an image of a divinity, the word εἰκών was commonly used to denote an image of a human in dedicatory or civic religious contexts (similar to ἀνδριάνς). During the classical period the most common term for an anthropomorphic dedication to a human recipient was εἰκών.²⁶⁹ In Herodotus, statues of temple servants in Egypt were *eikones*, while the

²⁶⁵ For the etymology, see Chantraine 1968: 354–5. For ἔϊσκω and ἔοικα, see *LfgreE* s.v. ἔοικα, Norheider.

²⁶⁶ See, e.g. *LSJ* s.v. εἰκών A II, III, IV.

²⁶⁷ For Benveniste 1932: 133, the distance between words derivable from “likeness” or “representation” and religious objects *per se* signified that the Greeks possessed no specific name for cult statue. For a modification of this perspective, see Vernant 1990: 225–6.

²⁶⁸ The definition comes from Romano 1980: 3; see p. 14 above.

²⁶⁹ See Robert 1968–90: 2.832–40; Koonce 1988; Dillon 2010: 12. The earliest epigraphical example of εἰκών is *CEG* 399, the base of a victory statue at Olympia dedicated to Euthymos of Locri in 472 BCE; cf.

Argives dedicated *eikones* of Kleobis and Biton at Delphi after their death in front of the cult image (*agalma*) of Hera.²⁷⁰ In tragedy, the meaning of the word could range from the sigils on the shields of the seven against Thebes, to the image of Glauke as she dressed herself in Medea's gifts.²⁷¹ In Euripides' *Herakles Furens*, Athena appeared as an εἰκών to the crazed Herakles in order to prevent the complete destruction of his family. Many commentators have taken this "image" of Athena as a reference to the monumental bronze *promachos*, which towered over the acropolis.²⁷² In a fragment of the *Theoroi* of Aeschylus, the votives, which the satyrs dedicated to Isthmian Poseidon, were *eikones* as well as *mimēmata* (likenesses, imitations) and *eidōla* (versions, copies).²⁷³

Like εἰκών, the word εἶδωλον takes part in a wide network of related terms that center on vision or appearance and thus also are related to the concepts "semblance" and "copy." The word has been translated in a variety of ways: phantom, ghost, image, phantasm, dream, resemblance, and representation.²⁷⁴ The term is derived from εἶδος (form, shape) and at its core refers to an image or representation; however, unlike εἰκών or ἀνδριάς (which involve verisimilitude), the word usually carries the connotation of false or uncanny copying.²⁷⁵ In the *Iliad*, an εἶδωλον of Aeneas is spirited away from danger by Aphrodite and an εἶδωλον of the dead Patroclus appears to Achilles in a

Keesling 2003: 181. See also the statue base for Lysimache, priestess of Athena Polias in *IG II² 3453* (c. 360 BCE) with Keesling 2003: 469.

²⁷⁰ Cf. the concubines (priestesses or attendants) of Myrcinus and the priests of Zeus at Thebes in Hdt. 2.130, 143. In both cases the statues are also referenced as *kolossoi*. Cf. Lloyd 1988: 3.80, 109. Cf. Hdt. 1.31 for Kleobis and Biton; Hdt. 7.69.2 for the golden εἰκών of Artystone, a favorite wife of Cyrus.

²⁷¹ Aesch. *Sep.* 559; Eur. *Med.* 1162.

²⁷² Eur. *HF* 1002 with, e.g. Stieber 2011: 141–2.

²⁷³ Aesch. *Theoroi TrGF* fr. 78a. On the relationship of the word *mimēsthai* to the plastic arts, see Vernant 1990: 232. On Aesch. *Theoroi* generally, see Stieber 1994.

²⁷⁴ See *LSJ* A II with, e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 839 (an "image" of a shadow); Soph. *Phil.* 947 (an unreal vision); *OC* 110 (image or ghost of Oedipus); *Tyro TrGF* fr. 659.6 (an "image" of a shadow); Pl. *Phaed.* 66c (illusions).

²⁷⁵ Chantraine 1968: 316–17. For treatments of the term εἶδωλον as part of a disjunctive pair with εἰκών, see Said 1987; Vernant 1990.

dream.²⁷⁶ In the *Odyssey*, the spirits of the dead met by Odysseus in the underworld are *eidōla*, while Athena fabricates an εἶδωλον in the form of the woman Iphimede to deceive Penelope.²⁷⁷ In Hesiod, Iphigenia is said to have been replaced by an εἶδωλον just before her salvation at Aulis.²⁷⁸ Vernant maintained that in the period before Plato, the term εἶδωλον did not refer to a “copy” but only to an uncanny natural double or likeness, such as the supernatural apparition (*phasma*), the dream (*onar*) and the soul phantom of the dead (*psychē*).²⁷⁹ In other words, the term did not participate in a philosophical debate over being and seeming, but instead denoted a phantom or version of an object, which had its own reality and existence: a double or a substitute.²⁸⁰

Nevertheless, because an εἶδωλον could signify a “representation” or “copy,” the term could also easily (although the usage is rare) refer to a material, sculpted image and thus possibly a cult statue. The items in Croesus’ dedications to Delphi include a golden statue (εἶδωλον) of a woman four and a half feet high, while in Sparta, royal funerals were celebrated with an “image” (εἶδωλον) of the dead king, which would be processed and carried to the burial ground.²⁸¹ The story of Helen’s εἶδωλον, which went to Troy in place of the living woman, was in told in Steisichorus’ *Palinode* and elaborated in Euripides’ *Helen*. In the play, the semantic overlap between εἶδωλον and terms referring to cult statues is clear – albeit conditioned by Euripides’ specific poetic and philosophical aims – and will be treated in detail below. In the *Helen*, the “phantom” or “copy” of Helen is referred to as an εἶδωλον four times and an ἄγαλμα three times.²⁸²

²⁷⁶ Hom. *Il.* 5.449–53; 23.72; 104.

²⁷⁷ Hom. *Od.* 11.83, 213, 476, 602 (shades of the dead); 4.796–7 (Iphthime); cf. 824, 835.

²⁷⁸ Hes. *Cat.* fr. 23a.21 M-W.

²⁷⁹ Vernant 1990: 233.

²⁸⁰ Vernant 1990: 235–6; 1991: 167–70; 186–90.

²⁸¹ Hdt. 1.51; 6.58; cf. Hdt. 5.92γ (the spirit of Periander’s wife Melissa).

²⁸² Eur. *Hel.* 34, 582, 683, 1136 (εἶδωλον); Eur. *Hel.* 262, 705, 1219 (ἄγαλμα).

Even if the εἶδωλον of the *Helen* does not literally signify a physical cult image, Euripides' use of the term exemplifies how “fixed” semantic definitions for words can and must change over time. The *Helen* makes use of a matrix of similar terms that serve to characterize the heroine of the play and her shadowy, ghost counterpart (the εἶδωλον). Each instance of each word in the tragedy possessed its own sphere of references and primary meanings associated with it, none of which were irrelevant to the specific context of its invocation, and all of which referred recursively to each other. For example, if Helen was metaphorically called an ἄγαλμα, she was literally a gift: a delight to her new possessor and a source of social pride to her original owner. However, she this presentation also simultaneously evokes a statue or votive given to a divinity and deposited in a temple. At the same time, if her “ghost image” is a perfect copy or phantom of this “delightful” ἄγαλμα, then the term εἶδωλον can slide into connoting not only Vernant's “uncanny dream copy” but also into connoting the closely-allied spheres of representation, sculpture, and religious ritual. Finally, if Helen describes her original travel to Egypt in terms that later come to be used for the transfer of a portable cult statue (ἀφιδρύσαντο), all of the words used to characterize her in the play as a beautiful, desired, sacred object have prepared the reader to understand her in these terms.²⁸³

The foregoing discussion has demonstrated the rich conceptual apparatus associated with the complex archaic and later Greek terminology for cult images, but the purpose of this chapter has also been partly negative. Authors have always felt free to pick and choose the terms which resonated in their particular analytical contexts and time periods. Thus, the terminology covering Greek religious statues both extends over a very

²⁸³ Eur. *Hel.* 273. See pp. 188-203 below.

large temporal span and is difficult, if not impossible, to compartmentalize definitively. Each of the terms carries its own unique, but not exclusive, valence, which contributes to our understanding of how the Greeks understood and interpreted the manipulation of their cult images.²⁸⁴ Consider how the vocabulary of fixity seen in terms such as ἔδος and ἴδρυμα, appears to carry with it notions of mobility, either terminated or foreclosed, while the derivative word ἀφίδρυμα activates this very suspended possibility of the movement of statues to connote a transferred ritual image. The term ἄγαλμα seems to transmute the very physicality of these images and a broader genus of dedicated items into the realm of social psychology in which their primary characteristic becomes their generation of a positive mental state in their pertinent constituency of donors, recipients, or spectators. The diction surrounding εἰκόν, εἶδωλον, and ἀνδριάς by invoking resemblance, imitation, and duplication focalizes the issues of anthropomorphism, humanity, and metamorphosis that will contribute directly to our exploration of surrogacy and substitution below.

In sum, while an understanding of the divergences in meaning between terms – such as, for example, ἔδος and ἀνδριάς – is indeed required for interpreting our literary record, the resulting analysis will not account for the natural tendency of language to be used metaphorically or for meanings to change over time. This tendency can only be accounted for by literary analysis. Compounding, or underlining, this dynamic is the fact that a large portion of the details of Greek religion are accessible only through the lens of late authors such as Pausanias and Philostratus. These authors' vocabulary is characteristic of their individual epoch and personal literary purposes and outlook. This characterization of the fluid nature of terms denoting cult images is just as true for works

²⁸⁴ See Mylonopoulos 2010b: 4.

of the fifth century, or any century for that matter. Consider Euripides' parallel invocation of the Argive dead as the ἄγαλμα and ἵδρυμα of Athens at *Suppliants* 632. Our knowledge that an ἄγαλμα primarily refers to a delightful gift to a powerful patron, and that an ἵδρυμα refers to the act, not the result of a religious dedication, is necessary, but not sufficient information, for a full understanding of the passage. Within the structure of the narrative, each of the terms emphasizes a different facet of the relationship of the deceased Argive dead to the lineage of Zeus, who protects the rights of foreigners and upholds the universal values shared by both Athens and Argos. In turn, the terms metaphorically recall the traditional way to display and memorialize this connection: a cult image. We can say that the Argives are an ἄγαλμα (treasure or splendor is the usual translation) of Zeus' city of Athens because they are Zeus' treasured descendants through Io; they are also an ἵδρυμα (usually translated bulwark or foundation) because their presence and foundation in Argos – from Lynceus to Perseus to Herakles – was considered to be one of the historical pillars of the archaic Greek community and self-image.²⁸⁵

All of the terms resonate with a wide variety of different meanings from different cultural contexts. We will see this problem in our exploration of the literary evidence for portable cult statues in the following chapters, which derive mainly from this period and use the entire available scope of terms to refer to ritual images. We can say generally that the language of the second sophistic trends towards a more explicit terminology and a more sustained theoretical framework for talking about religion and art. However, much of the theorizing and technical terminology found in these authors has its roots in the

²⁸⁵ There could have been many reasons for forging a historical link between Athens and Argos in the early 420s BCE. For the date of Eur. *Supp.*, see Collard 1975: 8–14.

usage of archaic, classical, and hellenistic Greece.²⁸⁶ The attempt in this chapter to excavate all the possible references and contexts for Greek cult images will (I trust) serve us well in our treatment of Euripides *Iphigenia among the Taurians* and the *Helen* where we are concerned to understand the impact of the ritual transport of cult images on the language and narrative of the Greek myth.

²⁸⁶ Cf., e.g. Elsner 1996: 515–16; Platt 2011: 7–11.

Chapter Three – Moving Statues in Ritual

At Greek festivals, the gods themselves often travelled with the worshippers in a procession (*pompê*) and were ritually “housed” or “deposited” in their own dwellings.²⁸⁷ The first part of this chapter will present the evidence for the mechanical process of processions that involved the manipulation of a cult statue. The second part of the chapter will explore how the straightforward arrival of an image and a divinity could be manipulated or changed. Each original moment responded to different conditions and circumstances of the worshipping community.

Processions, especially those involving images, displayed an incredible amount of variation in their terminology and function.²⁸⁸ According to Nilsson’s detailed rubric, movements involving divinities were divided into two categories: “movements to the god” and “movements with the god.” The former included “sacrifice processions” such as the Athenian Panathenaia, processions to a “cult space” such as the mountaintop of Zeus Ikmaios or Akraios, and “movements which connected two cult spaces” such as the Athenian procession to Eleusis.²⁸⁹ The latter category – with which we are concerned – was divided into further subcategories: “transport movements,” “epiphany

²⁸⁷ The only recent treatment of mobile statues in processions is Bettinetti 2001: 185–210. On Greek *pompai* generally, see Nilsson 1916; Bömer 1952 *RE s.v. Pompa*, cols. 1878–1994; Kavoulaki 1996; 2011; Graf 1996; Deshours 2011: 29–30; Warford 2015; Mikalson 2016: 26–8.

²⁸⁸ Cf. the law of Euagoros which explicitly differentiates *pompai* from *komai* (revels) at the great Dionysia – a distinction that is not upheld in other sources. Dem. 22.10: καὶ τοῖς ἐν ἄστει Διονυσίοις ἢ πομπῇ καὶ οἱ παῖδες καὶ ὁ κῶμος καὶ οἱ κωμῳδοὶ καὶ οἱ τραγωδοί. “the procession (πομπή) at the City Dionysia with the boys (sc. contests) and the revels (κῶμος) and the comedies and tragedies.” *Theōriai* (viewings) are also differentiated from processions, but the two activities – moving in a procession and viewing a spectacle – are closely related. On *theōriai* in general, see Parker 2005: 79–87; Kavoulaki 2011; Rutherford 2013: 51–70. In Eur. *Bacch.* 1047, Dionysus is the “escort of the *theōria*” travelling to Cithaeron (πομπὸς ἢ θεωρίας). On this phrase see Kavoulaki 1996: 306–12; Rutherford 2013: 146–7; 206–8.

²⁸⁹ Nilsson 1916. On the Athenian procession to Eleusis as a *pompê*, see Graf 1996: 57–8. On Zeus Ikmaios on Keos and Zeus Akraios on Pelion in Thessaly, see Heraklides Creticus *FGrH* 369A F 2 with Nilsson 1957: 5–8.

movements,” “installation movements,” and “cleansing movements,” where images of divinities were either installed in a new temple or brought outside and cleaned.²⁹⁰

More recently, Graf has posited a distinction between centripetal and centrifugal processions: centripetal processions traveled from the periphery to the center of a *polis*, centrifugal processions traveled from the *polis* center to a rural sanctuary in the countryside.²⁹¹ This approach builds on de Polignac’s contention that processions embody a system of bipolar associations between the center and periphery of a given *polis*, and specifically his treatment of the procession to the extra-urban Argive Heraion.²⁹² Thus, centripetal processions such as the Athenian Panathenaia and greater Dionysia defined “the conquering of urban space,” while the centrifugal processions such as the journey of the Molpoi from Miletus to the Apolline sanctuary at Didyma, served to “connect the outlying sanctuary with the city.”²⁹³ As Graf notes, given the incredible variety inherent in Greek religious *pompai*, for each instance “one has to consider not only its form but also the entire ritual context to which it belongs.”²⁹⁴

Nilsson’s category “installation movements” can give us a good idea of the complexities involved in any sort of taxonomy of processions. The nomenclature of “installation movements” implies that any included procession would either be a unique, one-time event, or would require the (perhaps) yearly construction of an entirely new cult

²⁹⁰ Nilsson 1916.

²⁹¹ Graf 1996: 55–65; see also Kavoulaki 2011.

²⁹² De Polignac 1995: 31–45; see Seaford 1994: 239–51 on the applicability of the pattern to Dionysus and Athens. See also Cole 2004: 12–21, 66–85; Warford 2015: 31–8.

²⁹³ Graf 1996: 59–61. For the *pompê* from Miletus to Didyma, see Milet. 1,3 133 = *SIG*³ 57; Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 52 with Bömer 1952 *RE s.v. Pompa*, cols. 1917–19; Gödecken 1986; Robertson 1987; Chaniotis 2010; Slawisch and Wilkinson 2018.

²⁹⁴ Graf 1996: 65.

statue, which presumably would have to be installed in a new temple or sacred space.²⁹⁵ However, it is clear that in *pompai* such as the Boeotian Daedala or the Delian Dionysia the construction and “installation” of “new” statues for each iteration of a festival was an integral, but not necessarily distinguishing part of these rituals.²⁹⁶ Furthermore, at Athens, it is notoriously difficult to determine even whether the “arrival” of the statue of Dionysus occurred at Choes in Anthesterion, or at the greater Dionysia in Elaphebolion, to say nothing of whether his arrival should be classed under “transport,” “installation,” or “epiphany” *pompai*.²⁹⁷

All of these sub-distinctions, though learned, tend to elide one important aspect of the cultural context of mobile cult statues: all processions referred – if occasionally in a very diffuse way – to an act of dedication: the first definition or inauguration of the two-way relationship of worshiper and worshipped. Because of the two-way relationship encoded in each “gift,” the act not only attempted to reenact an original dedication but was simultaneously a reproduction of the original moment when the god “arrived.” This quotidian context for an “arriving god” – that is, its role as an offering or a votive – adds an important element to the galaxy of metaphorical and metaphysical contexts through which the ancients understood the presence and absence of their divinities.²⁹⁸ In other words, from the perspective of the community of worshipers, this original moment would naturally correspond to the first gift deposited in the presence of the divinity.

Furthermore, this gift often took the shape of a representation of the divinity itself. A

²⁹⁵ Nilsson 1916: 316. Nilsson’s sole example of an “installation procession” is the *xoanon* of Artemis Leukophryene at Magnesia on the Meander.

²⁹⁶ For the Daedala, see Paus. 9.3.3–8; Plutarch of Chaeronea *FGrH* 388 F 1 *ap.* Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 5–6 with pp. 77–8 below.

²⁹⁷ For the *xoanon* of the great Dionysia, see Deubner 1966: 138–42; Pickard-Cambridge 1968: 57–100; Parke 1977: 125–36.

²⁹⁸ For general treatments of this dynamic, see, *e.g.* Sourvinou-Inwood 2005: 151–235 on Dionysus.

corollary of this focus on “arrival” is that any first dedication to a divinity could be, and, in fact, usually was, conceptualized (often in a convoluted way) as a coming from an external or foreign location.

For example, at Aigialeia in Achaia, the *dēmos* would process down to the river Sythas carrying or “leading” images of Apollo and Artemis (ἀγαγόντες δὴ τοὺς θεοὺς). The people would dedicate them in the temple of the goddess Persuasion (Πειθοῦς ἱερὸν) and then return them to the temple of Apollo. Pausanias’ description of the procession implies that the festival was a communal reenactment of the “arrival” of the gods and the salvation of the community.²⁹⁹ According to a traditional local myth, Apollo and Artemis came to Aigialeia from afar to obtain purification for the killing of the monster Pytho at Delphi. Smitten by a plague, local seers ordered the Aigialeians to propitiate Apollo and Artemis, and in response, the people sent seven boys and seven maidens as suppliants to the river Sythas in order to pray to Persuasion. Apollo and Artemis were “persuaded” to return; the plague ceased and ever since then, during the annual festival (ἑορτῆ) of

²⁹⁹ Paus. 2.7.7–8: ἐς δὲ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐσελθοῦσι Πειθοῦς ἐστὶν ἱερὸν οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἄγαλμα ἔχον. Πειθῶ δὲ ἐπὶ λόγῳ τοιῶδε αὐτοῖς κατέστη σέβεσθαι. Ἀπόλλων καὶ Ἄρτεμις ἀποκτείναντες Πύθωνα παρεγένοντο ἐς τὴν Αἰγιάλειαν καθαρσίων ἕνεκα. γενομένου δὲ σφισι δειμάτος, ἔνθα καὶ νῦν Φόβον ὀνομάζουσι τὸ χωρίον, οἱ μὲν ἐς Κρήτην παρὰ Καρμάνορα ἀπετράποντο, τοὺς δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἐν τῇ Αἰγιάλειᾳ νόσος ἐπέλαβε· καὶ σφῶς ἐκέλευον οἱ μάντιες Ἀπόλλωνα ἰλάσασθαι καὶ Ἄρτεμιν. οἱ δὲ παῖδας ἑπτὰ καὶ ἴσας παρθένους ἐπὶ τὸν Σύθαν ποταμὸν ἀποστέλλουσιν ἰκετεύοντας· ὑπὸ τούτων δὲ πεισθέντας τοὺς θεοὺς φασὶν ἐς τὴν τότε ἀκρόπολιν ἔλθειν, καὶ ὁ τόπος ἔνθα πρῶτον ἀφίκοντο Πειθοῦς ἐστὶν ἱερὸν. τούτοις δὲ εὐοκίτα καὶ νῦν ἔτι ποιεῖται· καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸν Σύθαν ἴασιν οἱ παῖδες τῆ ἑορτῆ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, καὶ ἀγαγόντες δὴ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐς τὸ τῆς Πειθοῦς ἱερὸν αὐθις ἀπάγειν ἐς τὸν ναόν φασὶ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. “Going into the *agora* is a sanctuary of Persuasion; this too has no image (ἄγαλμα). Their worship of Persuasion was established in the following way. When Apollo and Artemis had killed Pytho they came to Aegialea for the purpose of purification. Terror having come upon them, at the place that is now called Fear, they turned away to Carmanor in Crete, and a plague struck the people of Aegialea. Seers ordered them to propitiate Apollo and Artemis, and they accordingly sent seven boys and seven maidens as suppliants to the river Sythas. They say that persuaded by these (sc. youths), the deities (τοὺς θεοὺς) came to what was then the acropolis, and the place that they reached first was the sanctuary of Persuasion. They enact analogous ceremonies at the present day; the children go to the Sythas at the festival of Apollo and having brought the deities to the sanctuary of Persuasion, they say that they take them back again to the temple of Apollo. See Frazer 1965: 3.53–9; Bettinetti 2001: 203–5. For the comparable Delphian festival regarding Apollo’s killing of Pytho and purification at Tempe, see Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 31b *ap.* Strab 9.3.11–12 C422; Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F 80 *ap.* Ael. *VH* 3.1; Plut. *Mor.* 293c; 418a–b with Burkert 1983: 127–9.

Apollo, Aigialeian youths lead images of Apollo and Artemis to the empty temple of Persuasion and then deposit the gods back in their individual temples.

The local Aigialeian worship of Apollo and Artemis was connected – presumably just like the local Thessalian worship of Apollo at Tempe – to the deities’ arrival and purification during a mandatory exile. The movement of the seven maidens and seven boys first at the river Sythas, then at the temple of Persuasion and finally at the temple of Apollo, would have symbolically mirrored the arrival of Aigialeian Apollo and Artemis from Delphi. This movement would have been enacted necessarily in a purely local context. That is, the transition of the images away from the temple of Apollo to the temple of Persuasion (which had no images) and then back again was the general expression of the temporary absence and then presence of the gods.

The Greek term for a procession was a *pompê*. It signified the process of communally “leading” or “moving” a god from point A to point B. The etymology of the word indicates how essential the object carried, either a god or a votive, was to the enactment of Greek processions. As Parker notes in reference to Athenian ritual: “all processions appear to have remained what they were etymologically, sendings (gifts) or escortings (divinities): they brought an offering to a god or took the god someplace.”³⁰⁰ The term is derived from πέμπω (to send) and denotes simultaneously the action of sending and escorting.³⁰¹ In its Homeric usage, the escorting is done by a powerful figure – divine or human – who aids or protects a weaker one. For example, the help provided to Odysseus by the Phaiakians is called both a *pompê* and a *nostos*.³⁰² In the *Iliad*,

³⁰⁰ Parker 2005: 179.

³⁰¹ For the etymology of *pompê*, see Bömer 1952 *RE s.v. Pompa*, cols. 1879–82; Chantraine 1968: 879–80; Graf 1996: 65–7; Kavoulaki 2011: 137–43 on Aesch. *Eum.* 1003–47.

³⁰² E.g. Hom. *Od.* 5.32, 173; 6.290; 7.171; 8.33, 568; 13.151, 176, 180.

Bellerophon travels to Lykia under the “blameless *pompê* of the gods.”³⁰³ Hermes is *pompos* – “guide” or “escort” – for Priam in his journey to Achilles, while Athena is “*pompos*” for Telemachus.³⁰⁴ Hypnos and Thanatos bring the corpse of Sarpedon back to Lykia as *pompoi*.³⁰⁵

The first use of *pompê* as a “procession” occurs in Heraclitus’ discussion of the phallographic worship of Dionysus. It is stated that “unless the people made the *pompê* to Dionysus and sang the hymn to the “shameful bits” (αἰδοίοισιν) it would be a very shameless deed.”³⁰⁶ We find processions such as the “*pompai* of Apollo that aid mortals” (Ἀπολλωνίαις ἀλεξιμβρότοις πεδιάδα πομπᾶς) and the “smoky *pompê* of flocks” (μήλων τε κνισάεσσα πομπά), which belongs to Tlepolemus, the founder of Rhodes.³⁰⁷ In Herodotus’ description of the debt of Greek religion to practices in Egypt, the historian starts with the importation of the “phallic procession” by Melampus (τὴν πομπὴν τοῦ φαλλοῦ), continues with the transmission of the divinatory practices of Egypt to Dodona and Delphi, and concludes with the statement that it was the Egyptians who taught the Greeks to march in procession.³⁰⁸

A focal point of the activities of a Greek festival was often the carrying of portable images. On Taenarum in Lakonia, there was a famous cult of Poseidon, which

³⁰³ Hom. *Il.* 6.171.

³⁰⁴ Hom. *Il.* 24.153, 182, 487. Cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 91; Soph. *OT* 1548; *Aj.* 832.

³⁰⁵ Hom. *Il.* 16.681. See also the presence of Athena as “escort” in depictions of the deeds of Herakles and Zeus and Aphrodite as the “escorts” of Helen and Paris in, respectively, Aesch. *Ag.* 747 and Eur. *Hel.* 1121. Connected to this meaning of divine “accompaniment” or “escort” is the common use of the term to mean an “escort” of friendly winds that propel a traveler home. For this usage, see Hom. *Od.* 4.362; Pin. *Nem.* 7.29; Eur. *IA* 352; 1234; *Hel.* 1073; *Phoen.* 1711.

³⁰⁶ Heraclitus fr. 15 *DK*: εἰ μὴ γὰρ Διονύσῳ πομπὴν ἐποιοῦντο καὶ ὕμνεον ἄισμα αἰδοίοισιν, ἀναιδέστατα εἴργαστ’ ἄν· ὠντὸς δὲ Αἰδῆς καὶ Διόνυσος, ὅτεωι μαίνονται καὶ ληναῖζουσιν.

³⁰⁷ Pin. *Pyth.* 5.91; *Ol.* 7.80.

³⁰⁸ Hdt. 2.58.1: πανηγύρις δὲ ἄρα καὶ πομπὰς καὶ προσαγωγὰς πρῶτοι ἀνθρώπων Αἰγύπτιοι εἰσι οἱ ποιησάμενοι. “The Egyptians were the first among men to establish religious assemblies (πανηγύρις), processions (πομπὰς), and leadings (προσαγωγὰς).” Cf. Lloyd 1988: 2.265–6. On the πανηγύρις, see Parker 2005: 164–5.

was likely Achaean or pre-Doric.³⁰⁹ We have notices of a connected festival called a Tainaria and officials or celebrants named *tainaristai*.³¹⁰ At Sparta, a group of first century BCE inscriptions lists officials of the cult, among whom are a “σιοφόρος” (divinity-carrier) and an individual named Agiteles who is “carrying the god” (σὶν φέρων).³¹¹ At Ainos in Thrace, a Hermes Perpheraios (“carried-around”) was worshipped. Local coinage, dating to the middle of the fifth century BCE, depicted images of a small-scale cult statue set in a block of wood and shaped like a pillar.³¹² According to Callimachus, this image of Hermes Perpheraios was sculpted by Epeios, the creator of the Trojan horse, but was swept away by the Scamander and carried to Ainos, where it was discovered by fishermen who drew it up in their net. Thinking it was useless, the fishermen cast it back into the sea, but miraculously it returned ashore, and a shrine was established for it upon the beach.³¹³ The name Perpheraios was further connected to the “carrying around” of the statue by the fishermen and its installation in the city center. The people offered their catch to the god, one handing him round to another (αὐτὸν πε[ριφέρω]ν)³¹⁴ and then received him into the city (εἰ[σεδέξαν]το τῆ πόλει) and worshipped him as equal to the gods (καὶ [π]αραπλησίως

³⁰⁹ Paus. 3.25.4. On the cult generally, see Thuc. 1.128.1; 33.1; Ael. *VH* 6.7; Paus. 4.24.5; 7.25.3 with Nilsson 1957: 67–9; Bettinetti 2001: 188–90.

³¹⁰ Hesych. *s.v.* ταινάριας, τ 33 Latte: *παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις ἑορτὴ Ποσειδῶνος· καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ Ταιναρισταί.* “A festival of Poseidon among the Lakedaemonians. The *Ταιναρισταί* are associated with this festival.”

³¹¹ *IG* V.1 212.56; 210.55; see also 211.51.

³¹² On Hermes Perpheraios generally, see Romano 1980: 155–60; Bettinetti 2001: 91–3; 189; Acosta-Hughes 2002: 294–300; Petrovic 2010.

³¹³ Callim. *Ia*. VII fr. 197 Pfeiffer with *Dieg.* VII. 32–4; VIII.1–51; cf. Acosta-Hughes 2002: 272–7.

³¹⁴ The supplement was suggested by Herzog and cited by Pfeiffer; see the apparatus of Acosta-Hughes 2002: 276.

τ[οῖς θεοῖς] ἐτίμων). The action of movement or “passing around” of the image of Hermes Perpheraios and then its subsequent installation implies that the statue was conducted or led into the city in an annual *pompê*.

Similarly, at Methymna on Lesbos,³¹⁵ Pausanias tells us that fishermen recovered a block of olive wood which was formed into the shape of a face (πρόσωπον ἐλαίας ξύλου πεποιημένον).³¹⁶ According to the story, the fishermen consulted the Delphic oracle and were directed to send a bronze copy to Delphi and worship the block as the god “Dionysus Phallen” (Φαλλῆνα). We find the phrase “the carrying round of the image (*agalma*) at the Dionysia” (ἐν τοῖς Διονυσίοισι πρὸ τᾶς τῶ ἀγάλματος περιφοράς) in a Methymnian inscription.³¹⁷

The connection between reenacted dedication and the historical “arrival” of the god was occasionally explicit. Late in the third century BCE, the inhabitants of Magnesia on the Meander rebuilt their monumental temple to Artemis Leukophryene.³¹⁸ A pair of religious decrees belonging to the period of renovation contain instructions for the institution (or re-institution) of a new-years or inaugural festival (Ἰσιτήρια) to be performed at Magnesia.³¹⁹ The first decree provided for the installation of a cult statue of

³¹⁵ See Nilsson 1957: 282–3; Burkert 1983: 202–5; Bettinetti 2001: 96–7, 189. For the etymology of the name Φαλλῆνα, see Nilsson 1955: 593n6.

³¹⁶ Paus. 10.19.3. Cf. Anonymous on Lesbos *FGrH* 479 F 2b *ap.* Oinomaeus in Euseb. *Evang. Prep.* 5.36 with Parke and Wormell 1956: 136n337; Fontenrose 1978: 347.

³¹⁷ *IG* XII.2 503.10.

³¹⁸ The name “white brow” refers to a topographical location; cf. Rigsby 1997: 179. On Magnesia on the Meander and Artemis Leukophryene, see Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.19; DS 11.57-8; 14.36; Paus. 1.26.4; 3.18.9; Plut. *Them.* 29-30.3; Tac. *Ann.* 3.62.1; Vitruv. *De arch.* 3.2.6.

³¹⁹ See Rigsby 1997: 179–90; Bingöl 2007: 53–95; Chaniotis 2010: 4–5. The term *eisitêria* (“entering sacrifices” *sc.* ἱερά) refers primarily to the annual investiture of new eponymous magistrates: see *LSJ* s.v. εἰσιτήριος and εἰσιτητήρια; *Suda* s.v. εἰσιτήρια, εἰ 273 Adler: ἡμέρα ἑορτῆς, ἐν ἧ ἡ οἱ ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ πάντες προῖασιν: “A festival day on which all (magistrates) enter upon their invested power”; Dem. 19.190; *SEG* 33.115, with Chaniotis 2005: 45–6; Parker 2005: 434n64; Mikalson 2016: 4–5; 63–6. The renovation of the temple of Artemis coincided with an attempt to create panhellenic *stephanêphoric* games at Magnesia; see Rigsby 1997: 189–90; Sosin 2009. On the relationship of Magnesia on the Meander to Miletus and Ephesus in the Roman period, see Magie 1954: 78–9.

Artemis in the renovated temple alongside a series of subsequent requirements regarding the conduct of the annual festival commemorating this event (καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν μηνὶ Ἀρτεμισιῶνι τῆι ἕκτῃ).³²⁰ The second decree (which is only partly extant) referred back to the passing of the first decree and ordered the priests, dignitaries, and attendees to celebrate the festival according to previously established format.³²¹

The first decree was headed by a prescript, which states that the *stephanêphoros* of the Polykleidai (the highest ranking eponymous magistrate of Magnesia) – a certain Pythodelos – passed a motion concerning the installation of the *xoanon* of Artemis in a refurbished “Parthenon” (ὕπερ τῆς καθιδρύσεως τοῦ ξοάνου τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Λευκοφρυηνῆς εἰς τὸν κατεσκευασμένον αὐτῆι νῦν Παρθενῶνα). To this prescript was attached a prayer to the goddess Artemis Leukophryene and a list of procedures for the celebration of the festival of Artemis on the anniversary of her “installation” (καθιδρύσις) in the Parthenon. It is likely that the cult statue itself was modeled on that of Ephesian Artemis and included the characteristic chest protuberances, whether round breasts or bull-testes, of the famous *xoanon* at Ephesus.³²² According to the proclamation, on the sixth of Artemision, the *neôkoros* (warden or sacred officer of the temple), the priestess of Artemis, and the current *stephanêphoros*, would enact the “return” of the goddess to the Parthenon (συντελέσαι τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν τῆς θεοῦ εἰς τὸν Παρθενῶνα) on a day called “entering day,” that is, “new-years’ day” (τὴν δὲ ἡμέραν τήνδε ἀναδεδειχθαι εἰς τὸν ἀε[ὶ] χρόνον ἱερὰν προσαγορευομένην Ἰσιτήρια).³²³ The return (ἀποκατάστασιν) of the goddess would be accompanied by sacrifices (θυσίας), an “exodos” of women to the

³²⁰ LSAM 33a = *I.Magnesia* 100a = Donohue 1988: T 393.

³²¹ *I.Magnesia* 100b.

³²² For an attempt to recreate the formal features of the Magnesian *xoanon*, see Bingöl 2007: 65.

³²³ On *neôkoroî*, see *LSJ* s.v. νεωκόρος I, II.

temple precinct (γυναικῶν ἔξοδος εἰς τὸ ἱερόν), and hymns sung by a chorus of young girls led by the *neōkoros* (συντελείτω δὲ ὁ νεωκόρος καὶ χοροὺς παρθένων ἀΐδουσῶν ὕμνους).³²⁴ The *stephanêphoros* would organize the procession along with the *stephanêphoroi* of the previous year (πομπὴν συντελεῖν).

The inauguration or entrance (Ἰσιτήρια) of Artemis Leukophryene to be celebrated on the sixth of Artemision, likely was intended as a celebration of the anniversary of the original installation of the *xoanon* in the Parthenon. Furthermore, the bearing and dedication of the *xoanon* itself (or a copy) in the temple was an element of the festival proceedings. We know from a different decree concerned with the cult of Zeus Sosipolis at Magnesia, that the Magnesian *stephanêphoroi* would bear or “lead” images (*xoana*) of divinities in processions.³²⁵ This decree, which is dated to 197 BCE, directs the *stephanêphoros* to lead a procession carrying *xoana* of all twelve gods clothed in the finest garments and construct a *tholos* in the *agora* near the altar of the gods.

Often the culminating or original moment, which is ritually reenacted by the procession, is not an arrival from afar but is connected to some other important event. For example, the Plataian festival of the Daedala involved the fabrication, transportation, and cyclical re-dedication of multiple cult statues culminating in an evocation of the marriage of Zeus and Hera.³²⁶ According to the aetiological narrative given by Pausanias, after a fight with Hera, Zeus declared publicly that he was going to marry Plataia, a daughter of Asopos. He constructed a wooden cult image and started travelling with it in a wagon,

³²⁴ On the festival as a whole, see Nilsson 1957: 248–51; Dunand 1978.

³²⁵ SEG 15 667 = *I. Magnesia* 98 = Donohue 1988: T 362. On the cult of Zeus *Sosipolis*, see Nilsson 1957: 23–7; Chaniotis 2013: 36–7.

³²⁶ Paus. 9.3.3–8; Plutarch of Chaeronea *FGrH* 388 F 1 *ap.* Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 5–6. On the Daedala generally, see Nilsson 1957: 50–6; Burkert 1978: 132–4; Schachter 1981: 242–50; Avagianou 1991: 64–76; Bettinetti 2001: 121–3; Knoepfler 2001; Chaniotis 2002: 23–48; 2011: 264–5; Iverson 2007.

mimicking a wedding processions.³²⁷ Hera heard about his plan, but after discovering Zeus' "bride" was only a wooden image and not a woman, she was reconciled to Zeus. Accordingly, the Plataians celebrated the Daedala in order to commemorate this reconciliation because, "the men of old time gave the name of Daedala to cut images (*xoana*)."³²⁸ Every seventh year (the little Daedala) the Plataians would select and construct their *xoana* and then every sixtieth year (the Great Daedala), in concert with all of the major *poleis* of Boeotia, the statues would be prepared and adorned by the banks of the Asopos. The fourteen statues of the Great Daedala would be distributed by lot among the Plataians, Koroneians, Thespians, Tanagrans, Chaironeians, Orchomenians, Lebadeians, and Thebans while towns of lesser importance would pool their funds to construct communal images.³²⁹ The festival thus played a role in the organization and stratification of the differing constituent *poleis* of Boeotia within its *koinon*.³³⁰ The images, accompanied by a woman to act as bridesmaid, would be placed on a cart and driven from the river to a peak of Kithairon. There, each polis would build, dedicate, and then burn a huge wood and brush altar alongside the fourteen *daidala*. A cow would be sacrificed to Hera and a bull to Zeus.

This fabrication of multiple cult images is mirrored in the Dionysia on Delos, where a series of Hellenistic inscriptions describe an annual festival of Dionysus during

³²⁷ In Plutarch *FGrH* 388 F 1, the bride is named Daidale and Hera's attitude towards the festival is represented slightly differently; see Chaniotis 2002: 24–5.

³²⁸ Paus. 9.3.2: ἐπὶ ταύταις ταῖς διαλλαγαῖς Δαίδαλα ἐορτὴν ἄγουσιν, ὅτι οἱ πάλαι τὰ ξόανα ἐκάλουν δαίδαλα. "Concerning this reconciliation, they celebrate the Daedala festival, because the men of old called wooden images (ξόανα) *daidala*."

³²⁹ It would take 84 not 60 years for fourteen *xoana* to be created from little Daedala every six years. Many solutions have been proposed to solve this problem. See Iverson 2007: 402–8 on the views of, e.g. Nilsson 1957: 51; Schachter 1981: 248–9.

³³⁰ On this aspect of the festival, see Schachter 1981: 248–50; Chaniotis 2002: 36–7.

which an image (*agalma*) of the god was carried in a *pompê*.³³¹ At various points in time it was fitted with wooden wings (ξύλα εἰς πτέρυγας), drawn in a wooden cart (ξύλα εἰς τὸ φαλλαγωγεῖον) and dressed and painted.³³² Every year from at least 301 BCE (our first extant inscription), new funds were appropriated for the carving and decorating of a new *phallos*.³³³ It is unclear what happened to the previous *phalloi*, but presumably they were dedicated and housed in the temple of Dionysus. Indirect confirmation of the phallic worship of Dionysus on Delos comes from a choregic monument set up around 300 BCE by a certain Karystios, which consists of a huge stone phallus on top of a tall, square base with the front side inscribed with a bird with a *phallos* for a head.³³⁴

The most famous example of a moving statue signifying an “arrival” involves the *xoanon* and *phalloi* of Dionysus in Athens.³³⁵ Both major Attic Dionysian festivals, the Anthesteria and the Great Dionysia, provide significant, although keenly disputed, support for the manipulation of the statue. At the Anthesteria, there is evidence that a *katagôgia* (“leading down”) was enacted at some point during the three-day festival: a

³³¹ The image is called both a *phallos* and an *agalma*. The earliest inscription is *IG XI.2 144* (301 BCE). For the festival generally, see Vallois 1922; Nilsson 1957: 280–2; Romano 1980: 190–6. Vallois (1922: 95–6) presents a full list of the inscriptions mentioning the statue.

³³² For the wings, see *ID 372A.100* (c. 200 BCE); for the cart (φαλλαγωγεῖον), see *IG XI.2 144.34–5* (c. 301 BCE). For the painting of the statue, see *IG XI.2 144.35*. For the practice of dressing Greek cult statues generally, see Bettinetti 2001: 137–43

³³³ On certain of the inscriptions, the apparatus for carrying the statue is described as a projecting beam or yard-arm (κεραία). This item recalls both the *phallic* beam like images of Dionysus on the so-called Lenaian vases and also the ship-cart of the Anthesteria. For discussion see Vallois 1922: 96 with *LSJ s.v. κεραία* II 1, and, e.g. *IG XI.2 158.70*: εἰς τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Διονύσου κεραία. Romano 1980: 190 interprets the word as bone horn despite noting that the usual word for bone horn is κέρα. Vallois based his interpretation on a black-figure vase painting, which depicted a “type of sled” carried on the shoulders of celebrants bearing figures with poles for bodies and masks for heads. For discussion of the phallic worship of Dionysus, see Csapo 1997: 258–60, 265–79.

³³⁴ See Boardman 1992.

³³⁵ On the Anthesteria generally, see, e.g. Deubner 1966: 93–122; Hamilton 1992; Seaford 1994: 238–9; Parker 2005: 290–326. For the transported image specifically, see Nilsson 1916: 323–39 and Bettinetti 2001: 191–8.

Roman era decree confirms the existence of the event.³³⁶ Furthermore, this *katagôgia* of Dionysus at Anthesteria has been connected to evidence with the famous “ship cart” of Dionysus.³³⁷ At Smyrna, “a trireme raised into the air is escorted into the agora which the priest of Dionysus steers like a helmsman with its lines loose from the sea.”³³⁸ Many scholars have connected this ship cart in an Ionian festival not only to the *katagôgia* of the Anthesteria at Athens, but to the so-called *hieros gamos* of Dionysus and Ariadne.³³⁹ For example, according to Deubner, Dionysus would process from his temple at Limnai (the marshes) in his wheeled ship-cart towards a building called the *boukoleion* in order to consummate his marriage with the priestess called the basilinna.³⁴⁰ The ceremony would be enacted by a priest dressed as the god riding on a cart, which would be pulled through the street carrying celebrants hurling ritual insults.³⁴¹

The great Dionysia at Athens, which took place the month after Anthesterion (late March), provides alternate evidence for a moving cult image of Dionysus at Athens.³⁴² An ephebic inscription from the late second century BCE informs us that at some point during the festival, the image of Dionysus Eleuthereos was “led in” (εἰσήγαγον) to a

³³⁶ *IG* II² 1368 .111–17. Cf. *LSAM* 37.19–34 (third-century BCE from Priene): ἐχέτω δὲ καὶ στολὴν ἣν ἂμ βούληται καὶ στέφανον χρυσοῦν μῆνα Ληναίων καὶ Ἀνθεστηριῶνα, καὶ τοῖς καταγωγίοις καθηγήσεται τῶν συγκαταγόντων τὸν Διόνυσον. “let him have also the robe he wishes and a golden crown in the month of Lenaion and Anthesterion and at the *katagôgia* he will lead those bringing home Dionysus.” Cf. Pickard-Cambridge 1968: 8, T 32–5; Hamilton 1992: T 32–5.

³³⁷ See Boardman 1958 on the iconography of the ship cart.

³³⁸ Philostrat. *Vit. Soph.* 1.25.1 = Hamilton 1992: T 75. On the Smyranean festival, see Nilsson 1957: 267–9; Sourvinou-Inwood 2005: 155–6. On the Attic black-figure *skyphoi*, which show Dionysus accompanied by flute-playing satyrs riding in a cart modified to look like a ship, see *LIMC* s.v. Dionysus 827–9 Veneri 1986; Deubner 1966: plates 11, 1; Parker 2005: 303, fig. 19.

³³⁹ E.g. Deubner 1966: 103–4 with [Dem.] 59.73–8 = Hamilton 1992: T 66. Parker 2005: 302–3 is agnostic concerning the ship-cart’s native festival.

³⁴⁰ For Dionysus of Limnai, see Ath. 11.465a = Hamilton 1992: T 3.

³⁴¹ Deubner 1966: 103 with, e.g. Harp. s.v. πομπείας καὶ πομπεύειν, π 80 Keaney.

³⁴² For the movement of the image at the Dionysia specifically, see Nilsson 1916: 326–8. See, generally, Deubner 1966: 138–42; Pickard-Cambridge 1968: 57–66; Parke 1977: 125–9; Seaford 1994: 235–57; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a: 67–140.

temple in the neighborhood of the Academy – on the road to the Boeotian town Eleutherae – and placed by the hearth (ἑσχάρα) located there.³⁴³ Hymns were sung and sacrifices offered to the god; afterwards, in a torchlight procession, the image was likely ferried back to a small limestone temple of Dionysus just south of the theater.³⁴⁴ Despite the uncertainty surrounding this ritual movement, it is certain that the transportation of the image was considered to be a reenactment of his “original” arrival from the Boeotian border-lands; this arrival was, in turn, connected to the origin story of the *phallophoric* worship of Dionysus.³⁴⁵ There was a fundamental affinity between the processing or bearing of *phalloi* in the *pompê* and the transport of the cult image of Dionysus Eleuthereos: both would have recalled the placating of the god after his original arrival in Athens³⁴⁶ and all gifts to Dionysus were considered to be images of, or “similar to,” the god.³⁴⁷

Stories mythologizing and celebrating the acquisition or “arrival” of a cult statue without a description of a literal *pompê* are common. It is a normal case that the mass of

³⁴³ Paus. 1.29.2: καὶ ναὸς οὐ μέγας ἐστίν, ἐς ὃν τοῦ Διονύσου τοῦ Ἐλευθερέως τὸ ἄγαλμα ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος κομίζουσιν ἐν τεταγμέναις ἡμέραις. “There is a small temple, into which every year on arranged days they carry the image (ἄγαλμα) of Dionysus Eleuthereos.”

³⁴⁴ *IG* II² 1006.12–13: εἰσήγαγον δὲ [κ]αὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσχάρας εἰς τὸ θέατρον μετὰ φωτὸς. “They carried in Dionysus from the hearth to the theater with torches.” On this passage see Deubner 1966: 139; Pickard-Cambridge 1968: 60–1; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a: 69–70; Warford 2015: 98–106. See also *IG* II² 1011.11 (c. 106–5 BCE): εἰσήγαγον δὲ καὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ἀπὸ [τ]ῆς ἐσχάρας θύσαντες τῷ θεῷ [κα]ὶ ἀνέθηκαν φιάλην κατασκευάσαντ[ες τ]ῷ θεῷ ἀπὸ δραχμῶν ἑκατόν. “They carried in Dionysus from the hearth after they had sacrificed. They then having prepared a cup worth one hundred drachmae, dedicated it.”

³⁴⁵ It is possible that the act of transport was distinguished from the Dionysia as a whole or the *pompê* specifically: see Pickard-Cambridge 1968: 60–2; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a: 91–8; Paga 2012: 384 with Dem. 22.10. Seaford 1994: 239; 241–4, following Graf, connected the movement of the procession strictly with their different destinations: “outward procession, sacrifice and return to town.” On the iconography of the images connected to the famous “Lenaian vases,” see Romano 1980: 74–8; Sourvinou-Inwood 2005: 213–8.

³⁴⁶ See Pickard-Cambridge 1968: 62.

³⁴⁷ Cf. *IG* II² 2948, a second-century BCE Attic inscription which lists private gifts presented to Dionysus. These include ξόαν’ εἴκελά σοι. That is, *xoana* that are “similar to you (*sc.* Dionysus).” Cf. Donohue 1988: 61–2, T 399.

traditions, which grew up around the manipulation and movement of cult statues, are the mundane counterparts to such events and help to establish their significance. For example, “arriving” images were often claimed to have fallen from heaven or have been gifted magically to the community.³⁴⁸ Sometimes, the sense of mystery or uncanniness surrounding the suddenness of the arrival could be connected to traditions in which the statue arrived out of the depths of the sea, as at Methymna or Ainos.³⁴⁹

The Erythraean cult of Herakles was centered around a small (c. 0.5 m) statue, which was said to have emerged from the sea.³⁵⁰ The statue of the god autonomously sailed itself to the Ionian coast from Tyre, and both the Chians and the Erythraeans competed over its possession.³⁵¹ To decide the matter, it was decreed that women would have to cut off their hair and plait it into ropes to fish the god out of the sea and bring him on land. Thracian slave women cut off their hair, reeled in the statue to Erythrae and were rewarded with a central role in the worship of Herakles. The “secular” statue of the boxer Theagenes also assumes many of the characteristics of an arriving sacred statue. After the statue fell on an individual, it was tried in court, found guilty and “drowned” (submerged) in the sea. The Pythia subsequently declared that the statue was to be recovered, and, luckily, some fishermen happened to enmesh the statue in their nets. The image of

³⁴⁸ For example, the Trojan Palladion (before Odysseus and Diomedes stole it) was claimed to either have fallen from the sky or have been brought by Dardanus to Troy as Athena's or Zeus' gift. The origin from the sky is found in Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 179; *DH AR* 2.66.5; *Apollod. Bib.* 3.12.3; *Ov. Fast.* 6.421–5. The image as a gift from the gods is found in *DH AR* 1.68–72. The image of Artemis in *Eur. IT* 88, 977, 986 and Athena Polias in *Paus.* 1.26.6 were both “from heaven” (*diopetes*). The statue of Dionysus at Thebes in *Paus.* 9.12.4 is ζύλον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.

³⁴⁹ For this aspect of the images of Dionysus of Methymna and Hermes Perpheraios see Graf 1985: 300–7; Elsner 1996: 527–8; Bettinetti 2001: 91–9.

³⁵⁰ *Paus.* 7.5.5–8 describes the statue as “Egyptian in style”; for discussion, see Graf 1985: 296–313. Cf. also the diminutive Herakles Daktylos at Megalopolis in *Paus.* 8.31.3.

³⁵¹ In *Luc. Syr. D.* 7 the head of Osiris annually sails from Egypt to Byblos. Cf. the myths of Orpheus' head at Lesbos in, e.g. *Ov. Met.* 11.50–82; *Philostr. VA* 4.14.

Theagenes was hauled up from the sea, dedicated in its original *heroon* and sacrificed to “as a god.”³⁵²

The travels of a tiny votive image purchased at the famous sanctuary of Aphrodite on Paphos and carried to Naukratis give a sense of the scope of the myths that accreted around moving cult statues.³⁵³ Around the beginning of the seventh century, a certain Herostratos landed at Paphos on Cyprus and bought a tiny, span-sized (c. 15 cm) statuette (*ἄγαλμα*) of Aphrodite, which he then took with him on a voyage to Egypt. As he approached Egypt, a storm appeared, and the sailors prayed before the statue of Aphrodite who miraculously covered the ship with protective green myrtle.³⁵⁴ After Herostratos arrived safely at Naukratis, he sacrificed to the goddess, dedicated the statue to Aphrodite, and then feasted his *philoï* in the temple itself. Each participant was given a “Naukratite wreath.” Just as with a traditional cult statue, ritual feasting with the privileged *genos* and the naming of the sacred plant (among participants whom the archaic Athenians would call *orgeônes* or a *thiasos*), can be associated with the original arrival of the image.³⁵⁵

Of course, the most well-known examples of the transportation and arrival of a cult statue are much more grandiose than a single worshipper dedicating a small-scale *agalma* or driftwood washing up on the shore. In 204–5 BCE, the sacred stone of the

³⁵² See Paus. 6.11.6; Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 5.34 with Graf 1985: 302–3. For other examples of deadly falling statues, see Aris. *Poet.* 9.12; Theoc. *Id.* 23.60. For the image’s status “as a god” see Donohue 1997: 36.

³⁵³ Polycharmus *FGrH* 640 F 1 *ap.* Ath. 675f–6c.

³⁵⁴ For Aphrodite as a goddess of shores, the sea, and calming storms, see Nilsson 1957: 521–2.

³⁵⁵ On the *orgeônes*, see, e.g. Dig. 47.22.4; *IG* I³ 136; *IG* II² 1324; 1284; 1255–6 (the *orgeônes* of Bendis); Aesch. *Mysoi TrGF* fr. 144; *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 389; Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 35a with, e.g. Andrewes 1961; Parker 1996: 109–11; 337–40; Kearns 1989: 73–77; Lambert 1998: 46–9; Arnautoglou 2003: 31–58; Naiden 2013: 193–5. On the *thiasotai*, see *SEG* 44.60; 59.155 (Bendis); *IG* I² 2345 with Lambert 1999; Arnautoglou 2003: 61–5.

Magna Mater or Cybele was imported to Rome from either the Phrygian town of Pessinus (according to Livy, Strabo, and Valerius Maximus) or from Ida in the Troad (according to Ovid).³⁵⁶ In Livy's account, King Attalus I agreed to a request from Rome and the sacred stone was simply handed over. According to Ovid's much more florid telling, the goddess travelled in procession on a trireme from Crete to Cythera, thence to the mouth of the Tiber, and finally to the center of Rome. In both accounts, the ritual host of the goddess is specified in unusual terms; for Livy, the Roman possessor of the statue had to be the "best of the notable Romans" (*optimus bonorum*);³⁵⁷ for Ovid, the goddess must be received by one with "pure hands."³⁵⁸

Similarly, during the early Ptolemaic period, the cult of Sarapis was introduced to Alexandria from northern Anatolia.³⁵⁹ Athenodoros (as preserved in Clement) gives us four different variants for the context and cultural environment of the importation of the god. First, according to "some" the statue was a gift from the people of Sinope to Ptolemy II Philadelphus; second, "others" say that Sarapis was a Pontic idol and was carried in a ritual procession to Alexandria from Pontus. Third, according to a certain Isidoros, the statue was imported from the city of Antioch because local food supplies

³⁵⁶ Liv. 29.10.5, 11.7; Ov. *Fast.* 4.263–372; cf. Cic. *Har. resp.* 27–32; DS 34.33.2; Strab. 12.5.3 C567; Val. Max. 8.15.3; Sil. *Pun.* 17.3. See, e.g. Roller 1999: 263–86; for discussion in terms of the mobility of cult images, cf. Graf 1985: 304–6.

³⁵⁷ Liv. 29.14.10; the man in question is P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica.

³⁵⁸ A woman named Claudia Quinta took part in the procession, and, when the image was stranded in the Tiber, she helped move the goddess by praying and declaring her chastity; see Ov. *Fast.* 312–3. For Claudia Quinta who was probably a daughter of P. Claudius Pulcher (cos. 249 BC), see, generally, DS 34.33.2; Prop. 4.11.51–50; Plin. *HN* 7.120; Suet. *Tib.* 2.3; Val. Max. 1.8.11; Tac. *Ann.* 4.64.3. Graf (1985: 304–5) connected the challenge and confirmation of Claudia's chastity with the integration of "marginalized" figures into society. For discussion of the historical context see, e.g. Gruen 1992: 47–8; Burton 1996.

³⁵⁹ The sources are Tac. *Hist.* 4.83; Athenodoros of Tarsus *FGrH* 746 F 4 *ap.* Clem. Al. *Protr.* 4.48.2–6; Manetho *FGrH* 609 T 3 *ap.* Plut. *Mor.* 361–2a; cf. Hicks 2013. For the Ptolemaic worship of Sarapis specifically, see Fraser 1960. For the introduction or exportation of Sarapis to Delos in the Hellenistic period, see *IG* XI 4.1299 with Parker 1996: 216n68; 2017: 158–72.

were needed, and it was king Ptolemy who was positioned to provide them – in exchange, of course, for the gift of the statue. Finally, the origin of the statue of Sarapis is also associated with the legendary Egyptian pharaoh Sestrostis who was said to have imported the foreign sculptors responsible for manufacturing the image. In the variant of Sestrostis, the inclusion of a named creator and the concomitant rejection of an external origin for the statue serves as a compromise: the scenario provides a rationalized account of the origin of the god, while still maintaining the cult's antiquity and prestige. On the other hand, in Plutarch's account, we are told that it was Ptolemy I Soter (not his son) who saw a dream vision of the colossus of Pluton in Sinope, and this dream-image itself instructed the king to have itself carried as quickly as possible to Alexandria.³⁶⁰ Ptolemy obligingly sent servants who stole the statue and brought it away. A professional interpreter (ἐξηγητής) was then hired who confirmed to Ptolemy that the statue in Sinope was the one most like the one he saw in his dream. Only after being taken to Alexandria did it acquire the Egyptian name of Pluton, that is, Sarapis.

The introduction of Asclepius to Athens provides more detailed (albeit lacunose) evidence for our general picture of the “arrival” of a cult statue, and one, thankfully, well placed in the later fifth century.³⁶¹ The god Asclepius was introduced into Attica by a private citizen named Telemachus in 420/19 BCE. At the same time, the original sanctuary next to the theater of Dionysus was refurbished and an elaborate, new monument to the god was constructed. The dedication of the sanctuary, adjacent to a sanctuary of Pan and Aphrodite on the south side of the acropolis, included the

³⁶⁰ For the evidence for the (obviously contested) date of the origin or importation of the Ptolemaic cult of Sarapis, see Fraser 1972; McKenzie and Gibson 2004.

³⁶¹ See especially Clinton 1994; Parker 1996: 175–87; Wickkiser 2008: 62–76.

composition of a brief chronicle of the early years of the cult.³⁶² According to the very first entry of the chronicle, the god Asclepius was brought to Piraeus by Telemachus during the Great Mysteries, and then transferred to the city Eleusinion whence it eventually made its way to the acropolis in a wagon.³⁶³ Clinton argues that the image of the god processed in the wagon was a wooden statue, but it has long been asserted that it was a snake.³⁶⁴ It is likely that Telemachus himself was Epidaurian and that he brought the god to Athens with the help of his Epidaurian servants who were to minister the cult.³⁶⁵ If accurate, the arrival of the god thus took place in a context of private individual kinship and friendship relations as well as broader civic considerations.³⁶⁶ The status of relations with and control over Epidaurus were long a key strategic concern of Athenian policy and the importation of the cult was likely a signal of (perhaps renewed) closer relations between the two *poleis*.³⁶⁷ As with the case of the Roman importations of the Magna Mater and Sarapis, there are multiple available socio-political explanations for Asclepius' arrival in Athens at this particular point in time.³⁶⁸

³⁶² For the date and pre-420 BCE state of the sanctuary and the Ionic stoa, see Tomlinson 1969: 111–9; Hurwit 2004: 219–22. Telemachus' chronicle is spread across *IG II²* 4960–1 and *IG II²* 4963; see also *SEG* 25 226; 32 266. Cf. Aleshire 1991: 7–12; 72–3.

³⁶³ *IG II²* 4960.9–15. For the city Eleusinion and the Athenian welcome of Asclepius, see Miles 1998: 59–67.

³⁶⁴ *IG II²* 4960.11: δια[κόνον. Radt (*TrGF* IV p.57–8) assumes the presence of the snake and thus accepts the emendation of Körte, δια[κόνον: δ(ρ)ά[κοντα (cf. Clinton 1994: 24n20–2). At many *poleis* across the Greek world Asclepius was worshipped in the form of a snake. *E.g.* at Epidaurus Limeria the story of the god's arrival included a divine snake entering the city and seeking out his place of worship; see Paus. 3.23.7. See also *Ov. Met.* 15.622–744 for the Roman worship of the god as a snake.

³⁶⁵ See Clinton 1994: 18–21.

³⁶⁶ Cf. *Etym. Mag.* s.v. δεξιῶν, 256.6 Gaisford = *TrGF* IV T 67–73a, the famous story that Sophocles – referred to here as “Dexion” – hosted Asclepius and built an altar for him in his own house. For discussion, see Connolly 1998.

³⁶⁷ About a year after the founding of the sanctuary, the Eleusinian *genos* of the Kerykes disputed the allocation of the land with the Epidaurian Telemachus. On the Eumolpidae and Kerykes at Eleusis, see, *e.g.* Parker 1996: 177–8, 300–1; Blok and Lambert 2009: 114–19.

³⁶⁸ *E.g.* the peace of Nikias in 421 BCE could be presented as a relevant historical context for the arrival of the god. In the fifth century, non-Athenian branches of the Epidaurian cult of Asclepius were established at Sicyon and on Aegina; see Paus. 2.10.3; *Ar. Vesp.* 122.

Modalities of Movement: The Athenian Palladion

For various reasons, not every community wished to characterize the original, foundational moment of their divinity as an “arrival” and recapitulate it by the ritual processing of a cult statue from a foreign location. Athens separated the worship of their “arriving” divinity Dionysus from the worship of the autochthonous and stationary patron Athena who would receive her *peplos* at the great Panathenaia.³⁶⁹ How, then, are we to interpret the move of Dionysus Eleuthereos (“Liberating Dionysus”) from Boeotia into Athens at the great Dionysia? As a literal dedication or perhaps an arrival of a divinity from afar? It has not been lost on scholars that the institution (or elaboration) of the great Dionysia itself (safely placed at the end of the sixth century BCE), along with the concurrent birth of tragic performance, presumably bears a significant relation to the post-Cleisthenic self-image of the Athenian people as a free or democratic polity. That is, the event of the arrival of Dionysus to the theater at Athens and his corresponding departure from Boeotian Eleutherae signaled, in some way, the importation or creation of freedom itself.³⁷⁰ This observation must be balanced against (or combined with) the tradition that it was a certain Pegasus from Eleutherae who personally brought the *archaion xoanon* of Dionysus from Boeotia because the Athenians were smitten with a horrible disease of the genitals.³⁷¹ According to this story, Delphi prophesied to the men

³⁶⁹ On the ritual dressing of statues, see Romano 1980: 51–3; Barber 1992; Bettinetti 2001: 137–43.

³⁷⁰ See especially Seaford 1994: 243–8; Sourvinou-Inwood 1994: 272–5; 2003a: 72–5; Raaflaub 2000: 249–76. The traditional date of the founding of the Dionysia is Peisistratean (534 BCE). See, e.g. [Aris.] *Ath. Pol.* 3.3; 56.5; 57.1; Thuc. 2.15.4 with Pickard-Cambridge 1968: 57–8, 102; Shapiro 1989: 85–7; Parker 1996: 93–4. For the relevance of the specific location of Boeotian Eleutherae, see Ober 1985: 223 with Paus. 1.38.8: ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πεδίῳ ναός ἐστὶ Διονύσου, καὶ τὸ ξόανον ἐντεῦθεν Ἀθηναίοις ἐκομίσθη τὸ ἀρχαῖον. “In this plain (sc. of Eleutherae) is a temple of Dionysus, from which the old image (ξόανον) was carried off to Athens.” Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a: 73–5; 2005: 151–5 logically characterizes the event as a *xenismos* “welcoming” rite.

³⁷¹ Paus. 1.2.5. See also Paus. 1.38.8.

of Athens that because of their failure to worship Dionysus the only way to save themselves was to construct *phalloi* and worship the god by reenacting his sufferings.³⁷²

Religious rites, festivals, and communities change over time. Each community had the scope to create a unique modality for their “original” moment(s), depending on each’s particular history, characteristics, and circumstances.³⁷³ The co-identification of the movement of an “original” dedicator bringing a votive, and the “arrival” of the deity, or some other culminating moment, is partially a consequence of the necessarily close connection between a god and his or her representation, and (perhaps) the human tendency to assume that a personal representation would be the perfect gift for such a powerful patron. This “original” event was sometimes literally associated with a mythic ancestor bringing and dedicating an “original” statue. For example, the mythical Athenian Erisychthon was held responsible for importing the *xoanon* of Apollo from Attica to Delos.³⁷⁴ Along similar lines, Danaus was traditionally held responsible for dedicating both the original *xoanon* at the temple of Apollo Lykeios, and the *hedos* of Athena Lindia on Rhodes,³⁷⁵ while the statue of Zeus Herkios at Argos was said to have been brought from Troy by Sthenelos.³⁷⁶ On the acropolis of Sikyon, an image of Dionysus Lysios (the “deliverer” or “looser”) was said to have been brought by a certain

³⁷² ΣAr. *Ach.* 242a. The construction and bearing of multiple *phalloi* in a *pompê* concluding in the sacred precinct of Dionysus was certainly a part of some central portion the great Dionysia. For example, when the Athenian colony of Brea was established in 446–5 BCE, the colonists were required to bring a *phallos* to the Dionysia (*IG I³* 46.15–17 = *ML* 49.11–13, cf. Osborne and Rhodes 2017: 240–5). See Nilsson 1957: 263–4; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a: 75–8. In a similar vein, in the early fourth century, a decree of the second Athenian league required that Paros, as a colony of Athens, should bring a cow and a *phallos* to the Dionysia; see *SEG* 31 67.4–5.

³⁷³ Cf. Chaniotis 2011.

³⁷⁴ According to tradition, the statue was given to Ariadne by Daidalos. See Phanodemus *FGrH* 325 F 2; Paus. 1.18.5; 31.2; Plutarch of Chaeronea *FGrH* 388 F 1 = Donohue 1988: T 108. For Theseus, see Paus. 9.40.2.

³⁷⁵ For Apollo Lykeios, see Lykeas of Argos *FGrH* 312 F 2 *ap.* Paus. 2.19.5. For the dedication at the temple of Apollo Lindia, see Zeno of Rhodes *FGrH* 523 F 1 *ap.* DS 5.58.

³⁷⁶ For Zeus Herkios, see Paus. 2.24.34. For the Aphrodite at Patras, see Paus. 7.21.10.

Phanes before the Dorian invasion of Achaia.³⁷⁷ However, the trope of the ancient dedicator from a time long ago was often occluded, and the dedication was, in this case, simply cast as a divine “arrival” of the god. This situation of divine arrival, perhaps because of its lack of human actors, was more amenable to a universal application and thus more malleable or open to new applications. In these circumstances, it was left to the human authorities involved in the current ritual (the priests and priestesses) to promote and Moreover, these vague connections often provided the opportunity to reformulate the power dynamic and hierarchical structure of the worshipping community.

It follows that when the divinity concerned was deeply enmeshed in the self-image of the community – such as, for example, Athena at Athens – the details of this “original” arrival, whether considered to be the original votive brought by the forbear of a specific family, or the autonomous appearance of an omnipotent divinity, the moment was of extreme importance and was often contested. We shall see below that the manipulation of the *bretas* of Hera on Samos was intimately connected to the religious and cultural identity of the Samians. Similarly, on Rhodes, Danaus was considered to be the original dedicator of the statue of Athena Lindia,³⁷⁸ but alongside this claim, the records of the Lindian Chronicle also contained the dedications of mythological figures such as Herakles, Kadmus, and the Telchines as well as confirmed historical figures such as Darius and Ptolemy Soter.³⁷⁹ Simultaneously, the copy of Pindar’s seventh Olympian inscribed in golden letters in the temple hinted at a more general attempt to formulate the origin of Rhodes and worship of Athena Lindia in the context of the worship of Helios

³⁷⁷ Paus. 2.7.5.

³⁷⁸ See n63, n183 above.

³⁷⁹ Cf. Lind. Chron. *FGrH* 532 F 2 with Higbie 2003.

the sun god. The poem itself focuses on multiple, competing *ktistic* accounts: namely, the autochthonous birth of the island through the god Helios, the Heraklid claim of lineage of Tleptolemos, and the familial connections of the *laudandus* Diogenes.³⁸⁰ On the other end of the spectrum, Sparta, with its global narrative of Heraklid colonization and conquest, had no use for claims of autochthony. In many places such as Samos and Rhodes, perhaps because of a quirk of the historical record, or because of their inarguable status as islands open to foreign influence, we are aware of a more explicit integrative attempt to stitch together multiple narratives in festival performances. These narratives usually spanned both autochthonous and colonial perspectives.³⁸¹

Perhaps the best attested example of the dynamic nature of these mobile holy objects can be seen in the Trojan Palladion – perhaps the most famous example of a moving cult image in Greek culture.³⁸² Ostensibly a “cult statue” of Athena,³⁸³ the Palladion was originally located in Troy and associated with the protection of the city. The character of its use at Athens exemplifies the different and unexpected changes that a myth could undergo when transported to another community. It is a rich example of the variable aspects of a transfer of a cult statue, especially its relationship with an “original” moment – in this case, that of Athens.³⁸⁴ We will treat the variants of the myth in some

³⁸⁰ Pin. *Ol.* 7. The rhetoric of the poem modulates between Diagorid family history, Heraklid ideology, and the Rhodian worship of Helios. Cf. Sfyroeras 1993; Kowalzig 2007a: 226–57.

³⁸¹ On Samos see pp. 112–29 below.

³⁸² On the Palladion as a mobile cult statue, see Bettinetti 2001: 71–5. On its relationship to Athens, see Sourvinou-Inwood 2011: 225–46.

³⁸³ Cf. Hdt. 4.189.2: ἐκ Λιβύης ἦκει ἡ στολή τῶν Παλλαδίων. Here the *palladia* refer to general images of Athena.

³⁸⁴ The best treatment of the Athenian Palladion is Sourvinou-Inwood 2011: 225–62. However, her contention that the myth of the Palladion had no significant relationship to cult in Athens is at odds with the interpretation presented below.

detail because, taken together, they provide a template for the recurring elements of a story pattern with the theft, movement, and retrieval of a religious statue at its core.

Uniquely, because of the generality of the epic cycle, the ambivalence of the Palladion gives expression to the point of view of both the losing Trojans and the acquiring Greeks. There were two main mythological episodes that explicitly involved the statue: first, that it was stolen by Odysseus and Diomedes, and second, that the priestess Cassandra was supplicating it when she was raped by the lesser Ajax during the sack.³⁸⁵ The story of the theft by Diomedes and Odysseus and Cassandra's rape together serve to highlight the dispositive nature of a cult statue: plainly, you either had it or you did not.³⁸⁶ A priestess such as Cassandra and cult image such as the Palladion share an important trait: they both were objects capable of being appropriated.³⁸⁷ The theft and the rape together thus form a pair. Broadly, the action keys in on shifts of allegiance by Athena from opposed points of view: the conquering Greeks and the defeated Trojans. For the Trojans, the shift is from protector to destroyer; for the Greeks it is from champion to vengeful enemy.

Athena's most prominent role in the *Iliad* is as a champion of the Greeks. She provides Diomedes with divine strength during his *aristeia*, and when the priestess Theano presents Athena (and her image) with an intricately woven *peplos* and asks for

³⁸⁵ For Cassandra and the Palladion, see, e.g. *Iliupersis* Arg. 23–7 EGF; Alc. fr. 298 V; Soph. *Ajax the Locrian TrGF* fr. 10–18. The most complete physical description of the statue is Apollod. *Bib.* 3.12.3: ἦν δὲ τῷ μεγέθει τρίπηχυ, τοῖς δὲ ποσὶ συμβεβηκός, καὶ τῇ μὲν δεξιᾷ δόρυ διηρμένον ἔχον τῇ δὲ ἐτέρᾳ ἠλακάτην καὶ ἄτρακτον. “It was three cubits high with its feet joined together; in its right hand it held an upraised spear, and in the left a distaff and spindle.” For the formal features of the statue, see Castiglione 2015.

³⁸⁶ On a felt dissonance between the two variants, see Sourvinou-Inwood 2011: 230–4.

³⁸⁷ Cf. *Iliupersis* Arg. 23–5 EGF where Ajax steals the literal *xoanon*, not Cassandra. See Castiglione 2015: 441–2 and pp. 157–67 below for discussion of *hierosylia* with the priestess as object. The iconography emphasizes a parallelism between Athena herself, the *xoana*, and Cassandra. Cf. *LIMC* s.v. Aias II 336–51, Touchefeu 1981; s.v. Kassandra I 956–70, Paoletti 1994; Platt 2011: 93–100; Marconi 2011.

protection from the rampaging hero, the goddess denies the prayer.³⁸⁸ However, in the aftermath of the sack of Troy – a portion of the epic cycle not covered by the *Iliad* – the goddess’ allegiance is reversed. According to the *Iliupersis* of Arctinus, Athena disperses and destroys the Greek fleet because Ajax was not sufficiently punished for the rape of Cassandra.³⁸⁹ The goddess now protects the Trojans and harms the Greeks; this switch is sudden but not incomprehensible. Athena’s double role reflects the tenuous relationship of a besieged city to its gods. Just as the inhabitants of a city under attack could not be certain of their own survival, they could not be certain of the allegiance of their local deities who in the event of defeat would have “deserted” to the side of the victor.³⁹⁰

The uncertain possession of the Palladion represents the uncertainty of maintaining a god’s – any god’s – goodwill. The material nature of a cult statue inherently allows the object to be possessed and manipulated by different parties, but this possession was framed in terms of anthropomorphic, truly human qualities. Thus, possession of the goodwill of Athena, represented by the physical possession of her cult statue, marked not only the superiority of the conquerors in the eyes of the gods, but it also served as a reminder that, even for the victor, overconfident hubris and lack of piety would not go unpunished. The central theme of the *Iliupersis* tells us that even the victor cannot act hubristically and ignore the moral laws of the gods that are universal. It is an indication of the complexity and depth of the Greek cycle that possession of a single object – the Trojan Palladion – can represent the viewpoint both of the victor and of the vanquished.

³⁸⁸ Hom. *Il.* 6.93. On the posture of the Iliadic statue, see, e.g. Ridgeway 1977: 135–9; Romano 1980: 3; 91–9; Burkert 1985: 88–92.

³⁸⁹ *Iliupersis* Arg. 30–2 *EGF*; cf. Soph. *Ajax the Locrian TrGF* fr. 10–18.

³⁹⁰ Cf. Lefkowitz 1989: 73–4; Mikalson 1991: 152–7 on this dynamic as presented in Eur. *Tro.*

In the late fifth century, the theft of the Palladion was well known. It was a popular subject both for Athenian vase painters³⁹¹ and for dramatization on the tragic stage,³⁹² but there is no extant play concerning the theft, and not even a full classical synopsis of the myth.³⁹³ For a cohesive narration we are reliant on Apollodorus and the epitome of Lesches' *Ilias Parva* from Proclus' *Chrestomathia*, as found in Photius.³⁹⁴ Almost always it is the pair – Diomedes and Odysseus³⁹⁵– who make off with the statue (as in Apollodorus), but in some variants the thief is Odysseus alone. There was said to be a different, separate solo spy mission where Odysseus encountered and was denounced by Helen only to be saved by Hecuba³⁹⁶ or where he met and plotted with Helen about the sacking of the city and the theft of the Palladion. This mission is routinely combined with the theft as in the *Ilias Parva* of Lesches where Odysseus first “disfigures himself and enters Troy to reconnoiter.” He is then recognized by Helen and comes to some sort of agreement; only afterwards does he bring the Palladion out of Troy with Diomedes.

³⁹¹ LIMC s.v. Aias II 16–108, Touchefeu 1981; s.v. Athena 67–117, Demargne 1984; s.v. Diomedes 23–40, Boardman/Vafopolou–Richardson 1986.

³⁹² Cf. especially, Soph. *Lakainai TrGF* fr. 367–9a, and *Ajax the Locrian TrGF* fr. 10–18. Cf. Aris. *Poet.* 1459b6 on the ten tragedies taken from the *Il. Parv.*, which included a Πτωχεία (likely Odysseus as a beggar).

³⁹³ Sources for the theft of the Palladion include: *Il. Parv.* Arg. 23–4 EGF; *Iliupersis* dub. fr. 1 EGF ap. DH AR 1.68.2; Eur. *Rhes.* 499–509; Soph. *Lakainai TrGF* fr. 367–9a; Apollod. *Epit.* 5.10; 12–13; Conon *FGrH* 26 F 1.34; Quint. Smyrn. 10.350–60; Verg. *Aen.* 2.162–70; Serv. *Aen.* 2.166; Dictys Cretensis 5.8, Eizenhut; Malalas *Chron.* 109–11, Dindorf; *Suda* s.v. παλλάδιον, π 34 and Διομήδειος ἀνάγκη, δ 1164 Adler; Hesych. s.v. Διομήδειος ἀνάγκη, δ 1881 Latte; ΣΠ. *Resp.* 493d.

³⁹⁴ Apollodorus dates to the second, Proclus to the fifth, and Photius to the ninth centuries CE.

³⁹⁵ The pair are associated with multiple adventurous episodes besides the theft of the Palladion, e.g. the Doloneia of *Il.* 10, the murder of Palamedes (see Gantz 1993: 603–8), and the famous acquisition of Philoktetes from Lemnos.

³⁹⁶ Eur. *Hec.* 239–50; Cf. *Rhes.* 499–509.

In *Odyssey* 4, Helen and Menelaus narrate to Telemachus different variants of Odysseus' encounter with Helen during the war.³⁹⁷ After administering the *nêpenthês* drug, Helen recounts that Odysseus entered Troy as a beggar, where she alone recognized him and then let him go free. However, according to Menelaus, Helen's meeting with Odysseus took place when she mimicked the voices of the wives of the Greek heroes in an attempt to reveal their hiding places in the Trojan horse. We find that in the parallel narrations of the appropriation of the Palladion that display a Roman bias, it is Aeneas, not Odysseus and Diomedes who were said to convey the Palladion away from Troy.

Despite the variation in the identity of the thieves, the object in question is, of course, always the Palladion of Troy: a statue of Athena, which protected the Trojans and whose theft was prophesied to signal the downfall of the city.³⁹⁸ The statue had magical qualities: it was said to cause blindness;³⁹⁹ according to a certain Dionysius of Samos, it was constructed from the bones of the hero Pelops.⁴⁰⁰ We also find that there is a recurring uncertainty as to whether the statue stolen from Troy was the "real" Palladion or not. In the variant given by the mythographer Conon,⁴⁰¹ inside Troy, Diomedes climbed up on the shoulders of Odysseus in order to scale the wall of the temple, and once inside, refused to draw his comrade up after him. Diomedes was thus able to steal the Palladion by himself and, on the way back, he attempted to trick Odysseus by pretending that the image he had taken was not the true one. Odysseus however, saw the

³⁹⁷ Hom. *Od.* 4.240–56; 265–89. Cf. Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988: 208–9; Schmiel 1972a; Blondell 2013: 73–89.

³⁹⁸ According to Conon *FGrH* 26 F 1.34 and Quint. Smyrn. 10.343–61, Helenus provided the information that the fall of Troy was dependent on the theft of the Palladion.

³⁹⁹ Derkyllus *FGrH* 288 F 3 *ap.* Plut. *Mor.* 309e–f; cf. Paus. 2.24.2; cf. also the blindness of Diomedes cured by Athena in Hom. *Il.* 5.121–7.

⁴⁰⁰ Dionysius of Samos *FGrH* 15 F 3 *ap.* Clem. Al. *Protrep.* 4.47.6.

⁴⁰¹ Conon *FGrH* 26 F 1.34.

statue twitch in indignation, and thus realized that it was the true image.⁴⁰² According to another version, Aeneas was able to remove the images of the Trojan gods (here called *penates*) and “a” Palladion to take back to Rome, because Diomedes and Odysseus had stolen only *one* of the images of Athens.⁴⁰³ Dionysius also tells us that on account of precautions taken by the Trojans, Diomedes, and Odysseus actually took the *wrong* statue, and it was because of this mistake that Aeneas was able to take the true Palladion with him back to Italy.

The thieves of the Palladion often had inside help. It was usually Helen who opened the doors of the temple to Odysseus and Diomedes and allowed the Palladion to be taken.⁴⁰⁴ Her role in their infiltration of Troy goes back to our earliest textual sources, and she is present in every episode in which Odysseus ventures inside the walls of Troy.⁴⁰⁵ These include the solo mission to Hecuba, the theft of the Palladion, and the ambassadorial mission at the beginning of the war to request Helen back from the Trojans (the *apaitesis*).⁴⁰⁶ Sometimes she specifically allows the Palladion to be taken; sometimes she gives illicit information to Odysseus. Occasionally, in late sources, it is the Trojan Antenor⁴⁰⁷ and his wife Theano who help Odysseus and Diomedes procure the

⁴⁰² See *Suda s.v. παλλάδιον*, π 34 and Διομήδειος ἀνάγκη, δ 1164 Adler; Hesychius *s.v. Διομήδειος ἀνάγκη*, δ 1881 Latte; ΣΠΙ. *Resp.* 493d.

⁴⁰³ *Iliupersis* dub. fr. 1 *EGF ap.* DH AR 1.67–9. On multiple palladia, see Sourvinou-Inwood 2013: 232–46.

⁴⁰⁴ Louden 2011: 106–11 compares the roles of Helen and Theano in the Trojan War with Rahab’s in the Old Testament.

⁴⁰⁵ *E.g.* Sophocles (*Lakainai TrGF* fr. 367–9a, “the Laconian Women” *i.e.* the servants of Helen) mentions a trip through the muck and mire of a sewer – a detail that is subsequently mentioned in Servius and must belong to an infiltration of Odysseus (and probably) Diomedes.

⁴⁰⁶ Hom. *Il.* 3.203–24; 11.138–42; Soph. *Apaitesis TrGF* fr. 176–8; Bacch. 15; *Cypria* Arg. 72–4 *EGF*. While not an act of duplicity as such, the *apaitesis* has elements in common with Odysseus’ more secret exploits.

⁴⁰⁷ The choice is not completely surprising. Antenor had a both a long history of good relations with the Greeks and a complicated relationship to Troy. In the *Iliad*, like Nestor, he is characterized by his justice and wisdom in counsel. For example, he advised that Helen should be returned (Hom. *Il.* 7.347) and was a model of propriety during the *apaitesis* (Hom. *Il.* 3.207). However, he later appeared as a traitor to the Trojan cause and became involved in the theft of the Palladion (*i.e.* in the chronicle of Malalas).

Palladion.⁴⁰⁸ For example, during the *apaitesis*, it was Antenor and his wife, Theano the priestess of Athena, who hosted the Greeks. In Bacchylides' treatment of the myth, Theano opened the doors of the temple of Trojan Athena to Menelaus and Odysseus. The presence of Athena's temple is somewhat puzzling in the context of a request for Helen.⁴⁰⁹ A likely explanation is that the diplomacy of the *apaitesis* and the interaction between Odysseus and Theano was – at some point – felt to involve the priestess' Homeric duties as guardian of the sacred Palladion and thus to play some part in the theft of the statue.⁴¹⁰

The subsequent fate of the image is no less complex: the communities of Rome, Athens, Argos, and even Sparta claimed that the Palladion made its way to their city according to each city's complex system of local traditions. The Roman tradition held that after the sack, Aeneas succeeded in rescuing the statue and conveyed it away with him to Italy, where he then deposited it in the temple of Vesta at Rome.⁴¹¹ In the variant

Occasionally, he even brandished the signal torch for the Greeks to attack the city, and opened the wooden horse and the gates of Troy (DH *AR* 1.46; Serv. *Aen.* 2.15). After the sack, he usually remained in Troy, ruling there (Dictys Cretensis 5.17, Eizenhut). In Pindar he traveled with Helen to Cyrene and their descendants were worshiped by the ruling Battiadai (see, e.g. Pin. *Pyth.* 5.80–5 with the scholia including Lysimachus *FGrH* 382 F 6). According to another variant he is said to have emigrated with the Enetiens to Thrace and Venetia and to have founded Patavium (Strab. 12.3.8 C544; Liv. 1.1; Verg. *Aen.* 1.242).

⁴⁰⁸ E.g. Malalas *Chron.* 109.10–14 Dindorf: τοῦτο δὲ τὸ βρέτας (*sc.* the Palladion) Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ Διομήδης ἔκλεψαν κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ Ἀντήνορος, ἐξάρχου τῶν Τρώων, οὐτινος ἢ γυνή, ὀνόματι Θεανώ, ἦν ἱέρεια τῆς Παλλάδος, ὅπου τὸ αὐτὸ βρέτας ἀπέκειτο, εἰσελθόντες νυκτὸς οἱ περὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα καὶ Διομήδην ἐν τῇ Τροίῃ, καὶ παρακοιμηθέντες εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Παλλάδος, ὅτε τὰς ἐορτὰς τῶν ἀναθημάτων εἶχον οἱ Φρύγες καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες. “Odysseus and Diomedes stole the Palladion according to the plan of Antenor, leader of the Trojans whose wife was Theano, priestess of Athena. At the time the Phrygians and the Greeks were celebrating the festivals of dedications the band with Odysseus and Diomedes came into Troy by night where the statue was housed and were hidden in the temple.” Cf. *Suda s.v. παλλάδιον*, π 34 Adler; Dictys Cretensis 5.8, Eizenhut.

⁴⁰⁹ Bacch. 15.1–7; see Fearn 1997: 267–9. Jebb 1905: 363 explained Odysseus and Menelaus' presence at the temple of Athena thus: “Probably she has taken them thither in order that they may supplicate Athena to prosper their mission. Their hospitable reception at the house of Antenor is presupposed.” Fearn 1997: 278 interprets the presence of Theano at the *apaitesis* in terms of Bacchylides' interaction with the mythic background of the *Illiad*.

⁴¹⁰ See Cole 2008: 66–9 for a felt division in myth between “good” and “bad” Greek temple priestesses.

⁴¹¹ E.g. Ov. *Fast.* 6.419–46 with *Met.* 13.335–56; DH *AR* 2.66.5.

given by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Aeneas removed the images of the Trojan gods and “one of the remaining Palladia.”⁴¹² Another variant holds that it was Diomedes – also a prominent figure in Roman foundation myth – who, after bringing the statue to Italy, was convinced by Aeneas to give up the statue to its rightful owner, that is, Aeneas himself.⁴¹³ Once in possession of the image, Aeneas remembered the oracle, which demanded he stop whenever he had eaten his “tables”; he brought out the statues, prepared high pedestals and altars for them, and instituted sacrifices and female choruses. The general context of these ceremonies, while not specifically linked with the Palladion, implies rites of consecration for both the statue and the specific land that the statue protects. At Argos, the statue that was processed and ritually washed by the banks of the Inachus was identified with the Trojan Palladion. The scholiast to Callimachus’ *Bath of Pallas* tells us that a priest named Eumedes dedicated the statue on the acropolis of Argos after he was suspected of planning to betray the city to the returning Herakleidai.⁴¹⁴ Plutarch tells a similar story in which a certain Erginos was persuaded by Temenos (grandson of Herakles) – for reasons unknown – to steal the Palladion from Argos. Subsequently, after a quarrel amongst the conspirators, Leagros took the statue to Sparta where it was installed alongside a temple of Odysseus.⁴¹⁵ Strikingly, the Palladion is consistently linked with changes of sovereignty or hegemony.

⁴¹² *Iliupersis* dub. fr. 1 *EGF ap.* DH AR 1.67–9.

⁴¹³ See, e.g. Serv. *Aen.* 2.166; Sil. *Pun.* 13.51–78; first Vatican mythographer 40, 142, Bode. For Diomedes worship as a god in Italy, see Strab. 6.3.9 C284 with Malkin 1998: 234–57; for his further relations with Aeneas, see Verg. *Aen.* 11.243–95 and Paus. 1.11.7.

⁴¹⁴ ΣCallim. *Hymn* 5.37 in Bulloch 1985: 104. For the possible location of the temple on the Larissa hill, see Vollgraff 1929 = *SEG* 11 314.

⁴¹⁵ Plut. *Mor.* 302d; cf. Paus. 2.23.5. Odysseus was selected for this honor because of his role in the theft of the statue from Troy.

The Athenian case is in some ways the strangest. The Palladion was singularly unsuited for use at the center of an origin story or *aition* at Athens, presumably because the mythology of Attic origins called for autochthony.⁴¹⁶ The myth that included the arrival of the Attic Palladion is a relatively minor one and thus most likely represents a correspondingly opaque event in Athenian religious life. There was no desire among the Athenians to claim the arrival of the statue (or any other outside event) as an *ur-*foundation moment. Nevertheless, the Palladion held unquestionably a unique place in the religious “imaginary” of the city: primarily, the statue was felt to embody a certain equivalence with Athena Polias, the ancient cult image of Athena.

The image of Polias was integral to both the yearly and greater Panathenaia – the inaugural event in the classical Athenian religious calendar.⁴¹⁷ The central event of the festival was when a newly woven *peplos* was presented to the goddess and placed on her knees. This unspoken connection between the Polias statue and the Palladion is most strongly felt in book 6 of the *Iliad* where the unnamed statue, simply referred to as “Athena” received the prayers of the Trojan women and rejected them. Just as the priestesses of the greater Panathenaia presented a *peplos* to Athena Polias, in the *Iliad*, Theano lay a *peplos* over the knees of Trojan Athena.⁴¹⁸ The identification of this passage as a direct allusion to the Panathenaia is debatable.⁴¹⁹ What is clear, however, is that this

⁴¹⁶ The myth’s centrality to Homeric myth is a possible explanation for this phenomenon. The sheer number of *poleis* that claimed to possess the Palladion, as well as the marginality or localism of their associated myths compared with the rape of Cassandra and the theft, point to its broad geographical relevance.

⁴¹⁷ On the Panathenaia, see Neils 1992b; Deubner 1966: 22–34; Brelich 1969: 312–48; Parker 1996: 89–92; 2005: 253–6. On the *peplos* in particular, see Barber 1992.

⁴¹⁸ *Il.* 6.86–98, 286–31; cf. Kirk 1990: 164–8, 198–201; Latacz and Bierl *BK* IV 2.37–42, 99–107; Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 99–101, 154–66. On the lack of a word for statue in the passage, see Bettinetti 2001: 25–8; Marconi 2011: 159.

⁴¹⁹ For discussion, see Kirk 1990: 167–8 on *Hom. Il.* 90–2; Nagy 2009: 546–72; 2010: 266–72, 278–308.

scene, which is so central to the characterization of the defeated Trojans, must evoke a diffuse – and thus necessarily panhellenic – subtext for both the Athenian Panathenaia and the subsequent history of the Palladion. The placing of *peplos*, must have carried civic connotations that resonated well beyond Athens. The scene adds texture to the actions of the Trojan women by highlighting the stakes of war and the irreparable losses of the losing side. Similarly, audience knowledge of Odysseus and Diomedes’ future theft of the statue adds temporal depth to the scene’s anxiety over divine protection and its possible departure. However, the pretension to an unbroken possession of Attica posed no obstacle to the Athenians’ emotional identification with the Trojan appeal to *their* Athena.

In combination with this broad similarity between the Polias cult image and the Palladion, at Athens, the arrival of the Trojan statue was associated with Diomedes’ unfortunate clash with Demophon and the foundation of the Palladion law court – one of five active in fifth-century Athens. The court dealt with violence against slaves and foreigners.⁴²⁰ According to the version of Pausanias, in the aftermath of the Trojan war, as Diomedes put in at Phaleron carrying the stolen Palladion, Demophon misidentified the Argives as enemies, “snatched” (ἀρπάσαι) the Palladion, and killed a number of them as well as an innocent bystander.⁴²¹ The unsuspecting Athenian youth was knocked down by Demophon’s horse and trampled to death. At the order of Agamemnon (or alternatively, at the instigation of the family of the slain Athenian), Demophon underwent

⁴²⁰ The sources are collected in Boegehold *et al.* 1995: 139–46, T 40–53. Cf. Paus. 1.28.8–11; Kleidemus *FGrH* 323 F 20; Phanodemus *FGrH* 325 F 16 with Harp. *s.v.* ἐπὶ παλλαδίῳ, ε 107 Keaney; Clem. Al. *Protr.* 4.47; [Aris.] *Ath. Pol.* 57.3; *IG* I³ 369; Poll. *Onom.* 8.117–21; ΣAeschins. 2.87. On the court itself, see Travlos 1974; MacDowell 1963: 58–69; Boegehold *et al.* 1995: 47–8. For supplication and legal procedure at Athens, see Naiden 2006: 170–200.

⁴²¹ Paus. 1.28.8–11.

a trial with fifty Athenians and fifty Argives as judges (*ephetai*). In consequence, the image of Athena from Troy called the Palladion was set up at a sanctuary at Phaleron, (or perhaps at the south-east corner of the city) and a law-court was established there for those charged with involuntary homicide.⁴²²

In the fourth-century ephebic inscription describing the movement of Dionysus Eleuthereos, the ephebes are also said to have “led Pallas out to Phaleron and then back again in torchlight.”⁴²³ Burkert has hypothesized that the procession of the ephebes which “led Pallas to Phaleron and back” (συνεξήγαγον δὲ καὶ τὴν Παλλάδα Φαληροῦ) did not involve Athena *Polias* but rather the Palladion of Troy and the installation of the homicide court.⁴²⁴ Stress is laid on the crime of manslaughter in the myth of Demophon and the Palladion and the “bloodguilt” that this crime would incur. The Palladion court is also associated with an elite religious *genos* in Athens, the Bouzygai, who, at least until the Roman period, would perform a “sacred plowing” on the Athenian acropolis.⁴²⁵ Burkert in his study of the festival connected this performance with a sacrifice of the ox used for plowing, and a trial for this “crime” at the Palladion court.⁴²⁶

However, others, most recently Sourvinou-Inwood and Parker, have concluded that the Pallas of the inscription refers not to the Palladion but to the *xoanon* of Athena Polias and the Plynteria festival.⁴²⁷ At the Plynteria, the Polias was disrobed, taken

⁴²² For the location, see Plut. *Thes.* 27.3–5 with Travlos 1974; Boegehold *et al.* 1995: 47–8.

⁴²³ *IG II²* 1006.11–2: συνεξήγαγον δὲ καὶ τὴν Παλλάδα Φαληροῦ κακεῖθεν πάλιν συνεισήγαγον μετὰ φωτὸς μετὰ πάσης εὐκοσμίας. “They led Pallas out to Phaleron and from there back accompanied by torches and with all good order.”

⁴²⁴ Nagy 1991; Burkert 2001: 85–96.

⁴²⁵ *IG II²* 3177; *IG II²* 5055: βουζύγου ἱερέως Διὸς ἐν Παλλαδίῳ (Hadrianic era); *SEG* 30 85.10–11, 18–19 on which, see Oliver 1980: 41–3; Polyæn. 1.5. On the Bouzygai generally, see Parker 1996: 286–7.

⁴²⁶ Burkert 2001: 90–1. The “bovicide” of the Bouphonia is cited as a *comparandum*.

⁴²⁷ Sourvinou-Inwood 2011: 158–80 nominates the Plynteria on the basis of parallelism with the Athenian festival Skira or Skirophoria and associated procession to Skiron.

outside, veiled, processed to the sea, and then ritually washed by a member of the Praxiergidai *genos*.⁴²⁸ Philochorus tells us that at the time of the reforms of Ephialtes, a board of magistrates called the *nomophylakes* was created and subsequently given many of the responsibilities of the Areopagus, including the organization of the “procession for Pallas when the image is taken to the sea.”⁴²⁹ Because the name of the festival indicates washing, the *pompê* with the *hedos* of Athena noted by Philochorus has been (logically) assigned to the festival Plynteria mentioned by Xenophon and Plutarch.⁴³⁰

Which is a more satisfying explanation of the Athenian’s manipulation of the statue: a washing and purification festival or a performance of the inauguration of a homicide court? Which of the statues was involved? The Polias or the Palladion? These choices are not mutually exclusive, and the possibility is also viable, and indeed perhaps even likely, that either there were multiple statues of Athena and multiple *pompai*, which brought her to the sea and absolved a “crime,” or that a single *pompê* was interpreted in multiple ways. As we have seen, the acropolis housed multiple statues of Athena, each possessing a particular portion of the global cultural importance of the goddess at Athens. The Palladion, because of its association with the epic tradition, possessed a particularly broad and complex matrix of associations and myths. Any attempt to associate Athens

⁴²⁸ Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.12; Plut. *Alc.* 34.1. The festival took place on the twenty-fifth of Thargelion. For the date, see Sourvinou-Inwood 2011: 136n5 and the literature cited there. For the procession, see Hesych. *s.v.* ἡγητηρία, η 66 Latte. On the Praxiergidai, see *IG I³ 7* with Robertson 2004; Hesych. *s.v.* Πραξιεργίδαι, π 3205 Latte, with Parker 1996: 307; Sourvinou-Inwood 2011: 135–51; Warford 2015: 119–32.

⁴²⁹ Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 64b *ap. Suda s.v.* οἱ νομοφύλακες, ν 487 Adler: τίνες καὶ τῆι Παλλάδι τὴν πομπὴν ἐκόσμου, ὅτε κομίζοιτο τὸ ξόανον ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν. “Some of them arranged the procession for Pallas, when the image (τὸ ξόανον) was accompanied to the sea.” For the relation of the *nomophylakes* to the Areopagus, see, *e.g.* Cawkwell 1988; Rhodes 1981: 315. For their ritual role in the Plynteria, see Warford 2015: 123.

⁴³⁰ Hesychius tells us of magistrates or priestesses called “washers” who would likely be connected to the Plynteria: Hesych. *s.v.* Λουτρίδες, λ 1277 Latte: δύο κόραρι περι τὸ ἔδος τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς· ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ αὗται καὶ πλυντρίδες. “Two maidens associated with the image of Athena (τὸ ἔδος τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς); they are called also Plynterides.” See Parker 1996: 307–8.

with the Palladion required both assimilating the mass of traditions associated with that statue, and also achieving emplacement within the Athenian tradition characterized by autochthony.

However, ideas such as murder, bloodguilt, and purification were closely tied to the theft of cult images, and it is very plausible that a law-court for trying foreigners would be connected with an *ephebic* movement to the seashore. Note the similar narrative elements of Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, the subject of an extended treatment below. Both Demophon at the Palladion and Orestes at the Areopagus (a famous episode mentioned, but not emphasized, in the *IT*) are defendants in murder cases *and* involved with the theft of cult images. In many of our sources concerning the Athenian Palladion, the crime that necessitated the creation of the court oscillates between murder of foreigners, or their manslaughter (a more normal and rationalized situation), and the theft of the cult image of Troy, the Palladion.⁴³¹ In the *IT*, Orestes' theft of the *bretas* of Artemis was the primary motivation for both his travel to the Taurians and the deceptive removal of the image to the sea for purification.⁴³² Second,

⁴³¹ The sources for the episode that emphasize theft follow the outline of Kleidemus *FGrH* 323 F 20. Cf. e.g. Harp. s.v. ἐπὶ παλλαδίῳ, ε 107 Keaney: ἐπὶ παλλαδίῳ: Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ Κατ' Ἀριστοκράτους δικαστήριον ἔστιν οὕτω καλούμενον, ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ, ἐν ᾧ δικάζουσιν ἀκουσίῳ φόνου καὶ βουλεύσεως οἱ ἐφέται. ἔσχε δὲ καὶ τὸ δικαστήριον τὴν τοῦ Παλλαδίου ἐπωνυμίαν καὶ οἱ δικασταὶ τὴν τῶν ἐφετῶν ἐντεῦθεν. Ἀγαμέμνωνος μετὰ τῶν Ἀργείων σὺν τῷ Παλλαδίῳ προσενεχθέντος Ἀθήναις ἐξ Ἰλίου Δημοφῶν ἀρπάζει τὸ Παλλάδιον καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν διωκόντων ἀναιρεῖ. Ἀγαμέμνων δὲ δυσχεράνας δίκην τὸν ἀρπάσαντα ἀπαιτεῖ, καὶ συνίσταται τὸ κριτήριον ἐπὶ πενήκοντα μὲν Ἀθηναίων, πενήκοντα δὲ Ἀργείων, οὓς ἐφέτας ἐκάλεσαν παρὰ τὸ <παρ'> ἀμφοτέρων ἐφεθῆναι αὐτοῖς τὰ τῆς κρίσεως. "At the Palladion: used by Demosthenes in the speech against Aristokrates (23). It is the name of a *dikasterion* also mentioned in Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia*, in which the *ephetai* try cases of involuntary homicide and of *bouleusis*. The court had the name Palladion and the dicasts *ephetai* for the following reasons. When Agamemnon and the Argives with the Palladion put in at Athens on the way back from Ilium, Demophon stole the Palladion and killed many of those pursuing him. An angry Agamemnon demanded a trial of the thief (*ἀρπάσαντα*) and established a court of fifty Athenians and fifty Argives, whom they called *ephetai* from the fact that the matters of the case were referred to them from both sides." Trans. after Boegehold *et al.* 1995.

⁴³² *IT* 85–92 (Apollo's order for the theft and promise of release from pollution).

both myths involve the proper treatment of foreigners and guests. In all versions of the arrival of the Palladion to Athens, it is the reception of the visitors on Attic soil that is the focus of the narrative. In one late source, the court was not only explicitly associated with purification at the sea (καὶ καταγαγὼν ἐπὶ θάλατταν καὶ ἀγνίσας διὰ τοὺς φόνους ἰδρύσατο ἐν τούτῳ τῷ τόπῳ), but was said to have been founded to deal not only with crimes against metics and foreigners but also with cases of exile and atonement (φυγὴ καὶ αἴδεσις).⁴³³ In the *IT*, after his exile from Greece, Orestes arrives in Tauris as a foreigner, where he finds his sister Iphigenia has been tasked with killing every foreigner she meets. Their arrival back in Greece corresponds not only with a ceremony where the statue of Artemis is brought to the seashore to be purified from bloodguilt, but with an *aition* for the Anthesteria, which is characterized as a rationale for the proper treatment of foreigners, exiles, and those suffering from pollution.⁴³⁴ It is very possible the Athenian procession of ephebes associated with the origin of the Palladion court reenacted some kind of theft or aborted theft of an image of Athena – whichever image it literally happened to be.

⁴³³ *Lex. Patm. s.v. ἐπὶ παλλαδίῳ*, ε 148 Sakellion: τοῦτο τὸ δικαστήριον ἰδρύσατο Δημοφῶν ὁ Θησέως, κατὰ μαντείαν τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς Απόλλωνος. Μαθὼν γὰρ παρὰ Ἀλκμαίωνος Ἀργείου περὶ τῶν ἐν Φαλήρῳ ἀνηρημένων, ἔθαπεν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἰδρύσατο τὸ δικαστήριον τοῦτο. Ἐκλήθη δὲ ἐπὶ Παλλαδίῳ, ὅτι τὸ Παλλάδιον τὸ ἐκ Τροίας κεκομισμένον ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀργείων τῶν περὶ Διομήδηγ λαβὼν ὁ Δημοφῶν καὶ καταγαγὼν ἐπὶ θάλατταν καὶ ἀγνίσας διὰ τοὺς φόνους ἰδρύσατο ἐν τούτῳ τῷ τόπῳ. Ὡρισται δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ δικαστηρίῳ τούτῳ φυγὴ καὶ αἴδεσις. “At Palladion: Demophon son of Theseus founded this court at the order of an oracle of Apollo at Delphi, for having learned from Alkmaion the Argive about those killed at Phaleron, he buried them and established the court. It was called “at Palladion” because Demophon took the Palladion, which had been brought from Troy by the Argives with Diomedes, brought it down to the sea and purified it because of the homicides and established the court in this place. Exile and reconciliation are determined at this court. Trans. after Boegehold *et al.* 1995. For differing opinions on the value of this evidence, see Burkert 2001: 85–92; Sourvinou-Inwood 2011: 246–52.

⁴³⁴ Eur. *IT* 939–78. See pp. 159–61 below.

Chapter Four – Material Exchanges and the Divine Will

The last chapter argued that the movement of a cult image was simultaneously an exchange between human actors and an autonomous movement of a god. Chapter four will focus on the effects of respecting this two-sided nature. Considered as an object, the moving cult image represented an exchange; it was the start of a relationship between the previous owners of the item and the new. On the other hand, considered as a literal anthropomorphic divinity, the movement of the image represented not a human exchange, but instead the active movement of that divinity. The fact that both of these perspectives – object and subject – were active simultaneously accounted for the over-determined nature of many of the myths involving moving statues.

On the human plane, the manipulation of a cult statue was fundamentally a transaction; if there were competing claims for possession, conflict could ensue. Any transfer of a statue could be characterized in a positive way, as a gift, or, in a negative way, as a theft. The choice was simply a function of the perspective of the new owners and the old. This dynamic was reflected on the divine plane. Just as the transfer of the statue could be considered a gift or a theft by the human actors involved with the statue, the movement of the divinity could be construed as, for example, an arrival, a desertion, or an abduction.

However, if the arrival of the cult image in a procession was the same as the arrival of the god, this did not mean that the gods were dependent on human agency for their mobility. Respecting or interpreting the autonomous will of the divinities concerned played a central role in understanding any statue's movement, and in managing dissonant claims between parties. The points of view are thus connected: when statues were

bartered, stolen, lost, or given away, these actions were (perhaps naturally) understood in a contextual or emotional space cognate with an anthropomorphic divinity's experience of these same things.

Gift and Theft

Once successful, the relocation of the god occasioned the transfer or creation of important sociocultural elements between the two communities. For example, often the result of the transfer was the instantiation of cult in the new city – essentially an importation of the worship that establishes the god's new protective sphere. When the transfer was uncontested, this importation was seen in a context of continuity – as a gift. Even if the “arrival” of the divinity was framed as divinely inspired – fallen from heaven or emerged from the ocean – facts such as the previous home of the gift were not ignored, but rather framed so as to appear benign or especially authoritative. Other times however, the transfer was contested and characterized as a theft. Both of these cases – theft and gift (or loss or gain) – were analogous, the difference between them simply indicating the differing circumstances of the exchange between the two parties. A single myth could have variants in both categories. For example, the most common variant of the origin of the Palladion is that it was given to the Trojans by the gods, while its subsequent history is defined by its theft.

An example of the positive or “gift” importation of a cult statue was the process of creation of a legitimate ethnic or colonial link between the old possessors of the god and the new. For example, the transfer of the cult of Ephesian Artemis to Massalia in southern France occurred specifically in a colonial context. The transfer created a cultural link between the cult of its mother city and the *apoikia* or “home away from home” in

Massalia.⁴³⁵ As we have seen, the late term *aphidruma* is used specifically in this context of a positive movement of cult. It referred to an object – any appropriate object – which served as a token or statue for the new “branch” of the cult in the new location. An *aphidruma* manifested its holy status precisely because it was transported and maintained a vestige of referentiality to its original location.

Similarly, because the *genê* of archaic and classical Greece often claimed direct descent from single ancestor, this dynamic could be seen in the transportation of the bones of heroes such as Theseus and Pelops to and from different locations.⁴³⁶ For example, centuries after the Geloans’ founding of Akragas, the bones of the legendary Minoan king Minos were ritually conveyed (ἀφιδροθῆναι) to Crete as a marker of the (presumed) shared heritage between the two cities.⁴³⁷ At around 476/5 BCE, in the aftermath of the success of Salamis, Cimon captured Scyros and transferred the bones of Theseus back to Athens.⁴³⁸ The episode was almost certainly used to legitimize the acquisition of the island and the removal of the native inhabitants. The arrival or return of Theseus into Athens was accompanied by “splendid processions and sacrifices, just as if Theseus himself were returning to the city.”⁴³⁹ That the remains of heroes could be seen

⁴³⁵ See pp. 47–52 above.

⁴³⁶ See Boedeker 1993; McCauley 1999. Other examples include, *e.g.* Kleisthenes of Sikyon and Melanippos in Hdt. 5.67; the bones of Orestes in Hdt. 1.67.8; Paus. 3.3.5-6; 8.54.4; the transfer of Alcmene’s bones to Sparta in Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 84; Plut. *Rom.* 28.6; Paus. 9.11.1, 16.7; the transfer of Tisamenus from Helike to Sparta in Paus. 7.1.7-8. The Trojan Palladion was said to have been made of the bones of Pelops in Dionysius of Samos *FGrH* 15 F 3 *ap. Clem. Al. Protrep.* 4.47.6.

⁴³⁷ See DS 4.79.4 with pp. 50–1 below.

⁴³⁸ See Thuc. 1.98.1–2; Plut. *Thes.* 36.1–4; *Cim.* 8.5–7; DS 4.62.4; 11.60.2 with ΣAr. *Plut.* 637 and Parke and Wormell 1956: 181. For the date, see Podlecki 1971; Barron 1972. For the arrival of Theseus in Athens, see, *e.g.* Parker 1996: 168–70; McCauley 1999; Zaccarini 2015.

⁴³⁹ Plut. *Thes.* 36.2: οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πομπαῖς τε λαμπραῖς ἐδέξαντο καὶ θυσίαις ὥσπερ αὐτὸν ἐπανερχόμενον εἰς τὸ ἄστυ. “Athenians received him with splendid processions and sacrifices, as though Theseus himself were returning to the city.”

as iconic or totemic in their transposition should be remembered when we later consider the issues of surrogacy and substitution regarding statues and heroines.

On the other hand, when a statue was removed against the will of the old possessors, the act was not considered religious ritual, but rather stealing or looting; accordingly, the loss of the statue was seldom commemorated in cult. The theft of holy items from a temple (*hierosylia*) was a serious offence and carried with it the taint of pollution.⁴⁴⁰ At the trial after Arginusae in 406 BCE, Xenophon has Euryptolemos suggest that the defendants be tried under the law covering temple robbers and traitors; at Athens, if convicted, a temple-robber or traitor could not be buried in his home country, and his property became public.⁴⁴¹ In Plato, the crime is connected with the murder of parents.⁴⁴² However, the actions of an invading army were seen differently. In Euripides' *Troades*, Poseidon states that the normal activities of a conquering army, and indeed of a prosperous man, included "sacking cities, giving over to desolations temples and tombs, holy places of the dead..."⁴⁴³ Yet the distinction between an individual act of looting and a process of "calling on the gods to willingly depart" was important – albeit occasionally – to an invading army.⁴⁴⁴ Augustus' removal of the statue of Alean Athena from Tegea during the aftermath of Actium was framed as an example of religious scruple.⁴⁴⁵

⁴⁴⁰ See Parker 1983: 170–5; Miles 2008: 30–2; Gawlinski 2015. On the *asylia* of suppliants, see Mikalson 1991: 69–7, 176–8; Chaniotis 1996; Naiden 2006: 148–53.

⁴⁴¹ Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.22: κατὰ τόνδε τὸν νόμον κρίνατε, ὅς ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἱεροσύλοις καὶ προδόταις, εἴαν τις ἢ τὴν πόλιν προδιδῶ ἢ τὰ ἱερὰ κλέπτῃ, κριθέντα ἐν δικαστηρίῳ, ἂν καταγνωσθῆ, μὴ ταφῆναι ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, τὰ δὲ χρήματα αὐτοῦ δημόσια εἶναι. "Judge them under the following law, which applies to temple-robbers (ἱεροσύλοις) and traitors: that is, if anyone betrays the state or steals sacred property (τὰ ἱερὰ), he will be tried before a court, and if he is convicted, he will not be buried in Attica, and his property shall be of the people." Cf. DS 16.25.2; Aeschin. 2.142.

⁴⁴² Pl. *Leg.* 869b2–3, with Saunders 1990: 69–71 on Pl. *Leg.* 853b1–855a4.

⁴⁴³ Eur. *Tro.* 95–7: μῶρος δὲ θνητῶν ὅστις ἐκπορθεῖ πόλεις, ναοὺς τε τύμβους θ', ἱερὰ τῶν κεκμηκότων, ἐρημίᾳ δούς αὐτὸς ὄλεθ' ὕστερον; cf. Kovacs 1986.

⁴⁴⁴ See Rutledge 2007. For Cicero's use of temple theft (*spoliare*) as invective in, e.g. Cic. *Verr.* 1.5.14, see Miles 1998: 13–5.

⁴⁴⁵ Paus. 8.46.1–3.

Pausanias reports that “Augustus does not appear to have started the looting of dedications and statues of the gods, but to have employed an ancient and established tradition.” Pausanias then goes on to list multiple historical examples of statues that have changed hands in a legitimate way. First, at Troy, Sthenelos was given the statue of “household” or “courtyard” (ἐρκεῖος) Zeus, which he dedicated in Argos on the Larissa acropolis;⁴⁴⁶ second, Antiphemos the founder of Gela sacked the Sicilian city of Omphakê and brought home a daedalic statue;⁴⁴⁷ and third, Xerxes took the *xoanon* of Artemis from Brauron just as he had the bronze Apollo of Branchidai from Didyma.⁴⁴⁸ Unfortunately, and predictably, there are very few examples of narratives centered on the importance of lost statues.⁴⁴⁹ It was the military victors who wrote history and subsequently defined the resultant cult practice.

Herodotus’ story of the Aeginetan deities Damia and Auxesia well exemplifies the rooted, local protection provided by a cult statue, the danger of its removal, and the fundamentally two-sided dynamic of cult images.⁴⁵⁰ According to Herodotus, the Epidaurians had agreed to perform a yearly sacrifice to Erechtheus and Athena Polias in exchange for olive wood statues (*agalmata*) of the goddesses Damia and Auxesia. Subsequently, the Aeginetans, in a revolt from the Epidaurians, absconded with the statues and established them in their own territory. This establishment of the images was

⁴⁴⁶ Cf. Agias and Derkylos *FGrH* 305 F 7 *ap. ΣEur. Tro.* 16–17 and Paus. 2.24.3–4, where the statue is said to be the ancestral image of Zeus dedicated in the courtyard of Priam. On the statue itself, see Robertson 2002: 64–5. On the meaning of ἐρκεῖος, see Parker 2005: 16–18.

⁴⁴⁷ Cf. Paus. 9.40.4.

⁴⁴⁸ On Xerxes and Apollo Branchidae, which was later repatriated by the Seleucids, see Paus 1.16.3; 9.10.2, with Hammond 1998. Cf. also the seizure and return of the statues of Harmodius and Aristogeiton in Paus. 1.8.5; cf. Hdt. 8.53.

⁴⁴⁹ Cf. Sourvinou-Inwood 2005: 160 on the lack of “exit” ceremonies for Greek gods. See Aston 2011 on the tendency of *mixanthropic* gods to abscond.

⁴⁵⁰ Hdt. 5.82–5. See Bettinetti 2001: 65–78. The date of the episode is unknown but cannot be later than the middle of the sixth century BCE (it is likely much earlier). Cf. Figueira 1993: 36–42, 50–8.

accompanied by the institution of sacrifices and female choruses.⁴⁵¹ After their yearly tribute to Athena was discontinued, the Epidaurians told the Athenians to collect payment from the Aeginetans, who now, through their possession of the statues, were responsible for the tribute. The Aeginetans refused to pay and the Athenians then demanded the return of the statues, which touched off an armed conflict. An Athenian force (possibly of a single trireme) was dispatched to Aegina to retrieve the statues and, according to Herodotus, the goddesses themselves prevented the second theft by causing an earthquake and animating their material selves as they were being dragged away. The final resting spot of the images on Aegina was determined by the goddesses themselves who voluntarily and forcefully accepted that secondary place of worship. The reliance on the “will of the gods” to justify the forcible acquisition of statues possessed by other communities is characteristic of the movement of cult statues. Eventually, however, the Athenian settlers on Aegina (after 431 BCE) came to control the cult whose dedications they inventoried.⁴⁵²

The Will of the Gods

Because of the necessarily intimate connection between a god and its representation, the movement of a cult statue between communities could also be understood as equivalent to the movement of humans between communities. The foundation for this idea can be seen in the conception that the “will of the gods” was required to adjudicate between rival claims over a statue. One of the signal characteristics of ancient Greek sculpture is that the statues themselves could be considered to exhibit

⁴⁵¹ Hdt. 5.83: ἰδρυσάμενοι δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χώρῳ θυσίησί τε σφεα καὶ χοροῖσι γυναικῆϊοισι κερτόμοισι ἰλάσκοντο. “Having dedicated them in this place they propitiated them with sacrifices and choruses of jeering women.”

⁴⁵² *IG IV* 1588.

human abilities and attributes: to be or exhibit their own individual subject-hood. The legendary sculptor Daedalus was credited with creating sculptures so lifelike that they could literally move. The term *daedalic*, as used in Homer, referred to this very lifelike and magical character of magnificent works of art such as the shield of Achilles and the *gorgoneion* shield of Agamemnon.⁴⁵³ In Book 18 of the *Iliad*, Hephaestus' magical tripods and mechanical attendants are described as *daedalic*. The term refers primarily to the fact that the objects moved on their own and were endowed with life. In Plato's *Meno*, Daedalus' statues were said to be so lifelike that "if they are not fastened up they play hooky and run away; but, if fastened, they stay where they are."⁴⁵⁴ A similar theme appears in Aeschylus' *Theoroi*, where satyrs declared that the "*anathêmata* we dedicate to Poseidon at Isthmia, are uncanny and magical; there cannot exist a model closer to my shape than this representation of Daedalus."⁴⁵⁵ The stories of statues moving and speaking in response to important or catastrophic events are many.⁴⁵⁶ To take a pair of well-known examples, the Palladion was said to twist and avert its eyes when Ajax grasped Cassandra, just as the *xoanon* of Artemis was said to move in response to entreaties by Iphigenia.⁴⁵⁷

From this perspective, an important element of the power of legendary smiths such as Daedalus and Hephaistos is the power to create true animated beings: real-life

⁴⁵³ Hom. *Il.* 18.592 (armor); *Il.* 11.15–46 (Agamemnon's shield). Cf. *Od.* 23.200; Pin. *Pyth.* 5.35–42; Eur. *Hec.* 470 with scholia. Cf. Aston 2011: 323–6. See Morris 1992: 257–68, for the Hellenic use or borrowing of terminology, craftsmen and sculptural technique from the Levant. For the mythological figure Daedalus himself, see, e.g. Hom. *Il.* 18.592; Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 146; Hellanicus *FGrH* 323A F 22; Kleidemus *FGrH* 323 F 17; DS 4.76; Paus. 1.26.4; 2.15.1; 9.40.3.

⁴⁵⁴ Pl. *Men.* 97d: ἐὰν μὲν μὴ δεδεμένα ᾖ, ἀποδιδράσκει καὶ δραπετεύει, ἐὰν δὲ δεδεμένα, παραμένει. Cf. Pl. *Euthyph.* 11; Cratinus fr. 75 *PCG ap.* ΣEur. *Hec.* 838 = Donohue 1988: T 86. See Steiner 2001: 160–8.

⁴⁵⁵ Aesch. *Theoroi TrGH* fr. 78a–c, with Zeitlin 1994.

⁴⁵⁶ See, e.g. the goddess Fortuna Muliebris in DH *AR* 8.56.1–4; Plut. *Coriol.* 37.3–38.2; Val. Max. 1.8.4, with Petridou 2015: 49–64.

⁴⁵⁷ Alc. fr. 298 V; Eur. *IT* 1165.

living and breathing “statues.”⁴⁵⁸ It is perhaps unsurprising that attribution of human physical and mental characteristics to anthropomorphic gods, included the idea that the obtaining permission or the will of the gods to move themselves was a central component in transporting them: on the divine plane, any movement of a divinity is always seen as an extension of the will of the gods, not of the human actors. Accordingly, in Aeschylus’ *Septem*, we find Eteocles stating that “the gods of a conquered city abandon it.” The scholiast who treats this line cites a lost play of Sophocles called the *Xoanephoroi* where the gods of Troy carried out images of themselves out on stage.⁴⁵⁹ In one of our accounts of the importation of Sarapis to Alexandria, Tacitus reports that the people of Sinope surrounded the temple of Sarapis upon hearing of the transfer, but, unfortunately, were, among other factors, thwarted by the will of the god himself who personally embarked on the transport ship.⁴⁶⁰ In Livy’s description of the reduction of Veii, Camillus ritually requests Queen Juno to follow the conquering Roman army into her future city (Rome) and accept a temple worthy of her power.⁴⁶¹ During the sack, specially selected soldiers removed from the temples of Veii both the votive gifts that had been made to the gods, and the gods themselves. One of the soldiers said, “Are you willing, Juno, to go to Rome?” and the goddess nodded assent or, according to another story said, “I am willing.”⁴⁶² This practice – termed *evocatio* – was a traditional appeal by the Roman

⁴⁵⁸ See Steiner 2001: 136–45. For Hephaistos and the craft of the sculptor or smith as “generative” or “life giving,” see, e.g. Sfyroeras 1993 on Pin. *Ol.* 7.

⁴⁵⁹ Soph. *TrGF* fr. 452 *ap.* Aesch. *Sep.* 202–3 with scholia = Donohue 1988: T 1–5.

⁴⁶⁰ Tac. *Hist.* 4.83–4; cf. Hicks 2013.

⁴⁶¹ Liv. 5.21.2: Iuno regina, quae nunc Veios colis, precor, ut nos victores in nostram tuamque mox futuram urbem sequere, ubi te dignum amplitudine tua templum accipiat. “Queen Juno, who now dwells in Veii, I pray, that you follow us as victors to our city – which will soon be yours – where a temple worthy of your power will receive you.” On the *evocatio* generally, see DH *AR* 13.3; Liv. 5.21.2–7; Macrobian *Sat.* 3.9.7; 14–16; Serv. *Aen.* 2.351; 12.841, with Rutledge 2007; Hicks 2013.

⁴⁶² Liv. 5.22.5–6: dein cum quidam seu spiritu divino tactus seu iuvenali ioco, ‘visne Romam ire, Iuno?’ dixisset, adnuisse ceteri deam conclamaverunt. inde fabulae adiectum est vocem quoque dicentis velle

army to the deities of a besieged city that designed to inspire them to depart and take up new residence in Rome.

During Alexander's siege of Tyre,⁴⁶³ the Tyrians attached their image of Apollo to an altar of Herakles with a golden chain. It was believed that by doing this, Herakles would help prevent Apollo from abandoning the city in the event of its capture. In recounting with this episode, Plutarch takes the opportunity to comment on the Roman practice of *evocatio*. He tells us that the *evocatio* involved belief in certain evocations and enchantments (ἐκκλήσεις εἰσὶ καὶ γοητεῖαι) affecting the gods, by which the Romans believed that “certain gods had been called forth from their enemies, and had come to live among themselves, and they were afraid of having this done to them by others.”⁴⁶⁴

The Samian Tonaia

Because the travel of divinities was connected so strongly with the human act of dedication, the cult image was simultaneously a possession and an individual. The positive acquisition, or at least recognition of a “will of the gods” was a requirement for

auditam “Then when either touched through the god's spirit itself or some joke of youth one said ‘do you want to go to Rome Juno?’ the others declared that the goddess nodded in agreement. After that it was added to the story that she was heard to say, ‘I am willing’... .”

⁴⁶³ Curt. 4.3.21: aurea catena devinxere simulacrum (*sc.* of Apollo) araeque Herculis, cuius numini urbem dicaverant, inseruere vinculum quasi illo deo Apollinem retenturo. “They bound the statue of Apollo with a gold chain and attached the chain to the altar of Herakles, to whose divine power they had dedicated their city, as if for the purpose of that god holding Apollo back.” Cf. DS 17.41.8; Plut. *Alex.* 24.3–8 with Donohue 1988: 73–4; T 56, 61–2, 314. Graf 1988: 81–4 disputes the link between bound statues and the *evocatio*.

⁴⁶⁴ Plut. *Mor.* 279a: πότερον, ὡς τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν τινες ἱστορήκασιν, ἐκκλήσεις εἰσὶ καὶ γοητεῖαι θεῶν, αἷς νομίζοντες καὶ αὐτοὶ θεοὺς τινὰς ἐκκεκλήσθαι παρὰ τῶν πολεμίων καὶ μετοκηκέναι πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐφοβοῦντο τὸ αὐτὸ παθεῖν ὑφ' ἑτέρων; ὥσπερ οὖν Τύριοι δεσμοὺς ἀγάλμασι λέγονται περιβαλεῖν, ἕτεροι δ' αἰτεῖν ἐγγυητὰς ἐπὶ λουτρὸν ἢ καθαρμόν τινα προπέμποντες, οὕτως ᾤοντο Ῥωμαῖοι τὸ ἄρρητον καὶ τὸ ἄγνωστον ἀσφαλεστάτην εἶναι θεοῦ καὶ βεβαιοτάτην φρουράν. “Is the reason because, as some Roman writers have written, there are certain evocations and enchantments regarding the gods, by which the Romans also believed that certain gods had been called forth from their enemies, and had come to live among themselves, and they were afraid of having this done to them by others? Accordingly, the Tyrians are said to have thrown chains around their images, and other peoples require pledges or sureties when they process their images for bathing or some other purification, so the Romans believed that being unmentioned and unknown was the safest protection for a god.”

understanding the transfer of a cult statue. For example, the journey of the ship-cart of Dionysus Eleuthereos (whether during the Anthesteria or Great Dionysia) reenacted the god's arrival in Athens and symbolized the inauguration of his worship. The *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* has often been adduced in this context of Dionysus as the “arriving” god; Burkert called it “the appropriate prehistory of the ritual” (Hom. *Hym. Dion.* 1–15).⁴⁶⁵

Ἀμφὶ Διώνυσον Σεμέλης ἐρικυδέος υἱὸν	1
μνήσομαι, ὡς ἐφάνη παρὰ θῖν' ἄλός ἀτρυγέτοιο	
ἀκτῆ ἐπὶ προβλήτι νεηνίῃ ἀνδρὶ εἰοικῶς	
πρωθήβῃ· καλαὶ δὲ περισσεῖοντο ἔθειραι	
κυάνεαι, φᾶρος δὲ περὶ στιβαροῖς ἔχεν ὤμοις	5
πορφύρεον· τάχα δ' ἄνδρες εὐσσέλμου ἀπὸ νηὸς	
ληῖσται προγένοντο θοῶς ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον	
Τυρσηνοί· τοὺς δ' ἤγε κακὸς μόρος· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες	
νεῦσαν ἐς ἀλλήλους, τάχα δ' ἔκθορον, αἴψα δ' ἐλόντες	
εἶσαν ἐπὶ σφετέρῃς νηὸς κεχαρημένοι ἦτορ.	10
υἱὸν γάρ μιν ἔφαντο διοτρεφῶν βασιλῆων	
εἶναι, καὶ δεσμοῖς ἔθελον δεῖν ἀργαλέοισι.	
τὸν δ' οὐκ ἴσχανε δεσμά, λύγοι δ' ἀπὸ τηλόσ' ἔπιπτον	
χειρῶν ἠδὲ ποδῶν· ὁ δὲ μειδιάων ἐκάθητο	
ὄμμασι κυανέοισι,	15

Of Dionysus, glorious Semele's son, I will make remembrance: how he appeared by the shore of the barren sea, on a jutting headland, in the likeness of a youth in first manhood; the fine sable locks waved about him and he had a cloak of crimson about his strong shoulders. Suddenly men from a galley came speeding over the wine-faced sea, Tyrrhenian Pirates, led on by an ill doom. When they saw him, they nodded to one another, and at once leapt out, seized him, and set him aboard their ship, exulting, for they reckoned he was the son of a princely line fostered by Zeus. And they meant to bind him in grievous bonds; but the bonds would not contain him, the *lygos* twigs fell clear away from his hands and feet while he sat there smiling with his dark eyes.⁴⁶⁶

The god Dionysus appears alone on a beach in a non-divine representation (in the “likeness” of a youth); he is approached by Tyrrhenian pirates and involved in an

⁴⁶⁵ Burkert 1985: 166.

⁴⁶⁶ Translation adapted from West 2003.

unsuccessful coercion. Dionysus boards the ship of the pirates but only on his own terms and under his own power (the pirates are subsequently turned into dolphins). In the case of the Athenian worship of Dionysus we do not have explicit evidence for the inclusion of the prerequisite element for the god's appropriation, that is, the acquisition of the "will of the gods," but we would logically expect it to be present to some degree. The dynamics of Dionysus' capture and transportation in the *Hymn* reflect how his worshippers mediated the *adventus* of the god into their community with their own active role in the event.

The Samian Tonaia can provide further insight into the need to combine divine and human agency in the movement of cult images. The Tonaia (usually translated as the binding or tying) included a large-scale procession to an extra-urban sanctuary on the banks of the Imbrasos River and communal sacrifices.⁴⁶⁷ Since ancient times, the festival was understood as a celebration of the union of Zeus and Hera. For example, the Hellenistic epic poet Nicaenetus described Samian Hera as the "bride of Zeus" (*nymphê dios*), and Varro explicitly states that the festival was an enactment of a holy marriage (*hieros gamos*). However, it is also true that our most detailed evidence has little explicitly to do with a union of Hera and Zeus. Moreover, the sacrilegious binding or immobilization of the statue sits uncomfortably within a marriage or pre-marriage context. We shall argue that the dynamics of a contested exchange of the cult statue – that is, the aborted or failed retrieval of the image (*bretas*) back to Argos – is an important framework for understanding the festival. The movement of the cult statue represented by

⁴⁶⁷ It is unclear whether the Heraia and the Tonaia are two parts of the same festival or part of a connected group of festivals similar to the Hyacinthia, Gymnopaediai, and Karneia at Sparta. On the Tonaia generally, see Nilsson 1957: 46–50; Burkert 1978: 129–30; 1985: 134–5; Kyrieleis 1993: 135; Sourvinou-Inwood 2005: 152–3.

the ritual carrying of the *bretas* down to the sea, as well as its binding and subsequent release, places the Samian Heraion in opposition with the *other* most renowned sanctuary of Hera: the Heraion of Argos. This stance is consistent with how the community saw its “original” moment: the final retention and possession of the *bretas* served as an *aition* for the fundamental autochthony of the Samian worship of Hera. This aborted exchange was understood in a two-sided manner: both in terms of an object – the *bretas* of Hera – and in terms of the movement of a human agent, that is, the priestess Admete.

According to the tradition of the migrations, by the turn of the millennium (c. 1000–900 BCE), an Ionian populace had settled permanently in Samos. By the late eighth century, the settlement covered the entire area around the delta of the Imbrasos and the first temple of the Heraion was constructed in the middle of the eighth century BCE.⁴⁶⁸ A monumental dipteral temple – the so-called Rhoikos temple –⁴⁶⁹ replaced the original sometime in the mid-seventh to sixth century, which was itself quickly replaced in the late sixth century by a larger temple.⁴⁷⁰ There exists evidence for no less than five distinct cult statue bases in the sanctuary. When the first temple was replaced, perhaps in the mid-sixth century, the original geometric statue base was incorporated into the new building and was visible in the *pronâos* of the new temple alongside the new statue base located in the *cella*.⁴⁷¹ This continuous reuse of the statue base in its original orientation is an indication of the extraordinary extent to which the statue – including its history and myth

⁴⁶⁸ See Coldstream 1977: 71; 102–4.

⁴⁶⁹ For the temple and the architect, see Paus. 10.38.5; Hdt. 1.51.3; 3.41.1; 3.60.4; Plin. *HN* 8.198; 34.90; Vitruvius. *De arch.* 7; *praef.* 12.

⁴⁷⁰ Kyrieleis 1993.

⁴⁷¹ In the Roman period, the ancient geometric base was itself given a separate shrine, the “monopteros” to the east of the temple structure; see Romano 1980: 258–62; Kyrieleis 1993: 128.

– retained central importance to the worshipping community of the sanctuary.⁴⁷² These traditions revolved around both the contested possession of the *bretas* and its potential – but never actual – loss or theft.

As at many festivals across the Greek world, worship at the Heraion included a large-scale procession and communal sacrifices.⁴⁷³ The celebrants would recline on *stibades*, mats made out of willow (*lygos*), and drink and feast in honor of Hera.⁴⁷⁴ The local Samian historian Menodotus gives us an explicit description of the celebratory rite at the sanctuary and also an aetiological myth explaining the rite (Menodotus *FGrH* 541 F 1 *ap.* Ath. 671e–4a):⁴⁷⁵

Ἄδμήτην γάρ φησιν τὴν Εὐρυσθέως ἐξ Ἄργους φυγοῦσαν ἐλθεῖν εἰς Σάμον, θεασαμένην δὲ τὴν τῆς Ἥρας ἐπιφάνειαν καὶ τῆς οἴκοθεν σωτηρίας χαριστήριον βουλομένην ἀποδοῦναι, ἐπιμεληθῆναι τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ καὶ νῦν ὑπάρχοντος, πρότερον δὲ ὑπὸ Λελέγων καὶ Ἰνυμφῶν καθιδρυμένου· τοὺς δ' Ἀργείους πυθομένους καὶ χαλεπαίνοντας, πείσαι χρημάτων ὑποσχέσει Τυρρηνοῦς ληιστρικῶι [τε] βίωι χρωμένους ἀρπάσαι τὸ βρέτας, πεπεισμένους τοὺς Ἀργείους ὥς, εἰ τοῦτο γένοιτο, πάντως τι κακὸν πρὸς τῶν τὴν Σάμον κατοικούντων ἢ Ἄδμήτη πείσεται.

He says that Admete, the daughter of Eurystheus, fled from Argos to Samos and, after seeing Hera in a vision, she wished to give a thank-offering for her escape from home. She then undertook the care of the temple that exists today, that was previously founded by the Leleges [and the Nymphs]. But, when the Argives heard this, they became angry and persuaded the Tyrrhenians – who were pirates – through bribery to carry off the image of Hera. Argives were convinced that if that happened Admete would surely suffer some harm at the hands of the people of Samos.

⁴⁷² The presence of multiple statues of Hera at the sanctuary is confirmed by the dedication of a white *himation* to the “goddess behind” in a Hellenistic dedicatory inscription. Romano (1980: 260–7; 267n10) coordinates the “goddess behind” with the newer image consecrated at the time of the Rhoikos temple. This image would have been located “behind” the old geometric statue base still visible in the *pronaos*.

⁴⁷³ Cf. Kyrieleis 1993: 137–8 with Polyæn. *Strat.* 1.23.

⁴⁷⁴ Cf. Kron 1988: 138–40. On *stibades* of *lygos* also used in the Thesmophoria at Athens, see Parker 2005: 274.

⁴⁷⁵ Menodotus’ date is unknown but likely BCE.

We are told that, after her flight from Argos, Admete, daughter of Eurystheus, became the first priestess at the temple of Hera at Samos. The reason for Admete's exile is unclear,⁴⁷⁶ but upon her arrival at Samos, Hera appeared to her in an epiphany (τὴν τῆς Ἥρας ἐπιφάνειαν) and inaugurated her service as priestess in the temple as a receipt of a thank offering or dedication.⁴⁷⁷ The Argives, enraged at Admete's departure, dispatched Tyrrhenian pirates to Samos – not, however, to steal the woman back, as one would expect – but to steal the image of Hera (ἄρπάσαι τὸ βρέτας). That transposition is itself a striking indicum of ritual substitution. The Tyrrhenians succeeded in taking the *bretas* down to the shore, but, in the end were not able to complete their return to the Argolid. At the last moment, the goddess revealed herself to her captors and prevented their departure (Menodotus *FGrH* 541 F 1 *ap.* Ath. 671e–4a):

τῆς δ' Ἀδμήτης ἔωθεν δηλωσάσης ὅτι τὸ βρέτας ἠφανίσθη, καὶ ζητήσεως γενομένης, εὐρεῖν μὲν αὐτὸ τοὺς ζητοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς ἡϊόνος, ὡς δ' ἂν βαρβάρους [Κᾶρας] ὑπονόησαντας αὐτόματον ἀποδεδρακέναι, πρὸς τι λύγου θωράκιον ἀπερείσασθαι καὶ τοὺς εὐμηκεστάτους τῶν κλάδων ἐκατέρωθεν ἐπισπασαμένους περιελῆσαι πάντοθεν· τὴν δὲ Ἀδμήτην λύσασαν αὐτὸ ἀγνίσαι καὶ στήσαι πάλιν ἐπὶ τοῦ βάρου, καθάπερ πρότερον ἴδρυτο. διόπερ ἐξ ἐκείνου καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος ἀποκομίζεσθαι τὸ βρέτας εἰς τὴν ἡϊόνα καὶ ἀφαγνίζεσθαι ψαιστά τε αὐτῶι παρατίθεσθαι· καὶ καλεῖσθαι Τόναια τὴν ἑορτήν, ὅτι συντόνως συνέβη περιελιθῆναι τὸ βρέτας ὑπὸ τῶν τὴν πρώτην αὐτοῦ ζήτησιν ποιησαμένων.

On the next morning, Admete disclosed that the image had disappeared, and after a search, they found it on the beach. But [the Karians], as one would expect of barbarians, thought that the image had run away of its own accord, and so they fastened it to a mat of willow shoots, pulling the longest branches tightly on both sides of it, and wrapped it around. Admete unfastened the image and purified it and set it once more on its pedestal, just as it had stood before. Therefore, ever

⁴⁷⁶ In Apollod. *Bib.* 2.5.9, Admete desires the belt (*zōster*) of Hippolyte and her father Eurystheus asks Herakles to obtain it for her. Subsequently, Hera, disguised as an Amazon spreads a rumor that the queen herself is to be carried off, the Amazons attack Herakles and Hippolyte is killed. See Gantz 1993: 397–400; Fowler 2013: 288–91.

⁴⁷⁷ The sanctuary had been previously founded (καθιδρυμένον) by the Leleges and the nymphs. Cf. Hesych. *s.v.* ἄστου νυμφέων, α 7926 Latte.

since that time, they have carried the image to the beach every year and purified it and set offerings of barley-cakes beside it. The festival is called the Tonaia, because the image was so tightly wrapped by the men who first searched for it.

Subsequently, after Admete found the *bretas* on the beach, non-Greeks – the superstitious and barbarian Karians⁴⁷⁸ – could not trust that the goddess did not leave of her own free will (αὐτόματον) and fastened her tight to a mat of willow shoots (πρός τι λύγου θωράκιον ἀπερείσασθαι).⁴⁷⁹ Menodotus goes on to explain that every year in remembrance of this event, the celebrants of the Tonaia bring the statue of Hera to the beach, release, and purify her (λύσασαν αὐτὸ ἀγνίσαι) and then re-enthroned her beside her native willow.

For the celebrants of the Tonaia, confirmation of the original focalization of the goddess' worship was an actual event that could be ideologically contested in multiple ways. Understanding the history of the statue was cognate with the process of understanding from where the people of Samos who worshiped her had originated. The founding of the Heraion was connected to multiple autochthonous and colonial traditions and encompassed the interests of both Ionians and Dorians, as well as native populations of the Anatolian coast. According to Asios – an early epic poet cited by Pausanias – the eponymous Samia, a daughter of the river Meandros, married Ankaios,⁴⁸⁰ king of the

⁴⁷⁸ Karians is perhaps a gloss and is bracketed by Jacoby. The Karians are the most obvious candidate for “barbarians” but need not have been named explicitly.

⁴⁷⁹ On the *λύγος* tree (willow or withy) in cult, the branches of which were strewed by matrons on their beds at the Thesmophoria, see Burkert 1985: 134–5; 243–4; Kron 1988: 138–42; Parker 2005: 274n16, with Plut. *Mor.* 378e; Ael. *NA* 9.26; Plin. *NH* 24.59; cf. Paus. 3.14.7. Note Artemis *lygodēsma* (Orthia) in Paus. 3.16.7–11. White willow bark is an analgesic. For discussion of both the plant's perceived anti-aphrodisiac qualities, and the fact that it regulated lactation and menstruation, see Nilsson 1957: 48. Bettinetti 2001: 112 rightly notes that there is no contradiction: both qualities belong to Hera as wife (chastity and fertility).

⁴⁸⁰ For Asios of Samos *EGF* F 7 *ap.* Paus. 7.4.1, see Huxley 1969: 89–98; Mac Sweeney 2013: 91–103; Fowler 2013: 520–1. On the sometimes Argonautic Ankaios, see, *e.g.* Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* 2.865–7; Herodorus *FGrH* 31 F 45 *ap.* ΣAp. Rhod. *Arg.* 1.185–8 with Fowler 2013: 215, 586–7.

Leleges.⁴⁸¹ There was also an Ionian migration tradition where a descendant of Ion named Prokles, having been ejected from Epidauros by the Dorian Temenids, traveled to Samos where he married a native Karian woman. Afterwards, the Ephesians led by the Kodrid king Androklos were said to have defeated the Epidaurians and colonized Samos themselves, but were later ejected by the descendants of Prokles.⁴⁸²

The phenomenon of Karian, Dorian, and Ionian cultural elements living in close proximity and inspiring competing traditions was a common one in Ionia in the late archaic and classical periods. Herodotus himself was descended from Karian and Greek parents from Dorian Halicarnassus and spent significant time on Samos.⁴⁸³ Defining the exact relationship of the colonial settlers to the indigenous inhabitants was a conspicuous concern of the island's historical traditions. Pausanias explicitly tells us that “the inhabitants of Samos received the Ionians as settlers more of necessity than through goodwill” (οἱ τὴν νῆσον οἰκοῦντες ἀνάγκηι πλέον ἐδέξαντο ἢ εὐνοίαι συνοίκους Ἰωνας), while Themistagoras, an obscure historian cited in the *Etymologicum Magnum*, presents a variant in which the colonizer Prokles and the native Karians reach an agreement and divide the population into two tribes: *schesia* (divided) and *astypalaia* (old city).⁴⁸⁴ Still another variant of this overdetermined tradition is given by Pausanias (Paus. 7.4.4):

τὸ δὲ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐν Σάμῳ τῆς Ἥρας εἰσὶν οἱ ἰδρύσασθαι φασι τοὺς ἐν τῇ Ἀργοῖ
πλέοντας, ἐπάγεσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺς τὸ ἄγαλμα ἐξ Ἄργους· Σάμιοι δὲ αὐτοὶ
τεχθῆναι νομίζουσιν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τὴν θεὸν παρὰ τῷ Ἴμβράσῳ ποταμῷ καὶ ὑπὸ

⁴⁸¹ The Leleges were indigenous denizens of Ionia (Hom. *Il.* 10.429–8; Strab. 7.7.2 C322; 13.3.1 C619; 14.2.27 C662) who were sometimes believed to have been enslaved either by the Karians (Phylarchos *FGrH* 81 F 8 *ap.* Ath. 271b–c; Philippus of Theangela *FGrH* 741 F 2 *ap.* Ath. 271b; Plut. *Mor.* 302a–b) or sometimes by the invading Ionians (Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 155). Hdt. 1.172 offers two alternatives: either the Leleges and the Karians are identical and were under the rule (κατήκοοι) of Minos until they were driven out by the Ionians, or they are an indigenous people. See generally Fowler 2013: 96–100.

⁴⁸² Paus. 7.4.3. For discussion, see Fowler 2013: 582 on Ephesus.

⁴⁸³ On Herodotus' Karian parents, see Mitchell 1975; Herda 2015: 423–5.

⁴⁸⁴ *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Ἀστυπάλαια, 160.22 Gaisford.

τῆ λύγῳ τῆ ἐν τῷ Ἡραίῳ κατ' ἐμὲ ἔτι πεφυκυία. εἶναι δ' οὖν τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦτο ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα ἀρχαῖον ὃ οὐχ ἤκιστα ἂν τις καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ἀγάλματι τεκμαίροιο· ἔστι γὰρ δὴ ἀνδρὸς ἔργον Αἰγινήτου Σμίλιδος τοῦ Εὐκλείδου. οὗτος ὁ Σμίλις ἐστὶν ἠλικίαν κατὰ Δαίδαλον, δόξης δὲ οὐκ ἐς τὸ ἴσον ἀφίκετο.

Some say that the sanctuary of Hera on Samos was established by those who sailed in the *Argo*, and that these men brought the cult image from Argos. But the Samians themselves think that the goddess was born on the island by the river Imbrasos under the willow that, even in my time, grew in the Heraion. That this sanctuary is very old might be inferred especially by considering the image; for it is the work of an Aeginetan, Smilis, the son of Eukleides. This Smilis was a contemporary of Daedalus, though not as famous.

Here, we have one colonization narrative in which the temple (ἱερὸν) is founded (ιδρύσασθαί) by the Argonauts who hail, literally, from Argos; one indigenous, autochthonous narrative in which the goddess herself (τὴν θεὸν) is born under the famous willow (ὕπὸ τῆ λύγῳ) on the bank of the Imbrasos river;⁴⁸⁵ and one (semi-) historicizing version involving the Aeginetan artist Smilis or Skelmis (“sculptor”)⁴⁸⁶ – connected with the legendary Daedalus.

These contested accounts of the history of Samos and the inception of the Heraia centered on the cult statue itself. In general, the traditional focal point of a temple was the cult statue (*bretas*), which the sanctuary structure was meant to house and protect.

Whatever the chronological elaboration of a given sanctuary, it was the installation (*hidrusis*) of the *bretas* that was considered to be the precondition that allowed for the foundation of temple and the creation of the worshipping community as a whole.

Determining who was responsible for the importation or original creation of the *bretas*, was equivalent to determining the identity of those who worshipped her: in other words,

⁴⁸⁵ Cf. the traditions in Strab. 14.1.14–15 C637, where the island is named either Parthenia (later the name of the Imbrasos river) or Anthemus.

⁴⁸⁶ On the sculptor Smilis or Skelmis (both names refer to the same object: a knife or sculptor’s chisel) see Paus. 5.17.1; 7.4.4–7, with Romano 1980: 260–6; Donohue 1988: 202–5; Figueira 1993: 20–7; Bettinetti 2001: 107–16; Fowler 2013: 587n68.

the origins of both the Heraion and the Greek presence on Samos were closely associated with the origin and history of the statue. We find two options: either the worship of Hera (represented by the *bretas*) was imported from Argos or it was autochthonous. It is this dichotomy that is reflected in the Tonaia. The *aborted* or *failed* movement of the *bretas* back to Argos fixed the notional birthplace of Hera on Samos and served as a confirmation of a non-Argive autochthonous identity for the Heraion. Yet this privileging of autochthony does not efface the Argive *ktisis* of Samos so much as draw it into its orbit as a satellite of variant legitimization.

As we have seen, the aborted movement of the *bretas* was figured as the aborted movement of the human priestess Admete. This subtle co-identification of image and mortal is not altogether surprising. A partial comparandum can be seen in the Athenian worship of Dionysus as reflected in the *Hymn to Dionysus* as was explored above. There, the movement of the divinity, which is then recapitulated in the Athenian festival procession, is framed as the abduction of a young man masquerading as a divinity. In Menodotus, the reason for the Argive hiring of the non-Greek pirates is (perhaps paradoxically) not only slightly illogical, but also rationalized. The departure of the human priestess resulted in the attempted theft of the non-human *bretas*, and we are told that it is hoped the theft will cause some harm to Admete's reputation. The importance of Admete can at least be partly explained as a rationalization or reflection of the importance of female priestess in general to the worship of Hera in Argos.⁴⁸⁷ In turn, the priestesses of the Argive Heraion reflect the wider historical role of a female priestess in caring for, protecting, and maintaining the sanctuary housing the statue of the divinity.⁴⁸⁸

⁴⁸⁷ See Connelly 2007: 69–72 with Thuc. 4.133.

⁴⁸⁸ See pp. 140–57 below on Iphigenia.

The theft of an object is transformed into the more specific human circumstance of abduction or rape. We will treat this phenomenon in depth in the next chapter. In myth, these duties furnished the link between the human woman and the physical cult object: just like the valuable object they protected, these women could be taken away, stolen, or “convinced” to leave.⁴⁸⁹

The prominence of the human priestess Admete can also be tied to the fact that the ancient testimony unanimously identified the festival of Hera on Samos – the Heraia – with the very human context of marriage and specifically the goddesses’ marriage to Zeus.⁴⁹⁰ Indeed, the fact that the willow *lygos* was considered an anti-aphrodisiac plant – the “*castus agnus*” – along with the meaning of Admete’s name (undomesticated), implies that the tradition Menodotus was following also connected the Tonaia with a marriage or pre-marriage rite. Building on this insight, scholars such as Nilsson and Farnell have classed the Tonaia as involving a type of “holy marriage” (*hieros gamos*).⁴⁹¹ However, recent scholars such as Burkert and Graf, followed by Avagianou and Bettinetti, have called into question this connection to marriage.⁴⁹² First, it is noted that the passage of Menodotus describing the myth and festival has little explicitly to do with a marriage, and second, that the sacrilegious “binding” or “immobilizing” of the statue sits uncomfortably within a marriage or pre-marriage context.⁴⁹³

⁴⁸⁹ Stories of travelling women, especially priestess have a significant pedigree in ancient Greek religious thought; cf. the “doves” of Dodona in Hdt. 2.54–7; Soph. *Trach.* 171–3; Proxenos *FGrH* 703 F 7; Philostrat. *Imag.* 2.33; Paus. 7.21.2; 10.12.10. Cf. Lloyd 1988: 2.251–64.

⁴⁸⁹ Hdt. 1.1–3. Cf. Medea in, e.g. Pherecydes *FGrH* F 31, 32a–c.

⁴⁹⁰ E.g. Nicaenetus in Menodotus *FGrH* 541 F 1 *ap.* Ath. 15.673b: Διὸς εὐκλέα νόμφην; Varro *ap.* Lactant. *Div. Inst.* 1.17.8; August. *De civ. D.* 6.7.

⁴⁹¹ E.g. Farnell 1907: 1.186 saw “an allusion to the secret abduction of the bride.” See also Nilsson 1957: 48–9 and Clark 1988.

⁴⁹² Graf 1985: 90–7; Avagianou 1991: 46–58; Bettinetti 2001: 112–16.

⁴⁹³ While this interpretation does not require a culminating marriage, it is likely that the festival included one in some form. That is, the role of “husband” would be embodied by a chief priest and would be a

In place of the marriage ceremony, the binding and release of the *bretas* is placed at the core of the festival. According to Avagianou, the aetiological legend is “clearly a sacrilegious act, consisting of two phases and its expiation.”⁴⁹⁴ Graf’s influential reading contends that the rite belongs to a New Year festival type in which a bound goddess (usually Artemis) is released during a period of chaotic Saturnalian license.⁴⁹⁵ Graf places abstract concepts such as “society” and “community life” alongside the well-known initiatory aspects of the festivals;⁴⁹⁶ the two spheres – communal and age specific – are in dialogue. This interpretation is powerful and does indeed correspond to some aspects of the Samian worship of Hera.⁴⁹⁷ However, it is likely that alongside the pan-*polis* celebration of a “festival of license,” private folk-beliefs of an emotional nature played a part in the significance of the mobile statue.

prominent, hereditary position (though perhaps subordinate to the κληίδουχος of a Heraion). On this matter see Kron 1988: 136n9. For the binding of gods in general, see Faraone 1991a; 1991b; 1992: 74–9; Steiner 2001: 160–8. Merkelbach 1996 and West 2001 adduce as a comparison the return of Hephaistos as found in, e.g. Alc. fr. 349a–e V; Paus. 1.20.3; Hyg. *Fab.* 166; POxy IV 670.

⁴⁹⁴ Avagianou 1991: 51–3. The presence of the Imbrasos, as it forms a large portion of Avagianou’s critique of the marital aspect of the festival, deserves comment. Hera is said to be born at the side of the Imbrasos and is identified with her white willow tree on the banks of the river (παρὰ τῷ Ἰμβράσῳ ποταμῷ καὶ ὑπὸ τῇ λύγῳ). Pre-marriage rites commonly involved bathing in rivers, which was believed to enhance fertility (see Avagianou 1991: 6–7; Redfield 1982: 203; Larson 2001: 111–17). Simultaneously, rivers were also seen as lustful or wrathful *daimones*, which needed to be propitiated by the virginity of a maiden or a lock of her hair (see Currie 2002: 30–1). These two ideas were combined and then connected with a third: the arriving, colonizing hero who would defeat the lustful, violent river and marry the maiden in its stead; the most famous variant of this story (adduced by Currie 2002: 31–7) is Herakles fighting Acheloos for the hand of Deianeira (cf. Gantz 1993: 457–60; Fowler 2013: 329–33). The Tonaia involved movement to the sea, and then back to the Imbrasos. We might posit that the performance of the Tonaia, because it reflected the autochthonous stability of Hera and Admete, was the antithesis of this colonial story pattern. Cf. the description of the river Parthenios (later the Imbrasos) in Strab. 10.2.17 C457; Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* 1.187.

⁴⁹⁵ See Meuli 1975: 1055–82; Graf 1985: 93; Burkert 1985: 134–8; Avagianou 1991: 46–8. For the *gamos* as a drama of transformation and relocation, see Redfield 1982: 188–91; for its relation to coercion and consent, see Redfield 1982: 190–8. Cf. also Plut. *Mor.* 271d–e.

⁴⁹⁶ Graf cites Brelich in this connection.

⁴⁹⁷ According to Graf’s interpretation, the Tonaia included both a period of metaphorical release (the escape from the temple), and literal release (the loosening from the *lygos* and subsequent re-consecration). This indicates that the normative state of the statue was inaccessible to public viewing, *i.e.* hidden. The hidden cult statue, which is annually processed and displayed, has *comparanda* across the Greek world, and the *aition* of the Tonaia corresponds well to Graf’s two-part pattern. First, there is a hypothesized relaxation of social norms – an *interregnum* of the social order – when the statue is metaphorically “stolen,” and second, a “reconfirmation of the social order” when it is recovered and returned to the Heraion.

These emotions were focused on the real-life possibility of the abduction and departure of young women through contact with foreign raiders or colonists. After all it is not accidental that the proem of the *Histories* of Herodotus starts out with an exploration of this motif. While it is true Menodotus nowhere literally indicates that the celebrants ritually bound the *bretas*, many assume that they did.⁴⁹⁸ We can say also that the binding of the statue fundamentally was an attempt to restrain the goddess – as represented by her priestess – from departing permanently.⁴⁹⁹ Moreover, with the Tonaia we gain a glimpse into the ambivalent effects of a civic ritual focused on physically coercing a god. The acquisition of the god’s goodwill or divine acquiescence towards any type of move, which, in the end, could only be attributed to the divinity itself, was the subject of intense interest in many situations. As we have seen, at the end of our section of the *Hymn to Dionysus*, the pirates attempt to bind and coerce the god into accompanying them: the god relents, but only on his own terms.

When the Karians find the statue of Hera and bind it with the *lygos*, they are said to be acting “as one would expect of barbarians” (which is illustrative of later rationalizing and possibly of ethnochauvanism). Menodotus goes on to tell us that the Karians travelled to an Apolline oracle concerning the matter and were ordered to undergo a “penalty” for their impious actions (Menodotus *FGrH* 541 F 1):

ἱστορεῖται δ’ ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον τῶν Κάρων δεισιδαιμονίαι
 περισχεθέντων ἐπὶ τὸ μαντεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ παραγενομένων εἰς Ὑβλαν καὶ
 πυνθανομένων περὶ τῶν ἀπηνητημένων, θεσπίσαι τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ποινὴν αὐτοῦς
 ἀποδοῦναι τῇ θεῷ δι’ ἑαυτῶν ἑκούσιον καὶ χωρὶς δυσχεροῦς συμφορᾶς.

⁴⁹⁸ Bettinetti 2001: 110; Nilsson 1957: 48; Romano 1980: 257–60; Graf 1985: 94; Kron 1988: 140.

⁴⁹⁹ This is one of the options given by Merkelbach 1996: 19.

It is recorded that at about the same time the Karians, since they were completely given to superstition, went to the god's oracle at Hybla⁵⁰⁰ and inquired about these events. Apollo returned the answer that they must pay to the goddess a penalty (ποινήν αὐτοῦς ἀποδοῦναι τῇ θεᾷ) of their own choice and without any grave harm.

Apollo then prescribes the “penalty” or “reparation” (ποινήν) of wearing only willow wreaths for the Karians and laurel for special worshippers of the goddess at the festival of Hera. Just as Prometheus – after his release from chains – had accepted wreathing as punishment for his crime against Zeus, the Karians accepted the wearing of the *lygos* as punishment for their crime of binding the goddess with the same plant. The fact that the binding of the statue was seen as a blameworthy action or a sacrilege requiring a penalty, points to the hierarchical nature of the ritual: the Karians, not the colonizing Ionians or culturally dominant Dorians, are superstitious barbarians and can be blamed for the crime. Since the Karians, however, are incorporated into the general population of classical Samos, their barbaric superstition also allows for the ready accommodation or maintenance of a narrative element perhaps too simplistic for later educated opinion.

According to Menodotus, before the priestess Admete found the *bretas* of Hera, the Karians ran across it and bound it with willow shoots because they believed that the statue had run away of its own accord (αὐτόματον). As we have seen, cult statues, in their capacity as mysterious objects of religious reverence, were commonly said to move on their own or of their own accord. Consequently, it was the common-sense opinion of antiquity that their binding expressed a desire on the part of a religious community to

⁵⁰⁰ Hybla is ostensibly a Sicel town in Sicily, but there is no oracle securely associated with the location. Jacoby (*FGrH* IIIb 1.461) posited that the oracle referred to must be Karian. Cf. also Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Γαλεῶται, 196.19; Ὑλλούαλα, 648.18 Meineke.

keep their gods stationary, controlled, and present in their location.⁵⁰¹ In Menodotus' narrative we uniquely get a detailed account of a ritual centered on the binding of a statue. Whether such binding always constituted sacrilege or not, would probably depend on several factors: on the willingness of the interpreter to apply a rationalizing perspective, on a judgment to what degree the image instantiated the deity itself, or on the sacral or dedicatory investment of the binder in the statue. It is likely however, that in any detailed ritual enactment of binding, that is, the diminishing of a deity's freedom of movement, the perpetrators would be negatively characterized.

Other instances illustrate. At Sparta, a bound statue of the war god Enyalios was said by Pausanias to embody the idea of the permanent residence of the war-god in Lakonia.⁵⁰² Similarly, a Spartan statue of Aphrodite was displayed veiled and seated with fetters on her ankles. In explanation, Pausanias tells us that Tyndareos bound the goddess in order to show that the "relationship of women to their husbands was as absolute as fetters."⁵⁰³ Despite the difficulty of formulating a universal reference for bound statues, the tying of a god must have marked an attempt to control or, at least manage the power of the deity it represented. As Graf demonstrates, it was usually the *loosing* of a perennially bound statue that signaled the opening of a freeing "festival of license," the period when the god was given full access to his or her powers.

⁵⁰¹ E.g. Polemon fr. 90 Preller *ap.* ΣPin. *Ol.* 7.95a: Πολέμων γάρ φησι παρὰ Χίοις μὲν τὸν Διόνυσον δεδέσθαι καὶ παρ' Ἐρυθραίοις δὲ τὸ ἔδος τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, καὶ ὅλως πολλὴν κατεσπάρθαι λόγον περὶ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων ὡς μὴ μενόντων, ἀλλὰ πορευομένων ἄλλοσε πολλάκις. "Polemon says the Chians bound a Dionysus and the Erythraeans bound a statue of Artemis; in fact, the story about these statues is widely known: namely, that they do not remain but often travel around." Cf. Merkelbach 1996: 19–20; Naiden 2013: 45–6.

⁵⁰² Paus. 3.15.7. Cf. Faraone 1991a.

⁵⁰³ Paus. 3.15.11.

More abstractly, a control or reduction in the power of a female divinity can be framed in terms of a temporary— and usually dangerous — release from the goddess’ normative sphere of action. In Hera’s case, this control or reduction would be manifested by the absence or complication of the social pact of marriage: specifically, the anxiety arousing from the cases of adultery, rape, or intermarriage with non-Greeks.⁵⁰⁴ Furthermore, the tendency of ritual co-identification between human priestess and inanimate statue adds a sharper, more immediate perspective to the practice of binding or controlling female representations of divinities. The fear of the free movement of a statue or female divinity — especially in a context affected by a pervasiveness of incest taboo concerns — signaled an anxiety over a forced seizure by enemies or possible willing departure from a legitimate marriage. In the case of the worship of Hera at the Tonaia, the fear of this possibility for their autochthonous goddess was acted out, but ultimately *denied*: first, through the fact that the Argive theft was a failure, and second, through the shifting of the blame onto the native Karians for the sacrilege of doubting the fidelity of Admete and her goddess.

The binding of the goddess was thus not a straightforward ritual act but a sacrilegious, anti-social transgression, which called for culpability and required purification or expiation. A transgression of this sort was certainly not out of place in a civic religious setting. Across the Greek world, the *aitia* of the great festivals were often centered on a remembered negative event (or sequence of events), which was expiated by the institution of the festival.⁵⁰⁵

⁵⁰⁴ See pp. 157–68 on the role of foreign integration in Euripides’ *IT*.

⁵⁰⁵ Cf. the *aition* for the Spartan Karneia as in, e.g. Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F 357; Apollod. *Bib.* 2.8.2–5 with Robertson 2002.

In Menodotus' narrative, the movement of the *bretas* of Hera is simultaneously a *non-movement*, or failed movement, which emphasizes the nativity of the worship of the goddess. This is not to say, however, that the composition of the Samian populace was ever considered to be monolithic: an unchanging native group of Samians born – so to speak – from the earth. The belief in the perennial presence of the goddess Hera had to be integrated with a contradictory acceptance that Samos was an ethnically diverse society affected to some significant degree by colonization. The Karian's status as an *ur-native* population afforded them the possibility of representing the ancient autochthonous heritage of the Samian Heraion contraposed *against* the tradition of Dorian Argive influence. Simultaneously, the crime of binding the goddess served as a positive confirmation of Hera's native origin, minimized the historical Argive claims to cultural control over the cult, and marked the historically contested non-Greek status of the Karians themselves. Whether the statue is literally bound during the festival or not, I would contend that the ritual was both an expression of anxiety over the possibility of the goddess' betrayal and loss, and an absolute denial of that very possibility.

The worship of Hera's *bretas* at the Samian Tonia reflects the tendency to understand the movement of cult images in symmetrical terms: both as a dedication of an object, and an arrival of a divinity. In Menodotus, the two aspects are combined: first, the fortuitous arrival of the woman Admete, which, in effect, inaugurates the worship of Hera, and then, second, the *possibility* of her forcible repatriation (rape) as represented by the removal of the *bretas* by the Argives. In cult, the dynamics of the contested *possession* of both the cult statue – the carrying of the *bretas* down to the sea, its binding, and subsequent release – places the Samian Heraion in opposition with the Argive

sanctuary of Hera and was understood as the movement and possible abduction of the priestess Admete. In the end, the ritual serves to fix the home of Admete as Samos and characterize the Samian worship of Hera as autochthonous.

Conclusion

Our contention in the first part of the thesis has been that the human dynamics of using and possessing objects were central to the nature of cult statues. Statues could be bartered, stolen, lost, or given away; these actions – specific to possessions – influenced both how the divinity’s movement (*i.e.* its original arrival to a community) was understood and how the cult image was used in ritual. However, if the human manipulation of a cult image was determinative for its religious meaning, this did not mean that the gods were seen as dependent on the vicissitudes of human agency for their mobility. A ritual such as the Tonaia needed to represent the activities of the human participants who manipulated and accompanied the image, but it also needed to make them coincide with the projected intentions of an omnipotent god. We have argued that in the Tonaia, Admete functioned simultaneously as an object to be possessed, lost, and retrieved, and a subordinate “version” of Samian Hera. The role of the priestess who accompanied and cared for the image was thus one way to avoid the dissonance between human agency and divine omnipotence. We shall see in our subsequent analysis of Euripides’ *IT* and the *Helen*, that this mediating role of the priestess was especially appropriate in situations where the normative, human-centered practice of dedication was the physical act reflected in the narrative.

PART II

Chapter Five – Euripides

In part two, the foregoing analysis of the movement of cult images is used to read Euripides' *Helen* and *Iphigenia among the Taurians*. Physical cult images, whatever they actually looked like, represented the physical presence of the divine. Any movement of a cult image in a procession necessarily would be encountered both from the perspective of the human participants themselves (the carrying of an object) and from the perspective of the divinity (its own subjective movement). Just as there were multiple contexts in which objects could be transferred or manipulated (*i.e.* as a theft, evaluated negatively, or a positive gift) these same contexts would likely be reflected in how the subjective movement of the divinity was understood.

When a worshipper travelled from his home bringing an *agalma* as a gift to a divinity, or when a public *pompê* with attendant *kômoi* and choral performers transported a god to the sea and back home, there were multiple inflection points that determined how the act was understood. These points emerged from the physicality of the event itself. The first was the nature of the object dedicated; the materiality of the *agalma*, as its status as a physical object with shape, size, and texture had an effect on its ability to represent an ineffable divinity to an observer. The second was the relationship of the new, native location to the old or foreign one, that is, the relationship of the origin to the destination. A dedicator had a home that he left and a reason for making his journey. He had a reason to travel to a specific location and to give a specific gift. Furthermore, the normative dedicatory act naturally carried the possibility for the opposite situation:

deception and theft. The dedicator had a choice in the type of gift to give or whether to give something of value at all.

An approach that uses these inflection points to understand tragedy rests on the old premise that human activity or ritual (here construed very broadly as the act of moving a votive or cult statue) determined the shape of myth. The relationship between religious ritual and myth is complex; it has fascinated scholars for a long time.⁵⁰⁶ I do not claim that a particular ritual or procession at a particular time or place (such as the Athenian Arkteia or a festival of Helen at Sparta) is responsible for the content of the *IT* and the *Helen*, although this is a possibility. Rather, I contend that the act of moving a cult image informed religious attitudes about divinities, and, in turn, the articulation of Euripides' plays.⁵⁰⁷ This influence would have occurred with, or without, the conscious attention of the contemporary community.⁵⁰⁸ Ritual is often construed as a repeated action that is used as a pattern for understanding.⁵⁰⁹ This action can include any type of repeated, important activity, but is usually defined by the presence of a performative element.⁵¹⁰ The movement of a cult image displays this performative element. Dedication in particular was omnipresent in the cultural life of ancient Greece in both private and public contexts over a long period of time and was inextricably linked to the character of cult statues.

⁵⁰⁶ For surveys of the contributions of the Cambridge school and current reaction to their work see Bremmer 1998; Kowalzig 2007a: 13–43; Versnel 2014.

⁵⁰⁷ See the formulation of Mastrorade 2010: 308. Dedication, as a physical act favors *drômena* over *legomena*; cf. Burkert 1979: 35–58; Bremmer 1998: 18; Henrichs 2000: 176–7; Pilz 2011: 154.

⁵⁰⁸ Some scholars seem to skirt these issues. For discussion *viz.* Euripides, see O'Brien 1988: 100n7; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a: 50–3; Wright 2005: 352–62.

⁵⁰⁹ On approaches to ritual in Greek religion generally, see, *e.g.* Bremmer 1998; Gould 2001: 211, 216–20; Kowalzig 2007: 32–43; Pilz 2011: 151–2.

⁵¹⁰ See Kowalzig 2007a: 43–5; Pilz 2011.

Often, the generic concerns of the extant evidence determined which type of agency – human or divine – was dominant in ritual or dedication. For example, *leges sacrae* and proscriptive decrees necessarily presented a picture of religious activity from the perspective of the participant, while mythical or hymnic narratives necessarily presented that same picture from the perspective of the divinity.⁵¹¹ In later rationalizing authors, and works that included explicit *aitia* (itself a very old mode of discourse), elements from both perspectives were melded.⁵¹² The proscriptive, objective elements of ritual (cult personnel, manipulations of *xoana*) were combined with the movements and motives of subjective gods. Attic tragedy can, but does not have to present *aitia*, and like myth generally, its conventions (the performance of actors playing heroes) skew towards presenting divine agency.⁵¹³

However, an inanimate object must have made a poor display of the power of the divinity. The dedication of a simple terracotta votive, or even of an intricately carved chryselephantine *xoanon* would have been hard to figure as the movement of an ineffable divinity. These objects were just that, *agalmata*, beautiful objects representing human prestige and agency. In the case of processions recapitulating dedications, it is plausible that the position of the temple priest or priestess who tended the cult image or accompanied it at a festival procession existed to effect a more satisfying reenactment of

⁵¹¹ For reading greek gods through inscriptions versus *corpora* such as hymns, see Graf 2010. For the term *lex sacra* itself, see Lupu 2005: 4–9; Harris 2015. On the process of codifying *leges sacrae* from myths or unwritten norms, see Henrichs 2003; Stavrianopoulou 2011. For an example of both types of evidence in the context of mobile cult statues, cf. the evidence for Artemis Leukophryene, at Magnesia in *SEG* 15 668 = *I.Magnesia* 99 = Donohue 1988: T 393, and the narrative of Apollo and Artemis at Aigialeia (Sikyon) in Paus. 2.7.7–8 respectively. Cf. Elsner 1996: 520–21 on ritual, myth, and images as a combined phenomenon in Pausanias.

⁵¹² On the tendency of *leges sacrae* to get more explicit over time, see Chaniotis 1997. On their relation to tragic performance, see Chaniotis 2007.

⁵¹³ On Euripidean *aitia*, see, e.g. Scullion 2000; Mikalson 1991: 230–1; Dunn 1996; 2000; Romano 2007; Kowalzig 2006; 2007a: 24–32; Seaford 2009; Calame 2010.

the god's power and movement in performance. On the one hand, she could still enshrine the context of the human involvement in the procession: she was an object or *agalma*, whose mobility, possession and theft could mirror that of actual cult images and the dedications they represented. Concomitantly, in gendered terms, masculine predominance in communal decisions and in determining overt social gesture enhanced her status as *agalma*. On the other hand, because she had emotions, feelings, and desires, she could effectively represent the movement and individuality of the divinity itself. She was a link between the human agency of cult and the subjective biography of the divinity. The priestess blended agency and receptivity vis-à-vis the cult image and deity more dramatically (with deliberate word-play) than her male counterpart.

The question of what, exactly, the doings of Oedipus or Pentheus had to do with the daily religious life of Athens is not a simple one.⁵¹⁴ Transporting cult statues in literal cult *pompai* was a widespread and important part of Greek religious practice, but positing a direct causal relationship between an example or examples of this practice and the structure of a tragic plot is difficult.⁵¹⁵ The plays of Euripides display an avid, almost antiquarian interest in the history of cult and are reflective of a deeply religious atmosphere.⁵¹⁶ If we extract summaries from texts that present multiple *aitia* such as the

⁵¹⁴ See, e.g. Easterling 1993; 1997; Parker 1997; 2005: 136–52. For the issue of Euripides' relationship to his contemporary political context, see Goldhill 2000a; 2000b; Finkelberg 2006; Wohl 2015: 3–6, 89–109. See also Easterling 1997: 24 on the necessity of tragic discourse to offer a connection to every member of the audience.

⁵¹⁵ On tragic performance at the Dionysia as ritual, see, e.g. Easterling 1988; Gould 1996; Friedrich 1996; Lloyd-Jones 1998; Kowalzig 2007b; Calame 2017. For sober reflections, see Scullion 2005; Parker 2005: 136–52. For specific approaches, see, e.g. Zeitlin 1965; Seaford 1981; 1994: 368–405; Edmunds 1996; Henrichs 1994; 2000; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a: 141–200; Goldhill 2015.

⁵¹⁶ On antiquarianism in Euripides, see Battezzato 2016. For the type of religious belief presented in Euripides, see Lefkowitz 1989; 2016: 193–204; Mikalson 1991: 225–36; Parker 1997; Wildberg 2000; Mastrorarde 2010: 153–205; Ringer 2016: 4–8. For the gods of Euripides as anthropomorphic actors, see Easterling 1993; for their relation to physical representation, see Zeitlin 1994; 2010.

IT to aid analysis, it is important to remember that we will not be left with a proscriptive description of a ritual, or even of a clear narrative of a myth.⁵¹⁷

Leaving aside the vexed question of locating the origin and performance of tragedy itself in Dionysiac ritual, tragic performance generally resembles ritual: both activities involve a type of physical representation, stage directions, dressing up and a distancing of the real for the pretend or symbolic.⁵¹⁸ Indeed the performance of any choral poetry involved the *mimesis* of archetypal divine or heroic figures by a leader (*chorêgos*) and group of age-mates.⁵¹⁹ At the same time, facts as disparate as the representations in the Stoa Poikile, the names of the demotic *arkhâgetai*, and the contents of the sacred calendars of Marathon and Thorikos confirm the relevance of heroic figures as some kind of model (perhaps only a psychological one) for Euripides' audience.⁵²⁰ Iphigenia and Helen in particular have always held a special place in treatments of mortal heroes whose attachment to a tomb and specialized local cult shaped their differentiation from divinities.⁵²¹ However, if the setting of the Dionysia itself is not invoked, the fact that tragedy does not enjoy the same one-to-one relationship between performance and

⁵¹⁷ See Sourvinou-Inwood 1997: 162. Cf. Edmunds 1996: 1–38 where the visible movements of the body (mimetic) are used along side the discourse of the actors (diegetic) to create a non-textual dramatic performance of actors. The question of the relationship of a tragic text to its underlying narrative summary or plot is also treated narratologically. There have been a number of recent narratological interpretations of Greek tragedy, stemming from de Jong's 1991 study of messenger speeches. See, e.g. Goward 1999; the excellent remarks of Gould 2001: 319–34; Markantonatos 2002. Cf. the specific studies of Lamari 2010 on Eur. *Phoen.* and Markantonatos 2013 on Eur. *Alc.*

⁵¹⁸ Easterling 1988; Chaniotis 1997 on public ritual performed in the Hellenistic and Roman theater.

⁵¹⁹ Cf., e.g. Calame 1997: 19–88; Swift 2010: 35–60; Nagy 2013. See also, Fearn 1997; Wilson 2000: 21–4; Battezzato 2013 on Athenian dithyramb; Nagy 1990: 382–8; Murnaghan 2013: 156–7 on the tragic chorus.

⁵²⁰ Paus. 1.15.3; *SEG* 33 147.37–8 (Thorikos); For discussion in terms of Attic Hero cult, see Kearns 1989: 10–63; 1998; Kron 1999; Parker 1996: 33–6; 2005: 9–11, 21–36. On the helpfulness of mortal heroes in filling out the biography of a god, see Calame 2010: 247–8.

⁵²¹ See Burkert 1985: 190–208; Antonaccio 1995: 1–9; Ekroth 2002: 20–2; Larson 1995: 26–42; 104–6, and 116–18 on Iphigenia; Stafford 2010 on Herakles. For the claim that they require specialized sacrifice, see Ekroth 2002: 54–9; 121–8; Henrichs 2005 and the other contributions in Hägg 2005. On the complex issue of the god's connection to the death of the hero, see Nagy 1979: 174–210; Larson 2005: 116–18; Calame 2007: 174–82; 2010: 246–7.

ritual as traditional choral poetry, rightly necessitates the use of literary terms such as metaphor when talking about relevance of a play to daily life.⁵²² A different approach to the religious nature of tragic performance emphasizes choral mediation or projection: lyric passages that evoke and refer to their own theatrical performance in the *hic et nunc* are identifying their song with that of a mythologized ritual chorus elsewhere in time and space.⁵²³

Cult statues had a significant presence in the plays of Euripides.⁵²⁴ In the *Hippolytus*, the paired statues of Aphrodite and Artemis probably stood at either end of the stage and framed the thematic contrast between the goddesses.⁵²⁵ In the *Andromache*, the concubine Andromache is a suppliant at a physical *agalma* of Themis, and the goddess herself appears in a *dea ex machina* at the end of the play.⁵²⁶ In *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, Iphigenia removes the *bretas* of Artemis from its pedestal, carries it in her arms, and takes it off stage. Of course, actors “representing” gods and heroized figures also populated the stage, often emerging from on high.⁵²⁷ In Sophocles’ *Xoanephoroi*, the gods fled, carrying their own effigies as Troy was being sacked.⁵²⁸ For Easterling, the audience observing the actors representing the gods and heroes were always aware of elements of reality and of “make believe.” Embodied gods on stage were fundamentally

⁵²² Thus, for Zeitlin 1970: 659, the evocation of the ritual procession in the *parodos* of the *Electra* could only be a textual device, an ironic counterpart to the real Argive Heraea. In Zeitlin 1965: 463, 488–52, the inverted sacrificial language surrounding Orestes and Iphigenia in the *Oresteia* and the *IT* was a complex metaphorical system symbolically related to actual sacrificial practice. Cf. the formulations of Goff 1999: 109; Henrichs 2000: 175. For the relative importance of literary approaches to tragedy, see Griffin 1998; Seaford 2000

⁵²³ See, e.g. Henrichs 1994; 1996; Power 2010; Steiner 2011; Gagné and Hopman 2013b; Calame 2013; Nagy 2013.

⁵²⁴ For the tragic language of statues, see pp. 39–44, 52–4 above with Stieber 2011: 115–92.

⁵²⁵ Eur. *Hipp.* 101 (cf. 1399) with Barrett 1964: 154 and Rogers 2011: 18–24; Stieber 2011: 132–4.

⁵²⁶ Eur. *And.* 115–116; 1231–1272 with Rogers 2011: 42–63; Stieber 2011: 119–132.

⁵²⁷ See Mastrorarde 2010: 174–195.

⁵²⁸ Soph. *TrGF* fr. 452 *ap.* Aesch. *Sep.* 217–18, 304–11 with scholia = Donohue 1988: T 1–5.

metaphorical; their presence helped to dramatize human situations that were hard to grasp conceptually.⁵²⁹

Images on stage share this mimetic quality: an actor and a statue both were, and were not, the divinity. However, the audience's reaction to the capability of dramatic theater in every case to project a metatheatrical similarity between actor and image of divinity will not be the focus here.⁵³⁰ Rather, my position is that the desire to present icon, actor, and god on the same stage represented a grappling with the problem of representing a god as a palpable object. While this problem of representation could appear in many ritual contexts where humans impersonated divinities, the necessary dissonance between a physical object and a divinity was most strongly felt in processions accompanied by moving cult images. I contend that the solutions found in that specific ritual context influenced Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians* and the *Helen*.

The movement of a cult image to a temple reflected the advent of the divinity's presence and power as well as the memory (or appropriation) of the first significant *human* act of devotion to the divinity. I contend that the movement of Iphigenia and Helen (and their counterparts, the *bretas* and the *eidôlon* respectively) not only reflected this dynamic of divine representation, but also all the requirements and possibilities inherent in the action. The narratives of the plays are structured by the movement of each woman from origin to destination, their role in human-centered dedicatory substitution or surrogacy, their ability to represent faithfully a divinity, and the variable relationship between the giver and receiver of each object.

⁵²⁹ Easterling 1993: 78–9. Cf. Mastrorarde 2010: 158–9.

⁵³⁰ The concepts of metatheater and ritual overlap. For the possibility of theater to be metatheatrical in the *Helen* specifically, see, e.g. the formulation of Muecke 1986: 217 on disguise in Plautine comedy and Downing 1990 on *dolos* and *apatê*.

Iphigenia among the Taurians

Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians* was produced at an unknown date in the last quarter of the fifth century. Metrical considerations place its composition in c. 414/13 BCE or just before the first production of the *Helen*.⁵³¹ The action revolves around the relocation of a cult statue (*bretas*) of Artemis from the Taurian Chersonesos to Greece, specifically to Halai and Brauron in Attica. Orestes and Pylades, at the behest of Apollo, arrive among the Taurians in order to steal the *bretas*. After their arrival, the pair are captured by the Taurians and sentenced to be sacrificed to a local goddess (identified with Artemis). The priestess of the goddess is revealed to be Orestes' own sister Iphigenia, and when she, in turn, discovers who they are, the trio execute a plan to escape to Attica, bringing with them the *bretas*. Orestes is (uniquely) linked in this drama to an *aition* for the Anthesteria, while Iphigenia is connected to the origin of the worship of Artemis Brauronia. The play ends with a passage describing the advent of the *bretas* to the east coast of Attica and the inauguration of the cult of Artemis at Brauron and Halai Araphenides.⁵³²

There is no unequivocal epigraphical or archaeological evidence for the worship of Iphigenia at Brauron and many scholars have taken the position that Euripides simply invented the link between Iphigenia and Attic cult.⁵³³ However, Hall has taken a diametrically opposed position, citing the many places that claim to receive the Taurian

⁵³¹ Cf. Cropp and Frick 1985: 5–8 and 23; Hall 2013: xxv–xxxii. For the possible chronological priority of one play over the other see Marshall 2009 and the literature cited at n727 below.

⁵³² On the cult site at Araphenides, see Knell 1983; Hollinshead 1985; McInerney 2015; On Orestes and Halai, see, e.g. Graf 1979: 41; Lloyd-Jones 1983: 96–7; 100; Dowden 1989: 37; 134; Dillon 2001: 127–8. Cf. Bathrellou 2012 on Men. *Epit.* and the trope of abduction/rape in the context of the festival of the Tauropolia and initiation rites. For the fourth-century Athenian *ephebeia*, see, e.g. Aeschin. 1.49; [Aris]. *Ath. Pol.* 42; Plut. *Alc.* 15.4.

⁵³³ E.g. Pohlenz 1930: 442; Scullion 2000; Ekroth 2003: 59. Cf. Zeitlin 2011: 462–5; Hall 2013: xxix; McInerney 2015.

Artemis as implying the likelihood of the existence of a similar tradition at Brauron.⁵³⁴ This was *prima facie* always the more likely position.⁵³⁵ For Hall, the *IT* represents fundamentally the action of cult. Crucially, because the play takes place at a place of worship and reflects literally the actions of a priestess.⁵³⁶ *In toto*, Hall's discussion has the salutary effect of drawing our attention to Iphigenia in the *IT* as a priestess, celebrant, and guardian of a cult image.

Sourvinou-Inwood posited a modulated distance between the world of tragedy and the normative Athenian audience focused on attitudes towards foreigners and human sacrifice (her “zooming” and “distancing” effects).⁵³⁷ All the ritual actions in the play are seen in terms of their distance or closeness to the ritual world of the Athenians.⁵³⁸ For example, in the prologue, Artemis is the zoomed-in, normalized figure of Brauron and Attic cult (ἠϋξῶ φωσφόρω θεῶ, *IT* 21), but when the Taurians are mentioned (*IT* 30–42) the distancing goes into effect. This modulation plays itself out through the figures of Agamemnon and Artemis who are figured as opposed causes of the aborted sacrifice of Iphigenia at Aulis, and her resultant transfer to the Taurians. The Athenians are reassured

⁵³⁴ Hall 2013: 150–1 lists fifteen (!) places connected to the movement of the Taurian image of Artemis. See also Kowalzig 2013: 190–201. Her mid-sixth-century date for the connection is speculative (Hall 2013: xxix), and its coupling with the idea of Artemis as essentially an introduced goddess seems strained.

⁵³⁵ Cf., e.g. Lloyd-Jones 1983: 97–100; McInerney 2015.

⁵³⁶ Hall 2013: 142: “Performing it, or visually representing it necessarily meant mimetically creating a place where a divinity was worshiped.” Not without merit is her observation that Iphigenia is, uniquely, a “quest heroine” whose narrative motivation does not include sex, marriage or a male partner (Hall 2013: 32–45).

⁵³⁷ Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a: 30–41; 301–8. For similar discussions of the play (and *aitia* in general) in terms of a development from the savage practice of human sacrifice to civilized ritual, see, e.g. Strachan 1976; Lloyd-Jones 1983; Goff 1999: 109–10. For Burnett 1971: 49, the barbaric Taurian cult is like an “earthbred monster.” For a discussion of the related myth of the Pelasgians and the abducted Athenian women of the Brauronia in comparable terms, see Sourvinou-Inwood 2004: 149–50.

⁵³⁸ E.g. *IT* 4–29 (sacrifice at Aulis); 617–35 (sacrifice of Orestes); 1033–48 (manipulation of the statue) with Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a: 301–8.

of the normality of their world view without completely whitewashing the dark and bloody side of their goddess.

Similarly, Wolff links the explicitness of the *aitia* and the concerns over Artemis' request for human blood to a concern with "not the rejection or purification of myth or ritual, but a more complex understanding of them."⁵³⁹ The ritual elements of the play problematize the distance between present and past, not fix it securely. The *aitia*, with their shift from the fictional space of drama to the world of ritual activity experienced by the audience, mirror the narrative of the play, which focuses on returning from a "nightmarish realm of the barbarian other, back home to Greece."⁵⁴⁰ Goff interprets the violent and antisocial aspects of the play as elements of the problematic integration of Orestes and Iphigenia into adulthood: the "nonperformance" of Iphigenia's duties to Artemis in Tauris is a negative reflection of her ultimate place as a member of Athenian society.⁵⁴¹

Tzanetou compares the plot structure of *Iphigenia among the Taurians* to the foundation narratives of the Brauronia and the Arkteia and posits a correspondence or a "morphological similarity" between the actions involved in the festival of the Brauronia with the actions of Iphigenia in the *IT*.⁵⁴² In both situations, the experience of a simulated death, corresponds to a symbolic experience of death and then a reintegration into society – a central aspect of initiation ceremonies. Van Gennep's scheme of initiation is thus applied to the *IT*.⁵⁴³ My analysis builds on a number of these connections but places them

⁵³⁹ Wolff 1992: 312.

⁵⁴⁰ Wolff 1992: 312.

⁵⁴¹ Goff 1999: 110.

⁵⁴² Tzanetou 2000: 203.

⁵⁴³ For initiation in terms of the *IT*, see the literature cited at n687 below. For a critique of Van Gennep's model (separation, liminality, reintegration), see, e.g. Dodd 2003: 73 who gives an entertaining list of topographical features classed as "liminal."

in the context of the mobile cult statue and its relationship to dedication. Because the *IT* itself is centered on the facts of normative, human cult practice, the dedicatory nature of Iphigenia's cycle of movement is close to the surface.

Iphigenia

The scope of Iphigenia's significance in both cult and myth is unique. A central figure in both Greek myth and literature, she has been interpreted as a "faded goddess" who was later subordinated to and identified with Artemis.⁵⁴⁴ Iphigenia as the mortal daughter of Agamemnon appears first in the *Cypria*, but she also enjoyed occasional status as an independent object of reverence.⁵⁴⁵ At Megara, she had her own *herôon*.⁵⁴⁶ Her statue (ἄγαλμα) stood in the temple of Artemis at Aigeira, and at Hermione she was worshipped as Artemis Iphigenia.⁵⁴⁷ In the *IT*, this double nature is reflected in a certain similarity in placement between mortal and goddess. Both Artemis and Iphigenia are the subject of Orestes' quest.⁵⁴⁸ Both are addressed as πόντια in contexts that indicate a parallel posture of veneration toward her and the temple image of the Taurians and refer to their movement to Attica.⁵⁴⁹ Just before the chorus narrates their own desire to return to Greece and dance at a festival performance on Delos, Iphigenia calls on Artemis to return to Athens (*IT* 1082–8):

⁵⁴⁴ See, e.g. Farnell 1921: 444. Cf. Kearns 1989: 27–34; Larson 1995: 101–16.

⁵⁴⁵ *Cypria* Arg. 55–63 *EGF*. In Hom. *Il.* 9.155, 287, Agamemnon's daughter is called Iphianassa not Iphigenia; cf. Lucr. 1.85; ΣEur. *Or.* 22. In Hesiod she is called Iphimede and was either turned into the goddess Hekate (*Cat.* fr. 23b M-W *ap.* Paus. 1.43.1), or transformed into an *eidôlon* (*Cat.* fr. 23a.17–26 M-W) at the time of her sacrifice at Aulis. See also Phanodemus *FGrH* 325 F 14a; Stesich. fr. 178 Davies and Finglass = 215 *PMGF*.

⁵⁴⁶ Paus. 1.43.2. For Aulis, see, e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 1412–18 with 248–50; Pin. *Pyth.* 11.17–25; Eur. *IA*; Lucr. 1.84. Cf. Stesich. fr. 86 Davies and Finglass = 191 *PMGF ap.* Paus. 2.22.7 where Theseus and Helen are Iphigenia's parents. On the Attic appropriation of Iphigenia, see Hershkowitz 2016: 204–6.

⁵⁴⁷ Paus. 7.26.5; 2.35.1.

⁵⁴⁸ *IT* 77–94. On this point, see Burnett 1971: 48; Hall 2013: 29.

⁵⁴⁹ See *IT* 402, 463, 533, 1082 (Artemis); 1123 (Iphigenia).

ὦ πότνι, ἥπερ μ' Αὐλίδος κατὰ πτυχὰς
 δεινῆς ἔσωσας ἐκ πατροκτόνου χερός,
 σῶσόν με καὶ νῦν τούσδε τ'· ἢ τὸ Λοξίου
 οὐκέτι βροτοῖσι διὰ σ' ἐτήτυμον στόμα.
 ἀλλ' εὐμενῆς ἔκβηθι βαρβάρου χθονὸς
 τὰς Ἀθήνας· καὶ γὰρ ἐνθάδ' οὐ πρόπει
 ναίειν, παρόν σοι πόλιν ἔχειν εὐδαίμονα.

1085

Oh Mistress you who by the folds of Aulis saved me from the terrible hand of a murderer father, save me now too and these – or because of you the word of Loxias will no longer have truth for mortals. Be good-minded and leave this barbarous land for Athens. It is not fitting to live here when it is possible for you to possess a blessed city.⁵⁵⁰

Artemis is enjoined to transport herself from the land of the Taurians to Attica, just as she once transported Iphigenia to the Black Sea. The movement of the goddess to Attica is also invoked to parallel the escape of Orestes, Pylades, and Iphigenia from their current predicament. The language underlines the thematic similarity of the aborted sacrifices of Iphigenia at Aulis and Orestes in Tauris, but it also links the movement of the mortal with that of the goddess.⁵⁵¹ The chorus of Iphigenia's temple servants subsequently address their leader as *potnia* in the context of their own desire to return to Greece: “Now, mistress, an Argive penteconter is going to take you home” (καὶ σὲ μὲν, πότνι, Ἀργεῖα πεντηκόντορος οἶκον ἄξει).⁵⁵²

Despite the similarity of address, the mortal and the goddess are clearly not equals. Just as the chorus are servants, Iphigenia is the *prospolos* or *hiereia* of Artemis

⁵⁵⁰ All translations are my own unless otherwise noted. The text is that of Cropp 2000.

⁵⁵¹ Sansone 1975 treated the narrative similarities between the actions of the siblings strictly in terms of their connection to sacrifice. For example, when Iphigenia describes the ritual she hopes to perform with Orestes, her language recalls both her brother's arrival at the land of the Taurians, and also Iphigenia's own aborted sacrifice at Aulis. Thoas is told that the Orestes and Pylades will be bound (*IT* 1204), Orestes' head will be veiled (1207), and he will be lead to the seashore and washed (1191–3). Caldwell 1975 treated the similarities as a modified recapitulation of the *Oresteia* focused on tone and emotional effect. Cf. the formulations of Burnett 1971: 47–8, 58–9; O'Brien 1988: 110–15; Wolff 1992: 315.

⁵⁵² *IT* 1123–4.

– a situation almost unique in Greek tragedy.⁵⁵³ Iphigenia holds the cult image in the manner of a ritual manipulation.⁵⁵⁴ She performs a purification ceremony in the presence of the image while invoking Artemis with traditional language.⁵⁵⁵ As the head priestess of the temple of Taurian Artemis, Iphigenia is simultaneously implicated in a dedicatory service to Artemis (her priesthood), the plan to steal the *bretas*, and the cult *aitia* connected to Artemis of Brauron. However, she also is also identified with the subjective activities of the divinity: the importation of the goddess’ worship to Attica mirrors the inauguration of her own cult and movement home.⁵⁵⁶ Iphigenia’s ability to be both a gift and a representation of Artemis is owed to her role as a priestess. The individual dedicating the cult image or gift in a *pompê*, acted as an authoritative, socially significant link between the general, mechanical action of bringing a votive to a temple and the extremely abstract belief in the presence and movement of divinities. This double role is shown in the table below:

	Objective	Subjective
Dedication	Dedication of a votive in a shrine.	X (not present)
Divinity	X (not present)	Departure and arrival home.
Priestess	Possession by or service to a divinity.	Personification of divinity.

⁵⁵³ *IT* 34 (ιέρεια); 798 (πρόσπολος); cf. 716–26. For the term *prospolos*, cf. *IG* I³ 953. For Euripidean priestesses, cf. Praxithea in Eur. *Erechtheus TrGF* fr. 349–70 with Kearns 1989: 60–3; Larson 1995: 102–3; Connelly 1996; Sourvinou-Inwood 2011: 24–108; Calame 2011; Theonoe in Eur. *Hel.*; the Delphian priestess in Eur. *Ion* 1320–68. Compare the *melissonomoi* in Aesch. *Hiereiai TrGF* fr. 86–8 set at a Karian temple of Artemis with Frazer 1965: 4.223–4 on Paus. 8.13.1. See generally, Hamilton 1985.

⁵⁵⁴ *IT* 1157–8: τί τόδε μεταίρεις ἐξ ἀκινήτων βάρθρων, Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ, θεᾶς ἄγαλμ’ ἐν ὠλέναις; “Why are you carrying this (τόδε) *agalma* of the goddess in your arms, child of Agamemnon, having moved it from its immovable base?” 1315–6: σεμνὸν θεᾶς ἄγαλμ’ ἔχουσα.

⁵⁵⁵ *IT* 1398–40: ὦ Λητοῦς κόρη σῶσον με τὴν σὴν ἱερέαν πρὸς Ἑλλάδα ἐκ βαρβάρου γῆς καὶ κλοπαῖς σύγγνωθ’ ἐμαῖς. “Maiden of Leto, return me, your priestess to Greece from this barbarian land and forgive me for my theft.” The movement to the sea (*IT* 1039, 1192–3) and purification (*IT* 1191, 1199, 1216, 1221) has affinities with the Athenian Plynteria, the Argive worship of Athena, and the Samian Tonaia.

⁵⁵⁶ Cf. the formulations in Zeitlin 2005: 201, and 2011: 450–3, e.g. “Iphigenia herself bears a twofold allegiance. Beyond her sacerdotal function in the service of Artemis, she is a virtual doublet of the goddess in the play.” For this phenomenon as a Euripidean stylistic choice, see Hamilton 1985: 59–61.

The movement of a cult icon represented the dedication of a gift and the movement of a divinity. The act of dedication is a purely objective act, there is no subjective component. Conversely, the abstract movement of a divinity is a purely subjective act with no objective component. The priestess is able to embody both perspectives. This dynamic is not *limited* to the *IT*. In Menodotus' *aition* of the Samian Tonaia discussed above, the priestess Admete functioned as both the object sought by the temple robbers and as the representative of the autochthonous stability of Hera.⁵⁵⁷

Cult images were often processed to a temple by a priest or priestess accompanied by her group of age-mates and associated contingents made up of all segments of society. At Miletus, the priestess of Dionysus "... carried all the sacred objects and implements (ὄργια πάντα καὶ ἱρά), travelling before the whole city.... She knew the destiny reserved for the virtuous."⁵⁵⁸ At Magnesia on the Meander, during the procession concerning the "*kathidrusis* of the *xoanon* of Artemis Leukophryene"⁵⁵⁹ the priestess of Artemis along with the *neōkoros* would "enact the return of the goddess to the building called the *parthenon*" and lead "choruses of *parthenoi* who sing hymns in honor of Artemis."⁵⁶⁰ As

⁵⁵⁷ See pp. 122–9 above.

⁵⁵⁸ *IMilet* 6.2.733: "τὴν ὀσίην χαίρειμ" πολήτιδες εἶπατε Βάκχαι "ἱρείην" χρηστῆι τοῦτο γυναικὶ θέμις. ὑμᾶς κείς ὄρος ἦγε καὶ ὄργια πάντα καὶ ἱρά ἠνείκεμ πάσης ἐρχομένη πρὸ πόλεως. τοῦνομα δ' εἴ τις ξεῖνος ἀνείρεται, Ἀλκμειωνίς ἢ Ῥοδίου, καλῶμ μοῖραν ἐπισταμένη. See Henrichs 1968; 1974: 148–9. The inscription is an elegiac funeral epitaph (late third century BCE) of Alkmeionis. For the phrase καλῶμ μοῖραν, see Chaniotis 2008: 29–30.

⁵⁵⁹ *SEG* 15 668 = *I.Magnesia* 99.3–5: ὑπὲρ τῆς καθιδρύσεως τοῦ ξοάνου τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Λευκοφρυηνῆς εἰς τὸν κατεσκευασμένον αὐτῆι νῦν Παρθενῶνα.

⁵⁶⁰ *SEG* 15 668 = *I.Magnesia* 99.20–9: δεδόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ: τὸν μὲν νεωκόρον καὶ τὴν ἱέρειαν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ Ἀρτεμισιώνος τῆι ἕκτῃ ἰσταμένου συντελέσαι τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν τῆς θεοῦ εἰς τὸν Παρθενῶνα μετὰ θυσίας τῆς ἐπιφανεστάτης, τὴν δὲ ἡμέραν τήνδε ἀναδεεῖσθαι εἰς τὸν ἀε[ί] χρόνον ἱερὰν προσαγορευομένην Ἰσιτήρια, καὶ ἔστωσαν ἐν αὐτῆι ἐκεχειρία πᾶσι πρὸς πάντων, γινέσθω δὲ καὶ γυναικῶν ἔξοδος εἰς τὸ ἱερόν καὶ παρεδρευέτωσαν ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τὴν ἐπιβάλλουσαν τιμὴν καὶ παρεδρείαν ποιούμεναι τῆς θεοῦ: συντελείτω δὲ ὁ νεωκόρος καὶ χοροὺς παρθένων αἰδουσῶν ὕμνους εἰς Ἄρτεμιν Λευκοφρυηνήν. "Decision of the council and the people: on the sixth of Artemision, it being established that the *neōkoros* and the priestess of Artemis will enact the return of the goddess into the

the primary acting individual, the priestess had pride of place with the object she accompanied: the movement of the human and the movement of the object carried occurred along the same continuum; they departed, processed, and arrived in tandem.⁵⁶¹

Outside of procession settings, the role of the female priestess in caring for, protecting, and maintaining the sanctuary housing the statue of the tutelary divinity provided the primary context for both the period of subordination by or service to a god, and the cross-identification of god and celebrant.⁵⁶² Generally, women priests had to fulfill certain age and social requirements to be considered for their positions, which often were prestigious and expensive.⁵⁶³ There often was some kind of male supervision (*kyrioi*) over the priestess and the exact range of their religious responsibilities is uncertain.⁵⁶⁴ Often an aristocratic familial *genos* would control access to the privileges associated with a specific festival or ritual through serving as a priest for the community at large.⁵⁶⁵ The famous priestesses of Athena Polias were always chosen from the *genos*

Parthenon, with the most brilliant sacrifice, and that day will now be designated as a proclaimed sacred day for all time as “entering day” (Ἰσπτήριω); let a general truce be established on that day; let it occur that women go in procession to the shrine and let them do *paredria* inside of it, accomplishing the most suitable honors and *paredria* for the goddess. Let the *neōkoros* organize choirs of girls who sing hymns in honor of Artemis Leukophryene.”

⁵⁶¹ See Connelly 2007: 105–15.

⁵⁶² Men were certainly not absent from this dynamic. Cf. Paus 7.24.4 with Petridou 2015: 45–6 where the priests of Zeus at Aigion were selected based on their physical appearance to care for cult images. For the place of women in cult, see, e.g. Eur. *Melanippe Desmotis TrGF* fr. 494.12–21 with Connelly 2007: 165–6.

⁵⁶³ See Turner 1983: 174–382; Dillon 2001: 73–106. For a hypothetical view of a historical progression or “decline” from the original office of priestess (especially the Delphian Pythia) to the role of temporary initiate, see DS 16.26.6; Paus. 8.5.11–13 with Turner 1983: 198–205; Dowden 1989: 129–33; Connelly 2007: 44.

⁵⁶⁴ For examples of *kyrioi* (guardians), see Dillon 2001: 79–80; Cole 2008: 63–4. For qualification for priesthood based on sexual status, see Turner 1983: 174–231. Cf. the controversy over the *hiereis* and the Pythia at Delphi in, e.g. *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 393–6 with Fontenrose 1978: 214–24; Dillon 2002: 98–101; Connelly 2007: 43–4, 72–81. Cf. also the ὑποφήται of Dodona in Hom. *Il.* 16.235 with Parke 1967: 80–93.

⁵⁶⁵ Cf. Turner 1983: 15–51; Parker 2005: 89–99; Connolly 2007: 47–8. At Athens, the *demos* was, to some extent, responsible for selecting and empowering each individual *genos* to perform the rituals and ceremony at each sanctuary; cf. Chaniotis 2008; Blok and Lambert 2009; Naiden 2013: 185–201. On the social role of Athenian officiants in the Hellenistic period, see, e.g. Lambert 2012; Bremmer 2012; Mikalson 2016: 50–83. For the Athenian *genē*, see the appendix in Parker 1996: 284–327.

of the Eteoboutidai.⁵⁶⁶ Lysimache served for 64 years and was commemorated with an εἰκὼν on the acropolis in 360 BCE.⁵⁶⁷ It would have been the holders of such a priesthood who shouldered the responsibility for maintaining the expertise and knowledge required for performing the rituals associated with the cult of the divinity.⁵⁶⁸ Because the images associated with the sanctuaries were considered equivalent to divinities in their vital functions, they needed to be furnished with food and clothing⁵⁶⁹ and many offices held by women in cults involved this type of ritual care of statues.⁵⁷⁰ A well-known example of this type of service is the office of the *arrêphoroi*, who were a select group of two or four Athenian girls between the ages of seven and eleven who took part in various activities connected with the cult of Athena Polias.⁵⁷¹ According to Pausanias they “lived for a certain portion of time with the goddess,” that is, in the location where the image was emplaced.⁵⁷² The *lytrides*, were tasked with washing the *hedos* of Athena at the Plynteria festival⁵⁷³ and Myrrhine, the fifth century Athenian priestess of Athena Nike, served as the warden (ἀμφοπέλευσεν) of the ἔδος of Athena.⁵⁷⁴

⁵⁶⁶ See Dillon 2002: 84–5; Connelly 2007: 41, 46–7, 59–64.

⁵⁶⁷ *IG* II² 3453 = *CEG* 757; Plin. *HN* 34.76. She was possibly the model for Lysistrata in the Aristophanic play of that title. See Henderson 1987: xxxviii–ix; cf. Dillon 2001: 84–9; Connelly 2007: 62–4; Keesling 2012. For the office, see Blok and Lambert 2009: 105–9.

⁵⁶⁸ Cf., e.g. Pl. *Plt.* 290b–c: καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸ τῶν ἱερέων αὖ γένος, ὡς τὸ νόμιμόν φησι, παρὰ μὲν ἡμῶν δωρεὰς θεοῖς διὰ θυσῶν ἐπιστήμόν ἐστι κατὰ νοῦν ἐκείνοις δωρεῖσθαι, παρὰ δὲ ἐκείνων ἡμῖν εὐχαῖς κτῆσιν ἀγαθῶν αἰτήσασθαι: “And also for the category of priests, tradition says there is an expertise they have: namely, to give to the gods through sacrifices pleasing gifts from us and to request for us the gain of good things through prayers from them.” Cf. Chaniotis 2008: 20–4; Cole 2008: 57–8; Naiden 2013: 210–24.

⁵⁶⁹ See Faraone 1992: 5–7; Bettinetti 2001: 137–40.

⁵⁷⁰ Cf. Dillon 2001: 132–6; Connelly 2007: 39–41. For the care of cult images, see, e.g. Pl. *Phd.* 252d; Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F 344 with Bettinetti 2001: 137–60.

⁵⁷¹ On the *arrêphoria*, see, e.g. Harp. *s.v.* ἀρρηφορεῖν α 239 Keaney, with Deubner 1966: 9–16; Turner 1983: 345–50; Brulé 1988: 79–98; Neils 1992b: 17; Parker 1996: 271 and 2005: 218–23, 227; Dillon 2001: 57–60; Connelly 2007: 31–3. For their association with initiatory contexts, see Calame 1997: 130–1; 2010: 249–53. For the number of participants and selection mechanism, see Deubner 1966: 12; Brelich 1969: 233–5; Parker 2005: 220. For a complete list of sources, see Donnay 1997: 203–5.

⁵⁷² Paus. 1.17.3.

⁵⁷³ See also Bettinetti 2001: 153–60.

⁵⁷⁴ *IG* I³ 1330.11–13 = *CEG* 93; cf. n181 above.

A significant amount of comparative evidence displays a willingness to entertain this equivalence between divinities, images, and their attendants.⁵⁷⁵ Pausanias tells us that the *daphnêphoros* of Ismenian Apollo was chosen according to his beauty, health, and strength; the description implies that the dress and physical characteristics of the priest create an association with Apollo.⁵⁷⁶ In the procession of the Mysteries of Andania, designated female celebrants dressed themselves in imitation of divinities.⁵⁷⁷ At Athens, the *arrêphoroi* wore white clothing and golden ornaments specifically meant for the divinity, that is, the adornment usually associated with Athena Polias (λευκὴν δ' ἐσθῆτα ἐφόρουσιν καὶ δὲ χρυσία περιέθεντο, ἱερὰ ταῦτα ἐγίνετο).⁵⁷⁸ In a ceremony of Demeter's Mysteries in Syracuse, a pledge put on the purple vestments of the goddess and took a blazing torch in his hand to mirror the divinity.⁵⁷⁹ During an Arkadian ritual, a priest of Demeter Kidaria donned a mask in imitation of a goddess and enacted a scene where he apotropically struck underworld deities with a rod.⁵⁸⁰ The festival of Hermes Ram-

⁵⁷⁵ See Connelly 2007: 104–115; Chaniotis 1997: 245–8 on the theatricality on Hellenistic processions; Petridou 2015: 43–9 on “enacted epiphany.” Cf. “Year” in the *pompê* for Ptolemy Philadelphus in Kallixenos *FGrH* 627 F 2 *ap.* Ath. 196a–203b: μέσος δὲ τούτων ἐβάδιζεν ἀνὴρ μείζων <ἢ> τετράπηχυς ἐν τραγικῇ διαθέσει καὶ προσώποι, φέρων χρυσοῦν Ἀμαλθείας κέρασ, ὃς προσηγορεύετο Ἐνιαυτός. “a man more than four cubits (tall), in tragic costume and mask, bearing a golden horn of Amalthea, who was addressed as Year.”

⁵⁷⁶ Paus. 9.10.4. For the Daphnephoria, see Pin. fr. 94b–c, 104b S–M; Procl. *ap.* Phot. *Bibl.* 321a–b, Henry; Anonymous, “History of Herakles” *FGrH* 40 F 1 = *IG* XIV 1293b.

⁵⁷⁷ *Syll.*³ 736 Dittenberger = *LSCG* pp.120–34, 65.24–5: ὅσα<ς> δὲ δεῖ διασκευάζεσθαι εἰς θεῶν διάθεσιν, ἐχόντων τὸν εἰματισμόν, καθ' ὃ ἂν οἱ ἱεροὶ διατάξωσι. “Whichever women (sc. *hierai*) are to dress themselves in representation of the goddesses must wear the clothes that the *hieroi* order.” Cf. Paus. 4.26.6–27.3. For the inscription, see Nilsson 1957: 337–42; Deschours 2011; Gawlinski 2012: 131–2.

⁵⁷⁸ Paus. 1.27.3. Cf. Connelly 2007: 85–92. The dressing of the statues is a parallel phenomenon. In *IT* 1223, Iphigenia calls for the “goddess’ adornments” (θεῶν κόσμους) in preparation for her purification ceremony. The temple inventories at the sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron contain terms for six separate statues of the goddess along with their wardrobes See *IG* II² 1514 is the most complete inventory. See, e.g. *IG* II² 1516: 19–20; *IG* II² 1514: 39 for specific examples of dedicated clothing. Cf. generally, Linders 1972; Romano 1980: 86–93; Cole 1998: 36–43; Dillon 2001: 19–23; Cleland 2005.

⁵⁷⁹ Plut. *Dion.* 56.4. Cf. Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 155 regarding Ionian Kodrid status as priests of Eleusinian Demeter. Purple clothing is a sign of divine lineage.

⁵⁸⁰ Paus. 8.15.3: καὶ ἐπίθημα ἐπ’ αὐτῷ περιφερές ἐστιν, ἔχον ἐντὸς Δῆμητρος πρόσωπον Κιδαρίας: τοῦτο ὁ ἱερεὺς περιθέμενος τὸ πρόσωπον ἐν τῇ μείζονι καλουμένην τελετῇ ῥάβδοις κατὰ λόγον δὴ τινα τοὺς ὑποχθονίους παίει. “And it [a sacred chest made of stone] has a circular top with the mask of Kidarian

bearer (κριοφόρος) at Tanagra displays all three elements: a divinity, a selected representative youth, and a cult image.⁵⁸¹ According to Pausanias, the worship of Hermes Ram-bearer was inaugurated when the god Hermes saved the city from a plague by carrying a ram around its walls. To commemorate this event the sculptor Calamis created an image of Hermes carrying a ram and every year at the festival of Hermes (ἐν τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ τῆ ἑορτῆ) the youth chosen the most beautiful reenacts the walk around the walls of Tanagra with a young sheep or lamb on his shoulders.

Herodotus' description of Phye at Athens is an exceptional example of the intersection of humans and representations of divinities in the late Archaic period.⁵⁸² We are told that a human woman, selected on account of her tall stature and dressed as the goddess Athena, accompanied Peisistratus on his arrival at Athens.⁵⁸³ The pair entered the city on a chariot in an exceptionally aggrandizing manner, and the entire situation served as a sign to the Athenians that the goddess was personally escorting Peisistratus in his *katabasis* to their city (κατάγει ἐς τὴν ἑωυτῆς ἀκρόπολιν).⁵⁸⁴ The tyrant was using the stature and dynamism of the woman Phye to legitimize his literal “return” to power by

Demeter inside. This the priest puts on at the so-called greater Mysteries, and according to a certain rationale beats the underworld dieties with rods.” See Frazer 1965: 4.239.

⁵⁸¹ Paus. 9.22.1. Frazer 1965: 5.87–90 adduces a Phoenician origin for the well-known statue type of Hermes bearing an animal over his shoulders.

⁵⁸² Hdt. 1.60; cf. [Aris.] *Ath. Pol.* 14; Kleidemus *FGrH* 323 F 15. The event occurred during Peisistratus' second seizure of power in 546/5 BCE. For epiphanic elements in the story, see Pirenne-Delforge 2010: 130–31; Aston 2011: 313–15; Petridou 2015: 147–56.

⁵⁸³ The episode has further been connected to Athenian vase iconography showing Athena accompanying Herakles triumphally in a chariot. Whether these images refer to the *apotheosis* of Herakles or not, or specifically to the Peisistratean manipulation of the Panathenaea or not, the story of Phye gives us a glimpse of the way human celebrants could be integrated into significant religious and cultural situations. For discussion, see Cook 1987 and Ferrari 1994, each reacting to the study of Boardman 1972. For Herakles in archaic Athenian art generally, see Shapiro 1989: 157–63; for the vases, see *LIMC s.v.* Herakles VIII B 2877–908, Boardman 1990 with Shapiro 1987.

⁵⁸⁴ Connor 1987 shows that the tableau includes elements from marriage processions, epic interventions, arrival ceremonies, and parades celebrating athletic or military triumphs and myths and legends. His analysis focuses on the role of Phye as the *parabatês* of Peisistratus.

reenacting Athena's own return to Athens with Herakles; instead of a cult image, we have a living human, most likely associated with the worship of the goddess.

A similar narrative is found in Polyaeus. Here, we encounter more directly a description of a festival procession involving a priestess of Athena. The location is Pellênê in the easternmost part of Achaea, to the west of Sicyon.⁵⁸⁵ Polyaeus relates that as the Aetolians were besieging the city, the priestess of Athena, on the occasion of the festival of the goddess (τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱέρεια κατὰ τι νόμιμον ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας), led the procession from a high hill, opposite to the tower where the men of Pellênê were accustomed to arm themselves for battle. Just as in Herodotus, she was an extremely tall young woman, beautiful, and attired in a full suit of armor and three-plumed helmet. The Aetolians, of course, supposed that she was the goddess herself and had come for the protection of the city. They fled and suffered considerable loss.⁵⁸⁶ Nilsson argued that this yearly festival and procession of Athena at Pellênê (κατὰ τι νόμιμον ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας) involved the representation of the goddess Athena by the human priestess of Athena.⁵⁸⁷ While celebrants and priestesses could, of course, play many roles in any individual festival manipulation of a cult image, they could also function as literal representations of the divinity. In the traditions just outlined, a principle of

⁵⁸⁵ This location is not the Attic *deme* Pallênê where Peisistratus was victorious over the Athenians in c. 546 BCE (itself important in Attic mythology; see Wiesner 1949 *RE s.v.* Pallene (4), col. 247; Parker 1996: 331; 2005: 59). The influence of Herodotus' narrative on that of Polyaeus is an obvious possibility; by the same token, the later variant of Polyaeus points markedly to the ritual character of Herodotus' presentation.

⁵⁸⁶ Polyaeus. 8.59: Αἰτωλοὶ Πελληνεῦσιν ἐπεστράτευσαν. πρὸ τῆς Πελλήνης ὄχθος ἐστὶν ὑψηλὸς ἀντικρὺ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως, ἐφ' ὃν οἱ Πελληνεῖς συνελθόντες ὀπλίζοντο. τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱέρεια κατὰ τι νόμιμον ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας πανοπλίαν ἔχουσα καὶ τρίλοφον κράνος, ἡ καλλίστη καὶ μεγίστη τῶν παρθένων, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ἀπέβλεπεν ἐς τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ὀπλιζομένων πολιτῶν. Αἰτωλοὶ παρθένον ὀπλισμένην ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς προελθοῦσαν ἰδόντες αὐτὴν τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν σύμμαχον ἤκειν Πελληνεῦσι νομίσαντες ἀνέστρεψαν, Πελληνεῖς δὲ ἐπιδιώξαντες οὐκ ὀλίγους Αἰτωλῶν ἔκτειναν.

⁵⁸⁷ Nilsson 1957: 91.

substitutability seems at work, linking divinity, mobile cult image, and processing priestess (or priest for that matter).

This connection between priestess and divinity often surrounds cult images of Artemis.⁵⁸⁸ In the *aition* of the statue of Artemis Alpheiaia at Letrini in Elis, the personified Alpheios river attempted to rape the goddess Artemis by infiltrating a nocturnal feast that the goddess was celebrating with her nymphs.⁵⁸⁹ In Pausanias' narrative, the plan was foiled when the goddess hid herself in the midst of her nymphs and they all – goddess and celebrants – covered their faces in mud in order to affect their disguise. The emphasis on “abduction” could easily be, and was perhaps even required to be, understood as the spatial manipulation of the statue. Furthermore, the conspicuous task of the subordinate young females was to identify with or represent themselves as the god. It is a logical supposition that the image itself referred to by Pausanias was somehow

⁵⁸⁸ Cf. the procession of Artemis in Xenophon *Ephesiaka* 1.2.2–7. The description includes a number of elements that mirrors the Attic worship of Artemis at Brauron, including a procession out to a peripheral sacred location, a procession of both girls and boys dedicated to Artemis and an archetypal priestess serving as the instantiation of the goddess. The author is most likely second century CE. For discussion, see Dowden 1989: 40–1; Calame 1997: 95–6; Connor 1987; Connelly 2007: 85–6. For a table of narrative similarities between the *IT* and a number of greek novels, see Lefteratou 2013: 219–20. Hall 2013: 114–21 treats the similarities between the *IT* and other, similar, examples in the ancient novel as evidence for the geographical extent of the influence of Euripides' plays.

⁵⁸⁹ Paus. 6.22.9: γενέσθαι δὲ τὴν ἐπικλησιν τῆ θεῷ λέγουσιν ἐπὶ λόγῳ τοιῶδε· ἐρασθῆναι τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τὸν Ἀλφειόν, ἐρασθέντα δέ, ὡς ἐπέγνω μὴ γενήσεσθαι οἱ διὰ πειθοῦς καὶ δεήσεως τὸν γάμον, ἐπιτολμᾶν ὡς βιασόμενον τὴν θεόν, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐς παννυχίδα ἐς Λετρίνους ἐλθεῖν ὑπὸ αὐτῆς τε ἀγομένην τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ νυμφῶν αἷς παίζουσα συνῆν αὐτῇ· τὴν δὲ – ἐν ὑπονοίᾳ γὰρ τοῦ Ἀλφειοῦ τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν ἔχειν – ἀλείψασθαι τὸ πρόσωπον πηλῷ καὶ αὐτὴν καὶ ὅσαι τῶν νυμφῶν παρῆσαν, καὶ τὸν Ἀλφειόν, ὡς ἐσῆλθεν, οὐκ ἔχειν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων διακρίνειν τὴν Ἄρτεμιν, ἅτε δὲ οὐ διαγινώσκοντα ἀπελθεῖν ἐπὶ ἀπράκτῳ τῷ ἐγγειρήματι. “They say that the goddess (*i.e.* the cult image) received her name for the following reason. Alpheius fell in love with Artemis, and then, when he realized that he would not win the goddess as his bride by persuasion, he dared to violate the goddess. He came to Letrini when Artemis was leading an *pannychis* with nymphs who were celebrating with her. But Artemis – who had a suspicion of the plot of Alpheius – smeared her own face with mud and the faces of the nymphs with her. So Alpheius, when he came, was not able to distinguish Artemis from the others, and, not being able to find her, went away with his attempt undone.” See Frazer 1965: 4.100–1; Calame 1997: 92–3; Larson 2001: 157–8. The practice of smearing one's face with mud is associated with mystery initiations; the action connotes both a pollution-to-absolution cycle and disguise; see Burkert 1985: 78 with Dem. 18.259; Harp. *s.v.* ἀπομάττων, α 36 Keaney.

marked with mud and that the mingling of the age-mates with the goddess Artemis may have been performed as a civic ritual, which associated the select group of young women with the goddess. Just as in the *IT*, the final result of this collocation of references in Pausanias is the narrative indistinguishability of the image, the goddess, and auxiliary participants in the *aition*, that is, the original celebrants. This anthropomorphic tendency we have been tracking is naturally much more marked when the subject of emphasis is not an ineffable divinity, but a literal human priestess.

Iphigenia's role as an attendant to a cult statue signified not just a representation of a divinity, but also a form of dedication: a period of service to, or possession by, a divinity. In the *parodos*, the chorus are called to attend their leader or *hēgemôn*, Iphigenia (*IT* 123–36):⁵⁹⁰

εὐφαιμεῖτ', ὦ	
πόντου δισσὰς συγχορούσας	
πέτρας Ἀξείνου ναίοντες.	125
ὦ παῖ τᾶς Λατοῦς,	
Δίκτυνν' οὐρεία,	
πρὸς σὰν αὐλάν, εὐστύλων	
ναῶν χρυσήρεις θριγκούς,	
όσίας ὄσιον πόδα παρθένιον	130
κληδούχου δούλα πέμπω,	
Ἑλλάδος εὐίππου πύργους	
καὶ τείχη χόρτων τ' εὐδένδρων	
ἐξαλλάξασ' Εὐρώπαν,	135
πατρώων οἴκων ἔδρας.	

Be silent, you who live by the double clashing rocks of the Unfriendly Sea!
O daughter of Leto, Mountain-roaming Dictynna, to your court, to the golden
cornice of your well-columned temple, I, the slave of the *klēidoukhos*, send
my holy virgin step. I, who have left the towers and walls of Greece, rich in
horses, and Europe of the many forests, the seats of my ancestral halls.

⁵⁹⁰ For the call, see *IT* 137–8 with Kyriakou 2006: 82–3. For monodic songs serving to convene a chorus, cf. Ford 2010: 291–4 on *Hel.* 164–90; *Ar. Av.* 209–22.

As they arrive in front of the temple of Artemis, their movement is figured – leaving aside its obvious effect in the *hic et nunc* of performance – as having departed long ago from a location in Greece.⁵⁹¹ The group of *parthenoi* sing the praises of their god and priestess together. Each member who accompanies Iphigenia is a slave (δοῦλα) of the *amphipolos* of the goddess.⁵⁹² When Iphigenia asks for their help in the ritual preliminaries for the sacrifice of Orestes and Pylades, they hand their priestess a golden libation vessel.⁵⁹³ Later, just as the sacrifice is to take place, they pray to Artemis (ὦ πότνι') for a successful venture.⁵⁹⁴ When present at a sanctuary, a suppliant could become literally a possession of the god, and thus analogous to both a material dedication and a cult image.⁵⁹⁵ A member of the chorus in Euripides' *Phoenissae* declares in the context of their travel from Tyre to Thebes "I became a servant (λάτρις) of Apollo, equal to *agalмата* of wrought gold."⁵⁹⁶ The Phoenician women are travelling to Delphi both as

⁵⁹¹ For a strong sense of destination and homeland in a *parodos*, cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 121–4; *Hec.* 99–105; *Phoen.* 202–4; *Hel.* 179–83; *Bacch.* 64–5 with Arnott 1990: 8–10; Hose 1990: 1.117–8, 145–6. Cf. Zeitlin 1970 on Eur. *El.* 1067–74 and Taplin 1977: 410–15 on Aesch. *Eum.* 1003–44. For the *parodos* of *IT* as a festival procession, Cropp 2000: 182–3; Taplin 1977: 194n3, 282–3 *contra* Kyriakou 2006: 82–3. For a tragic chorus idealizing and embodying a traditional performance in a different location, see Henrichs 1994; Kowalzig 2007a: 56–68; Nagy 2013.

⁵⁹² *IT* 131; *IT* 1114–5: θεᾶς ἀμφίπολον κόραν παῖδ' Ἀγαμεμνονίαν λατρεύω. "I serve the child of Agamemnon servant of the goddess." Cf. *IT* 63, 439–55, 638, 1205 with Kowalzig 2013: 204. On divine service, see Pleket 1981: 159–71; Cole 2004 122–36. For the Homeric *amphipolos*, which connoted an intimate, subordinate relationship, see Thalmann 1989: 62–4. Cf. the significantly different presentation of Helen and her chorus in the *Helen* with Murnaghan 2013: 163–77.

⁵⁹³ *IT* 167–71. There is considerable confusion over the staging of Iphigenia's orders here and in *IT* 468–71, 638, 725–6. See Bain 1981: 37–9; Halleran 1985: 11–18; Cropp 2000: 208; Kyriakou 2003: 158, 161–2.

⁵⁹⁴ *IT* 463–6.

⁵⁹⁵ Cf. Eur. *Heraklid.* 243–4: εἰ γὰρ παρήσω τόνδε συλασθαι βίᾳ ξένου πρὸς ἀνδρὸς βωμόν, οὐκ ἐλευθέραν οἰκεῖν δοκῆσω γαῖαν... "For if I allow this altar to be robbed by force by a foreigner, I shall appear to rule a servile land..." On the passage, see Mikalson 1991: 72.

⁵⁹⁶ Eur. *Phoen.* 220–1: ἴσα δ' ἀγάλμασι χρυσοτεύκτοις Φοῖβῳ λάτρις ἐγενόμαν. Cf. *Phoen.* 281–2 with Stieber 1994: 143–5; Mastronarde 1994: 219; cf. Soph. *OC* 919–23. The chorus members of Eur. *Phoen.* are enslaved or servant *parthenoi* from Phoenicia who are unable to make their way to Delphi to serve as *amphipoloi* and performers at Apollo's temple. Cf. Power 2011 on the ability of choral performers to be figured as material dedicated objects. On the status of the chorus in the *Phoenissae*, see Gould 1996: 224; Foley 1985: 118–9, 137; Hall 1989: 113–6; Swift 2009b: 78–80, who rightly stresses the parthenic characteristics of the women. For choral movement in the *Phoen.* see Calame 1994; Lamari 2010: 167–9. On Euripidean choruses generally, see Mastronarde 1994: 219–20; Foley 2003; Calame 2013: 36–43.

“choice offerings” (ἀκροθίνια) and servants (δούλαι) to the god.⁵⁹⁷ In the *Ion*, when Creusa is a suppliant at the altar of Delphi she is the property of the god, just like Ion in his role as temple servant (λάτρις).⁵⁹⁸ This type of cult service could be a joyous obligation or a burden, or both. It could presumably be incurred for a variety of reasons and for periods of varying duration.⁵⁹⁹ Moreover, temple servants or priestesses who would be dedicated to and serve a goddess were a conspicuous features of Herodotus’ descriptions of the alien customs of foreign sanctuaries in the Black Sea region, the Near East, and Egypt.⁶⁰⁰ These elements, both real and imagined, were then taken up by the ethnographers and geographers who followed.⁶⁰¹ The life-size statues of priestess Pausanias describes before the entrance of the Argive Heraion represent this idea made concrete.⁶⁰²

Because of their status as *anathēmata*, we also find single priestesses – just like the mobile chorus in the *Phoenissae* and the *IT* – embodying the ability of a dedication to travel from origin to destination.⁶⁰³ Mobile priestesses of this sort have a significant pedigree of their own in ancient Greek religious thought.⁶⁰⁴ We have already encountered

⁵⁹⁷ Eur. *Phoen.* 202–5: Τύριον οἶδμα λιποῦσ’ ἔβαν ἀκροθίνια Λοξία Φοινίσσας ἀπὸ νάσου Φοῖβω δούλα μελάθρων. “Leaving the Tyrian swell I came, an offering for Loxias from the island of Phoenicia, a slave to Phoebus in his halls.” See Mastronarde 1996: 215.

⁵⁹⁸ Eur. *Ion* 1285: ἱερὸν τὸ σῶμα τῷ θεῷ δίδωμ’ ἔχειν. “I give my body as sacred for the god to possess.” Cf. 1287–9 with Hamilton 1985: 56–9.

⁵⁹⁹ Cf. Chaniotis 2011: 279–82 on the manumission practice at third-century CE Leukopetra in Macedonia.

⁶⁰⁰ See Hdt. 1.93, 199 with Budin 1988; Dillon 2001: 199–200. It is likely that the relationship of human sacrifice to normative sacrificial practice is analogous to the relationship of temple prostitution to initiatory practice.

⁶⁰¹ Cf. Strabo’s *hierodouloi* in Strab. 6.2.6 C272 (Aphrodite at Eryx, cf. DS 4.83); 8.6.20 C378 (Corinth, cf. Strab. 12.3.36 C559); 11.14.16 C533 (Anaitis in Armenia); 11.4.7 C503 (Selene in Albania); 12.2.3 C536 (the god Ma-Enyo); 12.2.6 C537 (Venasian Zeus in Cappadocia); 12.3.31 C537 (“Men” of Pharmaces at Diospolis in Cappadocia); 12.2.31–4 C557–8 (Comana in Cappadocia).

⁶⁰² Paus. 2.17.7. See Connelly 2007: 69–72. For the historical importance of the priestesses of the Argive Heraion, see Thuc. 4.133. For dedicatory statues of priestesses, which were common in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, see, e.g. von den Hoff 2008; Connelly 2007: 122–64; Dillon 2010; Mylonopoulos 2013.

⁶⁰³ Cf. Hall 1989: 113–16.

⁶⁰⁴ See Malkin 1991; Kron 1996: 153. Cf. Hdt. 2.54–7 where Egyptian priestesses are the first founders of the oracular sites at Dodona and Siwa. Cf. Lloyd 1988: 2.251–64. The Greek version presented by

one instance with the movement of the priestess Admete from Argos to Samos. Phaidra was said to have founded Eileithyia's cult in Athens by importing her image from Crete.⁶⁰⁵ The Nykuia painting by Polygnotos at Delphi depicted the priestess Kleoboia carrying a type of ritual box or chest as she transferred the cult of Demeter Thesmophoros from Paros to Thasos.⁶⁰⁶ From an inscription on the statue base of an image of Demeter at Knidos, we learn that Chrysina dedicated an *agalma* and an *oikos* to Kore and Demeter because the god Hermes told her to serve the goddess.⁶⁰⁷

Strabo's account of the transfer of the cult of Ephesian Artemis to Massalia by the Phokaians includes the transfer not only of the cult statue (*aphidruma*), but also the willing relocation of the priestess Aristarcha.⁶⁰⁸ According to Strabo, when the Phokaians left Ionia, they were told to take with them a *hêgemôn* from the Ephesian Artemis. Arriving at Ephesus they asked for instructions and were told that the head priestess Aristarcha would sail with them to Sicily and help found the cult of Ephesian Artemis in Massalia. Aristarcha subsequently took "a certain *aphidruma*" ("holy object to be set up away") from among the *hiera* of the temple for the Phokaians and installed herself as priestess of Artemis at Massalia.⁶⁰⁹ The votive and the priestess "arrive" and are dedicated at the temple together. Aristarcha, with her knowledge, training and experience was literally a member of the assemblage of holy items (*hiera*) at the temple of Artemis

Herodotus interprets the women as birds. For the myth, see Soph. *Trach.* 171–3; Proxenos *FGrH* 703 F 7; Philostr. *Imag.* 2.33. In several later sources, *πελειάδες* (doves) is used as a term for the priestesses of Dodona (Paus. 7.21.2; 10.12.10). The story recalls the famous invocation of the rapes of Helen and Europa in Hdt. 1.1–3, as well as the similar plot structures of the *IT* and the *Helen*. Cf. also Medea in, e.g. Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 31; 32a–c.

⁶⁰⁵ Paus. 1.18.5.

⁶⁰⁶ Paus. 10.28.3: ἔχει δὲ ἐν τοῖς γόνασι κιβωτὸν ὁποῖα ποιεῖσθαι νομίζουσι Δήμητρι. "She has on her knees a chest of the sort they are accustomed to make for Demeter." See Malkin 1989: 112–6.

⁶⁰⁷ *CEG* 860. See Kron 1996: 150–2; Dillon 2001: 24–5; Rigsby 2003.

⁶⁰⁸ Strab 4.1.4 C179 with Malkin 1991.

⁶⁰⁹ For the term *aphidruma*, see pp. 47–52 above.

that were prophesied to be taken to Massalia. Just like any other type of *hieron*, the priestess was also literally an *agalma*: a glorious object possessed by a divinity and bequeathed to a different community of worshippers. She would have taken part in the new religious ceremonies for which she became responsible for under these auspices. We can imagine that as a focalized celebrant in a local Massalian procession, a figure representing Aristarcha might have carried the Ephesian *hiera* to a temple of Artemis.⁶¹⁰ Her movement would have been figured as simultaneously the advent of the goddess from afar, the historical arrival of Aristarcha from Ephesus and perhaps also the initiation of a representative leader of a group of young women associated with her service.

The role of Iphigenia as a possession or object temporarily dedicated to and owned by the foreign goddess is reflected in her assigned role of κληιδούχος (key holder).⁶¹¹ While often simply associated (correctly) with the role of the priestess as “door-guardian” for the temple, the word likely refers both to the priestess’ role as protector *and* to her captivity. The other Euripidean use of the word is in *Hercules Furens*. In conversation with Theseus, Herakles refers to himself in hypothetical exile for the killing of his children as like one “having the key held before him” or “under lock and key” by “harsh barbs of the tongue” (κληιδουχούμενοι γλώσσης πικροῖς κέντροισι).⁶¹² Despite the lines’ obscurity, it is certain that the cause of Herakles being “under lock and key” by the “harsh barbs of the tongue” is identical to the cause of his exile: some kind of

⁶¹⁰ Cf. Connelly 2007: 167–8

⁶¹¹ *IT* 131, 1463. For the title and myth, see Kallithea in Phoronis *EGF* 4 with Hesych. *s.v.* ἰὸ καλλιθύεσσα, ι 1185 Latte, with Dowden 1989: 117–45; Fowler 2013: 2.238. Cf. also *IG* II² 974.23 and the fourth-century BCE priestess of Nemesis at Rhamnous. For examples from Cyprus, see Connelly 1988: 21–2; 2007: 92–104. See also the *klêidoukhos* of Euphranon in Plin. *NH* 34.78 with Palagia 1980: 40–1.

⁶¹² Eur. *Her.* 1285–7: φέρ' ἀλλ' ἐς ἄλλην δὴ τιν' ὀρμήσω πόλιν; κᾶπειθ' ὑποβλεπόμεθ' ὡς ἐγνωσμένοι, γλώσσης πικροῖς κέντροισι κληιδουχούμενοι. The best treatment of the extremely difficult expression is Renehan 1985: 172–5. I follow his translation but not his interpretation of the context.

shameful but divine pollution or madness. A reference to the office of a *klêidoukhos* is the simplest and most direct interpretation of the expression (despite the use of the middle/passive), and this indicates that the situation of Herakles after he has killed his children and the *klêidoukhos* of a Heraion are, in a way, similar. This similarity rests on the fact that both are subject to pollution.

The Euripidean reference in the *HF* is likely to Io. In myth, Io is the archetypal κληιδούχος of Hera; her role as Argive priestess is definitively complicated by her secret tryst with Zeus and subsequent exile, madness, and wandering as a cow.⁶¹³ Io's pollution, shame and exile are occasioned by her illicit affair with Zeus, while Herakles' pollution, shame and exile is occasioned by the murder of his children.⁶¹⁴ Both types of pollution are figured as possession by or contact with the divine. In the *Furens*, Lyssa (Madness) dramatically appears on stage to mark unequivocally the onset of Herakles' madness as divine.⁶¹⁵ The Euripidean expression is complex and ambiguous in that the coinage of the middle/passive form makes the euphemism of the term κληιδούχος explicit, while the reference to the captivity of the polluted subject (possession by or contact with the divine) is made in a literal situation of exile and movement.

Furthermore, it is possible that the effect of Euripides' ambiguity is so appropriate and evocative precisely because in the circumstances we are concerned with – *i.e.* the normative role of the female priestesses of Hera and Artemis – “being kept under lock and key,” did *not*, in fact, signal sex or pollution but rather its significant absence. The

⁶¹³ For Io generally, see Aesch. *Supp.* 299–31; *PV* 645–86; Akousilaus *FGrH* 2 F 26 *ap.* Apollod. *Bib.* 3.9.6; Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 67 *ap.* Apollod. *Bib.* 2.1.3; Hdt. 1.1.3; 2.41 with Fowler 2013: 235–6, 239. For Callisto see Gantz 1993: 725–9 with Hes. *Cat.* fr. 163 M-W; Paus. 8.3.6; Ov. *Met.* 2.425. Cf. the liaison at Artemis' temple at Patras in Paus. 7.18.12–19.6 with Redfield 1990: 119–24.

⁶¹⁴ On two very different acts, sex and murder, existing in the same category, see Parker 1996: 99–104.

⁶¹⁵ Eur. *Her.* 858–71.

priestesses of Hera, by their chastity and purity, manifest the possibility, not the fact, of the pollution represented by the career of Io. In other words, Admete's role in the Samian ritual of the Tonaia represents the *avoidance* of the Argive Io's compromised situation. In Menodotus' narrative, this successful avoidance is marked in advance by the inclusion of Tyrrhenian pirates in place of Zeus in the role of the perpetrator. The role as priestess or initiate was not an unpredictable contact (Lyssa and Herakles) or anti-social possession (Zeus and Io), but a socially appropriate yet temporary, "liminal" stage on the road to marriage: a period of adolescence. As we have seen, the priestesses of Hera and Artemis were often virgins, perhaps standing in as models for initiates. However, this does not mean that sex, or the pollution caused by sex, rape, or theft was absent from the dynamic of the rituals involved with these sanctuaries. The *avoided rape* or the *possibility of rape* – rape being another way to frame the adultery of Io – was indeed present and served to determine the structure of the narrative of the priestess Admete and the Tonaia.

The title of κληιδούχος indicated that the priestess was entrusted with the key(s) to the temple housing the cult statue.⁶¹⁶ Indeed, a bronze, curved key is a prominent iconographical signal of the woman priest and the role must have conferred a high level of visibility and importance.⁶¹⁷ Male priests were not depicted with a key but instead often with a sacrificial knife.⁶¹⁸ As we have seen, the role of a priestess was a position of high level of visibility and importance. Parallel to her everyday, practical duty of taking care of and protecting the *bretas* of the goddess, the priestess herself, because of the legitimate subordination or duty to her deity, could be seen herself as the "locked-in,"

⁶¹⁶ Aesch. *Supp.* 291–2. Cf. Eur. *Tro.* 253–9 and the role of Cassandra as priestess of Apollo.

⁶¹⁷ See Dillon 2001: 80–3; Connelly 2007: 92–5; von den Hoff 2008.

⁶¹⁸ See Parker 2005: 95n15.

valuable object of the temple. Thus, the priestess occupied a paradoxical location: although a κληιδούχος who protected the sacral property of her cult, she herself was capable of being stolen, raped, deported, or removed just like the statue and the dedications she protected in reality.

Orestes

Dedication was not the only way to manipulate a physical cult image. As we have seen, the movement could be framed in a positive manner, as a gift (dedication), or a negative manner, as a theft (*hierosylia*). Orestes' action in the *IT* does not coincide with the ritual mechanics of dedicating a statue, but instead with its removal. The *IT* dramatizes the assimilation of an alien culture and religion with Artemis' cult in Attica.⁶¹⁹ This assimilation is created both by Iphigenia's status as an object dedicated at a foreign location and also by Orestes' role as a thieving foreigner.

After the recognition scene, Orestes' first suggestion for stealing the *xoanon* is to either kill Thoas (*IT* 1020) or hide himself in the temple (1024) and jump out and snatch the statue. Iphigenia refuses both; the first is a crime against the gods (1021) and the second is too risky (1027). Iphigenia's suggestion is to tell Thoas that it is not right to sacrifice Orestes because he is unclean from the matricide (ὡς οὐ θέμις γε λέξομεν θύειν θεῶ... οὐ καθαρὸν ὄντα, 1035–7) and that the *bretas* needs purification as well because of contact with Orestes' taint (1041, 1200). She will tell Thoas that both need to be taken outside in the open air (1177) to be purified in secret at the sea shore (1039, 1193). Iphigenia herself will remove the statue from its base (1201), carry it in her arms (1044–

⁶¹⁹ E.g. Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a: 34; Wolff 1992; Goff 1999: 109–11.

5) down to the shore. Under cover of the purification ceremony, the siblings (and Pylades) will make their escape.

Because of her status as both Taurian and Greek, the piety of Iphigenia's ruse is hard to gauge.⁶²⁰ She will "say" to Thoas that certain conditions relating to *hosios* and *themis* are met (1033–7) a locution that (perhaps) implies deceit. From the native perspective, the rite is certainly suspect. We are told by a Taurian messenger that when Iphigenia reached the sea she was acting for the express purpose of "seeming to do something, she raised an cry (*ololugê*), and started reciting barbarian chants, acting the magus as if she were cleansing the bloodguilt."⁶²¹ Generally, the myth of a theft of a cult statue would naturally connote both deceit and complicity of a divinity who would engage in or allow deceit.⁶²² In a normative situation, the attitudes of skepticism and belief were always simultaneously available to ritual participants, but these positions were usually tightly mapped onto categories such as barbarian and Greek or stranger and native.⁶²³ On a schematic level, the religious situation described in the *IT* is clear: the foreign suppliants carrying pollution and the image of the goddess who decides their fate form a pair. They travel to the sea in tandem to cleanse both crime and punishment. The complications and drama arise because of Iphigenia's status as the representative of a foreign (to the Athenians) cult and Orestes' as a foreign (to the Taurians) thief.

The theft of the *bretas* from the Taurians both is, and is not, a serious affair.⁶²⁴

The fact that Apollo demanded it as an expiatory task implies that the action is difficult

⁶²⁰ For discussion, see Conacher 1967: 305–13; Burnett 1971: 59–62; Goff 1999: 113–15; Belfiore 2000: 34–8. Tzanetou 2000: 211 characterizes it as a mock ceremony.

⁶²¹ *IT* 1336–8: χρόνω δ' ἴν' ἡμῖν δρᾶν τι δὴ δοκοῖ πλέον, ἀνωλόλυξε καὶ κατῆδε βάρβαρα μέλη μαγεύουσ', ὡς φόνον νίζουσα δῆ. Cf. Burnett 1971: 59–62.

⁶²² Cf. Faraone 1992: 100–6 on DS 4.51–2 and the use of divine statues to deceive.

⁶²³ See Parker 1997 on the gods of Athens and other gods in Tragedy.

⁶²⁴ On Orestes' traditional status as an actor outside behavioral norms, see Bierl 1994: 83.

and out of the ordinary (*IT* 976–8). Iphigenia herself asks Artemis to forgive the theft; she expresses concern that the goddess will notice the statue’s absence (995–6, 1399–1400).⁶²⁵ On the other hand, just like the deception of Thoas, the crime is justified because it is committed against the barbarian Taurians. For his part, Orestes believes that if the theft were contrary to Artemis’ will, Apollo would never would have commanded him to take her *xoanon* to Athens.”⁶²⁶

Orestes’ task to steal the *bretas* emerges from his association with the Athenian Anthesteria.⁶²⁷ In his joy at recognizing Iphigenia, Orestes describes the details of his well-known mythological backstory: the murder of Clytemnestra, the flight from the Erinyes, and his final purification at the Areopagus court (*IT* 939–86). His narrative then shifts to Choes (“pitchers” or “beakers”), the third day of the Anthesteria festival.⁶²⁸ When Orestes arrived as a defendant at the Areopagus, no one was willing to host or receive him because of his pollution. Finally, he was allowed to rest and eat, but in silence, apart from the main group.⁶²⁹ The Athenians made a ritual (τελετή) from Orestes

⁶²⁵ The request for forgiveness takes the form of a traditional prayer; see Burnett 1971: 59; Cropp 2000: 258.

⁶²⁶ *IT* 1012–15: γνώμης δ’ ἄκουσον· εἰ πρόσαντες ἦν τόδε Ἀρτέμιδι, πῶς ἂν Λοξίας ἐθέσπισε κομίσει μ’ ἄγαλμα θεᾶς πόλισμ’ ἐς Παλλάδος καὶ σὸν πρόσωπον εἰσιδεῖν; “Listen to this thought: if this were hostile to Artemis how could it be that Loxias ordered me to bring the *xoanon* of the goddess to the city of Pallas and to see your face?” Cf. *IT* 711–15 and Burnett 1971: 56–8.

⁶²⁷ See Burkert 1983: 221–3; Hamilton 1992: 15–25, T 10; cf. T 13–18; O’Brien 1988: 98–9; Goff 1999: 115–18; Zeitlin 2011: 462–5. Romano 2012: 139–41 interprets the Anthesteria passage as an *aition* relating to Orestes confirmation as royalty through “retrospection and prediction,” and in terms of Orestes current (*i.e.* narrative) concerns and self-interest. Scullion 2000: 225–30 posits complete Euripidean innovation.

⁶²⁸ Cf. Phanodemus *FGrH* 325 F 11 *ap. Ath.* 437d = Hamilton 1992: T 18. According to this account, because Demophon was unwilling to allow Orestes to approach the holy places of Athens (*hiera*) or join in libations when he had not yet been tried at court (δικασθέντα), the king ordered the *hiera* to be locked up and a pitcher of wine placed before each participant. The pitchers of wine were then competitively drunk, and each participant would wrap his wreath around his own pitcher when he was finished. Finally, because of their link to Orestes (a cause of pollution) the wreaths were carried off to the sanctuary at Limnai and purified by a priestess of Dionysus. For Orestes and the Anthesteria generally, see Wolff 1992: 325–9; Robertson 1993; Scullion 2000; Gould 2001: 221–2; Parker 2005: 290–316; also Goff 1999: 110, 115–8.

⁶²⁹ *IT* 947–53: ...πρῶτα μὲν μ’ οὐδεις ξένων ἐκὼν ἐδέξαθ’, ὡς θεοῖς στυγούμενον· οἱ δ’ ἔσχον αἰδῶ, ξένια μονοτράπεζά μοι παρέσχον, οἴκων ὄντες ἐν ταύτῳ στέγει, σιγῇ δ’ ἐτεκτήναντ’ ἀπόφθεγκτόν μ’, ὅπως δαιτὸς γενοίμην πώματός τ’ αὐτοῖς δίχα· “... at first, not one of my guest-friends willingly received me

misfortunes and still have the custom of “honoring the three-quart pitcher” in his honor.⁶³⁰ The implication is that despite his status as an outsider – polluted and fury ridden – Orestes is integrated into Athenian society both through the Areopagus and his participation the Anthesteria. This extra locus of atonement is necessary because it responds to the crime of the theft of the *bretas* and Iphigenia from the Taurians – not the matricide.⁶³¹

Euripidean invention or not, the involvement of Orestes with the Anthesteria revolves around dividing the Athenian community into two groups: those who deserve hospitality and those who do not.⁶³² The action of the *IT* is presented as taking place on the Taurian Chersonesos, the Crimean peninsula extending into the Black Sea from Scythia to the north.⁶³³ The siblings both make their way to this bleak place through the inhospitable sea to an “unknown, inhospitable land” (ἄγνωστον ἐς γῆν, ἄξενον);⁶³⁴ the harsh rocks of the Symplegades serve as the boundary marker between Greece and the barbarian land and, more generally, between Europe and Asia itself.⁶³⁵

since I was hated by the gods. Those who had respect provided me with guest-fare at a table alone, although they were under the same roof. They made it so that I was unaddressed in silence so that I could enjoy the food and drink apart from them.” Cf. Cropp 2000: 231; Kyriakou 2006: 309–10.

⁶³⁰ *IT* 958–60: κλῶ δ’ Ἀθηναίοισι τὰμὰ δυστυχῆ τελετὴν γενέσθαι, κᾶτι τὸν νόμον μένειν, χοῆρες ἄγγοϋ Παλλάδος τιμᾶν λεών. “I have heard that among the Athenians, there is a ritual regarding my misfortunes and that even now still the custom remains that the people of Pallas honor the *choes* vessel.”

⁶³¹ So Burnett 1971: 47; Wolff 1992: 314–5; *contra* Zeitlin 2005: 215–20 (cf. 2011: 462–5) who posits that the rites of Iphigenia at Brauron dealing with the deaths of mothers are connected to an atonement for the matricide (*IT* 1465–6). In Aesch. *Eum.* 235–43, Orestes is purified *before* his arrival at Athens; see Cropp 2000: 230–2. For Goff 1999: 116–17 and Tzanetou 2000: 210, the failure of the Areopagus trial indicates the permanence of Orestes’ pollution and the impossibility of his integration. On the Euripidean use of the Areopagus generally, see Sourvenou-Inwood 1997: 171–5; Wolff 1992: 319–24; Cropp 2000: 50–6; Kyriakou 2006: 305–10; Torrance 2011.

⁶³² So Goff 1999: 120. Note, *e.g.* *IT* 950–1. Cf. Burnett 1971: 49, 51–2. See Belfiore 2000: 21–38 for a treatment of the *IT* strictly in terms of crimes against *xenoi* and *philoï*, specifically kin.

⁶³³ On the usually unhappy Greek experience of the Euxine, see West 2003. The geography of the play accords – for the most part – with Hdt. 4.99–103. See Hall 1987; Braund 2007a; 2007b.

⁶³⁴ *IT* 93–4, 218–19, 253, 341, 393–402.

⁶³⁵ *IT* 123–35. For the Symplegades, see, *e.g.* *IT* 241–2; 260; 393–406; 421–2; 746 with Kowalzig 2013: 189–90. For the possibility that Εὐρώπαν in *IT* 135 is a scribal error for the Εὐρώταν, see *IT* 400 with Cropp 1997; 2000: 184; Hall 2013: 53n19.

The Taurians, simultaneously threatening and inferior, provide a systematic counterpoint to the Hellenic heroes of the play.⁶³⁶ King Thoas is “a ruler of barbarians over barbarians.”⁶³⁷ When Orestes and Pylades arrive among the barbarians, they are met by herdsmen who, while observant and eloquent, clearly display primitive characteristics. The Taurians, for their part, show no interest in interaction or commerce.⁶³⁸ They are technologically and militarily inferior, gullible, and most importantly, adhere to a savage and murderous religion.⁶³⁹

A theft of a religious statue innately presents a complicated relationship between the infiltrating thieves and the native civilization. This complexity is sometimes reflected in the overdetermined nature of such myths. For example, the possession of the Palladion by Odysseus and Diomedes signaled the fall of Troy, but the *hubristic* attempted possession of Cassandra signaled the troubled *nostoi* for the Greeks. Another common way to manage these competing interpretations was to type the conduct of either party as extremely positive or negative. In Menodotus’ *aition* for the Samian Tonaia, the pirates who attempt to steal the *bretas* are simply the representatives of a failed Argive attempt at appropriation. In contrast, the *IT* presents an interest not in the unconditional negative typing of the Taurians, but in the assimilation and conditional acceptance of their customs and interests.

The Taurian cult of Artemis as an improper, savage worship first appears in extant literature in book four of the *Histories* of Herodotus.⁶⁴⁰ There, the Herodotean Taurians

⁶³⁶ Cf. Hall 1989: 201–3; Said 2002: 80–4.

⁶³⁷ *IT* 31.

⁶³⁸ In *IT* 407–21, it is the seafaring Greeks who travel to the Taurians in search of profit as merchants. On economic factors in the portrayal of Artemis in the *IT*, see Kowalzig 2013.

⁶³⁹ Cf. *IT* 1174; 1205 with Cropp 2000: 244–5.

⁶⁴⁰ Hdt. 4.103: τὴν δὲ δαίμονα ταύτην τῇ θύουσι λέγουσι αὐτοὶ Ταῦροι Ἰφιγένειαν τὴν Ἀγαμέμνονος εἶναι. “The Taurians themselves say that this deity to whom they sacrifice is Agamemnon’s daughter Iphigenia.”

worship a “parthenos” identified with Iphigenia who requires the sacrifice of “shipwrecked folk and those Greeks they capture sailing towards their shores” (τούς τε ναυηγούς καὶ τοὺς ἄν λάβωσι Ἑλλήνων ἐπαναχθέντες). The rites of sacrifice are gruesome: the priestess strikes the victim on the head with a club, skewers the head on a pole and throws the body off a cliff. In the *IT*, Iphigenia herself protests the bloody nature of her service. The dictates of Artemis are “sophistries” (σοφίσματα). The logic of a goddess who requires bloodshed and yet simultaneously shuns those associated with childbirth or corpses is rejected.⁶⁴¹ This bloodthirsty, savage nature of the Taurian worship of Artemis is seemingly confirmed when Athena declares that upon arrival at Halai, a temple is to be dedicated and “in recompense for your sacrifice” (τῆς σῆς σφαγῆς ἄποιν’) “whenever the festival is held, let a sword be held to a man’s throat and drawn out blood, for holiness and so the goddess may have her honor.”⁶⁴² A few drops of blood were substituted for the real human sacrifice of the barbarians. The violent practices of Artemis’ worship are domesticated.

As might be expected, a more straightforward story of infiltrating thieves is found in our non-tragic accounts of Artemis Brauronia.⁶⁴³ In these variants, because of the lack

For Artemis in the Crimean Chersonesos see Graf 1979; Bilde 2003; Kowalzig 2013. On the worship of the Parthenos in particular, see Braund 2007a.

⁶⁴¹ *IT* 380–5: τὰ τῆς θεοῦ δὲ μέμφομαι σοφίσματα, ἥτις βροτῶν μὲν ἦν τις ἄνηται φόνου ἢ καὶ λοχείας ἢ νεκροῦ θίγη χειροῖν, βωμῶν ἀπείργει μυσαρὸν ὡς ἡγουμένη, αὐτὴ δὲ θυσίαις ἤδεται βροτοκτόνοις. “I hate the trickeries of the goddess. Whoever of mortals ever contacts bloodshed or touches even a childbirth or a corpse with their hands, she bans them from her altars since she believes them polluted, but she herself delights in mortal-killing sacrifices.”

⁶⁴² *IT* 1459. See n712 below.

⁶⁴³ Hdt. 6.136–40. Cf. Hecataeus *FGrH* 1 F 127; Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 99–101; Plut. *Mor.* 247d–e; 296b. See Gould 1980: 54–5; Bathrellou 2002: 181–5 for the initiatory significance of the abduction trope in Menander. In Plut. *Mor.* 247a–f; 296b–d, it is the Tyrrhenians not the Pelasgians who settle on Lemnos and abduct the Athenian women from Brauron and head to Crete. Their final destination was confirmed by the accidental loss and retrieval of the cult image of Artemis. Cf. Hdt. 4.145, where the Pelasgians travelled to Sparta in order to (illogically) claim the Spartan heritage of Kastor and Polydeuces. For Sourvinou-Inwood 2004: 143–4 the paired settings of Athens and Sparta imply a comparison concerning the integration of foreigners.

of the mediating figure of Orestes, the roles are reversed, or rather, restored: the thieves are foreign, and the natives are Athenian. In Philochorus, we hear that a group of Lemnians sailed to Attica and seized maidens who were serving the goddess at Brauron as “bears” (*Arktoi*).⁶⁴⁴ In Herodotus, the rape of initiates at Brauron is presented in conjunction with Miltiades’ conquest of Lemnos in the early fifth century.⁶⁴⁵ At some unspecified time in the past, the Athenians had forced the aboriginal Pelasgians to leave Attica.⁶⁴⁶ According to the story presented by the Athenians themselves, the Pelasgians were expelled from Attica because they molested the daughters of Athenian citizens as they gathered water at a place called the Nine Springs (Ἐννεάκρουνος).⁶⁴⁷ Exiled to the island of Lemnos and seeking revenge, the Pelasgians travelled by boat to Attica, and abducted a large group of Athenian women (τὰς τῶν Ἀθηναίων γυναῖκας) who were celebrating the festival of Artemis at Brauron. Subsequently, children were born to these captive Athenian women on Lemnos, but, instead of rearing them as Pelasgians (or Lemnians), the women taught them the Athenian language and customs. Duly threatened by the Athenian identity of these children, the Lemnians murdered them.⁶⁴⁸ Herodotus

⁶⁴⁴ Philochorus 328 *FGrH* F 100: ... ὄρμησαν εἰς πλοῖα, καὶ κατασχόντες Βραύρωνά τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἤρπασαν παρθένους ἀρκευομένας τῇ θεῷ τοῖς Βραυρωνίοις, αἷς συνώικησαν. Cf. Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 99–101.

⁶⁴⁵ See Meiggs 1966: 424. See also the Attic cleuruchy in Lemnos in Thuc. 7.57.2 (colonists who spoke the same dialect and had the same laws) with Figueira 1991: 138; 253–6. For the status of Lemnos as “barbarian” in tragedy, see Hall 1989: 168–9. For these stories as political background for Eur. *Hypsipyle*, see Cropp 2003.

⁶⁴⁶ The Pelasgians are said by Strab. 5.2.3–5 C220–1 to have been driven from Boeotia to Attica by the Boeotian immigration, *i.e.* some two generations after the Trojan war (cf. Thuc. 1.12; 7.176.4). The Pelasgian episode in Attica would thus be dated c. 1100–1000 BCE. For their portrayal in terms of Herodotean story of Brauron, see Sourvinou-Inwood 2003b: 132–140. Cf. Hdt. 5.26–7 where Persian interference with Lemnos is implied.

⁶⁴⁷ The literary sources for Ἐννεάκρουνος are collected in Wycherly 1957: 137–42. The traditional interpretation of the Herodotean topography is to place Ἐννεάκρουνος to the SE of the acropolis near the Olympeion. Pausanias’ evidence is somewhat different: see Robertson 1998.

⁶⁴⁸ Cf. Hecataeus *FGrH* 1 F 138a; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 247f where these same Lemnians practiced human sacrifice.

implies that the reconquest of the island by Miltiades was in response to this murder of the descendants of the abducted celebrants.⁶⁴⁹

The Taurian Chersonesos is far – both geographically and culturally – from Lemnos. However, on the tragic stage of 411 BCE, this distance would perhaps have allowed a more palatable treatment of the assimilation of foreign elements into Athenian society.⁶⁵⁰ If transported into the contemporary world of the audience, these descendants would have had, if not a legitimate, at least an emotional claim to citizenship in Athens. The circumstances of Miltiades' reconquest – a fulfilled prophecy of a sea journey made to Lemnos in one day – recalls both the mechanics of the Athenian controlled Delia of the 420s BCE and a local Lemnian ritual dedicated to (probably) Hephaistos described by Philostratus.⁶⁵¹ It is possible that this similarity reflects an attempt on the part of the Athenians to integrate and assimilate local religious beliefs with their later hegemonic subjugation of Lemnos in an expanding Delian league.⁶⁵² The exile and return of Orestes and Iphigenia are framed against the proper integration of the interests and complaints of a foreign people in an ostensibly homogenous society. From the foreign point of view, Orestes is accomplishing a criminal act by his theft; the Taurians and no one else are the injured party. From the point of view of the Athenians, the typing of the act as positive or negative – and thus the resolution of, or atonement for the crime – rested on the dynamics

⁶⁴⁹ Hdt. 6.137–40.

⁶⁵⁰ For heroic distance or vagueness, see Easterling 1988; cf. the remarks of Allan 2008: 6–7 on heroic inversion and Wohl 2015: 94–109 on Eur. *Supp.* For the use of the Lemnian story in constructing Athenian imperial identity, see Lape 2010: 155–61.

⁶⁵¹ See Burkert 2001: 64–7 with Philostr. *Her.* 53.4–5. For the Delia, see Thuc. 3.104; *IG I³* 1468 with Meiggs 1966: 300–2; Parker 2008: 153–5; Kowalzig 2007a: 69–72; 110–18; 2013; Nagy 2010: 12–20; 218–28.

⁶⁵² See, e.g. Jacoby *FGrH* IIIb 1.310–11; Lape 2010: 135–6. The fact that access to the Black Sea region was crucial to the Athenian grain supply was another reason for the fair presentation of foreign claims. Cf. Kowalzig 2013; Hall 2013: 48–91 on contemporary Athenian interests in the region.

of the integration of the interests of the foreign people within the polity of Athens. An important interest for any group is their ability to redress a crime committed against them and this was a contentious issue in the context of the administration of the Athenian empire.⁶⁵³

In the *IT*, the inclusion of the polluted Argive Orestes as thief is crucial. The integration of foreigners was just as important to the accepting body as it was to the petitioning outsider.⁶⁵⁴ The difference is simply the shift of perspective from the individual undergoing the period of exile, to the community accepting his return. There is (late) evidence that Anthesteria and Choes formed part of a maturation rite concerning the initiation of young men.⁶⁵⁵ Orestes' "return" or integration into normalized Athenian society (in the case of the *IT*) can be,⁶⁵⁶ and has been, read as a symbolic pattern for the initiation of young male citizens.⁶⁵⁷ In the *Choepheroi*, he is characterized immediately as a young adult and his sacrifice of a lock of hair is a ritual act directly associated with an offering at the Athenian Apaturia, the festival most closely linked with integrating new citizens into Athenian civic life.⁶⁵⁸

⁶⁵³ *E.g.* it has long been maintained that a crucial lever of the Athenian *archê* was the partial removal of allied control over legal cases. Cf. Antiph. 5.47; *IG I*² 10 (the Erythraean decree); *IG I*³ 40 (the Chalcidian decree). See also Thuc. 1.77.1 with de Ste. Croix 1961: 270; Meiggs 1972: 232; Osborne and Rhodes 2017: 112–18, 170–80. On foreigners' claims to redress in the context of supplication, see Naiden 2006: 180–3.

⁶⁵⁴ Cf. Chaniotis 2006: 237–8 on the link between prohibition and community.

⁶⁵⁵ Philostr. *Her.* 12.2.720; *IG II*² 1368.127–6 with Burkert 1983: 221–3; Hamilton 1992: 57, T 72, 76; Ham 1999.

⁶⁵⁶ Unlike Iphigenia and Brauron, there is no direct evidence for the male ephebeia before the fourth century in Athens or for Halai Araphenides as a site for male initiation cult involving Orestes. See Lloyd-Jones 1983: 96–7; Sommerstein 2010: 47–60. For another ritual connected to Orestes, see the transport of Orestes' bones from Tegea to Sparta in Hdt. 1.67–8; Paus. 3.3.5; 8.54.4 with Boedeker 1993; McCauley 1999. He is also linked to various colonization narratives as in, *e.g.* Pin. *Nem.* 11.34; Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F 32.

⁶⁵⁷ *E.g.* Vidal-Naquet 1998: 106–22. See also Burnett 1971: 63–4; Zeitlin 1978: 160–74; Bierl 1994; Goff: 1999: 115–17; Tzanetou 2000: 209–16. For a critique see, *e.g.* Dodd 2003; Polinskaya 2003. For Apollo as a god of initiation, see Bierl 1994. For the cycle of Orestes framed as the emergence of a patriarchal social structure, see Zeitlin 1978; 2005.

⁶⁵⁸ Aesch. *Cho.* 6. For the *koureion* (the tendering of a lock of hair) at the Apaturia, see, *e.g.* Hesych. *s.v.* κουρεῶτις, κ 3843, Latte: μηνὸς τοῦ Πυανειῶνος ἡμέρα, ἐν ἣ τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς τῶν παίδων

The commission of a small-scale criminal or antisocial act is not an uncommon element of initiation-type rituals in ancient Greece. At the Delphian Septeria, members of the *genos* Labydae conducted a young boy in silence through a street called “Dolon’s Way,” (Δολωνίας); the boy infiltrated a sacred space and performed an act of ritual destruction.⁶⁵⁹ The Spartan *krypteia*, according to Plato, was the extremely harsh final training period of the *agôgê*, which preceded assimilation into the *Spartiate* class, or according to Plutarch, involved the surreptitious murder of subservient Helots as a final *rite de passage*.⁶⁶⁰ The descriptions are not incompatible and it is probable that in the fifth century, the participants of the *krypteia* were specially chosen young Spartans shortly before the attainment of full citizenship.⁶⁶¹ At the temple of Artemis Orthia-Lygodessa in Sparta, the *xoanon* – identified by Pausanias as the very same statue that Iphigenia and Orestes carried to Athens during their flight from the Taurians – was carried aloft by the priestess during a ritual where young men were ritually flogged.⁶⁶² A very conspicuous part of the evidence for the ritual regards a “stamina test” of the ephebes (τὸ περὶ τὰς καρτερήσεις) during which an attempted theft of cheese from Artemis’ altar by an attacking group was returned with blows from a whip by another group defending it.⁶⁶³

ἀποκείροντες τρίχας Ἀρτέμιδι θύουσιν. “A day in the month of Pyanepsion on which they sacrifice (θύουσιν) hair from the heads of young boys to Artemis.” For discussion, see Deubner 1966: 232–4; Cole 1984; Vidal-Naquet 1998: 109–11; Leitao 2003; Parker 2005: 458.

⁶⁵⁹ Plut. *Mor.* 418a–b; cf. 293c with Burkert 1983: 128–9.

⁶⁶⁰ Pl. *Leg.* 633b–c; Plut. *Lyc.* 28 = Arist. fr. 543 G; see also ΣPl. *Leg.* 633b. On the *krypteia* generally, see Cartledge 1987: 30–2; *OCD*³ s.v. *Krypteia*, 808, Hodkinson 1996; Ducat 2006: 281–339. See Vidal-Naquet 1998: 112–13 on the *krypteia* in terms of Spartan initiation and a critique of Jeanmaire’s 1939 analysis. For a different perspective, see Dodd 2003: 75. On stealing in the *krypteia*, see Ducat 2006: 300–1.

⁶⁶¹ See Ducat 2006: 308–10.

⁶⁶² Paus. 3.16.9; cf. Pl. *Leg.* 633b. For discussion, see Kennell 1995: 71–2; 126–8; Ducat 2006: 192–4. A connection between this practice and the action of Orestes in the *IT* was suggested by Wolff 1992: 315–16.

⁶⁶³ Xen. *Lac.* 2.9. On this passage and the Spartan worship of Artemis Orthia generally, see Ducat 2006: 249–60.

The theft of a cult statue held significance both a contemporary legal setting and an initiatory one. We saw above that the arrival of the Palladion at Phaleron was associated not only obliquely with the Trojan history of the object but with the unfortunate circumstances of its arrival on Athenian soil. In myth, when Diomedes arrived at Athens with the Palladion, the Argives were misidentified as enemies, attacked and then (sometimes), a youth was trampled to death by the Demophon's horse. This death was the origin of the Palladion court, which prosecuted crimes involving the deaths of foreigners and involuntary homicide.⁶⁶⁴ Furthermore, this myth is associated with a ritual manipulation or purification of a certain cult image of Athena where fourth-century ephebes "led Pallas out to Phaleron and then back again in torchlight."⁶⁶⁵

At Athens – or anywhere in the Greek world – the crime of the theft of the Palladion was unlikely to be presented as a crime *per se* if the injured party were the Trojans. Instead, the core of the issue at stake – the conduct and treatment of foreigners on home soil – was aligned to the native Athenian perspective. King Demophon misidentified the intentions and identity of the Argive Diomedes arriving at Athens. This mistake, in turn, resulted in the trial for the crime of either the theft of the Palladion from the foreigners, or their murder. In the *IT*, the Athenian ephebes and their exemplar Orestes were associated with this type of situation – not, for example, foreign allies or non-citizen *metics* – because they were able to temporarily and safely take on the role of foreigners, commit a covert crime on "foreign soil" (*i.e.* the theft of the Taurian *bretas* of Artemis) and finally expiate it and fulfill their reintegration back into society as full members.

⁶⁶⁴ See pp. 98-103 above.

⁶⁶⁵ *IG II²* 1006.11–2.

The Brauronia

The removal of Iphigenia and the *bretas* is ultimately made possible by Athena's prophecy concerning the worship of Artemis Brauronia (*IT* 1446–69):

μαθὼν δ', Ὀρέστα, τὰς ἐμὰς ἐπιστολάς
 (κλύεις γὰρ αὐδὴν καίπερ οὐ παρῶν θεᾶς)
 χώρει λαβὼν ἄγαλμα σύγγονόν τε σὴν.
 ὅταν δ' Ἀθήνας τὰς θεοδμήτους μόλης,
 χῶρός τις ἔστιν Ἀτθίδος πρὸς ἐσχάτοις 1450
 ὄροισι, γείτων δειράδος Καρυστίας,
 ἱερός· Ἀλάς νιν οὐμὸς ὀνομάζει λεώς.
 ἐνταῦθα τεύξας ναὸν ἱδρῦσαι βρέτας,
 ἐπώνυμον γῆς Ταυρικῆς πόνων τε σῶν,
 οὓς ἐξεμόχθεις περιπολῶν καθ' Ἑλλάδα 1455
 οἴστροις Ἐρινύων. Ἄρτεμιν δέ νιν βροτοὶ
 τὸ λοιπὸν ὑμνήσουσι Ταυροπόλον θεάν.
 νόμον τε θεὸς τόνδ'· ὅταν ἐορτάζῃ λεώς,
 τῆς σῆς σφαγῆς ἄποιν' ἐπισχέτω ξίφος
 δέρη πρὸς ἀνδρὸς αἵμά τ' ἐξανιέτω, 1460
 ὀσίας ἕκατι θεά θ' ὅπως τιμὰς ἔχη.
 σὲ δ' ἀμφὶ σεμνάς, Ἰφιγένεια, λείμακας
 Βραυρωνίας δεῖ τῆδε κληδουχεῖν θεᾶ,
 οὗ καὶ τεθάγη κατθανοῦσα, καὶ πέπλων
 ἄγαλμά σοι θήσουσιν εὐπήνους ὑφάς, 1465
 ἃς ἂν γυναῖκες ἐν τόκοις ψυχορραγεῖς
 λίπωσ' ἐν οἴκοις. τάσδε δ' ἐκπέμπειν χθονὸς
 Ἑλληνίδας γυναῖκας ἐξεφίεμαι
 γνώμης δικαίας οὔνεκ' ...

And Orestes, having learned my instructions (you hear the voice of the goddess, though absent), with the *agalma* and your sister in your possession go. And whenever you reach god-built Athens, there is a place near the borders of Attica, a neighbor to the cliff of Karystos, a sacred place: my people call it Halai. There build a temple and install the *bretas* in it, named for the Taurian land and the toils though which you struggled, travelling all over Greece because of the goads of the Erinyes. In future time mortals will hymn for Artemis the Tauropolian goddess. Put down this law: whenever the people keep her festival, in recompense for your sacrifice let a sword be held against a man's throat and blood be drawn: for holiness and so that the goddess may keep her honors.

You Iphigenia must serve as *klēidoukhos* in the holy meadows of Brauron. There at your death you will be buried, and people will dedicate, as an *agalma* for you the fine-textured webs of *peploi*, which women who have died in

childbirth leave in their homes. And these women of Hellas, I command you to send them out of this country because of their righteous judgement ...

Athena declares that Orestes is to convey the cult image of Artemis to Athens (ἄγαλμά θ' ἱερὸν εἰς ἐμὴν ἄξων χθόνα) and then, with the statue and his sister in conjunction (λαβὼν ἄγαλμα σύγγονόν τε σὴν) to build a temple and dedicate the image at Halai Araphenides on the Attic coast (ἐνταῦθα τεύξας ναὸν ἴδρυσαι βρέτας). The temple and image are to take their name from Orestes' labors and wanderings pursued by the furies (πόνων τε σῶν, οὐς ἐξεμόχθεις περιπολῶν καθ' Ἑλλάδα οἴστροις Ἐρινύων) and in the celebration of the Tauropolian goddess there will be blood drawn from the neck of a young man: "for holiness and so that the goddess may keep her honors" (όσίας ἔκατι θεά θ' ὅπως τιμὰς ἔχη).⁶⁶⁶ Iphigenia is to be the *klêidoukhos* of Artemis in the meadows of Brauron (λείμακας Βραυρωνίας δεῖ τῆδε κληδουχεῖν θεᾶ). After her death and burial at Brauron, she is to be presented the weaving of women who have died in childbirth as *agalmata*.

Aitia claim (perhaps clearly falsely) to remove a part of the need for a metaphorical relationship between the doings of mythological heroes on stage and the present reality of cult.⁶⁶⁷ They not only attempt to close a distance between the stage and reality of cult (dates, places), but also to indicate the scope of that distance itself.⁶⁶⁸ The

⁶⁶⁶ For the epithet Tauropolos, see Fowler 2013: 72–3 on Istros *FGrH* 334 F 18; Apollodorus of Athens *FGrH* 244 F 111. For Artemis Tauropolos in Attica, see Callim. *Hymn* 3.173; Strabo 9.1.22 C399 with McInerney 2015.

⁶⁶⁷ For Kowalzig 2007a: 27, 32, an *aition* "relates present with a mythical past ... it establishes a timeless continuity from the moment of origins to the present day, and claims that things have remained unchanged throughout." Calame 2010: 245–9 lists three effects of an Euripidean aetiological passage. First, the actual cult sanctions or justifies the performance of its *aition* on stage; second, the stage performance explains and legitimizes the ritual observances peculiar to the cult; and third, the historical aspect of the heroic characters on stage adapts the cult to new contemporary and political contexts. The link between the heroic biography of Iphigenia to the lived experience of initiates of Brauron is described in terms of "metaphors ... that link the hero with the divinity being worshipped and enable the constituents to share numerous characteristics." His example is Eur. *Hipp.* 1423–30. Tzanetou 2000: 203 posits a "morphological similarity" between the lives of Iphigenia and the Athenian initiates she represents in the *IT*.

⁶⁶⁸ See Mastronarde 2010: 158.

large amount of variation across all of our sources concerning the statue's final dwelling place shows the high importance placed on the destination of Orestes' foundation of the cult of Taurian Artemis.⁶⁶⁹ Hyginus preserves a variant – thought to rely on an epitome of Sophocles' *Chryses* – where Iphigenia and Orestes travel to the island of Zminthe. There, they find the home of Chryses, the priest of Apollo (known from the *Iliad*) who then directs them back to their father Agamemnon, in Mycenae *not* Athens.⁶⁷⁰ In Pausanias, we are told that not only do the Athenians and Spartans claim the statue, but so do Cappadocians on the Euxine and the Lydians who worship Artemis Anaeitis.⁶⁷¹ Strabo lists Halai Araphenides, but also Cappadocian Comana and Hierapolis-Castabala in Cilicia.⁶⁷² The shadowy Pythokles, as cited by Clement, adds Phokaia and the detail of a human sacrifice.⁶⁷³ In Sparta, the statue was identified with the image of Artemis Orthia brought to Lakonia by Astrabakos and Alopekos. According to Pausanias, it was this Spartan statue, not Athenian one, that was most likely to be the authentic one.⁶⁷⁴ In the Roman period, the myth of Orestes and Iphigenia's flight from the Taurians with the statue of Artemis was connected to the cult of the *rex nemorensis* at lake Nemi.⁶⁷⁵

⁶⁶⁹ See especially Graf 1979; Bilde 2003. Kowalzig 2013; Hall 2013.

⁶⁷⁰ Hyg. *Fab.* 221 = Soph. *Chryses TrGF* fr. 726–30.

⁶⁷¹ Paus. 1.23.7 (Attica, Brauron); 3.16.7 (Sparta); 3.16.8 (Cappadocians and Lydians). Seleucus finally imported the image to Laodikea in Syria.

⁶⁷² Strab 9.1.22 C399 (Attica); 12.2.3 C536 (Komana); 12.2.7 C537 (Castabala).

⁶⁷³ See Pythokles *FGrH* 833 F 2; Apollod. *Bib.* 6.27.

⁶⁷⁴ Paus. 3.16.7: τὸ δὲ χωρίον τὸ ἐπονομαζόμενον Λιμναῖον Ὀρθίας ἱερόν ἐστὶν Ἀρτέμιδος. τὸ ξόανον δὲ ἐκεῖνο εἶναι λέγουσιν ὃ ποτε καὶ Ὀρέστης καὶ Ἴφιγένεια ἐκ τῆς Ταυρικῆς ἐκκλέπτουσιν: ἐς δὲ τὴν σφετέρην Λακεδαιμόνιον κομισθῆναι φασὶν Ὀρέστου καὶ ἐνταῦθα βασιλεύοντος. καὶ μοι εἰκότα λέγειν μᾶλλον τι δοκοῦσιν ἢ Ἀθηναῖοι. ποίῳ γὰρ δὴ λόγῳ κατέλιπεν ἂν ἐν Βραυρῶνι Ἴφιγένεια τὸ ἄγαλμα; ἢ πῶς, ἢ νῆκα Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν χώραν ἐκλιπεῖν παρεσκευάζοντο, οὐκ ἐσέθεντο καὶ τοῦτο ἐς τὰς ναῦς. “The place named Limnaeum is sacred to Artemis Orthia. The wooden image there they say is the one Orestes and Iphigenia once stole out of the Taurian land, and the Lacedaemonians say that it was brought to their land because there also Orestes was king. I think their story more probable than that of the Athenians. For what could have induced Iphigenia to leave the image behind at Brauron? Or why did the Athenians, when they were preparing to abandon their land, fail to include this image in what they put on board their ships?”

⁶⁷⁵ Paus. 2.27.4; Serv. *Aen.* 2.116; 6.136; Hyg. *Fab.* 2.61; Strab. 5.3.12; cf. Frazer's famous beginning to *The Golden Bough*.

For Euripides, the Taurian *bretas* belonged at Halai and Brauron in Attica. Every four years, the Athenian *dēmos* would celebrate the Brauronia.⁶⁷⁶ Aristophanes alludes to a theoric procession from Athens to Brauron, and the celebration of the festival almost certainly involved a procession or movement of celebrants and attendees to the outlying sanctuary.⁶⁷⁷ The site was in use from Neolithic times to its abandonment (probably through flooding) in the late third century BCE.⁶⁷⁸ The cult itself goes back at least to the geometric period.⁶⁷⁹ The two main buildings of the sanctuary are a (probably) fifth-century Doric temple, and a large banquet building called the “stoa of the *arktoi*” furnished with benches (*klinai*) and tables. To the south of the stoa is a small, two-room structure with an antechamber and an *adyton* established in the mouth of a narrow sunken cave which, mainly based on the evidence of the *IT* above, was identified as the *heroön* of Iphigenia.⁶⁸⁰ The large, late-fifth-century banquet building or “stoa of the *arktoi*” consists of a long, narrow room open to the south and separated from the main corridor of the stoa by a courtyard. Because of the presence of a series of *stêlê* bases, this north porch

⁶⁷⁶ [Arist] *Ath. Pol.* 54.7 includes the Brauronia in a list of *penteteric* festivals. On the Brauronia and the Arkteia generally see, e.g. Brelich 1969: 222–77; Sale 1975; Brulé 1988: 179–283; Dowden 1989: 9–48; Sourvinou-Inwood 1988; Cole 1984; 1998; 2004: 198–230; Faraone 2003; Hall 2013: 30–5.

⁶⁷⁷ Ar. *Pax.* 871–6: Τρυγαῖος: τί φῆς; αὐτή Θεωρία 'στίν. Οικέτης: ἦν ἡμεῖς ποτε ἐπαίομεν Βραυρωνάδ' ὑποπεπωκότες; “Servant: Tell me, who is this woman? Trygaeus: Why, it's the same Theoria. Servant: What this girl here? Do you mean to say this is the Theoria we used to have when we'd have a few drinks and banged our way to Brauron?” Trans. adapted from Henderson 1998. See Peppas Delmousou 1988; Kowalzig 2007: 115–16; Connelly 2011: 316–17. For the Aristophanic context, see Olson 1998: 238.

⁶⁷⁸ See Diphilus fr. 29 *PCG*; Paus. 1.33. The site was excavated between 1948 and 1963 by J. Papadimitriou. No final excavation reports were written and a large amount of material remains unpublished. Because of this state of affairs, the identification and interpretation of many of the buildings is uncertain. For the deme itself, which was one of the twelve *poleis* of the Attic dodecopolis, see Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 94. For an overview of the topography of the sanctuary, see Themelis 2002; Ekroth 2003.

⁶⁷⁹ Parker 2005: 229.

⁶⁸⁰ The temple was probably constructed after the collapse of the cave entrance in the early fifth century BCE. See Ekroth 2003: 19–87, 75 for a collection of earlier scholars' nomenclature for the structures. The sunken cave itself (c. 25 m long) was divided by a corridor into a series of very small rooms or enclosures. One of the chambers of the cave itself contained the remains of a hearth or pyre, and evidence of four burials was discovered in an interior corridor. Within the enclosures were a series of pits or holes containing a large amount of sixth and fifth century pottery sherds, fragments of marble vessels, and terracotta figurines. Many of the so-called *krateriskoi* (which are linked to the Arkteia) were found as well.

has been interpreted as a storage or display area for inscriptions describing the textile dedications of women (*IT* 1462–7), or, alternatively, an area for the dedications themselves.⁶⁸¹

A type of small bowl or vase (*krateriskos*) has been found at the site dating from the middle of the sixth century to the middle of the fifth.⁶⁸² The *krateriskoi* show, in general terms, young women who dance, race by torchlight, and move in procession.⁶⁸³ They wear multiple types of clothing and in a number of instances they are depicted naked; the ages of the girls varies, with the included range usually interpreted as being between five and ten. In one very singular example we find a bear depicted alongside the celebrating adolescents.⁶⁸⁴ Within Attica, activity at Brauron occurred in some sort of spatial relationship with both the sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia on the Athenian acropolis, the sanctuary of Munychian Artemis at the Piraeus, and the shrine of Artemis Tauropolos at Halai Araphenides. All three locations have been found to contain *krateriskoi*.⁶⁸⁵

Artemis' identification with adolescence and the Brauronia have often been treated together in the context of the preparation of a younger generation of women for social maturity.⁶⁸⁶ The Brauronia included a culminating celebration of the achievement

⁶⁸¹ *IT* 1464–6. On the dedications, see *IG* II² 1514–31 with Linders 1972 who reconstructs six *stêlae* which were erected on the acropolis in Athens and inscribed with dedications at the Brauronia between the years 336–5 BCE; cf. also Cole 1998: 36–43; Ekroth 2003: 90–4; Cleland 2005. On clothing dedications for divinities generally, see Romano 1980: 131–2.

⁶⁸² See Sourvinou-Inwood 1988: 116–18; Kahil 1981; Parker 2005: 234–5.

⁶⁸³ For choral performance at the Brauronia, see Budelmann and Power 2015: 264–9.

⁶⁸⁴ Sourvinou-Inwood 1988: 116.

⁶⁸⁵ It is unclear whether the group of sanctuaries should be considered hierarchically, in a system with a center and a periphery, or in some other way. Cf. Deubner 1966: 205–6; Brelich 1969: 247–53; Viscardi 2015: 27–30. Sale 1975: 265–6 posits that the *aitia* derive ultimately from a temple legend of Munychia.

⁶⁸⁶ See Vernant 1991: 195–219; Calame 1997: 91–101; 142–85; Cole 1998; 2004. There is no single native Greek term for the phenomenon and thus no distinct concept of “initiation” in Ancient Greece. The Latin word *initia* first occurs in Varro and Cicero where it is a translation of the Greek μυστήρια and refers to the Mysteries of Eleusis or Samothrace. See Cic. *Leg.* 2.36; Varr. *Ling.* 5.59; *RR* 2.4.9. For further discussion

of the group of eligible maidens called “bears” (*arktoi*).⁶⁸⁷ A famous passage of Aristophanes’ *Lysistrata* includes the Brauronia in a heterogeneous collection of ritual activities appropriate for an adolescent female citizen.⁶⁸⁸ The members of the female chorus vaunt their right to advise the *dêmos* in its hour of need.⁶⁸⁹ The chorus member declares, “at seven years old I was an *arrêphoros*. Next when I was ten I was an *aletris* (“flour or corn grinder”)⁶⁹⁰ for the *archâgetis*⁶⁹¹ and then, while wearing the *krokotos* (saffron colored robe), I was an *arktos* (bear) at the Brauronian festival.”⁶⁹² According to Brelich, every Athenian girl underwent the process, a stance that accorded with his belief in the uniformity of the Athenian initiation process.⁶⁹³ For Sourvinou-Inwood, at each iteration of the Brauronia, all of the maidens who had completed a period of segregation

concerning terminology, see Graf 2003: 4n6. Our discussion will follow the schema of Brelich 1969: 10–35 whose perspective, terminology, and use of evidence derive from the anthropological and ethnological studies of Van Gennep 1909, Jeanmaire 1939, Gernet 1968: 154–71 and others. For female initiation in Greece, see, e.g. Brelich 1969: 1–112; Sourvinou–Inwood 1988: 15–20; Cole 1984; Dowden 1989: 4–6; Redfield 1990; Graf 2003: 9; Faraone 2003: 43–4.

⁶⁸⁷ For the separate existence of the Arkteia, see, e.g. the phrasing of Ar. *Lys.* 645: ἄρκτος ἢ Βραυρωνίως. Cf. Hesych. s.v. ἀρκτεία, α 7281 Latte: ἡ τῶν ἀρκτευομένων παρθένων τελετή. Ἀρκτεῦειν δὲ τὸ καθιεροῦν. Cf. Brelich 1969: 270–6; Sourvinou-Inwood 1988: 21–2.

⁶⁸⁸ See Faraone 2003: 47.

⁶⁸⁹ Ar. *Lys.* 638–47. The play was performed in 411 BCE.

⁶⁹⁰ A significant initiatory context for either the *aletrides* or the subsequently mentioned *kanêphoroi* (“basket-carriers”) is difficult to reconstruct with confidence. The *kanêphoroi* were girls who carried an offering basket (κανοῦν) in Greek processions. At Athens they were attested participants in the Panathenaia and the Dionysia (both Great and Rural variations). See *IG II²* 334; Aristid. *Or.* 18.2; Plut. *Mor.* 772a; *STheoc.* 2.66. For discussion see, e.g. Dillon 2001: 37–42; Faraone 2003: 45; Parker 2005: 218–23; Connelly 2007: 33–9. Whether all these activities were explicitly and necessarily related to some kind of culminating coming of age or “marriageable state” is uncertain.

⁶⁹¹ The epithet *archâgetis* means “founding goddess” and has been associated with Artemis (e.g. Walbank 1981; Sourvinou-Inwood 1988), Athena (e.g. Brelich 1969: 231; Stinton 1976; Faraone 2003: 45), and Demeter (e.g. Parker 2005: 223–4). All three identifications have points to recommend them. The context recommends Artemis; the title *archâgetis* most naturally relates to Athena as the eponymous goddess of Athens; Demeter is the most logical goddess for association with an *aletris*.

⁶⁹² Brelich 1969: 230 interpreted each of these roles as individual elements of a single state initiatory system divided by age-groups. On the other side of the scholarly spectrum, Walbank 1981 connected all of these roles to the worship of Artemis Brauronia.

⁶⁹³ Brelich 1969: 231, 263–5. The scale and topography of the site at Brauron tell against this theory. Unfortunately, the scholiast tells us simultaneously that “selected maidens” (ἐπιλεγόμενοι παρθένοι) took part in the Brauronia, and also that Artemis demanded that “all maidens” perform the ceremony. *ΣAr. Lys.* 644–5: ἐκέλευσε παρθένον πᾶσαν μιμήσασθαι τὴν ἄρκτον. For two different calculations of the number of Arktoi, see Dowden 1989: 27; Sourvinou-Inwood 1988: 116.

within the time available between the festivals would participate.⁶⁹⁴ Parker characterizes the situation as one of “universal right of access but limited actual participation.”⁶⁹⁵

This interpretation implicitly posits a “representative” individual who would take part in the ceremony on behalf of his or her age cohort (or some other natural aggregate). Thus, whether explicitly or not, a larger group than well-to-do or historically aristocratic families would still have experienced a connection to the rite. As Parker notes, “the *arrêphoroi* stand for their age-class in the sense that they present an ideal image of it.”⁶⁹⁶ Only a select group of young girls would be eligible for any particular ritual service.⁶⁹⁷

The representative, hierarchical nature of participation is deeply embedded in civic ritual. In the *IT*, it is reflected both by the relationship of Iphigenia to her chorus on stage and their relationship as a group to Artemis and her mythical band of nymphs.⁶⁹⁸ The humans mimic the divine and both groups of *choreutai* mimic or represent their leader, but there are also important hierarchical elements differentiating the two

⁶⁹⁴ As far as the age of the participants, the passage of Aristophanes implies that chorus member was above the age of ten when she was an Arktos. This position is contradicted by both the scholiast’s and the *Suda*’s commentaries on the passage, which tell us that the age-range of the girls was from five to ten. See ΣAr. *Lys.* 644–5; *Suda* s.v. Ἄρκτος ἢ Βραυρωνίως 3958, Adler: οὔτε πρεσβύτεραι δέκα ἐτῶν οὔτ’ ἐλάττους πέντε. For Sourvinou-Inwood 1988: 24, a strict limit for the initiate’s age at the lower range of five and at the upper range of ten would present the most logical period for enrollment in a *penteteric* festival that culminated in a final ceremony (*i.e.* the Arkteia). For the reading of Ar. *Lys.* 645 and proposed emendations for the phrase κᾶτ’ ἔχουσα, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1988: 136–48. For other opinions, see Brelich 1969: 264–5; Dowden 1989: 30.

⁶⁹⁵ Parker 2005: 233; cf. Faraone 1993: 47.

⁶⁹⁶ Parker 2005: 228.

⁶⁹⁷ The size and scope of relative participation would be conditioned by the social structure of the community. For example, in Athens of the late fifth-century there had been a century-long history of reformulating traditionally aristocratic civic structures. Participation in an initiatory rite such as the Brauronia must have reflected this dynamic. Cf. Dowden 1989: 27–30.

⁶⁹⁸ See Larson 2001: 107–110.

groups.⁶⁹⁹ Iphigenia is Greek.⁷⁰⁰ Her time spent among the Taurians is a temporary period of service, destined to be completed successfully. On the other hand, it is unclear exactly who the women attending Iphigenia are or how they got to the Taurian Chersonesos.⁷⁰¹ Emphatically described as slaves purchased in war and undergoing heavy hardship (*IT* 1075–77), they are requested to aid in Iphigenia’s and Orestes’ escape and they acquiesce despite an understanding that they will be at risk (1056–77). In the culminating *aition*, Athena orders that the chorus shall be returned to Attica, but their release occurs separately from Iphigenia, and is accomplished by the barbarian Thoas, not the women themselves (1475–85). Their status as Greek but (apparently) non-citizen servants or *hierodouloi* is juxtaposed against their clearly stated desire to dance at Delos and, by extension, participate in Athenian society.⁷⁰² We can imagine that similar distinctions based on birth and status would have determined the level or amount of participation in rites such as the Brauronia.

Participatory representation – where a prominent individual takes the place of a lesser, subordinate group – also has a relation to the concept of substitution in a dedicatory or sacrificial setting. As Faraone notes, representative initiation would be

⁶⁹⁹ This situation (*chorêgos* and *choreutai*) naturally displays – in some respects – the character of a performance of choral lyric. Cf. the situations in Hom. *Od.* 6.102–9 (Nausikaa compared to Artemis); *Hymn. Hom. to Artemis* 27.11–20 with Calame 1977: 19–53. Cf. Hamilton 1989; Budelmann and Power 201: 264–9 on the activities depicted on the *krateriskoi* and a comparison with the Arkteia.

⁷⁰⁰ The issue of Iphigenia’s status, while not at issue for the audience, is central to the play. See *IT* 1462–68 with Orestes’ recognition of his sister’s Argive status in *IT* 660–6, and Iphigenia’s notional religious duties in Greece in *IT* 221–5. On kinship and recognition, see Belfiore 2000: 29–34.

⁷⁰¹ Cropp (2000: 59) characterizes the chorus as “well-born Hellenic women.” It is perhaps better to view them as individuals with *some* type of claim to Athenian citizenship and allegiance but not a complete claim. Iphigenia’s pure status is guaranteed by her rescue and transport through Artemis. See Hall 1989: 110–13 on the *IT*’s treatment of foreigners; 160–72 for fifth-century geographical and imperial politics in tragedy.

⁷⁰² *E.g.* *IT* 1096–100: ποθοῦσ’ Ἑλλάνων ἀγόρους, ποθοῦσ’ Ἄρτεμιν λοχίαν, ἃ παρὰ Κύνθιον ὄχθον οἰκεῖ φοινικά θ’ ἀβροκόμαν... “Longing for the gatherings of Greeks, and Artemis Lochias who lives by the Kynthian hill and the luxuriously haired palm.” Cf. the chorus in Eur. *Hec.* 455–74 who refer to the festivals of Delian Artemis in direct relation to their fate as slaves. Cf. Henrichs 1996: 56–62; Nagy 2013.

cognate with the common “metonymic” or “representative sacrifice” where a community performs a rite or, in extreme circumstances, sacrifices an individual for the good of the community at large.⁷⁰³ A number of late lexicographical sources and scholia present accounts of the history of the Brauronia in these terms.⁷⁰⁴ In the scholia to the passage of Aristophanes, the origin of the Arkteia is linked to the appeasement of Artemis after the killing of a sacred bear.⁷⁰⁵ According to the *Suda*, the Athenians of Philaidae compelled their *parthenoi* to “play the bear” (ἀρκετεύειν) in order to appease Artemis for the killing.⁷⁰⁶ In Eustathius, Apollo ordered the Athenians to found a festival of Artemis at Munychia to remove the plague for the killing of a bear.⁷⁰⁷ A man named Embaros declared that he would sacrifice (θύσει) a daughter to Artemis under the condition that his descendants be granted the priesthood of Artemis. He then smartly hid his daughter in the *adyton* of the temple and sacrificed a goat in human clothing instead.⁷⁰⁸

These *aitia* have further been linked to the mythical sacrifice of Iphigenia by Agamemnon on the eve of the Trojan War.⁷⁰⁹ The mention of the *krokotos*, the saffron-

⁷⁰³ Faraone 2003: 47–8. Cf. Parker 2005: 66–7; Naiden 2013: 185–93.

⁷⁰⁴ For the texts *in toto*, see, e.g. Brelich 1969: 247–63; Faraone 2003: 54–7 distinguishes two streams of evidence: one, which attempted to provide an aetiological explanation for Aristophanes’ use of the term “*arktoi*,” in *Lys.* 644–5, and another, connected to the speech of Lysias. Differentiation between the two streams, while possible, is difficult as they both probably derive from a single Attidographic tradition (if that classification is construed broadly).

⁷⁰⁵ ΣAr. *Lys.* 644–5. According to the scholiast, “the Athenians had once encountered a famine after they had killed a tame bear to the displeasure of the goddess (ἐπειδὴ λιμῶ περιπεπτώκασιν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἄρκτον ἡμέραν ἀνηρηκότες τῆ θεᾶ), and thus the *parthenoi* at Brauron performed the sacrifice in order to placate the goddess.” For the significance of the bear, see Lloyd-Jones 1983; Bevan 1987.

⁷⁰⁶ *Suda s.v.* Ἄρκτος ἢ Βραυρωνίως α 3958, Adler. The passage includes the fact that the Athenians voted that a *parthenos* could not live together with her husband, until she had played the bear for the goddess (ἀρκετεύσειε τῆ θεᾶ). Cf. *Suda s.v.* Ἀρκεῦσαι α 3959, Adler. The territory of the deme of Philaidae contained the sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron.

⁷⁰⁷ On Artemisian Munychia, see Visconti 2015: 33–163.

⁷⁰⁸ Eust. *ad. Hom. Il.* 2.772, 1.517 van der Valk; cf. *Anecd. Bekk s.v.* ἀρκεῦσαι, α 206 Nauck; *Suda s.v.* Ἐμβάρως εἰμι, ε 937 Adler. Hesychius tells us that goats were sacrificed at the Brauronia. Hesych. *s.v.* Βραυρωνίως, β 1067 Latte: τὴν Ἰλιάδα ἦδον ῥαψῶδοι ἐν Βραυρῶνι τῆς Ἀττικῆς, καὶ Βραυρόνια ἐορτὴ Ἀρτέμιδι Βραυρωνία ἄγεται καὶ θύεται αἶξ.

⁷⁰⁹ *Cypria* Arg. 55–63 *EGF*; Eur. *IT* 28; *IA* 1587. See Wohl 2009: 60–82 for a psychoanalytic treatment of the act.

colored robe, in the passage of Aristophanes immediately identifies Iphigenia as a central figure in the ritual of the Brauronia: in the *Agamemnon*, Iphigenia wears, and then discards, such a *krokotos* during her sacrifice.⁷¹⁰ In both the *aitia* for the rite and Iphigenia's sacrifice at Aulis, a sacrificial substitute is exchanged for a human.⁷¹¹ The act, which is so central to the *Agamemnon* – the gift of a precious object to a divinity by a father – can thus be seen as the precursor and archetype for the ritual of the Brauronia. Embaros replaces his daughter with a goat, and Iphigenia is variously replaced in our sources by a deer, a bear, or a phantom *eidōlon*.⁷¹²

The idea of substitution in this sense is inherent in any evolutionary treatment of the Brauronia that emphasizes a movement away from human sacrifice.⁷¹³ Furthermore, as an act of human agency, it could be understood either as a deceitful exchange or an honest one.⁷¹⁴ The *Helen* and her *eidōlon* are intimately concerned with deceit and misrepresentation on the divine plane. In the *IT*, however, deceit is not at issue. The normative function of the adolescent female temporarily owned by the father and given to the goddess is emphasized.⁷¹⁵ The dedicatory function of the *arktoi* was conceptualized

⁷¹⁰ Aesch. *Ag.* 239. Cf. Stinton 1976; Sourvinou-Inwood 1988: 119–34.

⁷¹¹ Lloyd-Jones 1983: 98 following Burkert, placed this sacrificial act at the center of all initiation rites: “It (sc. the sacrifice) was designed to secure protection for the male in hunting and war, for the female in married life and childbirth. In theory, as the legend of Embaros indicates, human blood had to be shed to atone for the shedding of the blood of an animal dear to or even identified with the divinity; in historical times the place of the victim was taken by another animal.” Faraone 2003: 60 with a similar focus on sacrifice, bifurcated our evidence for the worship of Artemis Brauronia into two separate rituals. First, he posits a small-scale domestic pre-marriage celebration and second, a larger-scale “metonymic” sacrificial ceremony enacted to “avert a crisis and then to commemorate annually the aversion of that crisis.”

⁷¹² *Eidōlon*: Hes. *Cat. fr.* 23a.21 M-W; bear: Phanodemus *FGrH* 325 F 14; deer: Eur. *IA* 1587; *IT* 28, 784.

⁷¹³ For this perspective see, e.g. Brelich 1969: 197–8; Henrichs 1981: 198–208; Lloyd-Jones 1983; Brulé 1988: 195–7; Hughes 1991: 79–92; Bonnechere 1994: 38–52; Larson 1995: 104–6. The allusion to a mitigated or substituted human sacrifice in *IT* 1458–61 is some of the best evidence for this idea in Greek religious thought.

⁷¹⁴ E.g. as in the story of Embaros; cf. Vernant 1981: 43–56 on Prometheus. Cf. Faraone 1992: 94–112 on deceptive substitution in ritual. Note that in *IT* 29–30, it is Artemis who accomplishes the substitution. On the substitution of material objects in cult, see Naiden 2013: 122–8; Patera 2015. For possible Cypriot or Phoenician elements in the sacrifice of Iphigenia, see O’Byrhim 2000 with *DS* 20.14 and *IT* 626.

⁷¹⁵ Cf. Parker 2013.

as an extension of the physical, representative qualities of a votive in a ritual setting, private or public.⁷¹⁶ This function included an ability to be, on the one hand not only a substitute for the original victim (*i.e.* the animal killed by Agamemnon at Aulis or a mythical “bear”) but a representation of their leader Iphigenia and a larger group of non-participatory *parthenoi*.

A (now non-extant) oration of Lysias apparently involved a certain Phrynichus’ daughter and was concerned with heiresses and the allocation of disputed inheritances. The associated lexicographical notices of Hesychius and Harpocration serve to elucidate the orator’s use of the term “playing the bear” (Ἀρκεῦσαι) in the context of dedication. We are told by Harpocration that, “that *parthenoi* before marriage were dedicated to the Munychian Artemis or to the Brauronian one.”⁷¹⁷ In Harpocration, the young lady, or her guardian, was maligned because she had not been tithed (δεκατεῦσαι) or initiated (μῆσαι).⁷¹⁸ There is also preserved in the same entry an opinion credited to the

⁷¹⁶ Cf. Larson 2001: 101–7 on the “doll” votives dedicated by young girls.

⁷¹⁷ Harp. s.v. ἄρκευσαι, α 235, Keaney: Λυσίας ἐν τῷ Ὑπὲρ Φρυνίχου θυγατρὸς, εἰ γνήσιος, τὸ καθιερωθῆναι πρὸ γάμων τὰς παρθένους τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι τῇ Μουνυχίᾳ ἢ τῇ Βραυρωνίᾳ. τὰ δὲ συντείνοντα εἰς τὸ προκειμένον εἴρηται παρὰ τε ἄλλοις καὶ Κρατερῶ ἐν τοῖς Ψηφίσμασιν. ὅτι δὲ αἱ ἄρκευόμεναι παρθένοι ἄρκτοι καλοῦνται, Εὐριπίδης Ὑψιπύλῃ, Ἀριστοφάνης Λημνίαις καὶ Λυσιστράτῃ. “Lysias, in the speech on behalf of Phrynichus’ daughter, if it is genuine, used the word to mean that *parthenoi* before marriage were dedicated to the Munychian Artemis or to the Brauronian one. And statements corroborating what was said above are given by others, especially Craterus in his *Psephismata*, Euripides in his *Hypsipyle* and Aristophanes in his *Lemnians* and his *Lysistrata*, say that the *parthenoi* who play the bear are called bears.” Trans. after Faraone 2003. See Brulé 1988: 206–7; Parker 2005: 234–6.

⁷¹⁸ Harp. s.v. Δεκατεῦειν, δ 16, Keaney: Δημοσθένους δ’ ἐν τῷ Κατὰ Μέδοντος περί τινος παρθένου λέγοντος οὕτως: “οὐ δεκατεῦσαι ταύτην οὐδὲ μῆσαι,” Δίδυμος ὁ γραμματικὸς περὶ τούτου βιβλίον γράψας φησὶν ὅτι τὸ δεκατεῦσαι Λυσίας ἐν τῷ Περί τῆς Φρυνίχου θυγατρὸς ἄρκευσαι εἴρηκεν. δεκατεῦσαι μέντοι, φησὶν, ἐλέγετο κυρίως τὸ καθιερῶσαι, ἐπειδήπερ ἔθος ἦν Ἑλληνικὸν τὰς δεκάτας τῶν περιγινόμενων τοῖς θεοῖς καθιεροῦν. ἴσως δὲ τὸ ἄρκευσαι δεκατεῦσαι εἴρηκεν ὁ ῥήτωρ, ἐπειδὴ αἱ δεκέτιδες ἤρκευον. “Demosthenes in his speech *Against Medon* says thus about some *Parthenos* “... not to tithe (δεκατεῦσαι) or initiate (μῆσαι) her. Didymus, the grammarian in his book on this speech says that Lysias in his speech about Phrynichus’ daughter said that ‘to play the bear means to tithe (δεκατεῦσαι). He (*i.e.* Didymus) says that ‘to tithe,’ of course means to dedicate (τὸ καθιερῶσαι), since it is a Greek custom to dedicate one tenth of what remains (*i.e.* of war spoils) to the god. Similarly, the rhetor (*i.e.* Lysias said that ‘to pay a tenth’ (δεκατεῦσαι) also means ‘playing the bear,’ since girls ten years old used to play the bear.” Trans. after Faraone 2003.

grammarian Didymus that the word “dedicate” (δεκατεῦσαι) could be used in this sense of “to be a bear,” because “it is a Greek custom to dedicate one tenth of what remains (*i.e.* of spoils of war) to the god.” The verb δεκατεύειν refers to a gift to a divinity offered voluntarily and means literally to dedicate a tenth part or tithe.⁷¹⁹ Similarly, Hesychius tells us that “to play the bear” means to dedicate “τὸ καθιεροῦν.”⁷²⁰ Parker opined that these references to dedication and initiation should be read in tandem with passages of the speeches of Isaeus where the claim to inheritance hinged on what the guardian did, or did not, do (or provide) for his ward or offspring.⁷²¹ Thus the act of “playing the bear” for a young Athenian *parthenos* would be an accepted and perhaps expected (especially for an Athenian girl of a higher census class), but not required, choice to make on the part of her father or guardian.⁷²²

These passages of Hesychius and Harpocration not only provide evidence that young *parthenoi* were believed equivalent to dedicated objects but that these beliefs formed a part of the enactment of actual, real-life, ritual situations: the performance of the Brauronia. The initiate who “plays the bear” was considered to be, by necessity and not in simply a metaphorical sense, dedicated to the goddess Artemis just like a votive or a cult image. Recall that this relationship between object and person was already implicit in the semantics of the term *agalma*, a word used to describe both young women and dedicated items at sanctuaries.⁷²³

⁷¹⁹ See Jim 2014: 47.

⁷²⁰ Hesych. *s.v.* ἀρκτεία, α 7281, Latte: ἡ τῶν ἀρκτευομένων παρθένων τελετή. Ἀρκτεύειν δὲ τὸ καθιεροῦν; cf. *s.v.* Βραυρωνίσις, β 1067, Latte.

⁷²¹ Parker 2005: 233.

⁷²² Parker 2005: 231.

⁷²³ See pp. 39–44 above.

The Structure of a Mobile Cult Statue

The *Helen* and the *Iphigenia among the Taurians* were both produced at the end of Euripides' career.⁷²⁴ The two plays have been historically grouped apart from the majority of Attic tragedies⁷²⁵ – even those of Euripides – but they also mirror each other's structures, characters, and thematic concerns.⁷²⁶ In both plays, a beautiful heroine is exiled to a barbarian land, experiences hardships, and is then rescued and returned to Greece. In the *IT*, Iphigenia must participate in human sacrifice, and in the *Helen*, Helen must deal with an unpleasant suitor (Theoclymenus, the new king of Egypt). In both plays, a god abducted each woman, and their whereabouts are unknown to their families. In both, a close male relative arrives (Iphigenia's brother Orestes, Helen's husband Menelaus) and after the respective recognition scenes, both pairs of protagonists plot to rescue themselves from their hostile environment.⁷²⁷ The obstacle to be overcome is in both cases a barbarian king. The two heroines achieve their escape by means of a

⁷²⁴ The *Helen* was produced in 412 BCE; see Ar. *Thesm.* 850, 1060; ΣAr. *Ran.* 53 with Allan 2008: 2–3. The date of the *IT* is unknown but Cropp and Fick 1985: 22–3 calculate a date between 416 and 412 BCE based on resolution rates.

⁷²⁵ In terms of the plays' unique characteristics and tenor, the *Helen* in particular has sometimes been considered (often as a backhanded compliment) an example of the *genre* melodrama – as distinct from comedy and tragedy. Melodrama as a term was popularized by the important study of Kitto 1956 and is characterized by a surreal atmosphere, happy endings, and hints of parody; for differing opinions on the comedic tone of the *Helen* especially *Hel.* 386–514, see, e.g. Verrall 1905: 46–7; Zuntz 1960: 201–5; Podlecki 1970; Dale 1967: viii; Segal 1971: 556–8; Sutton 1972; Arnott 1990; Wright 2005: 1–60; Allan 2008: 198–200; Mastronarde 2010: 44–58.

⁷²⁶ It is unclear which play was written first. Soph. *Chryses TrGF* fr. 726–30 is sometimes thought to provide a comparandum but is itself undated; Marshall 2009; Hall 2013: 147. For early views on the subject, see Lesky 1939 *RE s.v. Orestes* (1), cols. 997–8. Matthiessen's (1963: 38–47) study of the structure of late Euripidean plays includes a detailed structural comparison between the *IT* and the *Helen*. His work is focused on attempting to determine which play was produced prior to the other, a perspective found in much subsequent scholarship on the plays as a pair. For differing opinions see, e.g. Platnauer 1938: xv who frames the similarity between the *IT* and the *Helen* – which “cannot be mere accident” – in terms of a model and a copy and chooses the *Helen* as the prior work; for Podlecki 1970: 418, “the dominant motifs of the *Helen* are adumbrated already in the *IT*”; Wright 2005: 46–8 posits that the *Helen*, the *IT* and the *Andromeda* were all produced as a single trilogy in 412 BCE; for other views, see Matthiessen 1963: 62–3; Luschnig 1972; Marshall 2009. For the *Helen*'s relationship to the *El.*, see Kannicht 1969: 1.32n13; Zuntz 1963: 64–70; Arnott 1990: 3.

⁷²⁷ For the chorus' role in this type of action, see Hose 1991: 2.18–35.

religious ceremony: Iphigenia pretends that the *bretas* of Artemis that Orestes has been instructed by Apollo to steal is in urgent need of cleansing because of contact with a murderer, while Helen pretends that she wants to give her husband a burial at sea. Formally, the prologues of both plays, as well as the immediately following episode, are linguistically and structurally similar. In the *IT*, the dialogue between Iphigenia and Orestes on the fate of the Greeks and especially the house of Atreus mirrors the dialogue between Teucer and Helen in the *Helen*.⁷²⁸

The cause of the internal structural similarity between the *IT* and the *Helen* has been sought in a wide variety of formal and thematic factors. Burnett classed both plays as “mixed and multiple action,” but argued that each presented itself slightly differently: the *IT* was a “rescue or salvation play,” while the *Helen* was a “suppliant raised” play.⁷²⁹ However, in the subsequent analysis, the similarities between the pair are only noted in passing and they are not compared structurally. Wright grouped the *IT*, the *Helen*, and the fragmentary *Andromeda* together as “escape-tragedies.”⁷³⁰ The criterion for this classification rests on the three plays’ similar treatment of the motifs of captivity and escape. However, again, the scheme does not impact the subsequent treatment of the plays.⁷³¹ The *IT* and the *Helen* are often grouped together for their formal affinities even if no thematic connections are posited by the scholar. For example, Verrall chose to treat the plays together and believed that, despite their obvious similarities, the spirit and emotional effect of the *IT* was real, while that of the *Helen* was a semblance or a sham. Thus, Iphigenia’s situation was “certain, hideous, and desperate” while as far as the

⁷²⁸ See Platnauer 1938: xv on *IT* 468–577 and *Hel.* 78–163.

⁷²⁹ Burnett 1971: 47–51 (the *IT*); 17, 76–8 (the *Helen*).

⁷³⁰ See Eur. *Andromeda TrGF* fr. 114–56.

⁷³¹ Wright 2005: 43–55.

Helen, “a hollower business could hardly be imagined.”⁷³² Numerous similarly couched statements concerning the differences in tone between the two plays can be found in all eras of Euripidean scholarship.⁷³³

Accordingly, there have been many treatments of Euripides that use an extra-textual structure to read the text.⁷³⁴ Each uses a different method to select the essential narrative facts, or meaningful elements for analysis.⁷³⁵ For example, Aristotle’s reading of the *IT*, while it cannot explicitly be termed a structural approach, will provide us with a well-known example of the problems with treating a tragedy as a monolithic narrative and also of the difficulty of selecting the significant elements for analysis. In the *Poetics*, the central plot of the *IT* includes six elements: the attempted sacrifice of Iphigenia, her disappearance to the Taurians, her circumstances among the Taurians, Orestes’ arrival among the Taurians, Orestes’ capture, and the recognition scene.⁷³⁶ The remaining actions do not pertain to the central plot; they are either an *epeisodion* or “outside the

⁷³² Verrall 1905: 46–7, 57. This position is in accord with Verrall’s overall view, which saw the plays of Euripides – including the *IT* and *Helen* – as fundamentally non-rational in all aspects. This approach obviates any need to motivate or explain the similarity. See Michelini 1987: 1–51.

⁷³³ See, e.g. Pohlenz 1930: 417; Conacher 1967: 323–8; Wolff 1972.

⁷³⁴ Cf. Lattimore 1964, who presents a thorough treatment of story patterns in Attic tragedy; Segal 1986 on structuralism and tragedy. For a structuralist treatment of Greek myth, see, e.g. Lévi-Strauss 1955: 431 where the “meaning” of a narrative (e.g. the myth of Oedipus) is found through the collation of gross constituent units called *mythemes* across multiple variants (e.g. “the hero reclaims his identity” or “Oedipus marries his mother”). Dundes 2007: 101–4 prefers the term *motifeme*. The most granular, complete, and well-known analyses of such “story patterns” are those of Propp 1964 and Greimas 1983. On the relationship between Levi-Strauss, Propp, and the Russian formalists, see Dundes 2007: 145–53. Edmunds 2016: 20–5, formulates the type: “The abduction of the beautiful wife,” to which the rape of Helen belongs, in terms of the typology of folktales (such as in, e.g. Aarne and Thompson 1961). Folktales types are made up of motifs, which are similar to Levi-Strauss’ *mythemes*, and are defined as (following Thompson) “the smallest element in a tale having the power to persist in the tradition.”

⁷³⁵ On this process, see the remarks of O’Brien 1988: 99–100.

⁷³⁶ Aris. *Poet.* 1455b2–12. On this issue in terms of Aristotle’s use of the *IT*, see especially Belfiore 1999: 360 with the literature cited there. For schematic perspectives on the *IT*, see, e.g. Caldwell 1974; Torrance 2011 on Aeschylus’ treatment of recognition in the *Oresteia*; O’Brien 1988, who articulates a schematic relationship between the *IT* and the myth of the house of Pelops; Hartigan 1991: 95–6, who, following Foley, sees Orestes’ journey as a *katabasis*. Wright 2005: 80–157, singles out, among many other elements, traditional and novel Euripidean plot points.

play” (ἔξω τοῦ μύθου). The treatment is incisive and consistent with the emphasis on recognition and reversal. However, for our purposes the significance of the movement of the *bretas* is inaccessible if the second half of the action is placed “outside the play.”

Burnett, in her *Catastrophe Survived*, a study that begins from Aristotle’s premises, gives six norms or plot elements of tragic action, which relate especially to the *IT*; three negative: punishment, vengeance, and self-sacrifice, and three positive: suppliant raised, rescue, and return.⁷³⁷ These plot elements are not explicitly termed structural, extra-narrative templates, and indeed, Burnett’s subsequent treatment of the plays does not overly emphasize her scheme. Sourvinou-Inwood uses the term “schemata” to refer to “one particular configuration of assumptions ... (*s.c.* that is), particular models of organizing experience that structure myths, collective representations, and texts (such as ‘patricide’, which structures all myths involving patricide) and are themselves structured by, and so express, the society’s realities, perceptions and ideologies.”⁷³⁸ While these “schemata” are used throughout her work on Artemis Brauronia and the *IT*, they are not used explicitly as a tool for analyzing the play as a whole.

Foley’s “*anodos* drama” (following Guépin) is an approach that explicitly applies a schematic treatment of myth and ritual.⁷³⁹ The analysis, which includes the *Helen*, the *IT*, and the *Alcestis*, isolates certain specific elements from a group of texts, combines them, and creates a distinct narrative structure.⁷⁴⁰ The pattern is first outlined with a comparison with the famous myth of Demeter and Persephone in the *Homeric Hymn to*

⁷³⁷ Burnett 1971: 47–75.

⁷³⁸ Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a: 30. Cf. Sourvinou-Inwood 1991: 3–20; 2004: 147–8.

⁷³⁹ Guépin 1968; Foley 1992; 2001: 304–6.

⁷⁴⁰ Guépin 1968: 120–33 termed the plays *korê* dramas; see further, Foley 1992; 2001: 301–22.

Demeter: Persephone is abducted by Hades and Demeter, in her grief, withdraws the power of fertility from the world. In the end, Persephone must live a third of her life in the underworld and Demeter in the end establishes the Eleusinian Mysteries for mankind. In the *Alcestis*, the *IT*, and the *Helen*, Euripides uses a bipartite structure based on the template or pattern of the Persephone story, where a heroine is abducted into a world of symbolic death, and is rescued, and then returns to civilization.⁷⁴¹ Thus, the three plays represent a story pattern familiar to the Athenian audience: the rape and descent (*kathodos*) of the goddess Kore/Persephone and her subsequent ascent (*anodos*) to the upper world. Foley is particularly interested in placing the articulation of each play's particular concerns with reputation, marriage, and funerary ritual.⁷⁴² Her study makes salient points that will be taken up in my own treatment of the *IT* and the *Helen*.

I do not propose to use the phenomenon of mobile cult statues in these plays as a universal key to unlock a hidden program of the *IT* and the *Helen*. Rather, an attempt will be made to uncover how a deep-seated consciousness about iconic surrogacy in ritual enriches the total thematics of the two dramas. It is undeniable that interpretations of specific Euripidean plays deploy the particular perspectives particular to each scholar and can correspond to individual expectations of his or her audience; each emphasizes the points or elements that he or she feels are relevant.⁷⁴³

⁷⁴¹ Foley 2001: 305. Cf. Zeitlin 2005: 204 on the *IT* as a drama concerning a cycle of birth and death, and Lefteratou 2013 on a structural approach to Iphigenia in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*.

⁷⁴² Cf. Rabinowitz 1993: 31–68 on Aesch. *Oresteia* and Eur. *Alc*.

⁷⁴³ *I.e.* different essential narrative facts, or meaningful elements of the underlying “story pattern” or “type” can be selected depending on the perspective of the reader. On this problem, see, *e.g.* Detienne 1977: 33; Dundes 2007: 127–9; Edmunds 2016: 10–3, 22–4. See Zuntz 1960: 202 and Wright 2005: 60–74, 352–62 for the problem regarding interpretations of the *Helen* and the *IT*. For a specific example, compare Sourvinou-Inwood's 2011: 257–8 reading of the myths of the Athenian Palladion with that found above (pp. 98–103). According to Sourvinou-Inwood, the Attidographic evidence presents a “schemata” of “people disembark in a place and are mistaken for enemies while in fact they are friends and/or allies,” which embodies the concept “battle with friends and/or allies (in this case the Argives) for which one (in

The chart below shows my structure of a mobile cult statue. A mobile image was both an object and a divinity. These perspectives are represented by the columns “Objective” and “Subjective” below. The *IT* focuses on the cult image as an object *per se*: its use as a representation, dedication and object to be stolen. The drama arises from human interaction with the mechanics of their own cult practice. The *Helen* focuses on the cult image as a divinity and its ability to represent a god. It dramatizes human interaction with divine agency in the creation and use of cult images. It is possible that both of these perspectives arose from different elements of funerary cult: the ritualized actions of a community who transported a corpse (or a representation) and gifts for use in the afterlife were defined by human agency, while the status of the deceased itself was deeply bound up in issues of representation and divine agency.⁷⁴⁴

	Objective <i>IT</i>	Subjective <i>Helen</i>
Object	Iphigenia/ <i>bretas</i>	Helen/ <i>eidôlon</i>
Giver	Agamemnon	Hermes
Foreign Location	Tauris	Egypt
Recipient	Artemis	Proteus
Taker	Orestes (<i>hierosylia</i>)	Menelaus (<i>parakatathêkê</i>)
Native Location	Athens (Brauron-Halai)	Sparta (Therapnai)

The Object, Giver, Foreign Location, Recipient, Taker, and Native Location are narrative roles defined by functions, similar to Propp’s *dramatis personae* and Greimas’ actants.⁷⁴⁵

They are based on the physical act of dedication.

this case the Athenians) is not culpable.” This synopsis, while relevant and perspicacious, elides the very elements (or *mythemes*) that interest us (*i.e.* the theft).

⁷⁴⁴ Steiner 2001 *passim* can be viewed as a book primarily about cult statues from a subjective perspective. See, *e.g.* the excellent discussion of immobility and funerary statues in 135–56.

⁷⁴⁵ Propp 1968: 19–20; Greimas 1983: 197–221.

The Object is the object moved or dedicated, that is, the cult statue. In *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, the role is shared between Iphigenia and the *bretas* of Artemis. This sharing of the status of Object between woman and statue is embodied by the role of the priestess. Her place in the hierarchical relationships required by the normative, human act of dedication is the base context for this “representation” of both Artemis and a possession (the *bretas*). As caretaker of her *bretas*, and central celebrant in her cult, Iphigenia “represents” Artemis in a subordinate manner. As a dedication or sacrifice chosen to represent the interests of a larger group, she “represents” her chorus and the Arktoi as an example or paradigm. Dramatically, the problems presented by these objective, human-centered relationships are thematized: the misrecognition and hybridity of kin scrambles the organization of a civic hierarchy based on representation or substitution; any notion of deceit or bad faith on the part of the giver (*i.e.* Agamemnon at Aulis) carries the *possibility* of a failed or inappropriate gift.

In the *Helen*, the Object is shared between Helen and the *eidôlon*. Instead of misrecognition of kin and human deceit, it is the gods themselves who misrepresent reality and create deception.⁷⁴⁶ The *eidôlon* – a deceptive but divine object – dramatizes man’s belief in the efficacy and appropriateness of representation itself. At Sparta there was a deep tradition of representation with objects in performance and the legitimacy of these activities were under scrutiny both at home and abroad. Helen’s true nature is occluded by the manufactured and divine *eidôlon* but revealed by the (quasi-) human Theonoe. Menelaus can only retrieve his reputation by falsifying his own burial, the very

⁷⁴⁶ Cf. the formulation of Kovacs 2002: 7–8.

element that marked royal status at Sparta and necessitated the procession of a cult image.

Because a dedication was a transaction, the roles of Giver, Recipient and Taker are defined by their relationships to each other. First, the presence of the three roles means that the *IT* and the *Helen* represent dedication as an ongoing system. By retrieving the object and bringing it back to its origin point, the Taker allows the entire process to be understood as cyclical. In the *IT*, the primary relationships follow the literal pattern of a dedication. Agamemnon (the Giver) dedicates Iphigenia (the Object) to Artemis (the Receiver). The reason for this gift is one of the most interesting and opaque points in Greek mythology. For our purposes, the fact that Orestes (the Taker) steals the *bretas* and retrieves the Object without the consent of the Giver indicates the problematic nature of the original transaction between Agamemnon and Artemis. In the *Helen*, Hermes or Zeus (the Giver) gives Helen (the Object) to Proteus (the Receiver) as a deposit to be retrieved by Menelaus (the Taker). Because this transaction between Zeus and Proteus operates at a high level of authority, it is relatively simple and unproblematic. All of the tension resides in the retrieval of the deposit: the interaction between Menelaus and Proteus' representatives, Theonoe and Theoclymenus.

The Foreign Location is a general or impersonal context or setting for the Receiver: Barbarian Tauris and the cult of Artemis, Egypt and king Proteus. Conversely, the Native Location is a context for the active male participants (Taker) in their native communities: Orestes' identity as an Athenian ephebe, Menelaus' as a Spartan king. However, the return of the Object (Iphigenia and Helen) to the Native Location, is at the core of both plays. Iphigenia's status as a model for the initiates at Brauron and Helen's

as a model for initiatory cult at Sparta reverses their status as passive objects and transforms them into participants.⁷⁴⁷

The *Helen*

Immediately after its first production in 412 BCE, the *Helen* gained a reputation for originality. The plot is simple, if slightly disorienting to an audience accustomed to the traditional hallmarks of Homeric myth.⁷⁴⁸ In the prologue, we discover that Helen was not stolen from Menelaus. Instead, jealous over the decision of Paris, Hera created a false image (*eidôlon*) of Helen that Paris subsequently stole and took to Troy. After the war, Menelaus, in possession of the *eidôlon* and coming home, was blown off course and landed by chance in Egypt. There he reunites with his actual – now recognized as faithful – wife Helen and unmasks the false *eidôlon*. With the help of the priestess Theonoe, the pair concoct a plan to escape and return to Sparta. They convince the Egyptian King Theoclymenus that Menelaus has died and needs burial at sea. As soon as a boat is acquired, the pair escapes and returns to Sparta.

Helen/*eidôlon*

Helen has been described in recent scholarship as uniquely “doubling” or “uncanny,” a figure who embodies mediation and ambiguity.⁷⁴⁹ For Austin, Helen is determined by “ontological ambiguity.”⁷⁵⁰ Gumpert posits that Helen’s character possesses an innate ability to “unsettle the very status of what *is*, disturbing the line

⁷⁴⁷ See Foley 2001: 305, 318–24 on the impact of Helen’s return on the status and reputation of Menelaus.

⁷⁴⁸ Aristophanes characterized it as *kaina* (new, revolutionary). Ar. *Thesm.* 850: ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν καινὴν Ἑλένην μιμήσομαι. “I know, I’ll mimic that new Helen.” See Kannicht 1969: 1.21–6; Arnott 1990. The adjective *kainos* could refer simultaneously to the new production of the *Helen*, and to its “new” or revolutionary character. For positions on Euripidean originality in the *Helen*, see Kannicht 1969: 1.33; Wright 2005: 80–157.

⁷⁴⁹ Cf. Worman 1997: 155 for Helen’s body a locus of deception and ellusiveness.

⁷⁵⁰ Austin 1994: 11.

between appearance and reality, original and facsimile.”⁷⁵¹ For Zeitlin, Helen’s “mode of being in the world is predicated on multiplicity and proliferation.”⁷⁵² Segal characterized the Helen of Euripides as someone whose beauty personified deception and illusion, yet still managed to unite the manifold paradoxes structuring the play. Her transport by Hermes and return from her sojourn in Egypt was the “obverse” of the illusory nature of the *eidôlon*; it served to mediate between the categories of true and false.⁷⁵³

While these characterizations mainly derive from Helen’s *eidôlon* – the phantom image that both is and is not Helen – the ambiguity also had a traditional element.⁷⁵⁴ In the *Iliad*, Helen blamed herself for the advent of the Trojan war,⁷⁵⁵ while Antenor and the Trojan elders pitied and exculpated her. Priam preferred blaming the gods for his misfortunes, a position that aligned with the will of Zeus himself (*dios boulê*).⁷⁵⁶ These opposed perspectives (praise and blame) are also found in lyric. For example, compare Alcaeus’ unflattering comparison between Helen and Thetis, and the positive, sympathetic evocation in Sappho 16.⁷⁵⁷ There is some evidence that Hesiod knew of Helen’s *eidôlon*, but Stesichorus’ *Palinode* (the “recantation”) is the first poem we know

⁷⁵¹ Gumpert 2001: 4.

⁷⁵² Zeitlin 2010: 263.

⁷⁵³ Segal 1971: 569–71, 592.

⁷⁵⁴ For the *Helen*’s relationship to traditional myth, see Holmberg 1995: 19–28; Allan 2008: 18–22; Edmunds 2016: 103–61.

⁷⁵⁵ For the Trojan war as unambiguously Helen’s fault, see, e.g. *Il.* 6.357–8: εἴνεκ’ ἐμεῖο κυνὸς καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ’ ἄτης, οἷσιν ἐπὶ Ζεὺς θῆκε κακὸν μόνον, ὡς καὶ ὀπίσσω ἀνθρώποισι πελώμεθ’ ἀοίδιμοι ἔσσομένοισι. “because of shameless me, and the *atê* of Alexander, on whom Zeus sent an evil fate, so that in the future we will be famous in song for the men who will be born.” Cf. *Il.* 2.187; 3.121–8; *Od.* 4.145 with Hes. *Op.* 164–5; she is blamed in *Helen* 109; 198; 362–74 (expressions colored by the presence of the *eidôlon*). Cf. Blondell 2013: 62–72.

⁷⁵⁶ Hom. *Il.* 3.164–5: οὐ τί μοι αἰτιή ἐσσί, θεοὶ νύ μοι αἰτιοὶ εἰσιν οἳ μοι ἐφόρμησαν πόλεμον πολὺδακρυν Ἀχαιῶν. “You are not the cause for me; it is the gods surely who are to blame who roused against me the tearful war of the Achaeans.” For further examples of a mitigated view, see the full *teichoskopia* of *Il.* 3.156–65 with Latacz and Bierl *BK* III 2.67–70. On the *dios boulê*, see, e.g. Eur. *Hel.* 36–41 with *Cypria* fr. 1 *EGF*; Hes. *Cat.* fr. 196–204 M-W; *Op.* 156–73; Eur. *El.* 1282–3; *Or.* 1639–42. For discussion, see Kannicht 1969: 53–7; Allan 2008: 12–13; Edmunds 2016: 117–18.

⁷⁵⁷ Alc. fr. 283; 42 V; cf. Ibycus fr. 383.6–9 *PMG*; Sappho fr. 16 V. Cf. Blondell 2013: 96–116.

of to definitively include her stay in Egypt.⁷⁵⁸ From Isocrates we hear that Stesichorus was struck blind for his slander of Helen and then later forced to recant (that is, composed the *Palinode*).⁷⁵⁹ According to an anonymous lyric commentator preserved on an Oxyrhynchus papyrus, Chamaeleon believed that Stesichorus wrote two *Palinodes*, one challenging Homer, the other Hesiod.⁷⁶⁰ Just as in Euripides, in the Homeric *Palinode*, Helen did not go to Troy but stayed in Egypt with Proteus. A passage of Plato's *Phaedrus* gives us the fragment: "It is not true that story. You did not embark on the well-benched ships. You did not go to Troy."⁷⁶¹ We do not know with certainty that Stesichorus included the *eidōlon* in his exoneration of Helen, but it is very likely that he did.⁷⁶²

Gumpert called the *Helen* "a staging of the *Palinode*" and indeed, a contrast between a "true," faithful Helen and a "false," compromised one (the *eidōlon*) is a central theme of the play.⁷⁶³ As a whole, the *Helen* is animated by a series of binary pairs or choices that were influenced by philosophical debates over epistemological and cultural relativism in the late fifth century.⁷⁶⁴ In the play, it is not easy to know what is real and

⁷⁵⁸ A Byzantine paraphrase of Lykophron (Hes. fr. dub. 358 M-W) tells us that Hesiod used the *eidōlon*. For discussion, see Dale 1967: xxiii; Kannicht 1969: 1.24–5n5; Davies and Finglass 2015: 302–3 who doubt the accuracy of the scholion, *contra* Griffith 2002: 241–2. Cf. Aesch. *Proteus TrGF* fr. 210–13 with Griffith 2002; Eur. *Elec.* 1278–83.

⁷⁵⁹ Isoc. 10.64. For the *Palinode*, see Stesich. fr. 90–1 Davies and Finglass = *PMGF* 192; Pl. *Resp.* 586c; Isoc. 10.64; Conon *FGrH* 26 F 1.18; Paus. 3.19.11. For discussion see, e.g. Kannicht 1964: 1.26–41; Woodbury 1967; Sider 1989; Bassi 1993; Austin 1994: 90–117; Wright 2005: 80–115; Beecroft 2006; Allan 2008: 18–22; Boedeker 2012: 65–9; Blondell 2013: 117–22; Davies and Finglass 2014: 299–343; Edmunds 2016: 136–42.

⁷⁶⁰ POxy 2506 = Stesich. fr. 90.1–10 Davies and Finglass = 193 *PMGF*.

⁷⁶¹ Pl. *Phaed.* 243a = Stesich. fr. 91a Davies and Finglass: οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος οὐδ' ἔβας ἐν νηυσὶν εὐσέλμοις, οὐδ' ἵκεο Πέργαμα Τροίας.

⁷⁶² On this issue, see Davies and Finglass 2014: 305–6.

⁷⁶³ Cf., e.g. Segal 1971: 558–62, 559n27 and *passim*; Burnett 1971: 152; Galeotti Papi 1987: 28–40; Austin 1994: 9; Gumpert 2001: 52; Allan 2008: 47–9.

⁷⁶⁴ For the *Helen*'s relationship to contemporary philosophical trends, see, e.g. Matthiessen 1968: 699–702; Burnett 1960: 160–1; Kannicht 1969: 1.57–68; Allan 2008: 18–54 and Wright 2005: 226–337. Segal 1971: 582 gives a final count of over ten pairs, e.g. "Reality vs. Illusion," "*Odyssey* vs. *Iliad*" "Egypt vs. Troy," "Inward life vs. Outward action" and "Rebirth vs. Death." For discussion of the play in terms of the

what is not. In the prologue, we are told that Paris thought that he had abducted the real Helen, but instead it was the *eidōlon*, an “empty appearance” (κενήν δόκησιν).⁷⁶⁵ When Teucer sees Helen, he exclaims “Gods what sight (ὄψιν) do I see? The deadly image (εἰκὼ) of a hateful woman who has ruined me and all the Greeks! Let the gods curse you, to the extent you possess the imitation (μίμημα) of Helen.”⁷⁶⁶

Simply by its nature as a representation, the *eidōlon* is connected to the language of cult statues.⁷⁶⁷ Helen exclaims (*Hel.* 259–66):

τέρας γὰρ ὁ βίος καὶ τὰ πράγματ' ἐστὶ μου, τὰ μὲν δι' Ἥραν, τὰ δὲ τὸ κάλλος αἴτιον.	260
εἶθ' ἐξαλειφθεῖς ὡς ἄγαλμ' αὔθις πάλιν αἴσχιον εἶδος ἔλαβον ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ, καὶ τὰς τύχας μὲν τὰς κακὰς ἄς νῦν ἔχω Ἕλληνες ἐπελάθοντο, τὰς δὲ μὴ κακὰς	265
ἔσφριζον ὥσπερ τὰς κακὰς σφριζουσί μου.	

My life and doings are a monstrosity, partly because of Hera, and partly my beauty is the cause. I wish I had been wiped clean like an *agalma*, and made plain instead of beautiful, and the Greeks had forgotten the evil fate that I have now, and would remember what is not evil, as they now remember what is.⁷⁶⁸

The metaphor is drawn expressly from the world of the plastic arts and, in particular, the practice of painting statues (*kosmēsis*).⁷⁶⁹ The language fits the context; understood as a painted *agalma*, Helen is the quintessential desired beautiful object. She is upset over the

traditional status of Helen as *archē kakōn* of the Trojan war (*i.e.* the *Helen* as an anti-war play), see Kannicht 1969: 1.53–7; Segal 1971: 566–9, 572–82; Meltzer 1994; Allan 2008: 4–9.

⁷⁶⁵ *Hel.* 36.

⁷⁶⁶ *Hel.* 71–5: ὦ θεοί, τίν' εἶδον ὄψιν; ἐχθίστης ὀρῶ γυναικὸς εἰκὼ φόνιον, ἧ μ' ἀπόλεσεν πάντα τ' Ἀχαιοῦς. θεοί σ', ὅσον μίμημ' ἔχεις Ἑλένης, ἀποπτύσειαν. On these lines, see Allan 2008: 158; Steiner 2001: 54. On Teucer and the theme of illusion generally, see Burnett 1971: 76–8; Segal 1971: 562–6.

⁷⁶⁷ See pp. 61–7 above.

⁷⁶⁸ I am using the text of Allan 2008.

⁷⁶⁹ The term ἐξαλείφω (to erase) can refer equally to removing the paint on a statue and to removing the pigment from a painting. Kannicht 1969: 2.89; Steiner 2001: 55; Stieber 2011: 172–8 prefer statue. See further Allan 2008: 180–2; Zeitlin 2010. For Kannicht 1969: 2.89–90 all references to *agalmata* as *graphai* are from a time when painting statues was not normative practice; on polychromy in statues, see Pl. *Resp.* 420c; Eur. *Hypsipyle TrGF* fr. 752c; Chaeremon *Alphesiboia TrGF* IV 71 fr. 1; Plut. *Mor.* 348e with Primavesi 2003: 91–106; Panzanelli 2008: 18–19. On beauty as a sculptural metaphor, see Pl. *Charm.* 154b–c. For the adornment of Aphrodite, see Blondell 2013: 7–12.

death her manufactured doppelganger has caused in the war and wishes she could remove the physical beauty (εἶδος καλόν) that caused all the trouble in the first place. The negative pole of the binary axis “illusion vs reality,” is fundamentally represented by the beautiful and deceptive *eidôlon*.

Simultaneously, the factor that allowed the “real” woman to be usurped by the *eidôlon* was the female’s ability to be figured as an object; she could be possessed, acquired, laid up as a treasure, and crucially, pretend to be real. In the Greek mind, beauty – especially feminine beauty – was fundamentally connected with deception and danger.⁷⁷⁰ Both Helen and the *eidôlon*’s ability to use deception (*apatê* or *dolos*) is made possible by their beauty (*kallos*). Helen’s beauty is, of course, a central element in her myth in all of its variants.⁷⁷¹ Like Helen, Aphrodite herself is characterized as the master of deception, the treacherous one (*dolios*), bloody Cypris bringing death to the Danaans (*Hel.* 238–9). As in the *Iliad*, the mortal Helen charges the goddess with “passions, deceits (*doloi*), treacherous devices, and loves that bring blood upon houses” (1103–4).⁷⁷²

Both Euripides’ Helen and her *eidôlon* displayed characteristics belonging to a statue; each was a beautiful *agalma*, a delight to its possessor, and a μίμημα, a representation (*Hel.* 875). Explicitly manufactured by divine hands, the *eidôlon* was also the ultimate vehicle of deception. If read purely in terms of trends in the aesthetics of cult images, the existence of the *eidôlon* could be taken as an extreme example of the fifth-

⁷⁷⁰ See Blondell 2013: 15–22, 48–62. Cf. Hes. *Op.* 62–3: ἀθανάτης δὲ θεῆς εἰς ὅσα εἴσκειν παρθενικῆς καλὸν εἶδος ἐπήρατον “liken (sc. her shape) to an immortal goddess in its face, the lovely beautiful form of a goddess.” For discussion, see Faraone 1992: 100–6; Steiner 2001: 24–6. On Pandora’s relationship to Helen, see Constantinidou 2004. See Hurwit 1995 for Pandora as a statue and her relation to Athena Parthenos.

⁷⁷¹ See Blondell 2013: 4–22; Edmunds 2016: 121n96.

⁷⁷² Allan 2008: 265 compares the evocations of Eros and Aphrodite in Eur. *Med.* 630–1; cf. also *Hipp.* 529; *IA* 554–5.

century tendency towards realism and secularization of traditional religious norms – a growing distance from the gods.⁷⁷³ As Zeitlin notes, “Beauty is an issue that in the climate of the late fifth century was intimately bound up with aesthetic standards of art and representation... thus the *eidōlon* participates in a discourse not just about seeming and being but one that hints at the relations between the model and the copy.” I contend that these worries over multiple holy objects should not be seen as simply a reflection of Euripidean religious skepticism or growing secularization. Menelaus’ reaction just before he meets his real wife is one of *aporia* (*Hel.* 483–514):

τί φῶ; τί λέξω; συμφορὰς γὰρ ἀθλίας
 ἐκ τῶν πάροιθεν τὰς παρεστῶσας κλύω,
 εἰ τὴν μὲν αἰρεθεῖσαν ἐκ Τροίας ἄγων 485
 ἦκω δάμαρτα καὶ κατ’ ἄντρα σώζεται,
 ὄνομα δὲ ταῦτόν τῆς ἐμῆς ἔχουσα τις
 δάμαρτος ἄλλη τοισίδ’ ἐνναίει δόμοις.
 Διὸς δ’ ἔλεξε παῖδά νιν πεφυκέναι.
 ἀλλ’ ἦ τις ἔστι Ζηνὸς ὄνομ’ ἔχων ἀνήρ 490
 Νείλου παρ’ ὄχθας; εἷς γὰρ ὅ γε κατ’ οὐρανόν.
 Σπάρτη δὲ ποῦ γῆς ἔστι πλὴν ἵνα ῥοαὶ
 τοῦ καλλιδόνακός εἰσιν Εὐρώτα μόνον;

What am I to make of this? I hear new troubles right after of old ones. I come bringing a wife I took from Troy, and she is being kept in a cave, and yet there’s another woman, with the same name as my wife, living in this house. She said the woman was Zeus’ daughter. Is there some man called Zeus by the banks of the Nile? No there is only one, in heaven. And where on earth is there a Sparta except where the Eurotas flows past banks on lovely reeds?

This is a state of almost existential confusion.⁷⁷⁴ Menelaus has arrived in Egypt with a woman in his possession, only to meet with an exact replica. He questions the existence of a fixed identity of Zeus and the location of his home in Lakonia. The couple’s

⁷⁷³ On these issues, see Steiner 2001: 172–81.

⁷⁷⁴ For Kovacs 2002: 35–6, Menelaus’ attitude is ludicrous and an episode of comedy, *contra* Allan 2008: 203. Arnott 1990: 14–15 humorously characterizes Menelaus as “one of limited brain.” Holmberg 1995: 35 is similarly unimpressed.

subsequent recognition scene is a series of epistemological questions happily resolved. Informed that the *eidōlon* was at Troy, Menelaus doubts that a craftsperson could create such a lifelike, breathing body (*Hel.* 581). When asked to explain, Helen declares that it was crafted by the gods out of aether (582) as a substitute (διάλλαγμα) to deceive Paris (584).⁷⁷⁵ The origin of Menelaus' confusion is the existence of *two* versions or replicas of one individual. Through its manufacture by the gods, the *eidōlon* is holy (*hieron*) just as Helen is.⁷⁷⁶ It dwells in a cave (607), departs to the *aether* above the sky (605–6, 617), and delivers prophetic speech (608–15).⁷⁷⁷

Zeitlin follows Vernant in linking Euripides' *eidōlon* to a Platonic concern over the act of imitation (*mimēsis*) and its far- (three-fold-) removed relationship from both “appearance” and “reality” (*i.e.* the Forms). In the fourth century, the term μίμημα was to take on an explicit theoretical and polemical cast in the aesthetic philosophies of Plato and Aristotle.⁷⁷⁸ Vernant's focus is on both the cult statue's conceptual development from a religious “idol” to an anthropomorphic “image,” and Plato's subsequent philosophical critique of “appearance” and “imitation” as expressed in poetry, sculpture and dance. It is certainly correct that Euripides associated the *eidōlon* with the aesthetic and philosophical critiques of the fifth-century and their later elaboration. However, the discomfort of Teucer and Menelaus in the presence of the *eidōlon* likely did not signal a distaste for realism, but a certain unease over the traditional process of representation itself.

⁷⁷⁵ Cf. Segal 1971: 590–2 who differentiates between Hera's and Theonoe's conception of aether.

⁷⁷⁶ Cf. *Hel.* 1135–6 εἰδῶλον ἱερὸν Ἥρας. Kannicht 1969: 2.294 cites Eur. *HF* 797; Pin. *Hymn.* 1.2 S-M both regarding the *genos* of Spartoi at Thebes.

⁷⁷⁷ See Kannicht 1969: 2.171–2. On caves as *loci* of power, see Larson 2001: 8–11; Aston 2011: 159–68.

⁷⁷⁸ See, *e.g.* Vernant 1990: 164–85. Cf. Pl. *Resp.* 599a7–d3; 601b11; Pl. *Resp.* 379a–395d4. For these passages in terms of anthropomorphic statuary, see Steiner 2001: 54–6.

Just as with an inanimate statue, there must have been an understandable disinclination to accept the equivalence between a human participant in a ritual, and the divine recipient of that ritual. One reason for this unease is the fact that closeness to the gods signaled social status and therefore a power relation between those who had it and those who did not. Herodotus' reaction to the story of Phye is good example of this mindset: it must have taken, then as now, an extremely conservative, or an extremely cynical person to accept or promote the co-identification of a human and a divinity. Only in specific circumstances and for specific people was it even acceptable on its face. For example, at Athens, while the Eumolpidae and the Kerykes must have maintained their monopoly on the prominent positions at Eleusis assiduously, there was still a feeling of unease in their (presumably legitimate) use of religious authority and representation.⁷⁷⁹ According to Plutarch, Kallias came to the battle of Marathon dressed in priestly attire – he was the *dadouchos* of the Eleusinian mysteries – and stole the treasure of a Persian soldier who mistakenly thought he was a king.⁷⁸⁰ This anxiety over representation and deceit is also found in myth. Salmoneus, the son of Aeolus attempted to have himself worshipped as Zeus by driving around on a chariot producing fake lightning flashes and striking bronze pots.⁷⁸¹ When his ruse was revealed, he was thrown into Tartarus.⁷⁸² Just as the *aporia* of Menelaus represented a real reaction to divine images, Salmoneus' impersonation of Zeus is not (entirely) farcical. The ritual practice of striking bronze

⁷⁷⁹ See, e.g. Clinton 1974: 8–16; Gagné 2009.

⁷⁸⁰ Plut. *Aris.* 5.5–6, 25; ΣAr. *Nub.* 64: Καλλίας ὁ δαδοῦχος ὁ ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ στολῇ προελθὼν ἐπὶ τὴν μάχην. *Suda s.v.* λακκόπλουτον, λ 58 Adler, with Clinton 1974: 47–9.

⁷⁸¹ Hes. *Cat.* fr. 10, 30.1–30 M-W; Apollod. *Bib.* 1.9.7. Cf. Alcyone and Ceyx in Hes. *Cat.* fr. 16 M-W.

⁷⁸² Cf. Menekrates the fourth-century Syracusan doctor who dressed up as Zeus. For discussion, see Versnel 2011: 439–44 on Ath. 7.289. Cf. Clem. Al. *Protr.* 4.54.2–6 with Fredricksmeier 1979.

objects is attested at both Eleusis and the burials of Agiad and Eurypontid kings at Sparta.⁷⁸³

In a different manner, the opaque and disputed roles of the participants in the Athenian Anthesteria point both to an interest in the similarity between human and god, and a simultaneous discomfort with the equation. The festival was centered on the subjective movement and actions of a god: the arrival of the *xoanon* of Dionysus to Athens.⁷⁸⁴ During the Anthesteria, the Basilinna (queen) and the Archon Basileus are said by two late testimonia to stage a “meeting and a marriage” at the Boukoleion near the Prytaneion.⁷⁸⁵ The rite apparently included the administration of an oath to a member of a group of aged or reverend woman (*gerairai*) and was explicitly called the “marriage of Dionysus.” Whatever the details of the ritual, it is probable that the Archon Basileus performed a role that required a level of identification with Dionysus. Similarly, Diodorus’ evidence for the *hieros gamos* of Zeus and Hera at Knossos is conspicuous in its lack of corroboration.⁷⁸⁶ Fowler characterized the atmosphere surrounding these myths as one of anxiety.⁷⁸⁷ The existence of the *eidōlon* allowed a dissonance between model

⁷⁸³ Apollodorus *FGrH* 244 F 110b: ἐπεὶ ὁ τοῦ χαλκοῦ ἦχος οἰκεῖος τοῖς κατοικομένοις· φησὶ <δ> Ἀπολλόδωρος Ἀθήνησι τὸν ἱεροφάντην τῆς Κόρης ἐπικαλουμένης ἐπικρούειν τὸ καλούμενον ἠχεῖον. καὶ παρὰ Λάκωσι βασιλέως ἀποθανόντος εἰώθασι κρούειν λέβητα. “Because the sound of bronze is characteristic of the departed. Apollodorus says that the *hierophant* of Korê beats the so-called gong (ἠχεῖον). And among the Spartans when the king has died their custom is to beat cauldrons.” Cf. Pin. *Isth.* 7.3; Hdt. 6.58.1.

⁷⁸⁴ See pp. 79–82 above.

⁷⁸⁵ [Aris]. *Ath. Pol.* 3.4; [Dem.] 59.73–8. For discussion, see Deubner 1966: 101–7; Seaford 1994: 269–70; Dillon 2001: 101–4; Parker 2005: 303–5. Hamilton 1992: 55–6 provides a skeptical perspective. The Archon Basileus was considered the democratic successor in the sacred duties of the archaic Athenian king. For his duties, see [Aris]. *Ath. Pol.* 3; 57; Pl. *Plt.* 290e.

⁷⁸⁶ DS 5.72.4: λέγουσι δὲ καὶ τοὺς γάμους τοῦ τε Διὸς καὶ τῆς Ἥρας ἐν τῇ Κνωσίων χώρα γενέσθαι κατὰ τινα τόπον πλησίον τοῦ Θήρηνος ποταμοῦ, καθ’ ὃν νῦν ἱερόν ἐστιν, ἐν ᾧ θυσίας κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ἁγίους ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχωρίων συντελεῖσθαι, καὶ τοὺς γάμους ἀπομιμεῖσθαι, καθάπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς γενέσθαι παρεδόθησαν. “They also that the marriage of Zeus and Hera occurred in the area of Knossos, at a certain place near the river Theren, where now a temple stands in which holy sacrifices are accomplished every year by the natives and the marriage is imitated (ἀπομιμεῖσθαι), according to which it was done from the beginning.” See Avagianou 1991: 71–3.

⁷⁸⁷ Fowler 2013: 523.

and copy to exist naturally in a mythical narrative, that is, it allowed certain “realistic” point of view to sit alongside the subjective, biographical actions of divinities. *Eidōla* were divine falsifications and, as such, could present the objective, human side effects or concerns of their existence such as skepticism, trickery and doubt separate from the actions and intentions of mortals.

Unlike Orestes and Iphigenia, Menelaus and Helen are man and wife. In the *Helen*, the *eidōlon* is an *agalma* made by Hera (*Hel.* 31–4) out of cloud (704–5, 1219),⁷⁸⁸ when it disappears, it departs towards the folds of aether, hidden in heaven (606). According to Kannicht, Euripides’ *eidōlon* was cognate with myths where a goddess was saved by the deceptive creation of an object (usually a cloud made by Zeus) prior to sleeping with a mortal.⁷⁸⁹ Generally, as a manufactured representation, an *eidōlon* both deceives and protects. In Book Five of the *Iliad*, Aeneas is wrapped in a protective cloud by Aphrodite and then removed by Apollo to the god’s holy precinct at Pergamon.⁷⁹⁰ Apollo created an *eidōlon* in the likeness of Aeneas and his armor and “the Achaeans and the Trojans fought over this image.”⁷⁹¹ In Aeneas’ escape we find two characteristic elements – a disguising cloud and a deceptive representation – but in many other cases, the nimbus or cloud is associated with a divine figure who is protected from the

⁷⁸⁸ Eur. *Hel.* 704–5: οὐχ ἥδε, πρὸς θεῶν δ’ ἤμεν ἠπατημένοι, νεφέλης ἄγαλμ’ ἔχοντες ἐν χεροῖν λυγρόν. “No not her: we were deceived by the gods, we had in our hands a horrible *agalma* of cloud.” Diggle, citing Kirchoff brackets 705 while Kannicht 1969 and Allan 2008 include it.

⁷⁸⁹ Kannicht 1969: 1.36–8; see Steiner 2001: 13–16, 22–6, 54–6. On the typology, see Cook 1940: 3.69–103. For weather magic more generally, see the references in Fowler 1993: 33n12. Cf. the myth of Athamas and the relationship of Ino and Nephele in, e.g. Aesch. *TrGF* fr. 1–4a; Soph. *TrGF* fr. 1–10; Eur. *TrGF* fr. 398–423, 819–38; ΣAr. *Nub.* 257. Cf. Nilsson 1957: 10–12 on Zeus Laphystios.

⁷⁹⁰ On Aeneas in Hom. *Il.* 5.449–53, see Kirk 1990: 107; Vernant 1991: 186–7. Cf. the wounding of Aeneas in *Il.* 5.311 with Kirk 1990: 93, where Aphrodite envelops him in her arms. In *Il.* 3.373–82 Aphrodite envelops Paris in a cloud to protect him; cf. Latacz and Bierl *BK* IV 2.131–4. For other Homeric cloud rescues, see *Il.* 11.752 (Nestor relates the rescue of the sons of Aktor by Poseidon); 20.443–444 (Hektor by Apollo). Kannicht 1969: 1.33–5 emphasizes that these scenes belong to a type involving “ironic salvation” where the opponents are tricked.

⁷⁹¹ Hom. *Il.* 5.449–53.

unwanted advances of a human suitor. For example, in *Pythian 2*, Ixion indecently pursued Hera but was tricked into sleeping with a deceptive cloud image of the goddess manufactured by Zeus. The offspring of their union were the monstrous and hubristic centaurs.⁷⁹² In the *Helen*, the *eidôlon* is specifically manufactured by Hera in order to cause the Trojan war, but her action also served to protect the *real* Helen from the (apparently) unwanted advances of Paris (*Hel.* 31–55). Kannicht proposed that the function of both the Stesichorean and the Euripidean *eidôla* was to protect the real Helen from Paris and to “save her status as a Dorian goddess,” that is, her marriage to Menelaus.⁷⁹³

In order to present an element of psychological realism, myths including a human suitor and divine consort needed to involve deception or disguise. In the Attic legend of Kephalos and Prokris (our main source is Pherecydes), Kephalos was so handsome that the goddess Eos (Dawn, the time of dew) fell in love with him.⁷⁹⁴ Kephalos rejected her advances, and so Eos insinuated that Prokris his wife was unfaithful. Plagued by doubt, Kephalos disguised himself and successfully seduced Prokris. Afterwards they were reconciled and Prokris in turn became jealous. Kephalos often went up to Hymettus and declared to the sky: “come to me cloud! (*nephelê*).” Prokris understood this *nephelê* to be a rival; she went up to spy on her husband and was accidentally killed by a javelin toss.⁷⁹⁵

⁷⁹² Cf. Pin. *Pyth.* 2.35–7: ἐπεὶ νεφέλα παρελέξατο, ψευδὸς γλυκὸ μεθέπων, αἴδιρις ἀνήρ: “Because he slept with a cloud, a foolish man having followed a sweet lie.” For Ixion, see, e.g. Hom. *Il.* 14.312–39; Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 51b with Fowler 2013: 149–50 and n93. Both Aesch. *TrGF* fr. 89–93 and Eur. *TrGF* fr. 424–7 wrote *Ixiones*.

⁷⁹³ Kannicht 1969: 1.38.

⁷⁹⁴ See Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 34; Ov. *Met.* 7.655–720; Hyg. *Fab.* 189; Hesych. s.v. Κεφαλίδα, κ 2396 Latte.

⁷⁹⁵ Fowler 1993 interpreted the story as a *hieros gamos* that explained the origin of an agricultural festival based on rain magic: the *proerosia*. For the Thorikan calendar see *SEG* 33 147.16–17 with Lupu 2005: 115–17; Osborne and Rhodes 2017: 264–73. In Boedromion (the month when the *proerosia*

Just like Paris' *eidôlon* is an image of Helen, Kephalos' *nephelê* is a representation or an "image" of Eos. Prokris' jealousy and doubt over who *exactly* was meeting with her husband is the same doubt as that over the legitimacy of a human representing a divinity in ritual. In Pherecydes, there is no use of language connoting physical representations and the figures of Eos and *nephelê* are connected by suggestion and proximity; in the *Helen*, model and false copy are identified as such.

The multiple variants of the liaison of the human Eëtion with the goddess Demeter shed light on the way goddesses, deceptive *eidôla*, and ethereal clouds could be coextensive with terms denoting cult images. In Homer and Hesiod, the goddess Demeter desired and slept with the hero Eëtion.⁷⁹⁶ Their union produced Ploutos ("Wealth"), a figure associated with the underworld, the abundance of crops, and the Eleusinian Mysteries.⁷⁹⁷ Zeus became enraged when he learned of the affair and incinerated Eëtion with a thunderbolt. However, in later traditions, Demeter was unwilling, and Eëtion attempted to rape either the goddess herself, or an apparition, or a cult statue. Hellanicus tells us that "Eëtion, whom they call Iasion, was struck with a thunderbolt because of the

occurred) Kephalos is to receive a choice sheep and Procris is to receive a table (of offerings). For the *proerosia* at Thorikos, see Parker 1996: 47. Cf. Janko 1992: 197–207 on *Il.* 14.292–353.

⁷⁹⁶ In Hom. *Od.* 5.125–8, Eëtion appears in a list of divine women and their consorts. Cf. Hes. *Theog.* 969–74; *Cat.* fr. 177 M-W; DH *AR* 1.61.4. He is Iasion in Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F 23 *ap.* ΣHom. *Od.* 5.125–28; DS 5.48–9; 77.2; Apollod. *Bib.* 3.12.1–3 (Samothrace). See generally, Avagianou 1991: 165–75 with a review of earlier scholarship; Fowler 2013: 522–3.

⁷⁹⁷ Πλούτος or Πλούτων "wealth" could be an alternative name for Hades, the lord of the underworld and husband of Persephone. He could be depicted as a king, an old man, or a young boy. Cf. Pl. *Cra.* 403e; Hes. *Theog.* 969–74; *Hym. Hom. Dem.* 483–9. Ar. *Plut.* 727 with scholia; Soph. *TrGF* fr. 273, 283. For discussion, see Deubner 1966: 85–6; Robinson 1979: 164–6; Clinton 1992: 49–55; 105–13; Parker 2005: 336–8.

outrage he committed upon the cult statue of Demeter.”⁷⁹⁸ According to the mythographer Conon, Iason “outraged a phantom (φάσμα) of Demeter.”⁷⁹⁹

The tendency to replace implicit concepts (goddess) with concrete facts (statues) might reflect antiquarianism or the infiltration of later rationalizing accounts.⁸⁰⁰ But the choice between goddess, image, and phantom as desired object was also likely determined by where, and if, the myth cared to dramatize disbelief and doubt.⁸⁰¹ A cult statue must, to some extent, exhibit contact with human agency. As an immaterial representation falsified expressly by a divinity, an *eidōlon* placed the intentions of the gods, not human cult practice under scrutiny. When a cult statue did appear, it is likely that, as in the *IT*, the actual, physical manipulation of the icon and the human problems this situation presented were at issue, not simply representation.

While we have been focusing on male suitors and female divinities (Kephalos and *nephele*/Eos, Ixion and Hera, Paris and Helen) the situation could be reversed: the male god could disguise himself.⁸⁰² The most prominent example of a male god taking on the guise of a human to sleep with a mortal woman is a myth that held special importance at Sparta: the conception of Herakles involving Zeus, Amphitryon and Alkmene.⁸⁰³

⁷⁹⁸ Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F 23: καὶ Ἡετίωνα, ὃν Ἰασίωνα ὀνομάζουσι, καὶ φασὶ κεραυνωθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑβρίζοντα ἄγαλμα τῆς Δήμητρος: “Eëtion, whom they call Iasion, they say he was struck by a thunderbolt because he disrespected the ἄγαλμα of Demeter.”

⁷⁹⁹ Conon *FGrH* 26 F 1 21.2–3: ὁ μὲν Ἰασίων φάσμα Δήμητρος αἰσχῶναι βουλευθεὶς ἐκεραυνώθη. “Iason was struck with lightning because he wanted to disrespect the φάσμα of Demeter.”

⁸⁰⁰ Cf. Fowler 2013: 523n3.

⁸⁰¹ The story of the Proetids at Tiryns demonstrates that the presence of cult images in myth was old. Cf. Hes. fr. 131 M-W; Akousilaos *FGrH* 2 F 28 *ap.* Apollod. *Bib.* 2.26: αὐταὶ δὲ ὡς ἐτελειώθησαν, ἐμάνησαν, ὡς μὲν Ἡσιόδός φησιν, ὅτι τὰς Διονύσου τελετὰς οὐ κατεδέχοντο· ὡς δὲ Ἀκουσίλαος λέγει, διότι τὸ τῆς Ἥρας ζόανον ἐξητέλισαν. “And these when grew up, they (sc. the Proetids) went mad, as Hesiod says, because they would not accept the rites of Dionysus. But Akousilaos says that it was because they disrespected the ζόανον of Hera.” For discussion, see Dowden 1989: 71–95.

⁸⁰² See Bettini 2004.

⁸⁰³ This myth forms the plot of Plautus’ *Amphitruo*, a play that displays many narrative and thematic affinities with the *Helen*; cf. Muecke 1986 and especially Bettini 2004. For the myth see, e.g. Hom. *Il.* 14.323–4; *Od.* 11.266–8; Hes. *Cat.* fr. 195.8–63 M-W; Eur. *Alkmene TrGF* fr. 87–104.

Briefly, Zeus, having taken on the form of the mortal Amphitryon, conceived Herakles in a “long night” with Alkmene. When Amphitryon returned, the ruse was uncovered, and Alkmene subsequently gave birth to twins: Herakles by Zeus; Iphikles by Amphitryon. The myth reflects both the extreme interest in the paternal lineage of Herakles on the part of the ruling Heraklids in Sparta, and a logically commensurate fear of illegitimacy and rejection from the ruling class of Spartiates.⁸⁰⁴

In the historical period, these ideas were reflected in the Herodotean narrative of the birth of Demaratus, a Eurypontid king in the second half of the sixth century and early fifth century BCE.⁸⁰⁵ During his rivalry with the Agiad Kleomenes, Demaratus’ legitimacy was brought into question. Demaratus’ father Ariston had a wife who was the most beautiful woman in Sparta; previously plain, she had become beautiful through the intervention of “the goddess” Helen at Therapnai.⁸⁰⁶ When it was declared that Ariston could not be the father of Demaratus, the woman refuted the charge, declaring: “on the third night after Ariston brought me to his house, a phantom resembling him came to me (ἦλθέ μοι φάσμα εἰδόμενον Ἀρίστωνι). It came and lay with me and then put on me the garlands it possessed ... For the garlands had clearly come from the hero's precinct established at the courtyard doors, which they call the precinct of Astrabakos, and the seers responded that this was the same hero who had come to me.”⁸⁰⁷ The story recalls but does not mirror that of Alkmene. Astrabakos was not Zeus. He simply was a local

⁸⁰⁴ For the Heraklids, see, e.g. Cartledge 1987: 159–68, 331–431; Ferrari 2008: 23–9.

⁸⁰⁵ Hdt. 6.61–70; Paus. 3.7.7–8. Cf. Boedeker 1987; Aston 2011: 316–18; Edmunds 2016: 175–7.

⁸⁰⁶ Hdt. 6.61.3: ἐφόρει αὐτὴν ἀνὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέρην ἐς τὸ τῆς Ἑλένης ἱρόν. τὸ δ’ ἐστὶ ἐν τῇ Θεράπνῃ καλεομένη ὑπερθε τοῦ Φοιβίου ἱροῦ. ὅπως δὲ ἐνεῖκειε ἡ τροφός, πρὸς τε τῷ ἀγάλμα ἴστα καὶ ἐλίσσετο τὴν θεὸν ἀπαλλάξαι τῆς δυσμορφίης τὸ παιδίον. “she carried her every day to the temple of Helen; this is the place called Therapnai, beyond the temple of Phoebus. Whenever the nurse carried her there, she set her beside the *agalma* and asked the goddess (τὴν θεόν) to free the child from ugliness.”

⁸⁰⁷ Hdt. 6.69.

Spartan hero whose tomb Pausanias places directly adjacent to the home of Ariston. According to Pausanias it was Astrabakos and his brother Alopekos who brought the Taurian image of Artemis – identified as Artemis Orthia to Sparta.⁸⁰⁸ Unlike Helen, Astrabakos and Zeus are thought to directly inhabit or embody Ariston and Amphitryon. Myths involving a male god seemingly did not necessitate a negative, physical “version” but instead relied on a straightforward and positive disguise.

Eidōla occluded every human interest in a cult statue except for one: belief in the “truth” or efficacy of the representation in his presence. In the *Agamemnon*, in the aftermath of the *real* Helen’s abduction from Sparta, we find representations filling the (projected) thoughts of Menelaus: a *phasma* and *kolossoi* are poor imitations of the living wife.⁸⁰⁹ For Steiner, these *kolossoi* display an inner vacancy and a lack of force; they are a foil, a ritual remedy gone awry.⁸¹⁰ Indeed, if the Homeric story of Helen’s theft and adultery were the dominant one any representation of Helen at the house of Menelaus (the Menelaion) would lose a portion of its authority. Aeschylus’ *kolossoi* diminish the status of Helen’s cycle of departure and return at Sparta while Euripides’ *eidōlon* enhances it. The fact that there are *two* suitors in Euripides’ *Helen*, Paris (off stage) who obtains the deceptive, disguising “cloud image” and Menelaus, who obtains the “real” Helen, means that the function of the *eidōlon* to represent doubt and deception could be articulated more clearly than in the myths of Eëtion or Kephalos.⁸¹¹ The thematic dichotomies of the *Helen* securely locate “false” in the figure of the *eidōlon* and “true” in

⁸⁰⁸ Paus. 3.16.6–9; see n932 below.

⁸⁰⁹ Aesch. *Ag.* 416–17: φάσμα δόξει δόμων ἀνάσσειν. εὐμόρφων δὲ κολοσσῶν ἔχθεται χάρις ἀνδρί: “a phasma seems to rule the house. The grace of well-formed *kolossoi* is hateful to the husband.” See Stieber 1994: 104–14; Steiner 1995; 2001: 191–4; Griffith 2002: 247–9.

⁸¹⁰ Steiner 1995: 177, 181–2; cf. 2001: 193–5.

⁸¹¹ See Edmunds 2016: 121–42 for a detailed typological analysis of the different abductions of Helen.

the figure of Helen *and* any use or manipulation of her *agalma* at Therapnai.

Paradoxically, the existence of the *eidôlon* confirms the traditional relationship of a physical statue to a goddess (Helen) within Spartan cult practice.

At Sparta, in myths where normative royal paternity was at issue, the active deceiving figure is male and positively typed; in stories where the active deceiving figure is female, she is “protected” by a negatively typed, inanimate object; that is, a cloud, an *eidôlon*, or a cult image. These permutations reflected complex gendered ideas about the creation of authority in performance and the significance of the use of physical images versus bodily representation. We shall argue below that these categories are *reversed* in the actual performance of ritual. In the *Helen*, when Menelaus obtains the real Helen and the pair returns to Sparta, any ambivalence about a mortal sleeping with a divine figure is removed – to the extent that Helen is in fact considered a divine figure. It is likely that even hinting at this removal was only possible when the act was limited in the social authority it could generate. One way to see the presence of the subjective *eidôlon* in place of a literal cult statue in Euripides narrative is as a reflection of both the stationary, funerary nature of a (hypothetical) image of Helen at Therapnai, and the prominence of human participants in the enactment of festivals in her honor. Because of Menelaus’ status as a Spartan king, ritual embodiments of Helen and her husband would have been both traditional and carefully calibrated.⁸¹²

Egypt

The status of the *eidôlon* as an immaterial “phantom” places the entire emphasis of human interaction on the figure of Helen herself. In the course of explaining her

⁸¹² Cf. Nagy 1990: 347–9 on the link between choral leadership and kingship at Sparta.

predicament to the chorus, Helen says that the gods transferred her (ἀφιδρύσαντο) to a barbarian land.⁸¹³ This *aphidrusis* to Egypt was sanctioned by Zeus himself (*Hel.* 45–6) and aligned with his divine plan (36–4, 1316–18). As Malkin has shown, the term *aphidruma* (in authors such as Dionysius and Strabo) connotes the movement of a holy object to a new location of worship.⁸¹⁴ In the *Helen*, Helen’s movement to Egypt is framed as a deposit or trust on the part of Zeus.⁸¹⁵ In her supplication of Theonoe, Helen declares “Hermes gave me to your father to keep safe for my husband. Now he is here and wants to take me back.”⁸¹⁶ In an exchange of cult images or a dedication, there are at least two parties: the giver and the recipient. In some cases (such as in the case of a theft or a retrieval), there was a third party: the taker, the one who withdraws or steals the deposit. In the *Helen*, the giver is Hermes, the messenger of the gods, the recipient is Proteus and the taker is Menelaus.

The technical term for the status of a deposited possession is a παρακαταθήκη (“that which has been laid up beside one”).⁸¹⁷ The word could mean anything entrusted and accepted for safekeeping.⁸¹⁸ Herodotus puts the word in Leotychidas’ mouth as he asks the Athenians for the return of Aeginetan hostages.⁸¹⁹ In Thucydides, Archidamus

⁸¹³ Eur. *Hel.* 273–5: ἔπειτα πατρίδος θεοί μ’ ἀφιδρύσαντο γῆς ἐς βάρβαρ’ ἦθη, καὶ φίλων τητωμένη δούλη καθέστηκ’ οὐσ’ ἐλευθέρων ἄπο. “Next, the gods have transferred me from my native country to a barbarian culture, and without friends, I have become a slave though I was born free.” On Egypt in the *Helen*, see, e.g. Jesi 1965; Segal 1971: 571–3, who equates it with Sparta.

⁸¹⁴ Malkin 1991; see pp. 47–52 above.

⁸¹⁵ Cf. Juffras 1993: 51–3 on the *Helen* as a partial *inversion* of a typical suppliant play where the protagonist suffers male violence.

⁸¹⁶ *Hel.* 910–11: Ἑρμῆς ἔδωκε πατρὶ σῶ σῶζειν πόσει τῶδ’ ὅς πάρεστι κάπολάζυσθαι θέλει. Cf. 241–9.

⁸¹⁷ The point was suggested by Zuntz 1960: 209–10. Cf. Burnett 1971: 89–90.

⁸¹⁸ Cf., e.g. Hdt. 2.156; 5.92; Isoc. 1.22; Thuc. 2.72.3; Pl. *Resp.* 332a; 442e; Lys. 32.16; Arist. *EN* 1135b7; *Rhet.* 1383b21; Dem. 28.15; Aeschin. 1.7; Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.2. If trust were to be ignored, or *asylia* denied, the object – if a person – would be termed ἔκδοτος (cf. Hdt. 3.1.1; 6.85.2; Eur. *Ion* 1251). Note the exchange between Peisetairos and Poseidon over Basilinna in Ar. *Av.* 1630–6 with the legal meaning of *LSJ* s.v. ἐκδίδομι, A I 2a.

⁸¹⁹ Hdt. 6.87a; cf. 6.73. The prisoners are otherwise referred to as *homēroi*. Cf. Figueira 1993: 95–102.

uses the term to refer to the hypothetical care of the entire *polis* of Plataia.⁸²⁰ The idea of a trust or deposit is central to Plato's treatment of theft in the *Laws*.⁸²¹ There, anything that a man has laid up in store for himself (κειμήλιον) should never be moved. Soothsayers should not be employed to locate anything given in trust (παρακαταθήκην) and the old maxim should hold: "thou shalt not move the immovable."⁸²²

The term could also refer to people. In Plato, it is a duty to treat orphans as sacred *parakatathēkai*.⁸²³ In Demosthenes, the term denotes children given over to family members as wards.⁸²⁴ Besides the request of Leotychidas, Herodotus uses the word twice. In book five, Periander employs the oracle of the dead in Thesprotia in order to surreptitiously locate the *parakatathēkē* of a guest-friend.⁸²⁵ In book two, we hear that according to the *hieroi logoi* of Chemmis or (Chembis) in Egypt, when Typho (i.e. Seth) came seeking for Osiris at Buto, Leto received Apollo as a *parakatathēkē* from Isis and hid him in safety on the island.⁸²⁶ Chemmis was probably an important source of Egyptian legends to be molded and interpreted by Greek poets. According to Herodotus, the association of Buto with a floating island derived from Greek myths of Delos/Ortygia, and the *hieroi logoi* of Chemmis formed the basis for an Aeschylean tragedy where Artemis was Demeter's daughter, not Leto's.⁸²⁷

⁸²⁰ Thuc. 2.72.3: μέχρι δὲ τοῦδε ἔξομεν παρακαταθήκην, ἐργαζόμενοι καὶ φορὰν φέροντες ἢ ἂν ὑμῖν μέλλῃ ἱκανὴ ἔσῃσθαι. "and up until this time we will hold it as a *parakatathēkē*, working it and making it yield as much as might be sufficient for you."

⁸²¹ Pl. *Leg.* 913a–914c; cf. 869b2–3; 853b–855b.

⁸²² Pl. *Leg.* 913b: ἐπὶ πολλοῖς γὰρ δὴ λεγόμενον εὖ τὸ μὴ κινεῖν τὰ ἀκίνητα καὶ περὶ τούτου. Cf. 684e; 843a.

⁸²³ Pl. *Leg.* 927c.

⁸²⁴ Dem. 28.15: ... τὰ σώμαθ' ἡμῶν εἰς τὰς χεῖρας ἐνέθηκεν παρακαταθήκην ἐπονομάζων. "...he placed our bodies in their hands, calling us a *parakatathēkē*."

⁸²⁵ Hdt. 5.92. Cf. the soothsayers Plato decried in *Leg.* 913.

⁸²⁶ Hdt. 2.156 cf. Lloyd 1988: 3.142–6; Burstein 2009; Oxford Encyclopedia of Egypt s.v. Isis, Griffiths; s.v. Buto, Von Der Way, 2001.

⁸²⁷ Hdt. 2.156.6: Ἀπόλλωνα δὲ καὶ Ἄρτεμιν Διονύσου καὶ Ἴσιος λέγουσι εἶναι παῖδας, Λητοῦν δὲ τροφὸν αὐτοῖσι καὶ σώτειραν γενέσθαι. Αἰγυπτιστὶ δὲ Ἀπόλλων μὲν Ἵϋρος, Δημήτηρ δὲ Ἴσις, Ἄρτεμις δὲ Βούβαστις. ἐκ τούτου δὲ τοῦ λόγου καὶ οὐδενὸς ἄλλου Αἰσχύλος ὁ Εὐφορίωνος ἤρπασε τὸ ἐγὼ φράσω,

Helen's divine transportation to Egypt is only found in the *Helen*, but just as with the Stesichorean *eidolon*, there is ample evidence that Euripides was working within an established tradition. According to Herodotus' citation of the *Cypria*, Paris reached Troy directly from Sparta within three days. However, according to Proclus' summary, the pair headed to Crete and Sidon before finally reaching the Troad.⁸²⁸ As Herodotus himself notes, Paris and Helen's voyage from Sparta and stopover in Phoenicia is mentioned in the *Iliad*. In Book Three, Paris reminds Helen of their stop at an island called Kranae.⁸²⁹ In Book Six, we learn that it was at Sidon that the Trojans procured the *peplos* that Hekabe and the Trojan women laid on the knees of Trojan Athena.⁸³⁰

Herodotus also gives a variant of Helen's time in Egypt, which accords with the outline, if not the details, of Euripides' play.⁸³¹ The major point of difference between the two is the absence of the divine *eidolon* in Herodotus, and the connected fact that Paris brings Helen to Egypt.⁸³² The Herodotean narrative of Helen has much in common with one of the major themes of the *IT*: the proper treatment and behavior of foreigners. Just as

μοῦνος δὴ ποιητέων τῶν προγενομένων: ἐποίησε γὰρ Ἄρτεμιν εἶναι θυγατέρα Δήμητρος. τὴν δὲ νῆσον διὰ τοῦτο γενέσθαι πλωτήν. ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω λέγουσι. "They say that Apollo and Artemis were the children of Dionysus and Isis, and that Leto was made their τροφόν and σώτειραν. In Egyptian, Apollo is Horus, Demeter Isis, Artemis Bubastis. It is from this story and no other that Aeschylus son of Euphorion stole (ἤρπασε) his idea that I am talking about, alone of all preceding poets: he wrote that Artemis was the daughter of Demeter. It is because of this that the island was said to float." Cf. Paus. 8.37.6; Aesch. *TrGF* fr. 333. The story that Aesch. was tried for revealing the Eleusinian Mysteries might be adduced in this context; see Arist. *NE* 1111a6–10 with, e.g. Gagné 2009: 220n52. For the movement of Chemmis, see Hecataeus *FGrH* 1 F 305. Radt (*TrGF* III pg. 408) notes that the phrase "καὶ οὐδενὸς ἄλλου" implies that there were, in fact, others.

⁸²⁸ For the direct trip, see *Cypria* fr. 11 *EGF* ap. Hdt 2.117; for a stop in Crete and then on to Sidon, see *Il.* 3.443–5; *Cypria* Arg. 20–7 *EGF*; Apollod. *Epit.* 3.4; Dictys Cretensis 1.5, Eizenhut.

⁸²⁹ Kranae is either a place name or an epithet "rocky." Cf. Latacz and Bierl *BK* III 2.154; *LfgrE* s.v. Κραναιή, Kullman; ΣHom. *Il.* 3.445a, Erbse.

⁸³⁰ Hom. *Il.* 6.86–98, 286–31 with Kirk 1990: 164–8, 198–201; Latacz and Bierl *BK* IV 2.37–42, 99–107; Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 99–101, 154–66. Nagy 2010: 266–72 with n32 connects the Sidonian visit to the imperial ideology of the great Panathenaia.

⁸³¹ Hdt. 2.112–20. Cf. Lloyd 1988: 3.43–52, for the date in Egyptian chronology (cf. DS. 1.62). For discussion of the passage, see Dale 1967: xvii–xxiv; Kannicht 1969: 41–8; Austin 1994: 118–36; Allan 2008: 22–4; de Bakker 2012; Blondell 2013: 150–8.

⁸³² See Allan 2008: 22.

in the *IT*, multiple travelers arrive at a foreign land. Unlike the barbarian Taurians, the Egyptians treat their guests with respect and hospitality; when the Greeks commit a crime, they are treated with harsh but fair justice.

According to the Herodotean account, after his abduction of Helen from Sparta, Paris was driven off course by winds to the Canopic mouth of the Nile. A group of Paris' slaves escaped to a local temple precinct of Herakles and charged Paris with his theft of Helen to Thonis, the warden of the mouth.⁸³³ King Proteus' palace was in Memphis, just south of the temple of Ptah (Hephaistos) in an area called "the Phoenician camp." It was here that Herodotus tentatively identified a temple of Aphrodite the Stranger (ξείνη) as the temple of Helen.⁸³⁴ Proteus heard both sides of the case fairly,⁸³⁵ but, in the end, because of Paris' deception of Menelaus, it was decided that both the *chrēmata* and the woman would be held until their rightful owner came to reclaim them.⁸³⁶ Herodotus continues with an Egyptian account of what "must" have occurred if the real Helen had never arrived at Troy, but instead was with Proteus in Egypt. According to this account, when Menelaus arrived with the Greek army, the Trojans declared they did not have

⁸³³ Cf. Hellenicus *FGrH* 4 F 153 ap. Σ ad. Hom. *Od.* 4.338: ὁ Θῶνος βασιλεὺς ἦν τοῦ Κανώβου καὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου στόματος, ὃς πρὶν μὲν ἰδεῖν Ἑλένην ἐφιλοτιμεῖτο Μενέλαον, ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὴν ἐπεχείρει βιάζεσθαι· ὁ γνοὺς Μενέλαος ἀναρεῖ αὐτόν· ὄθεν ἡ πόλις Θῶνις ὠνόμασται, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Ἑλλάνικος. "Thonos was the king at the Canopic and Herakleian mouths of the Nile. Before he saw Helen, he was ingratiating to Menelaos, but after he saw her he attempted to rape her. When Menelaos learned of this, he killed him. This is how the city of Thonis got its name, as Hellenicus relates." Cf. Ael. *NA* 9.21; Strab. 17.1.6 C791 with Fowler 2013: 550–2; Blondell 2013: 73–89. Cf. Hecataeus *FGrH* 1 F 308 on Menelaus' helmsman and the Canopic mouth of the Nile.

⁸³⁴ Cf. Hecataeus *FGrH* 1 F 309: Ἑλένειος· τόπος πρὸς τῷ Κανώβῳι. Ἐκαταῖος Περιηγήσει Λιβύης. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ἑλενειεύς; Plut. *Mor.* 857b with Allan 2008: 22–3. For the epithet ξείνη Ἀφροδίτη, see Strab. 17.1.31 C807; Lyc. *Alex.* 831–2 with scholia.

⁸³⁵ Hdt. 2.114: συλλαβόντες ἀπάγετε παρ' ἐμέ, ἵνα εἰδέω ὃ τι κοτὲ καὶ λέξει. "seize him and bring him to me, so that I may know what he might say." For Proteus as a moral example, see de Bakker 2012.

⁸³⁶ Hdt. 2.115: νῦν ὧν ἐπειδὴ περὶ πολλοῦ ἦγνμαι μὴ ξεινοκτονέειν, γυναῖκα μὲν ταύτην καὶ τὰ χρήματα οὗ τοι προήσω ἀπαγέσθαι, ἀλλ' αὐτὰ ἐγὼ τῷ Ἑλλήνι ξείνῳ φυλάξω, ἐς ὃ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐλθὼν ἐκεῖνος ἀπαγαγέσθαι ἐθέλη. "Now since I believe it is of great value to not kill strangers, I will not allow you take away this woman and the possessions. Instead I shall watch them for the Greek stranger until he come and take them away."

Helen: she was in Egypt with Proteus. Unfortunately, the Greeks did not believe this and sacked the city. During the sack, Helen was not found and so Menelaus travelled to Egypt to find and reclaim his wife. Once there, Menelaus unfortunately proved just as criminally minded as Paris. He abducted two native children, sacrificed them, and had to leave Egypt.⁸³⁷

Like the voyage of Paris and Helen *before* the war, Menelaus' return stop in Egypt was a firm part of tradition.⁸³⁸ In the *Odyssey*, Menelaus and Helen entertain Telemachus with Egyptian gifts obtained from their wanderings after leaving Troy.⁸³⁹ In the *Helen*, when Menelaus (unknowingly) arrives to collect the deposit laid up for him by Zeus, he is shipwrecked and without his companions (*Hel.* 408–15).⁸⁴⁰ He encounters an old woman who is ignorant of his fame (454) and doubts his good intentions (452).⁸⁴¹ Just as with the arrival of Orestes and Pylades in Tauris, the arrival of Menelaus and his companions in Egypt carries with it the threat of piracy and theft. Helen warns him that Theoclymenus will kill him upon arrival at the palace (781–2). To Proteus' son, the Greek is either a spy or a thief who has come to steal Helen (1175–6), and he is not wrong to think so. Menelaus himself expresses his (true) desire to steal Helen.⁸⁴²

⁸³⁷ On this story, see Lloyd 1988: 3.51. Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 857b.

⁸³⁸ E.g. Helen's silver basket given by Alcandre the wife of Polybus from Thebes (*Od.* 4.125–7); the famous *nēpenthês* drug comes from Polydamna, the wife of Thon (*Od.* 4.219–34). Cf. Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988: 206–7; Allan 2008: 11–12 (see also, Hom. *Il.* 9.381–4).

⁸³⁹ The most detailed episode involves his time on the island of Pharos with Proteus (here, the old man of the sea) in Hom. *Od.* 351–424. Detained on the island because he did not offer correct sacrifice, Eidothea, the daughter of Proteus, took pity on him and helped him escape. Cf. Aesch. *Proteus TrGF* fr. 210–15 with Griffith 2002: 237–50.

⁸⁴⁰ The situation recalls Odysseus' arrival at Scheria in rags. Cf. Segal 1971: 569–73; Wolff 1973: 63–4; Eisner 1980: 31–7; Holmberg 1995; Foley 2001: 306–7; Friedman 2007: 198–203 who frames the situation as one of necessary incompleteness and loss.

⁸⁴¹ On the relationship of the situation to a normal suppliant scene or play, see Burnett 1971: 79–80.

⁸⁴² *Hel.* 738–43: μένειν τ' ἐπ' ἀκταῖς τοὺς τ' ἐμοὺς καταδοκεῖν ἀγῶνας οἱ μένουσί μ', ὡς ἐλπίζομεν, κεῖ τήνδε πῶς δυνάμεθ' ἐκκλέψαι χθονός, φρουρεῖν ὅπως ἂν εἰς ἔν ἐλθόντες τύχης ἐκ βαρβάρων σωθῶμεν, ἢν δυνώμεθα. “Tell them to stay on the beach and watch for the outcome of the trials that I fear will be mine and hers and if I can somehow manage to steal her from the land, they should be ready and waiting so that

“of the torches” to send him kindly visions (*Hel.* 569: ὦ φωσφόρ’ Ἐκάτη, πέμπε φάσματ’ εὐμενῆ). In response, Helen flatly denies that she is a nightwalking *prospolos* of Enodia (570: οὐ νυκτίφαντον πρόσπολον Ἐνοδίας μ’ ὀρᾶς).⁸⁴⁵ In the *IT*, when Iphigenia emerges from the temple to cleanse the *bretas* and Orestes, she does not cleanse the aether with torches (a strange concept), but, more prosaically, the temple of Artemis.⁸⁴⁶ While we never find Helen serving as a literal priestess or servant of a divinity, it is notable that in the myths of the theft of the Trojan Palladion she holds a position very similar to Theonoe and Iphigenia. Not only was Helen deeply implicated in the theft of the cult image of Troy by Odysseus and Diomedes, but her help was exactly the type that a priestess of Athena would be placed to give. It was exactly this help that Iphigenia provided Orestes in the *IT*.⁸⁴⁷ In some very late sources, it is Theano, the actual priestess of Athena, who is blamed for aiding the theft of the Palladion.⁸⁴⁸

In the *Helen*, it is Theonoe, the daughter of Proteus, who provides the link between the traditional role of temple priestess and Helen’s departure from Egypt and return to Sparta.⁸⁴⁹ Helen is a suppliant (*hiketis*) at the tomb of Proteus (*Hel.* 65, 799–801); the choice of location surprises Menelaus. The tomb, topped by sacrificial flames just like an altar fronting a Greek temple (547), was a locus of power and veneration in

⁸⁴⁵ Cf. the emphasis of Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a: 32 on the epithet *phosphoros* in *IT* 21 to denote the Attic worship of Artemis Brauronia in particular.

⁸⁴⁶ *IT* 1177. Aether is normally the cleansing agent itself (*IT* 1216). For the comparison between Iphigenia and Theonoe, see Hamilton 1985: 59–63; Allan 2008: 244–5.

⁸⁴⁷ E.g. in *Il. Parv.* Arg. 23–4 *EGF*, Helen coordinates with Odysseus on his spy mission just before the theft of the Palladion with Diomedes.

⁸⁴⁸ E.g. Malalas *Chron.* p.109.10–14, ed. Dindorf; *Suda s.v. παλλάδιον*, π 34 Adler. Cf. the discrepancy over who holds the keys to Athena’s temple at Troy in the *Iliad*. In Hom. *Il.* 6.86–98 it is Hekabe; in *Il.* 286–31 it is Theano, wife of Antenor and priestess of Athena. See Kirk 1990: 164–8, 198–201; Latacz and Bierl *BK IV* 2.37–42, 99–107.

⁸⁴⁹ For Hamilton 1985: 61–4, Theonoe embodies perfect integration with her religious beliefs.

Euripides' Egypt (1165–8).⁸⁵⁰ As the daughter of Proteus, Theonoe is, in effect, the spokesperson for Egypt and thus represents the possibility of Menelaus reclaiming his rightful property.⁸⁵¹ Helen and Menelaus present their case to the priestess as a pair of *hiketides*; only with her blessing can they return home to Sparta.

As Kannicht notes, Theonoe is the only character for whom the puzzling dichotomies of “seeming vs. being” and “truth vs. reputation” do not apply. She knows all divine things, both the present and the future.⁸⁵² By some ineffable power or skill, Theonoe knows the exact moment the gods will decide the fate of the suppliants (*Hel.* 879). This knowledge gives Theonoe the ability to decide (887) whether Helen and Menelaus should be turned over to her brother Theoclymenus to be killed, or not (887–892).⁸⁵³ This choice is framed as a judicial choice between litigated positions. While Menelaus' case is formed by his cognizance of his character and precarious reputation, Helen's is formed by an awareness of her status as a piece of property in danger of being denied return to its rightful owner.⁸⁵⁴ She argues that god (ὁ θεός) wants men to acquire goods without stealing (904) and that her father Proteus would want Theonoe to respect the wishes of a rightful owner and return the possession of a neighbor (915–16). In the

⁸⁵⁰ Eur. *Hel.* 547: σὲ τὴν ὄρεγμα δεινὸν ἡμίλλημένην τύμβου 'πὶ κρηπῖδ' ἐμπύρους τ' ὀρθοστάτας, “You, the one trying so desperately to get to the steps of the tomb and the blazing pillars, stay.” Cf. Allan 2008: 209; Mikalson 1991: 36n90. For ὀρθοστάτας, which could be anything put upright (a pillar, a stone block or an offering of food), see Kannicht 1969: 2.156–7. For the meaning of food offering, see Poll. *Onom.* 6.74; Hesych. s.v. ὀρθοστάτης· εἶδος πέμματος, ο 1199 Latte. Orthostats were carried in the procession of the Thargelia, see Porph. *Abst.* 2.7 with Deubner 1966: 190. For the meaning of pillar or block, see Eur. *HF* 979–80; *Ion* 1134. On Proteus' tomb generally, see Allan 2008: 237 with Ar. *Thesm.* 887–8.

⁸⁵¹ Segal 1971: 588 characterized her as the “spirit of Egypt.”

⁸⁵² E.g. Eur. *Hel.* 13. τὰ θεῖα γὰρ τὰ τ' ὄντα καὶ μέλλοντα πάντ' ἠπίστατο. See, e.g. Zuntz: 1960: 213–4; Burnett 1971: 157–9; Segal 1971: 585–8; Kannicht 1969: 1.71.

⁸⁵³ On the exact extent of Theonoe's knowledge and its relation to prophetic *technê*, see Kannicht 1969: 1.74, with, e.g. *Hel.* 874: Ἐλένη, τί τὰ μὰ – πῶς ἔχει – θεσπίσματα; cf. 515–27, 530–40. On the deliberative and independent nature of her decision see Dunn 1996: 147; Allan 2008: 245.

⁸⁵⁴ Cf. Zuntz 1960: 210–11 with *Hel.* 910–11.

end, Theonoe chooses the side of Hera (1005) and Helen herself.⁸⁵⁵ We are told the priestess' choice was not based on argumentation or traditional religious scruple, but on her own internal notion of justice (δικαίον).⁸⁵⁶

The entire moral apparatus of the play, including the antinomy between “reality” and “appearance,” has thus been reduced to a stark choice: to act with piety (εὐσεβεῖν) or to act with injustice (ἀδικεῖν).⁸⁵⁷ Theonoe is perfectly – and uniquely – positioned to make this choice, despite, or perhaps because, she is uniquely positioned in regard to Greek religious norms. The pure, virgin priestess represents a source of authority separate from the two goddesses involved in the decision of Paris: Hera and Aphrodite.⁸⁵⁸ Just as the *kaina* Helen is an alternative to Homeric Greek myth, the return of Helen to Sparta made possible by Theonoe can be seen as an alternative to the normal squabbling of the goddesses.

This possibility is brought out by the tenor of Helen's prayer, which concludes her formulation of the pair's *mechanêma* (*Hel.* 1094–1106). In the *IT*, a parallel prayer to Artemis emphatically identifies the speaker (Iphigenia) with the goddess addressed (Artemis) and prays for their simultaneous return to Attica.⁸⁵⁹ In the *Helen*, just as the presence of the *eidôlon* separated the will of Hera from fate of the bodily Helen, the wishes of worshipper are sharply separated from those of her addressee. Hera is the nominal addressee (and does receive a brief request for aid) but most of the language is

⁸⁵⁵ For Burnett (1971: 89) this moment evokes Athena's decision in Aesch. *Eumen.* Cf. Boegehold 1989 on *IT* 965–6. For Theonoe as Athena, see Pl. *Crat.* 407b with Post 1964: 103–4; Burnett 1971: 89; Austin 1994: 173–4; Foley 2001: 319.

⁸⁵⁶ *Hel.* 998: ἐγὼ πέφυκά τ' εὐσεβεῖν. On Theonoe's relationship to presocratic and Platonic thought, see Kannicht 1969: 1.74–6; on her positioning within traditional norms, see Allan 2008: 254.

⁸⁵⁷ Cf. *Hel.* 998, 1010.

⁸⁵⁸ Segal 1971: 590–2 connected this superiority with Theonoe's link to the substance aether.

⁸⁵⁹ *IT* 1082–8.

taken up remonstrating and pleading with Aphrodite, the goddess most closely associated with Helen in her *Iliadic* persona.⁸⁶⁰ Theonoe is the actual fulcrum through which the *mechanêma* is achieved, but she, of course, cannot receive the prayer (she is the one who suggests praying to the gods in the first place).⁸⁶¹ If not quite redundant, the prayer speaks to self-reliance. Hera's aid is not strictly required; Theonoe has already provided the necessary help; the priestess' embodiment of the authority of her father Proteus and the charge given to him by Zeus to keep the *parakatathêkê* safe for Menelaus is the underlying authority for Helen's return home.⁸⁶²

Sparta

While the *eidôlon* embodied the "false" side of the system of opposites animating the *Helen*, the "true" side was not void. Despite Dale's contention that the *Helen* contained no themes of metaphysical or psychological depth, the play does strike a certain muted but deep religious tone.⁸⁶³ Fundamentally, it is the living and breathing Helen and her eventual return to Sparta that stand against the empty aestheticism and deception of the *eidôlon*. What is Helen's status as a divinity? And what is the significance of her return to Sparta? The questions have a much different tenor in the case of Helen than, for example, Iphigenia, who, while a recipient of cult herself, is always situated in a subordinate relationship to Artemis in myth.

There is significant and oft-cited evidence for Helen's status as a divinity in her own right. For Nilsson, Helen was the echo or expression of a Bronze Age Minoan

⁸⁶⁰ See Blondell 2013: 7–12. Cf. *Il.* 3.395–412 with Kirk 1985: 322–3; Edmunds 2016: 194–5.

⁸⁶¹ *Hel.* 1024–7. Cf. the prayer of Menelaus (in disguise) to Theoclymenus in *Hel.* 1441–50 with Kannicht 1969: 2.272–3.

⁸⁶² Cf. Menelaus' prayer to Zeus at *Hel.* 1441–50.

⁸⁶³ Dale: 1967: xvi. The comments of Burnett 1971: 76–8 on the tone of the *Helen* are apposite.

vegetation divinity who was worshipped in a cycle of death and rebirth.⁸⁶⁴ Helen herself was an “old goddess” while the abduction myths involving both Paris and Theseus were the reflection of a Minoan religious ritual (*hieros logos*). West considered the origin of Helen’s divinity to be even older than the Minoan civilization. The myth of Helen was a “nugget” of Indo-European mythology fossilized in the myth of archaic and classical Greece.⁸⁶⁵ Helen was the daughter of Zeus and had two brothers, the Dioscuri, Kastor and Polydeukes who ride on horses and were worshipped as “lords” (*anakes*) and saviors (*sotêres*).⁸⁶⁶ These elements can be paralleled to some extent in cognate Indo-European myth contexts such as those containing the Sanskrit *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata* epics and the *Rig Veda*. Helen is analogous to *sûryâ*, “the daughter of the sun” and the Dioscuri are analogous to the *aśvins*, horse-riding progeny of *dyaus* the Vedic sun god.⁸⁶⁷ In a similar vein, the etymology of the name Helen was linked to the Indo-European root **swel* that is related to the word for sun.⁸⁶⁸

These theories are partially prompted by the fact that in archaic and classical Greece, Helen had a significant cult presence in Sparta – a presence separate from her role in Homeric myth. She had two cult centers: the Menelaion at Therapnai (“servants”

⁸⁶⁴ Nilsson 1955: 475–6; cf. Nilsson 1950: 451–5. For a critique of this perspective, see Edmunds 2007: 15–17; 2016: 162–4.

⁸⁶⁵ West 2011: 85.

⁸⁶⁶ For Helen’s parentage, see, e.g. Hom. *Il.* 3.418; *Od.* 4.184; 219; 227; Isoc. 10.16, 38; Eur. *Hel.* 1144, 1526 (daughter of Zeus); *Cypria* fr. 7 *EGF* (daughter of Nemesis); Cratinus *Nemesis* fr. 115 *PCG*; Eur. *Hel.* 16–22, 214–16, 1642–5; Isoc. 10.59; Apollod. *Bib.* 3.10.7; (birth from Leda or egg). See generally, Gantz 1993: 318–23; Blondell 2013: 27–31; Edmunds 2016: 105–9. On the *Aśvins*, see Skutsch 1987; West 2007: 185–91; Edmunds 2016: 88–9.

⁸⁶⁷ West 2007: 227–32. Cf. Skutsch 1987: 189.

⁸⁶⁸ West 2007: 231n116. The difficult etymology of Helen’s name has often been taken for evidence of her divine nature in very different ways. Clader 1975: 63–9 lists the rejected explanations of previous scholars including ἔλ- from swell and thus cognate with σελήνη (moon) and ἐλ- from ἐλάνη “torch” or “basket.” Cf. Skutsch 1987; Edmunds 2016: 87–91.

or “homestead”⁸⁶⁹ and Platanistas (“Plane-Tree Grove”) within Sparta.⁸⁷⁰ Herodotus, in the context of his discussion of Demaratus, says there was a shrine to Helen at Therapnai and refers to Helen’s persona there as “the goddess” (τὴν θεόν).⁸⁷¹ Integrated into an abandoned Middle Helladic settlement, the site was established in the late eighth century and later called the Menelaion.⁸⁷² More than three thousand dedicatory lead figurines of wreaths, a symbol of marriage, have been found at the sanctuary. Dedicatory inscriptions confirm that Helen and Menelaus were worshipped together.⁸⁷³ On the mouth of a bronze *aryballos* dating to the last quarter of the seventh century is inscribed in Laconian script: “Deinis dedicated this... to Helen and Menelaus.”⁸⁷⁴

Menelaus is usually considered an afterthought or appendage to the cult of Helen.⁸⁷⁵ In the *Helen*, he is certainly portrayed as a bumbling foil for the heroism of his wife.⁸⁷⁶ When Theonoe’s support is confirmed, Menelaus’ first plans for escape, like Orestes’ in the *IT*, border on the absurd.⁸⁷⁷ He suggests riding off on a chariot (to Greece!) (*Hel.* 1039) and hiding in the temple to murder Theoclymenus (1043–4).

⁸⁶⁹ On the etymology of Therapnai, see Bölte 1934 *RE* s.v. Therapne, cols. 2351–3; Kretschmer 1935: 90–1. For *therapontes*, *therapeuo*, and *Therapnaiuo* as terms for cult officials and worshippers, see Forrest 1966. See Nagy 1978: 32–4, 289–95 on the word in Homer and Nagy 2013 on *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 157. For its meaning of “homesteads” in Euripides, see Dodds 1960: 207–8 on Eur. *Bacch.* 1043–5.

⁸⁷⁰ Most likely *Platanus Orientalis*; see Sanders 2009: 199, on the topography of the sanctuary.

⁸⁷¹ Hdt. 6.61.3: ἐφόρει αὐτὴν ἀνὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέρην ἐς τὸ τῆς Ἑλένης ἱρόν. τὸ δ’ ἐστὶ ἐν τῇ Θεράπνῃ καλεομένη ὑπερθε τοῦ Φοιβίου ἱροῦ. ὅπως δὲ ἐνείκειε ἢ τροφός, πρὸς τε τῷγαλμα ἴστα καὶ ἐλίσσετο τὴν θεὸν ἀπαλλάξαι τῆς δυσμορφίης τὸ παιδίον. “She (sc. the nurse of Demaratus’ future mother) carried the child every day to the sacred precinct of Helen, which is in the area called Therapnai, beyond the temple of Phoebus. Whenever the nurse carried the child there, she set her beside the *agalma* and requested that the goddess (τὴν θεόν) free the child from ugliness.” On this passage, see Edmunds 2016: 185–6.

⁸⁷² Cf. Alc. 7 fr. 1 *PMGF* = POxy 2389; Hdt. 6.61–70; Isoc. 10.63; Polyb. 5.18.4; Paus. 3.19.9–10; ΣEur. *Tro.* 210. See Catling and Cavenagh 1976; Catling 1976; 1995; 2009 (the BA material); Barber 1992; Tomlinson 1992; Antonaccio 1995: 155–66, 197.

⁸⁷³ Catling and Cavenagh 1976: 148; Cavanagh and Laxton 1984.

⁸⁷⁴ Δεῖνι[ς] τὰδ’ ἀνέθεκε Χαρ[ι] Φελέναι Μενελάφο. See Catling and Cavenagh 1976: 148; Edmunds 2016: 174–85.

⁸⁷⁵ See, e.g. Isoc. 10.61–3. Cf. Edmunds 2016: 177–80.

⁸⁷⁶ Cf., however, Torrance 2009 on *Hel.* 835 and the oath on the head of Menelaus.

⁸⁷⁷ E.g. Arnott 1990: 15; Verrall 1905: n50, 111.

However, just like the ruse of Iphigenia and Orestes made use of a central element of Orestes' myth (pollution), the return of Menelaus to Sparta likely referenced an important part of Menelaus Spartan identity: his status as king and the location of his grave at Therapnai (the Menelaion). Helen's *mechanêma* involves a false burial at sea (1057–84). Helen and a disguised (real) Menelaus will acquire the boat for the ceremony and then travel home to Sparta and Therapnai.

During Helen's deception of Theoclymenus, the pair discuss the practice of interment in a cenotaph. Helen claims she wants to give her dead husband a burial (*Hel.* 1239). Many of the requests are traditional: blood of a horse or bullock is needed (1255–8); the animal must not be malformed (1259); the bier is to be covered with robes (1261, cf. 1243, 1279); bronze armor (1263) and all good things the earth brings forth (1265) are to be presented to the deceased; the family must be present (1275). Despite the generality of these requirements and Helen's own insistence that they are Greek customs, Menelaus' identity as a king focuses the ritual on Sparta. When the Egyptian questions the efficacy of burying a man who is not present (1240), Helen says that the Greeks have a custom: “whenever someone dies at sea... we bury the body in empty robes.”⁸⁷⁸ Theoclymenus immediately nominates the Spartans, the “descendants of Pelops,” as those especially knowledgeable in this practice (1242–4).

The burial of Spartan kings was an elaborate, communal affair involving the presence of thousands of mourners, both male and female.⁸⁷⁹ According to Herodotus,

⁸⁷⁸ *Hel.* 1241–3: Η: Ἑλλησίν ἐστι νόμος, ὃς ἂν πόντῳ θάνῃ. ΤΗ: τί δρᾶν; σοφοί τοι Πελοπίδαι τὰ τοιάδε. Η: κενοῖσι θάπτειν ἐν πέπλων ὑφάσμασιν. Allan 2008: 289 adduces the Athenian war dead in Thuc. 2.34.3 as a *comparandum*.

⁸⁷⁹ Cf. Hdt. 6.58; Xen. *Hel.* 3.3.1 with Cartledge 1997: 331–43; Richer 2012: 178–95, 225–38. On the royal funeral's relationship to hero cult, see Parker 1988; Cartledge 1988.

whenever an Agiad or Eurypontid died in war, they constructed an image (*eidôlon*) of the dead king and processed it to the royal grave on a decorated couch.⁸⁸⁰ For Schaefer, the *eidôlon* of king Leonidas was a life-size or close to life-size figure.⁸⁸¹ It is probable that only when the body of a king was absent or inaccessible (as in the case of Leonidas), the *eidôlon* was used: if available, the embalmed body of the king who died abroad was brought back to Sparta, processed to the grave, and interred.⁸⁸² In the fourth century, when Agesipolis died from fever at Olynthus he was embalmed in honey and brought home to receive the royal burial.⁸⁸³ According to Plutarch, the death of Agesilaus occurred as he returned from a diplomatic mission to Egypt.⁸⁸⁴ Borne along the coast by winds, he stopped at an uninhabited spot in Libya called the harbor of Menelaus and died. According to custom, his body was embalmed in wax and transported back to Sparta.

However, the Menelaion was not strictly a royal tomb, and Menelaus himself was not strictly a king. The shrine at Therapnai contained neither a tomb nor a grave.⁸⁸⁵ The Agiads and Eurypontids traced their lineage to Herakles and were buried within Sparta at separate locations.⁸⁸⁶ Menelaus' royal pedigree was based in Homeric epic. While this pedigree was probably too diffuse to be used to stake out ideological claims to power within a Sparta dominated by Lycurgus and the *timai* of the twin kings, it naturally

⁸⁸⁰ Hdt. 6.58.

⁸⁸¹ Schaefer 1957: 228–9.

⁸⁸² Cf. Leonidas in Hdt. 7.225, 238; Paus. 3.14.1 with Cartledge 1987: 334. Cf. the interment of the regent Pausanias in Thuc. 1.133–4 and *IG* V.1 660 a Trajanic era inscription honoring a contestant at games held at the graves of Leonidas, Pausanias, and the “other heroes.” For the importance of a local burial to Spartan kings, see Paus. 9.13.10. Cf. the transportation of the bones of, e.g. Orestes, Theseus, and Cimon, with n436 below.

⁸⁸³ Xen. *Hell.* 5.3.19: καὶ ἐκεῖνος μὲν ἐν μέλιτι τεθεῖς καὶ κομισθεὶς οἴκαδε ἔτυχε τῆς βασιλικῆς ταφῆς; Plut. *Ages.* 40.

⁸⁸⁴ Plut. *Ages.* 40.1–2; Paus. 3.9.1.

⁸⁸⁵ Antonaccio 1995: 166. Cf. Paus. 3.19.9–10 and the paraphrase of Alcman in ΣEur. *Tro.* 210.

⁸⁸⁶ Paus. 3.12.8. There is no extant evidence for the burials. For possible locations, see Sanders 2009: 195–7.

existed as a possible, submerged focus of authority.⁸⁸⁷ The appeal of this situation to both the Athenian audience of the *Helen* and later consumers of the posthumous legacy of Agesilaus was based on this very real *possibility* of authority it represented. Menelaus' ties to both Egypt and Libya were not just fifth-century propaganda but had roots in traditional narratives of the area.⁸⁸⁸

The hero's wanderings in the *Odyssey* included stops in Cyprus, Phoenicia, Libya, and Egypt and meetings with the Ethiopians, Sidonians, and the shadowy Eremboi.⁸⁸⁹ Herodotus locates the port of Menelaus on the Libyan mainland opposite Cyrene, and Pindar includes Helen and Menelaus in his *ktistic* account of Cyrene itself.⁸⁹⁰ Teucer's voicing of the Athenian claim to Cyprus in the prologue is an indication of the interest these sorts of narratives generated (*Hel.* 142–50).⁸⁹¹ Part of Helen's deception of Theoclymenus is the false statement that Menelaus died in Libya (1211), and Menelaus, as he describes his wanderings in Crete and Libya, references the “lookout of Perseus,” presumably a mythical location far to the west (765–71).⁸⁹²

⁸⁸⁷ On the interaction of the ideology of Lycurgus with that of the Spartan kings, see Beck-Schachter 2016.

⁸⁸⁸ Cf. Herodotus' excursus on the lineage of Agiad and Eurypontid kings (Hdt. 6.52–3), where we learn that outside of Sparta, all the Greeks believed the line of Dorian kings before Perseus were Egyptian (*i.e.* Danaus and Lynceus); cf. Hdt. 2.91.5. See Malkin 1990 on Lysander and Spartiate links of *xenia* with Egypt and Libya in the late fifth century.

⁸⁸⁹ Hom. *Od.* 4.81–5.

⁸⁹⁰ Hdt. 4.169: ἢ τε Πλατέα νῆσος ἐπικέεται, τὴν ἔκτισαν οἱ Κυρηναῖοι, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἠπειρῷ Μενέλαος λιμὴν ἔστι καὶ Ἄζιρις “in between lies the island of Platea, which the Cyrenaeans colonized, and on the mainland is the harbor called Menelaus, and the Aziris, which was a settlement of the Cyrenaeans.” Cf. Malkin 1994: 46–57; Fowler 2013: 552. For Malkin 1994: 51–2, the port of Menelaus is an unreachable destination indicating the extent of colonization. For Cyrene, see Pin. *Pyth.* 5.80–5 with scholia = Lysimachus *FGrH* 328 F 6.

⁸⁹¹ Cf. Pin. *Nem.* 4.46 with Kannicht 1969: 2.69–7; Allan 2008: 164. For Athenian interests in Cyprus, especially surrounding the accession of Evagoras in 411 BCE, see Isoc. 9; Dem. 12.10; DS 13.106.6 with Meiggs 1966: 477–86.

⁸⁹² Eur. *Hel.* 766–9: τί σοι λέγοιμ' ἂν τὰς ἐν Αἰγαίῳ φθορὰς τὰ Ναυπλίου τ' Εὐβοικὰ πυρπολήματα Κρήτην τε Λιβύης θ' ἃς ἐπεστράφην πόλεις, σκοπιάς τε Περσέως; “Why should I speak of our losses in the Aegean or the beacons of Nauplios on Euboea or Crete and the cities I visited in Libya or the lookouts of Perseus?” On the σκοπιάς Περσέως see Kannicht 1969: 2.217; Allan 2008: 140, 235, 322 on *Hel.* 1463–4. Passages such as these and *IA* 1500 imply that the Atreid connection to the Peloponnesus was thought to stem from Perseus.

Unlike the ancestors of the Agiad and Eurypontid kings, Menelaus did not have an actual tomb in Sparta but a cenotaph at Therapnai.⁸⁹³ If he is thought of as a figure capable of projecting authority, the fact that he died in Libya or Egypt could be used explain why a festival procession or *ekphora* from Sparta out to Therapnai would have included an *eidôlon* to represent his absent body. Its presence would have served as a model for the actual burial practice for an absent king, while simultaneously being capable of representing renewal or rebirth. The literal reenactment of the situation for the corpse of Agesilaus is instructive: his posthumous return to Sparta was a mirror of that of Menelaus, but presumably he was buried alongside the other Eurypontid kings.⁸⁹⁴ One result of the personal appropriation of non-local or panhellenic heroes was the creation of contradictions such as these. In the *Helen*, the *mechanêma* is a trick; Menelaus is not dead; the return of his living body to Sparta and its accompanying movement to Therapnai would not represent his interment as a historical monarch, but the renewal of his marriage to Helen.⁸⁹⁵ This situation would have matched well the prerogatives of the actual kings of Sparta.

What significance accompanied the arrival of this *kaina* Helen and her marriage to Menelaus? Many scholars have associated our dedicatory sequence – the movement and seclusion of Helen in Egypt, subsequent retrieval, reunification with her husband, and return to Sparta – as a sequence referencing both the transition of *parthenos* to *gynê* and a cosmic cycle of death and rebirth symbolized by the myth of Demeter and Kore.⁸⁹⁶

⁸⁹³ Cf. the Spartan tomb of Orestes in the agora (Paus. 3.11.10).

⁸⁹⁴ Note, however, the location of the tombs of Leonidas and the regent Pausanias in Paus 3.14.1.

⁸⁹⁵ For the marriage of Helen and Menelaus generally, see Edmunds 2016: 110–18. For its presence in the *Helen*, see *Hel.* 638; 720–5. For these lines' use in reconstructing Stesichorus and as a model for Theocritus 18, see Hunter 2015: 153n20. Cf. Stesich. *Helen* fr. 88 with Davies and Finglass 2015: 327–8.

⁸⁹⁶ E.g. Zeitlin 1981; Juffras 1993; Holmberg 1995; Zweig 1999; Foley 2001: 304–5; Swift 2009a.

The sequence has been further connected to coming of age or pre-marriage rituals of young Spartan women.⁸⁹⁷ At face value, this is a strange claim; Helen, as she exists in Egypt, is definitively not a *parthenos*, but a mature woman who has been married (usually more than once) and given birth to a child. However, it is likely that this very ability to possess attributes of both a virgin and a wife both prompted and allowed her close association with cult.⁸⁹⁸

Theocritus' *Epithalamium to Helen* describes the dance and song of twelve maidens before the newly-painted chamber (πρόσθε νεογράφω θαλάμῳ) of Menelaus.⁸⁹⁹ The most logical location for such a (hypothetical) performance is the Menelaion (ξανθότριχι πὰρ Μενελάῳ), but the scene is unspecific.⁹⁰⁰ The *parthenoi* narrate the wooing of Helen and compare themselves to their leader and exemplar.⁹⁰¹ In line 38, Helen's future transition from *parthenos* to wife is marked by an acknowledgement of her status as a "housewife" (ὦ χαρίεσσα κόρα, τὸ μὲν οἰκέτις ἤδη) and the chorus compare themselves (ἄμμεξ δ' ...) to suckling lambs who miss the udder of the ewe that bore them.⁹⁰² It is in this context of transition that the *parthenoi* announce that they will institute a different practice or ritual in honor of Helen: flowers are to be gathered, a garland is to be placed on a sacred plane tree, and letters are carved in the bark in Doric: "Reverence me. I am Helen's tree" (σέβου μ' Ἑλένας φυτὸν εἰμί). This *aition* for

⁸⁹⁷ See Brelich 1969: 41–3; Calame 1997: 141–206; Ducat 2006: 243–7; with, e.g. Paus. 4.16.9 on the maidens of Artemis Karyatis.

⁸⁹⁸ Helen's only child is Hermione. For Helen as an idiosyncratic γυνή and the implicit connection between childlessness and beauty, see Foley 2001: 304–5; Edmunds 2016: 110–21.

⁸⁹⁹ Theoc. *Id.* 18. See Gow 1952: 348–61; Hunter 1996: 149–66; 2015; Edmunds 2016: 164–8. Cf. Stesich. fr. 84–9 Davies and Finglass.

⁹⁰⁰ Cf. the house of Menelaus at Platanistas in Paus. 3.14.6: ἐκτὸς κατὰ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους τὸ ἄγαλμα ἔστιν οἰκία τὰ ἐφ' ἡμῶν ιδιώτου, Μενελάου τὸ ἀρχαῖον. "Opposite the image of Herakles there is a house, which in our time is private, but was of old Menelaus'."

⁹⁰¹ Theoc. 18.11–15, 26–31.

⁹⁰² Theoc. 18.38–42 See Gow 1952: 358 on the term οἰκέτις.

Helen's tree has been connected to Platanistas ("Plane-Tree Grove"), a Spartan sanctuary located by Pausanias in the district of Pitanê, directly adjacent to the *hiera* of Alcman and Herakles.⁹⁰³ Hunter posits that the maidens will "not only found a cult in Helen's honor, but the first priestesses of that cult."⁹⁰⁴

In the *Helen*, the language of the play assimilates the heroine with the role of a young bride to be (*nymphâ*).⁹⁰⁵ The very first line of the play invokes the "beautiful-virginal flows of the Nile."⁹⁰⁶ In the *parodos*, Helen sings a lament, calling on the Sirens to console her in order that Persephone in her nighttime halls may receive a paeon for the dead (*Hel.* 167–72):

πτεροφόροι νεάνιδες,
παρθένοι Χθονὸς κόραι
Σειρῆνες, εἴθ' ἐμοῖς
μόλοιτ' ἔχουσαι
Λίβυν λωτὸν ἢ σύ
ριγγας αἰλίνοις κακοῖς

You winged maids, virgin daughters of Earth, Sirens, come to my woeful dirges holding Libyan lotus-flute or pan-pipes.⁹⁰⁷

Helen addresses the Sirens as her age-mates, winged *parthenoi*, daughters of Earth. The Sirens are then asked (*Hel.* 173–8) to send (πέμψαιτε) their musical inspiration and talent to Helen so that "Persephone may receive a song (*paeon*) for the dead."⁹⁰⁸ For Ford, the ode invokes a reciprocal doubling of song by both the Sirens in Hades and the chorus in Egypt. The Sirens come (μόλοιτ') to Egypt flying from the underworld to join Helen's

⁹⁰³ Paus. 3.15.3.

⁹⁰⁴ Hunter 1996: 158; Edmunds 2016: 167–8.

⁹⁰⁵ See Juffras 1993; Zweig 1999: 165–9; Swift 2009a; 2010: 218–40; Murnaghan 2013: 167–9.

⁹⁰⁶ *Hel.* 1: Νείλου μὲν αἶδε καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί. Cf. Arnott 1990: 2–3; Swift 2009a.

⁹⁰⁷ The text is very uncertain. On the passage generally see, e.g. Kannicht 1969: 2.59–84; Hose 1991: 1.93–100 who adduces *Hipp.* 121–3; Robinson 1979: 165–6; Willink 1990; Pucci 1997: 53, 9; Allan 2008: 165–79. See Ford 2010: 200–1 for the generic status of an underworld *paeon*.

⁹⁰⁸ *Hel.* 175. See Soph. *TrGF* fr. 861; Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* 4.896–8; Pl. *Crat.* 403d with Allan 2008: 172; Swift 2009a; Ford 2010: 288n17, for the cthonic associations of the Sirens.

monody and transform the lament into the choral performance of a paean – a gift for Persephone.⁹⁰⁹ In the stanza immediately following, Helen’s song is compared to that the sorrowful cry of a *nymphê* (*Hel.* 186–90):

αἰάγμα-
 σι στένουσα νύμφα τις,
 οἷα Ναῖς ὄρεσι φύγδα
 νόμον ἰεῖσα γοερόν, ὑπὸ δὲ
 πέτρινα γύαλα κλαγγαῖσι
 Πανὸς ἀναβοᾷ γάμους.

...some Nymph crying woe, such as a Naiad fleeing sends out to the mountains, a mournful sound, and in accompaniment to the screams the rocky recesses shout aloud the marriage of Pan.

Helen’s song is like a bride’s lament, and in particular, like that of a mountain Naiad who is snatched away as the bride of Pan.⁹¹⁰ The prophetic knowledge that Hermes has, in fact, abducted Helen and in doing so saved her from woe, is not currently relevant to Helen as she sits as a suppliant at the tomb of Proteus.⁹¹¹ Helen’s time in Egypt represents a transition period between maidenhood and marriage, characterized by lament, sorrow, and travails before she is happily reunited with her husband.

Central to this idea is the content of the final *stasimon*: the ode to the great Mother, where the chorus sings of a certain person, presumably Helen, who has incurred Demeter’s wrath by not “honoring her rites.”⁹¹² The song begins by describing the Mountain Mother’s search for her abducted daughter (*Hel.* 1301–14):

ὄρεῖα ποτὲ δρομάδι κώ-

⁹⁰⁹ Ford 2010: 288–91; Murnaghan 2013: 173–6.

⁹¹⁰ Cf. Swift 2010: 225–6.

⁹¹¹ *Hel.* 44–51, 56–9. Cf. Burnett 1971: 77–80; Allan 2008: 155.

⁹¹² *Hel.* 1301–67. The ode has long been considered to be a chief example of a tendency in late Euripides towards the detachment of the chorus from the narrative action; cf. Dale 1967: 147; Swift 2009a: 1n2; 2010: 230n122; see Mastronarde 2010: 126–45 on Euripidean choruses’ connection to the dramatic action generally and 141–1 on the *Helen* specifically. On the significance of the ode, see Golann 1945; Verrall 1905: 61–72; Kannicht 1969: 2.327–49; Allan 2008: 292–304; Swift 2009a; 2010: 229–38; Battezzatto 2013: 102–10.

λω μάτηρ ἐσύθη θεῶν
 ἀν' ὑλάεντα νάπη
 ποτάμιόν τε χεῦμ' ὑδάτων
 βαρύβρομόν τε κῦμ' ἄλιον
 1305
 πόθῳ τᾶς ἀποιχομένας
 ἀρρήτου κούρας.
 κρόταλα δὲ βρόμια διαπρύσιον
 ἰέντα κέλαδον ἀνεβόα,
 1310
 θηρῶν ὄτε ζυγίους
 ζευξάσα θεᾶ σατίνας
 τὰν ἀρπασθεῖσαν κυκλίων
 χορῶν ἔξω παρθενίων
 κούραν <ῶρμα σωσομένα>

Once the mountain-dwelling Mother of the Gods rushed on swift feet along the wooded glens and the sea-like streams of water and the deep-thundering swells of the ocean in longing for her vanished daughter the unspoken one. Roaring cymbals, their piercing din travelling, shouted out when she yoked her chariot with its team of wild beasts and <darted off to find> her daughter snatched away from the circling dances of maidens.⁹¹³

The Mountain Mother's daughter, "the unspeakable one" (ἀρρήτος κούρα) has been abducted from her dancing chorus of *parthenoi* (κυκλίων χορῶν ἔξω παρθενίων) as they picked flowers (*Hel.* 1316–17). Subsequently, the Mother's grief causes barrenness, starvation, and the cessation of sacrifices to the gods, and Zeus attempts to assuage her by commissioning performances of dances and songs by the Muses (1341–52). The text of the end of the ode is extremely uncertain, but it seems a child (ῶ παῖ, 1356) has incurred divine anger by neglecting the goddess' worship (θυσίας οὐ σεβίζουσα θεᾶς, 1357). The Mother's worship is unmistakably characterized as Dionysiac. She is Bromios (1364, cf. 1308); her adherents wear deerskin and wield the ivy crowned *narthêx* (1358–68).⁹¹⁴

⁹¹³ For the text, see Allan 2008: 300–1; <ῶρμα σωσομένα> is supplied by Kovacs 2002.

⁹¹⁴ For these items and their connection with the Mountain Mother, see Dodds 1960: xxiii–xxv, 76–7 on *Eur. Bacch.* 78–134; cf. *Eur. Cretans TrGF* fr. 472; *Pin. Isth.* 7.3. Cf. Battazzato 2013: 105–6 for links between Demeter and Dionysus.

The language of the ode invokes three different deities, the Mountain Mother, Demeter, and Dionysus, and implicitly links Demeter's experience of searching for and finding Persephone to Helen's deposit in Egypt and return to Sparta.⁹¹⁵ All three divinities had a significant presence at Athens. The Mountain Mother or Cybele is named directly (ὄρεία μάτηρ θεῶν, 1301–2, cf. 1320, 1355–6) and identified by her cult location on Ida (1324).⁹¹⁶ At the time of the production of the *Helen*, a temple to Great Mother (the Mêtroon) was located in the Athenian agora and used for the deposition and storage of civic records.⁹¹⁷ Late accounts claimed that the Athenians imported the Mother as recompense for incurring her anger at the treatment of Persian emissaries (*mêtragyrtaï*, beggar-priests) on the eve of Darius' invasion in 491.⁹¹⁸ Some have accordingly seen the Mother's anger as a reflection of (perhaps subconscious) Athenian unease and guilt over their war activities. Helen's return from Egypt is a reflection of their response: the importation of the Mountain Mother to the administrative center of Athenian power.⁹¹⁹

⁹¹⁵ Cf. Zweig 1999: 171–3; Mastronarde 2010: 141 who emphasises that Helen is only allusively mentioned once in the final stanza of the ode.

⁹¹⁶ For Ida (either in Asia minor or Crete) and Cybele, cf. Eur. *Cretans TrGF* fr. 472; DS 17.7.5, ΣApoll. Rhod. 1.1126.

⁹¹⁷ For the Mêtroon at Athens, see, e.g. *IG I³* 138.11–12; Thompson and Wycherly 1972: 29–38; Graf 1985: 107–15; Frapiccini 1987; Parker 1996: 188–95; Roller 1999: 143–77. The literary and epigraphical sources are collected in Wycherly 1957: 150–60.

⁹¹⁸ E.g. Julian *Or.* 5. 159a: λέγονται γὰρ οὗτοι περὺβρίσαι καὶ ἀπελάσαι τὸν Γάλλον ὡς τὰ θεῖα καινοτομοῦντα, οὐ ξυνέντες ὁποῖόν τι τῆς θεοῦ τὸ χρῆμα καὶ ὡς ἡ παρ' αὐτοῖς τιμωμένη Διὸς καὶ Ἑρέας καὶ Δημήτηρ... εἶτα μῆνις τὸ ἐντεῦθεν τῆς θεοῦ καὶ θεραπείας τῆς μήνιδος... ἢ τοῦ Πυθίου πρόμαντις θεοῦ, τὴν τῆς Μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν μῆνιν ἐκέλευσεν ἰλάσκεσθαι: καὶ ἀνέστη, φασίν, ἐπὶ τούτῳ τὸ μητρῶον, οὐ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις δημοσίᾳ πάντα ἐφυλάττετο τὰ γραμματεῖα. “The Athenians are said to have driven away the Gallus (priest of the Mother) as an innovator in religion, not understanding how important the goddess was, and how she was the goddess honored amongst them as Deo, Rhea, and Demeter ... from that followed the wrath of the diety and the attempt to appease it ... the prophetess of Delphi required them propitiate the wrath of the Mother of the Gods. The Mêtroon, they say, was set up for this purpose – the place where all the civic records were guarded for the Athenian populace.” Trans. adapted from Wycherly 1957. For the Mother's connection to authority and sovereignty in fifth century Athens, see Roller 1999: 143–69; Dillon 2001: 154–7; Munn 2006: 317–47. For the *mêtragyrtaï*, see Burkert 1978: 102–5; Roller 1999: 161–9; Munn 2006: 58–66, 249–61. Cf. ΣAr. *Plut.* 431.

⁹¹⁹ See Golann 1945: 34 citing Musgrave in Beck's *Euripidis Tragoediae, Fragmenta, Epistolae* (1778–88) 3.564; Cerri 1983. Roller 1996: 310–13, 317 not unreasonably sees the invocation of the Mountain Mother

While the Mountain Mother is possibly figured directly as Demeter through the epithet *Dêô* (1343), she is connected to Demeter most obviously by the narrative of her abducted daughter, the “unspeakable one” (1307), who was snatched as she gathered flowers from the dances of her fellow *parthenoi* (1310–18).⁹²⁰ Just as Demeter sorrowed for the rape and disappearance of her daughter Persephone, the daughter’s absence caused barrenness and famine through the extreme grief of the Mother (1306, 1319–37).⁹²¹ The parody of the *Helen* in Aristophanes *Thesmophoriazusai* guarantees that some connection was felt between the situation of Helen and that of the participants of Attic cult centering on Demeter and Persephone.⁹²²

Verrall believed the play was written for performance at a private event on the island of Helene in connection with the Thesmophoria.⁹²³ Held over three days in the fall, participation in the Thesmophoria was the privilege and mark of married Athenian women. The first day of the three day festival was called the *anodos* or “going up.”⁹²⁴ For Harrison, the *anodos* (the recovery of remains of sacrificial piglets) was accompanied by a corresponding *kathodos* (the deposition of remains).⁹²⁵ For Parker, the term simply

as an attempt to integrate the dominant moral and social values of an elite community with a foreign healing ritual.

⁹²⁰ In *Hel.* 1343 the choice is between *δηῖωι* (wretched) and *Δηοῖ* or *Δηώ* (dative or genitive of Demeter); Allan 2008 prints *Δηώ*. Cf. the *apparatus* of Diggle’s *OCT*; Golann 1945; Kannicht 1969: 2.350–1 with *Hymn. Hom. Dem.* 47. It is probable that the reading that makes the least explicit sense is correct (*δηῖωι*). For variations on the name of Persephone, see *Hymn. Hom. Dem.* 56; Hes. *Theog.* 913 with, e.g. Nilsson 1957: 313–25, 354–62; Burkert 1983: 259–64; Sourvinou-Inwood 1991: 147–88. For its “unspeakable” (*ἄρρητος*) nature see Pl. *Crat.* 404c–d; Paus. 8.37.9; Hesych. s.v. ἄρρητος κόρη· ἢ Περσεφόνη. Εὐρυπίδης Ἀλεξάνδρω, α 7429 Latte = Eur. *TrGF* fr. 63.

⁹²¹ For flowers in the cult of Demeter, see *Hymn. Hom. Dem.* 1–29, 417–433; Stratonike in Hes. *Cat.* fr. 26.18–23 M-W; Creusa in Eur. *Ion* 887–90; Mosch. *Europa* 63–74 with Richardson 1974: 141–2.

⁹²² Ar. *Thesm.* 850–912. Cf. Rau 1967: 53–65; Robinson 1979; Zeitlin 1981; Arnott 1990: 12–14; Foley 2001: 301–32; Tzvetou 2002.

⁹²³ Verrall 1905: 61, 69–73, 86–9. Cf. *Hel.* 1670–5. On the Thesmophoria, see Nilsson 1957: 313–16; Deubner 1966: 50–60; Burkert 1985: 242–6; Dillon 2001: 110–20; Parker 2005: 270–83.

⁹²⁴ *IG II²* 1173.23; Ar. *Thesm.* 281, 585, 623, 893. Cf. Burkert 1983: 261n26; Parker 2005: 272n11.

⁹²⁵ Harrison 1908: 120–3 on ΣLuc. *Dial. meret.* 2.1. For a Thesmophorian *kathodos*, see ΣAr. *Thesm.* 585. For a translation of the Lucian scholion, see Parker 2005: 273.

described an ascent to a sanctuary on a hill.⁹²⁶ Foley linked the term explicitly to the return of Helen from Egypt and posited a link between the travel of Helen to Sparta and the initiates journey at Eleusis.⁹²⁷ Euripides' Egypt is indeed described in terms recalling the underworld: rich and welcoming.⁹²⁸ Foley's comparison of the *Alcestis* and the *Helen* (rightly) underlines the marriage and death thematics of both plays. But if the *hieroi logoi* of the Great Mysteries and the Thesmophoria provided an Athenian context for the travels of Helen, the appropriate setting for her marriage was not Eleusis or Athens but the tomb of Menelaus at Sparta.

In the final ode of the play, just after Menelaus and Helen make their escape, the chorus sings of the couple's return home (*Hel.* 1451–511). Sailors of their Phoenician ship are urged to send (πέμποντες) Helen to Lakonia, the fair-harbored shore of Perseid homes (Περσειῶν οἴκων ἐπ' ἀκτάς, 1464). In the antistrophe, we are presented with a rich picture of Spartan religious life (*Hel.* 1465–78):⁹²⁹

ἧ που κόρας ἄν ποταμοῦ
 παρ' οἶδμα Λευκιππίδας ἦ πρὸ ναοῦ
 Παλλάδος ἄν λάβοι
 χρόνῳ ξυνελθοῦσα χοροῖς
 ἦ κώμοις Ὑακίν-
 θου νύχιον ἐς εὐφροσύναν,
 ὄν ἐξαμιλλασάμενος
 τροχὸν ατέρμονα δίσκου
 ἔκανε Φοῖβος, τᾷ <δὲ> Λακαί-
 ναι γᾶι βούθυτον ἀμέραν
 ὁ Διὸς εἶπε σέβειν γόνος·

I think she will find the daughters of Leucippus by the swell of the river or before the temple of Pallas, as she arrives home at the time of the dances or revels of Hyacinthus and their nighttime feasting, (Hyacinthus) whom Phoebus, trying to

⁹²⁶ Parker 2005: 272; cf. Dillon 2001: 113.

⁹²⁷ Foley 2001: 304. For the myth of Persephone as an *aition* for both the Great Mysteries and the Thesmophoria, see, e.g. Clinton 1992: 29–30; Bremmer 2014: 9–11.

⁹²⁸ E.g. *Hel.* 68–70. Cf. Guépin 1968: 128–33; Robinson 1979; Foley 2001: 306–8.

⁹²⁹ See Steiner 2011: 305–9; Murnaghan 2013: 167–9.

hurl far the round discus, killed, and thereafter to the land of Lacedaemon the son of Zeus gave order to keep a day of sacrifice.

Upon arrival, Helen will perhaps find the Leukippidai standing by the swell of the Eurotas (Artemis Orthia) or before the temple of Athena Chalchioikos. Her arrival will coincide with the time of the Hyacinthia, a summer Apolline festival linked to the outlying Lakonian community of Amyclae.⁹³⁰ These Spartan institutions, Athena Chalchioikos, Artemis Orthia, and the Hyacinthia and the Leukippidai all carry associations in the drama with Helen's rape and return to Sparta to varying degrees. The temple of Athena on the Spartan acropolis was the location of Helen's capture by Hermes (*Hel.* 226–8).⁹³¹ The swell of the Eurotas (οἶσμα ποταμοῦ) recalls the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia in the flood plain of that river.⁹³² According to later tradition, it was there that Helen was abducted by either Theseus or by the Apharetidai, Idas and Lynceus.⁹³³ The Messenian twins were themselves connected to the story of the abduction of the daughters of Leukippus by the Dioscuri.⁹³⁴

⁹³⁰ For the Hyacinthia, see, e.g. Calame 1997: 174–85; Richer 2012: 77–102. For the *nostos* of Menelaus, see Edmunds 2016: 155–6.

⁹³¹ Cf. *Ar. Lys.* 1320–1 with Allan 2008: 323.

⁹³² Cf. Waugh 2009; Calame 1997: 156–89 for the flagellation and the *bretas* see Paus. 3.16.7–11 with pp. 166–7 above. For the topography, see Sanders 2009: 201. For the connection to Spartan initiatory cult, see the famous passage of Alc. fr. 1.61 *PMGF* with Hamilton 1989; Nagy 1990: 345–7; Calame 1997: 4–7, 192–3; Ferrari 2008: 83–8; Tsantsanoglou 2012: 63–70, 137.

⁹³³ Plut. *Thes.* 31 citing Hellanicus, uniquely tells us (among other variants) that the Apharetidai gave Helen to Theseus. See Hershkowitz 2016: 273–4; Edmunds 2016: 70–1. On the abduction of Helen by Theseus generally, see Edmunds 2016: 70–6; see Hershkowitz 2016: 170–244, for the age of Helen at the time of her Athenian abduction, and appendices (245–315) for the ancient sources concerning Theseus' abduction.

⁹³⁴ For the Apharetidai and the Leukippidai, see, e.g. Theoc. 22.137–51; *Ov. Fast.* 5.699–720; Paus. 3.16.1 with Calame 1997: 185–7. See also the story of the rape of Marpessa in *Hom. Il.* 9.555; Bacchyl. 20 S-M with Edmunds 2016: 66–9. According to Hyginus, the Leukippidai were priestesses of Minerva and Diana. *Hyg. Fab.* 80.1: Idas et Lynceus Apharei filii ex Messenis habuerunt sponsas Phoebe et Hilairam Leucippi filias; hae autem formississimae uirgines cum essent et esset Phoebe sacerdos Mineruae, Hilaira Dianae, Kastor et Pollux amore incensi eas rapuerunt. “Idas and Lynceus, the sons of Aphareus from Messenia had wives named Phoebe and Hilaria, the daughters of Leucippus. Since these two were the most beautiful maidens – Phoebe was a priestess of Minerva, Hilaria of Diana – Kastor and Pollux, inflamed with love, carried them off.”

The chorus figure themselves as Libyan cranes (οἰωνῶν στιχάδες),⁹³⁵ winging their way to Sparta at the behest of their leader (πρεσβυτάτου, 1482) to herald the news that Menelaus is returning home (Μενέλεως πόλιν ἐλὼν δόμον ἤξει, 1493–4).⁹³⁶ The Dioscuri are to traverse the aether on their horses (μόλοιτέ ποθ' ἵππιον οἶμον δι' αἰθέρος ἰέμενοι, 1495–6) and accompany Helen home (1495–1511). The last ode of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* presents a similar collection of choral performers: maidens (κόραι) are to dance and sing to Apollo, the god of Amyclae, Athena Chalcioikos, and the Tyndaridai (the Dioscuri). Their chorus leader (χοραγός) is to be Helen, Leda's daughter.⁹³⁷

Generally, the chorus describe a mythical invitation to perform a religious ceremony upon arrival at Sparta. Helen's absence has caused grief and pain; upon her return she is to perform a festival rite to Athena, the Leukippidai and other divine figures of Sparta that will sooth the pain felt at her absence. Her return to Sparta as a faithful wife, betrothed to Menelaus provides a map for the education and development of young women.

The Menelaion at Therapnai was sacred to Helen, Menelaus, and the Dioscuri.⁹³⁸ Helen and Menelaus were believed to be buried there in a cenotaph.⁹³⁹ In the *Odyssey*, Menelaus' immortal status is linked to his marriage to Helen. Proteus prophesizes that the immortals will send him (πέμψουσιν) to the Elysian plain because he has Helen as wife

⁹³⁵ Diggle prints στιχάδες (a poetic form of στίχος, “row”) crediting Burgess. Allan 2008 prints στολάδες (an adjective form derived from στόλος “host,” cf. Kannicht 1969: 2.389; Steiner 2011: 313n74).

⁹³⁶ See Steiner 2011: 309–15.

⁹³⁷ Ar. *Lys.* 1296–1320. Cf. Henderson 1987: 210–22.

⁹³⁸ For the Dioscuri, see Alc. 7 fr. 1 *PMGF*; Pin. *Pyth.* 11.63; *Nem.* 10.56; *Isth.* 1.30–1.

⁹³⁹ Paus. 3.19.9–10.

and is thus the son in law of Zeus (οὔνεκ' ἔχεις Ἑλένην καὶ σφιν γαμβρὸς Διὸς ἐσσι).⁹⁴⁰ Isocrates declares that Helen has “established him as a partner in her house and a sharer of her throne forever” while the Spartans even in his day at Therapnai “perform ancestral sacrifices to both of them, not as heroes but as gods.”⁹⁴¹ For Edmunds, this cult was one in which “the hero (or heroes) received a kind of sacrifice that could be identified as specifically for the gods.”⁹⁴² In the *Helen*, it is likely that this modulation or uncertainty between hero and god was presented in terms of a specific ritual activity: the festival celebration of Helen and Menelaus’s marriage and the connected rites of Spartan royal funerals.

In the *Helen*, as Helen departs in the (false) funeral *cortège* of her husband, she is figured as a divinity: “Zeus’ daughter left the royal palace and set off for the sea, and as she stepped delicately along she cleverly lamented for her husband – who was not dead but nearby.”⁹⁴³ Just as with Iphigenia’s purification of Orestes in the *IT*, the description of the Spartan “funeral procession” is placed in mouth of a foreign observer. Doubt is presented, but from the outsider’s perspective and in the guise of an accurate eyewitness report.⁹⁴⁴ This view provides a picture of the rites from a source with no knowledge of

⁹⁴⁰ Hom. *Od.* 563–9. Cf. Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988: 227; Hunter 2015: 154–5; Edmunds 2016: 157–9, 214–15. Cf. Apollod. *Epit.* 6.30.

⁹⁴¹ Isoc. 10.62–3: ἀλλὰ καὶ θεὸν ἀντὶ θνητοῦ ποιήσασα σύνοικον αὐτῇ καὶ πάρεδρον εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα κατεστήσατο. καὶ τούτοις ἔχω τὴν πόλιν τὴν Σπαρτιατῶν τὴν μάλιστα τὰ παλαιὰ διασώζουσαν ἔργῳ παρασχέσθαι μαρτυροῦσαν· ἔτι γὰρ καὶ νῦν ἐν Θεράπναις τῆς Λακωνικῆς θυσίας αὐτοῖς ἀγίας καὶ πατρίας ἀποτελοῦσιν οὐχ ὡς ἥρωσιν ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῖς ἀμφοτέροις οὖσιν. “But even made him a god instead of a mortal and established him as partner and accompaniment (πάρεδρον) to her forever. And in addition I can produce the city of the Spartans, which preserves excellently its ancient traditions, as a witness; for even now at Therapnai, in Laconia, the people offer holy ancestral sacrifices, not as to heroes, but as to gods, both of them.”

⁹⁴² Edmunds 2016: 180. Cf. Papillon 1996.

⁹⁴³ Eur. *Hel.* 1526–9: ἐπεὶ λιποῦσα τούσδε βασιλείους δόμους ἢ τοῦ Διὸς παῖς πρὸς θάλασσαν ἐστάλη σοφώταθ' ἀβρὸν πόδα τιθεῖσ' ἀνέστενε πόσιν πέλας παρόντα κού τεθηγκότα. Cf. Allan 2008: 330; Kannicht 1969: 2.402 on the meaning of σοφώταθ' in this context and its associated verb.

⁹⁴⁴ Eur. *IT* 1336–41.

Greek custom but also no stake in the “truth” or sanctity of the proceedings.

Paradoxically, this misdirection provides the clearest indication that a real religious situation is being represented. In the *IT*, the issue is group integration and the identification of kinship and identity; in the *Helen* it is authority and the status of Helen and Menelaus’ as divinities.

While the chorus had previously expressed their agreement with the claim that Zeus was Helen’s father (*Hel.* 1145–6), the statement occurred just after one of the most explicit presentations of doubt and *aporia* in the play: “What mortal can search out and tell what is god, what is not god, and what lies in between?”⁹⁴⁵ In the prologue, Helen described her own parentage in equivocal terms (16–30). In their culminating appearance from on high, her brothers, the Dioscuri, do not explicitly declare her as the daughter of Zeus; she is the daughter of Leda whom Zeus has decreed should be “called a goddess and receive *xenia* from mortals” (θεὸς κεκλήσῃ ξενιά τ’ ἀνθρώπων πάρα ἔξεις μεθ’ ἡμῶν· Ζεὺς γὰρ ὧδε βούλεται, 1667–8). There is, of course, no such equivocation in the case of Menelaus. He is not to become the son of Zeus but the son-in-law (γαμβρός). In the Spartan choral ode, it is Apollo who is emphatically the offspring of Zeus (ὁ Διὸς εἶπε σέβειν γόνος, 1475); in Menelaus’ prayer before the launching of the *mechanēma*, fatherhood is invoked in a broad, gnomic context: “Zeus, you who are called father, look upon us and shield us from harm” (ὦ Ζεῦ, πατήρ τε καὶ σοφὸς κλήζῃ θεός, βλέψον πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ μετάστησον κακῶν, 1441–50).

⁹⁴⁵ *Hel.* 1136–7: ὅ τι θεὸς ἢ μὴ θεὸς ἢ τὸ μέσον τίς φησ’ ἐρευνάσας βροτῶν; cf. Zuntz 1960: 216–21; Kannicht 1969: 2.296–7; Allan 2008: 278–9. The text of the entire passage is difficult. Earlier editors such as Murray placed the conduct of mortals, not the identification of the divine, as the source of doubt.

I contend that the description of the Egyptian messenger was influenced by the celebration of the Heleneia at Sparta.⁹⁴⁶ In Athenaus' famous description of the Hyacinthia, *parthenoi* were processed in painted wicker carriages (κάνναθρα) decorated with wild animals.⁹⁴⁷ These carriages were also used in the worship of Helen, and most likely served as one means of processing from the acropolis, up the hill to the Menelaion (εἰς τὸ τῆς Ἑλένης).⁹⁴⁸ When the procession arrived at the cenotaph and remains of the Bronze Age palace, a select group of celebrants would ascend the ramp meant for animal sacrifice and approach the naïskos containing the image of Helen.⁹⁴⁹ The *agalma* or *kolossos* enthroned on Menelaus' "tomb" would greet the living woman selected to represent her age-group by beauty, birth and stature.⁹⁵⁰ This woman, whose arrival in procession signaled the inauguration of the marriage of Helen and Menelaus, was accompanied by a royal *eidolon*.

The Heleneia festival was both a funeral and a marriage. In the play, as Helen departed the house of the Egyptian king, she lamented her disguised husband who was "not dead but nearby" (παρόντα κοῦ τεθνηκότα, *Hel.* 1529). This locution referenced *both* the living and disguised Menelaus of the play, and also to the partner of the female celebrant in cult. Why not a living representation of Menelaus in the Spartan celebration?

⁹⁴⁶ Hesych. *s.v.* Ἑλένεια, ε 1992 Latte: ἑορτὴ ἀγομένη ὑπὸ Λακόνων. As in the Spartan ode at *Hel.* 1465–84, almost certainly other celebrations were interleaved within the scene; *i.e.* the Hyacinthia, Gymnopaïdai, or the Therapnateia. Cf. Hesych. *s.v.* Θεραπνατίδεια, θ 335 Latte: ἑορτὴ παρὰ Λάκωσι. It is probable that certain elements (*i.e.* the ship) refer directly to Egyptian religious practice.

⁹⁴⁷ Polycrates *FGrH* 588 F 1 *ap.* Ath. 139f: e.g. ... τῶν δὲ παρθένων αἱ μὲν ἐπὶ καννάθρων φέρονται πολυτελῶς κατεσκευασμένων. "Some *parthenoi* are carried in elaborately decorated wagons." Cf. Ducat 2006: 243–7.

⁹⁴⁸ Hesych. *s.v.* κάνναθρα, κ 675 Latte: ἀστράβη ἢ ἄμαξα, πλέγματα ἔχουσα, ὑφ' ᾧ πομπεύουσιν αἱ παρθένοι, ὅταν εἰς τὸ τῆς Ἑλένης ἀπίωσιν. "Kannathra: mule's saddle (or padded saddle) or wagon, with wicker-work, on which maidens take part in the procession when they go off to the shrine of Helen."

⁹⁴⁹ For a reconstruction of the archaic Menelaion with ramp and naïskos, see Catling 1976: 34–7. For the image, see Hdt. 6.61.3. Cf. the *kolossoi* of Aesch. *Ag.* 416–17, which could be completely imaginary or at Mycenae. I believe the mention of Menelaus allows them to be placed at Sparta.

⁹⁵⁰ On beauty contests and Helen, see Calame 1997: 197–200.

The procession of royal *eidôla* of Agiad and Eurypontid kings was an exceedingly rare event; usually it was the embalmed body of the king that would receive the royal burial, not the *eidôlon*. As such, it was an honor that pertained only when a king was both dead *and* absent. It spoke to the generality, importance, and (usually) ancient nature of the individual.⁹⁵¹ As the evocation of his death and burial by Agesilaus shows, the royal pedigree and funeral of Menelaus was capable of exerting actual authority at Sparta in the right circumstances. Perhaps a human participant would emphasize too strongly issues of current Spartan kingship and authority. A funeral procession of the royal *eidôlon* of Menelaus at the Heleneia would connote just the right combination of the absence and presence of power.

⁹⁵¹ Cf. Cartledge 1988 and Parker 1988 and the panhellenic character of Leonidas' achievements.

Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been both to understand the influence of the manipulation of cult images in general and the impact of such manipulation on the plays of Euripides. The factor that made a cult image uniquely important for any narrative with a religious element (such as the *Iphigenia among the Taurians* and the *Helen*) was that each was, by nature, both an object and also the seat of a divinity. Their importance was thus tied up in the ability of a human to own, steal, and give them away, but also in the need to represent this manipulation as the autonomous movement of a divinity. The *IT* and the *Helen* each dealt with this two-sided factor in a different way.

The first three chapters surveyed the material and linguistic evidence for cult statues from the perspective of their mobility. In important respects, cult statues were similar to smaller-scale terracotta figurines and bric-a-brac, which crowded the *cellae* and porches of all Greek temples. No matter how small or large, each cult statue was ultimately a possession and thus had a history connected to this human process of ownership, travel, and gift-exchange. This inherently votive dynamic was reflected in the historical, formal development of cult images and also in our literary record. While each different term used to denote a cult image emphasized a different aspect of a relationship to religious objects, the two-sided, dedicatory nature of a cult image was never far from the surface. The ideas of verisimilitude and representation encoded in terms such as *eikôn* and *andrias*, were fundamental parts of the conceptual and linguistic context of a cult image, but so were the spheres of gift-giving (*agalma*) and cultural exchange (*kolossos*). In later periods, we find a term (*aphidruma*) that literally refer to the (ancient) process of transferring a cult image between communities. Calling an *aphidruma* was thus a direct

reference to the process of moving and dedicating a cult image that must, at some level, have been associated with the history of many cult images in Greece.

A cult image was also a public, not a private religious object; Romano defined it as “an object which displayed a special setting or a primary role in cult activities.”⁹⁵² By definition, any significant cult image had relevance to the community at large, not simply to the individual who obtained or dedicated it. The dynamics inherent in every object, that is, mobility, transportation, and exchange, were thus reflected in the movement of cult images enacted in cyclical communal processions. Generally speaking, all processions either brought a gift to a god or took a god someplace. Festivals such as the Athenian Dionysia and Boeotian Daedala as well as the worship of Hermes at Ainos in Thrace and Artemis at Magnesia on the Meander involved the spatial manipulation of images. Sometimes this movement was intra-polis, as, for example, during the installation of Artemis Leukophryene at Magnesia. Sometimes it involved movement to or from locations with a subordinate relationship to the main population center. Often it involved the creation or insertion of an imaginary original destination from which the divinity could arrive “from afar.” One can imagine that each individual spatial relationship (origin and destination) could serve to starkly frame political or economic hierarchies and geographical relationships starkly (as in de Polignac) or confirm the uniformity of the participating citizen body, or both simultaneously.⁹⁵³ The dynamics of each example would be determined by the historical circumstances of the original manipulation of the object and depend on the evolving needs of and the successive contexts within the community concerned.

⁹⁵² Romano 1980: 3.

⁹⁵³ De Polignac 1995.

A ritual event such the one at the Great Dionysia was a complex, ideologically powerful moment formed over a long period of time. *Pompai* involving moving cult statues needed to evoke not just the human act of stealing, acquiring and giving an object, but also the apparently autonomous movement of the divinity itself. The fourth chapter focused on the dynamics inherent in reconciling (or attempting to reconcile) these two kinds of agency. Usually the machinations of humans (either theft or gift) were simply coordinated with the claim that the gods were complicit in whatever action caused their transfer or arrival. In situations such as these (for example, the Herodotean narrative about the Aeginetan deities Damia and Auxesia) the “will of the gods” to stay or go was used to justify whatever human action precipitated the movement of the image. However, we also find situations where both types of agency – divine and human – were not opposed or coordinated, but an attempt was made to combine them in a natural way. In the Samian Tonaia, we found that the movement of the ancient image or *bretas* to the seashore as well as its return and rededication in Hera’s temple, was understood *both* terms of the manipulation of an object and the movement of a divinity. Specifically, the priestess Admete served as the link that allowed these two perspectives to exist simultaneously. It was Admete who first traveled to Samos to inaugurate the Samian worship of Hera and it was (nominally) to repatriate Admete that the Argive agents followed her to Samos and attempted to steal the *bretas*.

The second part of the thesis presented a structure for analyzing how the *IT* and the *Helen* articulated the manipulation of a cult statue. First, it is important to recognize that either of these perspectives (human or divine) could be naturally emphasized or deemphasized according to the presentational context or medium. For example, we gain

our most vivid appreciation of the impact of the human process of dedication on the context of a cult image in *Iphigenia among the Taurians* because the aetiological passages of that play present a mythological narrative linked to literal cult practice; that is, the human actions of transportation, theft, and exchange are emphasized. On the other hand, in the *Helen*, the mythological machinery is narrated with the human element completely absent and the actions of the subjective actors or protagonists of myth – Helen and Menelaus – are emphasized. This latter perspective is, of course, the norm for any literary presentation of Greek myth ostensibly without a link to ritual practice or an *aition*.

The structure of the “mobile cult image” is comprised by six elements defined by their narrative function: the Object, the Giver, the Receiver, the Taker, the Native Location and the Foreign Location. In the *IT*, the relationships between the Object (Iphigenia), Giver (Agamemnon) and Receiver (Artemis) follow the pattern of an important human manipulation of a religious object: dedication. As a human gift to a divinity, a dedication was an expression of what would have been, and is, a common understanding of the hierarchical relationship between mortal and god: namely, the fealty and subservience due to a superior. Not every movement of a cult image was a dedication, but because of the importance of this religious posture, it is likely that there was a felt connection (or at least a desire to create a connection) between a worshipper travelling from his home bringing an *agalma* as a gift to a divinity, and a public *pompē* with attendant choral performers transporting a god away from his *nâos* and then back again. Both the semantics of *agalma* and the material record support a connection between cult image and votive.

However, using dedication as a template for the movement of a divinity created a certain conceptual dissonance. While a dedication was an act of devotion and fealty, it was also fundamentally an act of human agency (the carrying and depositing of a possession). In other words, if the foundational act was the authoritative, human manipulation of an image of a divinity, framing the action of emplacement as the autonomous movement of the divinity was difficult. I argued that this difficulty was addressed by the presence of the human priestess who cared for and accompanied the image in procession. In the *IT*, Iphigenia (the Object) functioned as *both* a representation of Artemis and an object possessed and given to the goddess (the Receiver). Furthermore, because of the inclusion of the *aition* for cult at Brauron, a parallel dedicatory dynamic was present in the cult practice of the Brauronia and the Arkteia. On the other hand, the opposite of a gift, or dedication, is a theft. In the *IT*, Orestes (the Taker) steals his sister from the Taurians and transports her back to Attica. This action – just like the theft of the Palladion – served to highlight the relationship between foreign elements in a culture (the Taurians) and the native constituents (the Athenians). Taking the evidence of the Athenian Palladion into consideration, it is possible that an Attic ritual involving the transfer of an icon to the sea, its theft (or avoided theft), a trial, and a resultant enrollment or initiation of young male citizens lay behind Euripides' presentation of Orestes' actions in the *IT*. Both the dedication of Iphigenia and the theft of Orestes reflected the dynamics and problems inherent in the use of cult images in ritual.

In the *Helen*, human interaction with their own manipulation of cult images is deemphasized and instead we find a focus on human interaction with the divine aspect of representation. Helen herself is not a priestess whose abduction and subsequent retrieval

reflected the human thematics of dedication, initiation and group cohesion. In place of this normative, “representative” relationship between Iphigenia and Artemis, we find a divine but deceptive and illusory *eidôlon*, and a human woman who approaches the status of a divinity. The *eidôlon* did, in fact, serve as a cult object, but in a particular way. In the *Helen*, all of the concerns over of the manipulation of cult images (the actions of the Giver, Receiver and Thief), were transferred completely out of the realm of physical objects and cult practice and into the realm of myth and the human activities of Helen herself. Thus, Helen is figured as a deposited trust (*parakatathêkê*), given to Proteus (the Receiver) by Hermes (the Giver) and retrieved by Menelaus (the Taker), but these relationships did not dramatize problems inherent in the *realia* of cult practice. Instead, the *eidôlon*’s status as a cult statue served purely to call attention to the appropriateness or “truth” of itself as an object of worship *per se*.

This concern was a crucial one. At Sparta, authority was traditionally centered on figures who had exclusive access to contexts in which they would “represent” or figure themselves as gods – albeit within a restricted scope. Helen’s recovery by Menalus (and the parallel loss of her *eidôlon*) signaled the renewal of her marriage. Our evidence points to a cyclical reenactment of this event at Sparta involving a representative number of *parthenoi* who invoked the divine elements in Helen’s local Spartan persona. In the case of the Agiad and Eurypontid kings, during the classical period, this representation occurred (importantly) when they were no longer living. If a king died away from Sparta, and his body could not be recovered, an image (*eidôlon*) would be processed to his grave at a lavish funeral. It is likely that these (rare) real-life royal funerals with processed *eidôla*, and the traditional performance of a festival to Helen (the Heleneia) were both

associated with the tradition of Menelaus' return from Egypt. In the *Helen*, Menelaus was alive and in possession of the living Helen when he returned to Sparta. The prominence of these living characters and their juxtaposition in the play with "deceptive" objects such as Helen's *eidôlon* hints at the importance of religious images in these activities. For example, one can imagine a performance of the Heleneia (or a related festival to Helen), which first reenacted a funeral with an *eidôlon*, and then culminated in a rebirth and marriage featuring living participants. The relationship of these traditional celebrations to the funeral rites of the Agiads and Euryontids would have been determined by the current social and political atmosphere at Sparta. The specifics of Euripides' critique of "representation" and divine deceit embodied by both Helen's *eidôlon*, and the *mechanêma* of Menelaus' funeral reflected a traditional uncertainty over rights of access to divine representation and performance.

Bibliography

- Aarne, A. and Thompson, S. 1961. *The Types of the Folktale: A Classification and Bibliography. Antti Aarne's Verzeichnis der Märchentypen*. Trans. by S. Thompson. Helsinki.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. 2002. *Polyeideia: the Iambi of Callimachus and the archaic iambic tradition*. Berkeley.
- Albers, G. 2001. "Rethinking Mycenaean Sanctuaries." In Laffineur, R. and Hägg, R. eds. 131–41.
- Alberti, L. 2009. "The Tomb of the Double Axes at Isopatra." In D'Agata, A. L. and Van de Moortel, A. eds. 99–106.
- Alcock, S. E. and Osborne, R. 1996. eds. *Placing the gods: sanctuaries and sacred space in ancient Greece*. Oxford.
- Aleshire, S. 1991. *Asklepios at Athens: epigraphic and prosopographic essays on the Athenian healing cults*. Princeton.
- Alroth, B. and Hellström, P. eds. 1996. *Religion and power in the ancient Greek world: proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1993*. Stockholm.
- Alroth, B. 1988. "The Positioning of Greek Votive Figurines." In Hägg, R., Marinatos, N. and Nordquist, G. eds. 195–203.
- . 1989. *Greek gods and figurines: aspects of the anthropomorphic dedications*. Uppsala.
- Allan, W. 2008. *Euripides: Helen*. Cambridge.
- Andrewes, A. 1961. "Philochoros on Phratries." *JHS* 81: 1–15.
- Anguissola, A. 2006a. "Note on Aphidruma 1: Statues and Their Function." *CQ* 56: 641–3.
- . 2006b. "Note on Aphidruma 2: Strabo on the Transfer of Cults." *CQ* 56: 643–6.
- Antonaccio, C. 1995. *An archaeology of ancestors: tomb cult and hero cult in early Greece*. Lanham.
- . 2005. "Dedications and the Character of Cult." In Hägg, R. and Alroth, B. eds. 99–112.
- Ajootian, A. 1996. "Praxiteles." In Palagia, O. and Pollitt, J. J. eds. *Personal styles in Greek sculpture*. Oxford. 91–129.
- Arafat, K. W. 1995. "Pausanias and the Temple of Hera at Olympia." *ABSA* 90: 461–73.
- . 2009. "Treasure, Treasuries and Value in Pausanias." *CQ* 59: 578–92.
- Arnautoglou, E. 2003. *Thusias heneka kai sunousias: private religious associations in Hellenistic Athens*. Athens.
- Arnott, W. G. 1990. "Euripides' Newfangled Helen." *Antichthon* 24: 1–18.
- Aston, E. 2011 *Mixanthropoi: animal–human hybrid deities in Greek religion*. Liège.
- Athanassaki, L. and Ewen, B. eds. 2011. *Archaic and classical choral song: performance, politics and dissemination*. Berlin.
- Austin, N. 1994. *Helen of Troy and her shameless phantom*. Ithaca.
- Avagianou, A. 1991. *Sacred marriage in the rituals of Greek religion*. New York.
- Bakker de, M. 2012. "Herodotus' Proteus: Myth, History, Enquiry, and Story–Telling." In Baragwanath, E and Bakker de, M. eds. *Myth, truth, and narrative in Herodotus*. Oxford. 107–26.
- Barrett, J. C. 1991. "Towards an Archaeology of Ritual." In Garwood, P. *et al.* eds. 1–10.

- Barron, J. P. 1972. "New Light on Old Walls: The Murals of the Theseion." *JHS* 92: 20–45.
- Barber, E. J. W. 1992. "The *Peplos* of Athena." In Neils, J. ed. 103–119.
- Barber, R. L. N. 1992. "The Origins of the Mycenaean Palace." In Catling, H. W. and Sanders, J. M. eds. 11–23.
- Barrett, W. S. ed. 1964. *Hippolytus*. Oxford.
- Bathrellou, E. 2012. "Menander's *Epitrepontes* and the Festival of the Tauropolia." *CA* 31: 151–92.
- Battezzato, L. 2013. "Dithyramb and Greek Tragedy." In Kowalzig, B. and Wilson, N. eds. *Dithyramb in Context*. Oxford. 93–110.
- . 2016. "Euripides the Antiquarian." In Kyriakou, P. and Antonios, R. eds. 3–20.
- Baumbach, J. D. 2009. "'Speak Votives, ...'. Dedicatory Practice in Sanctuaries of Hera" In Prêtre, C. and Huysecom–Haxhi, S. eds. 203–23.
- Bassi, K. 1993. "Helen and the Discourse of Denial in Stesichorus' *Palinode*." *Arethusa* 26: 51–75.
- Beck-Schachter, A. 2016. "The Lysandreia." In Figueira, T. ed. *Myth Text and History at Sparta*. Piscataway. 105–67.
- Beecroft, A. J. 2006. "This Is Not a True Story: Stesichorus' 'Palinode' and the Revenge of the Epichoric." *TAPA* 136: 47–69.
- Belfiore, E. S. 1992. "Aristotle and Iphigenia." In Rorty, A. ed. *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics*. Princeton. 359–77
- . 2000. *Murder among friends: violation of philia in Greek tragedy*. Oxford.
- Bennett, F. M. 1917. "Primitive Wooden Statues Which Pausanias Saw in Greece." *CW* 10: 82–6.
- Benveniste, E. 1932. "Le sens du mot 'kolossos' et les noms grecs de la statue." *RPh* 6: 118–35.
- Bettini, M. 2004. "Construire l'invisible. Un dossier sur le double dans la culture classique." *Metis* 2: 217–30.
- Bettinetti, S. 2001. *La statua di culto nella pratica rituale greca*. Bari.
- Berger, E. 1986. *Der Parthenon in Basel: Dokumentation zu den Metopen*. Mainz.
- Bevan, E. 1987. "The Goddess Artemis, and the Dedication of Bears in Sanctuaries." *ABSA*: 17–21.
- Bierl, A. 1994. "Apollo in Greek tragedy: Orestes and the god of initiation." In Solomon, J. ed. *Apollo: Origins and Influences*. Tuscon. 81–96.
- Bilde, P. G. 2003. "Wandering Images: From Taurian (and Chersonesean) Parthenos to (Artemis) Tauropolos and (Artemis) Persike." In Bilde, P.G. et al. eds. *The cauldron of Ariantas. Studies presented to A.N. Šćeglov on the occasion of his 70th Birthday*. Aarhus. 165–83.
- . 2009. "Quantifying Black Sea Artemis: Some Methodological Reflections." In Fischer–Hansen, T. and Poulsen, B. eds. *From Artemis to Diana: the goddess of man and beast*. Copenhagen. 303–32.
- Bingöl, O. 2007. *Magnesia on the Meander: an archaeological guide*. Istanbul.
- Bittel, M. 1981. "Hittite Temples and High Places." In Bîrân, A. ed. *Temples and high places in Biblical times: proceedings of the colloquium in honor of the centennial of Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, Jerusalem, 14–16 March 1977*. London. 63–73.

- Bloesch, H. 1943. *Agalma: Kleinod, Weihgeschenk, Götterbild. Ein Beitrag zur frühgriechischen Kultur und Religionsgeschichte*. Berlin.
- Blok, J. 2014. "The priestess of Athena Nike: a new reading of IG I³ 35 and 36" *Kernos* 27.1–26.
- Blok, J. and Lambert, S. 2009. "The Appointment of Priests in Attic gene." *ZPE* 169: 95–121.
- Blondell, R. 2013. *Helen of Troy: beauty, myth, devastation*. Oxford.
- Blundell, S. and Williamson, M. eds. 1998. *The sacred and the feminine in ancient Greece*. London.
- Boardman, J. 1958. "A Greek Vase from Egypt." *JHS* 78: 4–12.
- . 1972. "Herakles, Peisistratus and Sons." *RA* 1: 57–72.
- . 1992. "The Phallos–Bird in Archaic and Classical Greek Art." *RA* 2: 227–42.
- . 2008. "Sources and Models." In Palagia, O. ed. *Greek Sculpture: function, materials, and techniques in the archaic and classical periods*. Cambridge. 1–31.
- Boedeker, D. 1993. "Hero Cult and Politics in Herodotus: The Bones of Orestes." In Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L. eds. 164–78.
- . 2012. "Helen and 'I' in Early Greek Lyric." In Marincola, J. *et al* eds. 65–82.
- . 2017. "Significant Inconsistencies in Euripides' *Helen*." In McClure, L. ed. 243–57.
- Boegehold, A. L. 1989. "A Signifying Gesture: Euripides, Iphigenia Taurica, 965–66." *AJA* 93: 81–3.
- Boegehold, A. L. *et al.* eds. 1995. *The lawcourts at Athens: sites, buildings, equipment, procedure, and testimonia*. Athens.
- Bonnechère, P. 1994. *Le sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne*. Liège.
- Braund, D. 2007. "Parthenos and the Nymphs at Crimean Chersonesos: Colonial Appropriation and Native Integration." In Bresson, A. *et al.* eds. *Une Koiné pontique: cités grecques, sociétés indigènes et empires mondiaux sur le littoral nord de la mer Noire (VIIe s. a.C.–IIIe s. p.C.)*. Bordeaux. 191–200.
- . 2007b. "Black Sea Grain for Athens? From Herodotus to Demosthenes." In Gabrielson, V. and Lund, J. eds. *The Black Sea in antiquity: regional and interregional economic exchanges*. Aarhus. 52–3.
- Brellich, A. 1969. *Paidēs e Parthenoi*. Rome.
- Bremmer, J. 1998. "'Religion,' 'Ritual' and the Opposition 'Sacred' vs. 'Profane.'" In Graf, F. ed. 9–32.
- . 2012. "Athenian civic priests from classical times to late antiquity: some considerations" In Horster, M. and Klöckner, A. eds. 219–36.
- . 2013. "The Agency of Greek and Roman Statues from Homer to Constantine." In *Opuscula* 6: 7–21.
- . 2014. *Initiation into the mysteries of the ancient world*. Berlin
- Bremmer, J. and Erskine, A. eds. 2010. *The gods of ancient Greece: identities and transformations*. Edinburgh.
- Briault, C. 2007. "Making mountains out of molehills in the Bronze Age Aegean: visibility, ritual kits, and the idea of a peak sanctuary." *World Archaeology* 39: 122–41.

- Brinkmann, V. 2008. "The Polychromy of Ancient Greek Sculpture." In Panzanelli, R. *et al.* eds. 18–39.
- Brulé, P. 1988. *La fille d'Athènes: la religion des filles à Athènes à l'époque classique: mythes, cultes et société*. Paris.
- Brunel, J. 1953. "À propos des transferts de cultes: un sens méconnu du mot *aphidryma*." *RPh* 27: 21–33.
- Budelmann, F. and Power, T. 2015. "Another Look at Female Choruses in Classical Athens." *CA* 34: 252–95.
- Budin, S. L. 2008. *The myth of sacred prostitution in antiquity*. New York.
- Bulloch, A. W. 1985. *The fifth hymn: the Bath of Pallas*. Cambridge.
- Burian, P. 2007. *Euripides: Helen*. Oxford.
- Burkert, W. 1979. *Structure and history in Greek mythology and ritual*. Berkeley.
- . 1983. *Homo necans: the anthropology of ancient Greek sacrificial ritual and myth*. Trans. by P. Bing. Berkeley.
- . 1985. *Greek religion*. Trans. by J. Raffan. Boston.
- . 1987. "Offerings in Perspective." In Linders, T. and Nordquist, G. eds. 43–56.
- . 1988a. "Katagógia–Anagógia and the goddess of Knossos." In Hägg, R., Marinatos, N. and Nordquist, G. eds. 81–8.
- . 1988b. "The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece." In Fox, M. V. ed. *Temple in society*. Winona Lake.
- . 2001. *Savage Energies*. Chicago.
- Burnett, A. P. 1960. "Euripides' *Helen*: A Comedy of Ideas." *CP* 55: 151–63.
- . 1971. *Catastrophe survived: Euripides' plays of mixed reversal*. Oxford.
- Burstein, S. M. 2009. "Hecataeus of Miletus and the Greek Encounter with Egypt." *AWE* 8: 133–46.
- Burton, P. 1996. "The Summoning of the Magna Mater to Rome (205 BCE)." *Historia* 45: 36–63.
- Buxton, R. ed. 2000. *Oxford readings in Greek religion*. Oxford.
- Calame, C. 1997. *Choruses of young women in ancient Greece: their morphology, religious role, and social functions*. Trans. by D. Collins and J. Orion. Lanham.
- . 1994. "From Choral Poetry to Tragic Stasimon: The Enactment of Women's Song." *Arion* 3: 136–54.
- . 2009. "The abduction of Helen and the Greek Poetic Tradition; Politics, Reinterpretations and Controversies." In Dill, U. and Walde, C. eds. 645–61.
- . 2010. "Identities of Gods and Heroes: Athenian Garden sanctuaries and Gendered Rites of Passage." In Bremmer, J. and Erskine, A. eds. 245–72.
- . 2011. "Myth and Performance on the Athenian Stage: Praxithea, Erechtheus, their Daughters, and the Aetiology of Autochthony." In Markantonatos, A. and Zimmerman, B. eds. 139–61.
- . 2013. "Choral polyphony and the ritual functions of tragic songs." In Gagné, R. and Hopman, M. eds. 35–58.
- . 2017. *La tragédie chorale: Poésie grecque et rituel musical*. Paris.
- Caldwell, R. 1974. "Tragedy Romanticized: The Iphigenia Taurica." *CJ* 70: 23–40.
- Cartledge, P. 1987. *Agisilaos and the crisis of Sparta*. London.
- . 1988. "Yes, Spartan kings were heroized." *LCM* 13: 43–4.

- Castiglioni, M. P. 2015. "Il Palladion e la statua di Atena a Troia: riflessioni su due temi iconografici e sulla loro fusion" *GAIÀ* 18: 435–54.
- Catling, H. W. 1976. "Excavations at the Menelaion, Sparta, 1973–1976." *AR* 23: 24–42.
- . 1995. "A Mycenaean Terracotta Figure from the Menelaion." *BSA* 90: 183–93.
- . 2009. *Sparta: Menelaion I: the Bronze Age*. London.
- Catling, H. W. and Cavanagh, H. 1976. "Two inscribed bronzes from the Menelaion, Sparta." *Kadmos* 15: 145–57.
- Catling, H. W. and Sanders, J. M. eds. 1992. *Philolakôn: Lakonian studies in honour of Hector Catling*. Athens.
- Cavanagh, W. G. and Laxton, R. R. 1984. "Lead Figurines from the Menelaion and Seriation." *BSA* 79: 23–36.
- Cawkwell, G. L. 1988. "ΝΟΜΟΦΥΛΑΚΙΑ and the Areopagus." *JHS* 108: 1–12.
- Cerri, G. 1983. "La madre degli Dei nell'*Elena* di Euripide: tragedia e rituale." *Quaderni di Storia* 18: 155–95.
- Chaniotis, A. 1996. "Conflicting Authorities: Asylia between Secular and Divine law in the Classical and Hellenistic Poleis." *Kernos* 9: 65–86.
- . 1997. "Theatricality Beyond the Theater. Staging Public Life in the Hellenistic World." *Pallas* 47: 219–59.
- . 2002. "Ritual Dynamics: The Boiotian Festival of the Daidala." In Horstmanshoff, H. F. *et al.* eds. *Kykeon: Studies in Honor of H.S. Versnel*. Leiden. 23–48.
- . 2005. "Griechische Rituale der Statusänderung und ihre Dynamik." In Steineke, M. and Weinfurter, S. eds. *Investitur und Krönungsrituale*. Cologne. 44–61.
- . 2006. "Rituals between Norms and Emotions: Rituals as Shared Experience and Memory." *Kernos* 16: 221–38.
- . 2007. "Theater Rituals." In Wilson, P. ed. *The Greek theater and festivals*. Oxford. 48–66.
- . 2008. "Priests as Ritual Experts in the Greek World." In Digne, B. and Trampedach, K. eds. 17–36.
- . 2009. "From Women to Woman: Female Voices and Emotions in Dedications to Goddesses." In Prêtre, C. and Huysecom–Haxhi, S. eds. 51–68.
- . 2010. "The Molpoi Inscription: Ritual Prescription or Riddle?" *Kernos* 23: 375–9.
- . ed. 2011a. *Ritual dynamics in the ancient Mediterranean: agency, emotion, gender, representation*. Stuttgart.
- . 2011b. "Emotional continuity through ritual: initiates, citizens, and pilgrims as emotional communities in the Greek world." In Chaniotis, A. ed. 263–90.
- . 2013. "Processions in Hellenistic Cities; Contemporary Discourses and Ritual Dynamics." Alston, R. *et al.* eds. *Cults, creeds and identities. Religious cultures in the Greek city after the Classical age*. Leuven. 21–48.
- . 2017. "The Life of Statues of Gods in the Greek World." *Kernos*. 30: 91–112.
- Chantraine, P. 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*. 4 vols. Paris.
- Clader, L. L. 1976. *Helen: the evolution from divine to heroic in the Greek epic tradition*. Leiden.
- Clark, I. 1988. "The *gamos* of Hera: Myth and Ritual." In Blundell, S. and Williamson, M. eds. 13–26.

- Cleland, L. 2005. *The Brauron clothing catalogues: text, analysis, glossary and translation*. Oxford.
- Clinton, K. 1974. *The sacred officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Philadelphia.
- . 1992. *Myth and cult: the iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Stockholm.
- . 1994. "The Epidauria and the Arrival of Asclepius in Athens." In Hägg, R. ed. 17–34.
- Coldstream, J. N. 1977. *Geometric Greece: 900–700 BC*. New York.
- Cole, S. G. 1984. "The Social Function of Rituals of Maturation: The Koureion and the Arkteia." *ZPE* 55: 233–44.
- . 1998. "Domesticating Artemis." In Blundell, S. and Williamson, M. eds. 27–44.
- . 2004. *Landscapes, gender, and ritual space: the ancient Greek experience*. Berkeley.
- . 2008. "Professionals, Volunteers, and Amateurs." In Digne, B. and Trampedach, K. eds. 55–72.
- Collard, C. 1975. *Euripides: Supplices*. 2 vols. Groningen.
- . 1980. *Euripides*. New surveys in the classics, no. 14. Oxford.
- Conacher, D. 1967. *Euripidean drama: myth, theme and structure*. Toronto.
- Connelly, J. B. 1988. *Votive sculpture of Hellenistic Cyprus*. New York.
- . 1996. "Parthenon and Parthenoi: A Mythological Interpretation of the Parthenon Frieze." *AJA* 100: 53–80.
- . 2007. *Portrait of a priestess: women and ritual in ancient Greece*. Princeton.
- . 2011. "Ritual Movement Through Greek Sacred Space: Towards an Archaeology of Performance." In Chaniotis, A. ed. 313–46.
- Connolly, A. 1998. "Was Sophocles heroised as Dexion?" *JHS* 118: 1–21.
- Connor, W. R. 1987. "Tribes, Festivals and Processions; Civic Ceremonial and Political Manipulation in Archaic Greece." *JHS* 107: 40–50.
- Constantinidou, S. 2004. "Helen and Pandora: A Comparative Study with Emphasis on the *Eidolon* Theme as a Concept of *Eris*." *Dodone*. 165–241.
- Cook, A. B. 1940. *Zeus: a study in ancient religion*. 3 Vol. Cambridge.
- Cook, R. M. 1987. "Pots and Peisistratan Propaganda." *JHS* 107: 167–9.
- Corbett, P. E. 1970. "Greek Temples and Greek Worshippers: The Literary and Archaeological Evidence." *BICS* 17: 149–58.
- Cousland, J. R. C. and Hume, J. eds. 2009. *The play of texts and fragments: essays in honour of Martin Cropp*. Leiden.
- Cropp, M. 1997. "Notes on Euripides, 'Iphigenia in Tauris'." *ICS* 22: 25–41.
- . 2000. *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris*. London.
- . 2003. "Hypsipyle and Athens." In Csapo, E. and Miller, M. C. eds. *Poetry, theory, praxis: the social life of myth, word, and image in ancient Greece: essays in honour of William J. Slater*. Oxford. 129–143.
- Cropp, M. and Fick, G. 1985. *Resolutions and chronology in Euripides: the fragmentary tragedies*. London.
- Csapo, E. 1997. "Riding the Phallus for Dionysus: Iconology, Ritual, and Gender–Role De/Construction." *Phoenix* 51: 253–95.
- Currie, B. 2002. "Euthymos of Locri: A Case Study in Heroization in the Classical Period." *JHS* 122: 24–44.

- Curty, O. 1995. *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques: catalogue raisonné des inscriptions contenant le terme syngeneia et analyse critique*. Geneva.
- D'Agata, A. L. and Van de Moortel, A. eds. 2009. *Archaeologies of cult: essays on ritual and cult in Crete in honor of Geraldine C. Gesell*. Princeton.
- Dale, A. M. 1967. *Euripides: Helen*. Oxford.
- Daly, K and Riccardi, L. A. eds. *Cities called Athens*. Lewisburg.
- Davidson, J. et al. eds. 2006. *Greek Drama III: essays in honour of Kevin Lee*. London.
- Davies, J. K. 2001. "Temples, Credit, and the Circulation of Money." In Meadows, A. and Shipton, K. eds. 2001. *Money and its uses in the ancient Greek world*. Oxford. 117–28.
- . 2007. "The Phokian Hierosylia at Delphi: Quantities and Consequences." In Sekunda, N. ed. 2007. *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald*. Gdansk. 75–96.
- Davies, M. and Finglass, P. J. 2014. *Stesichorus: the poems*. Cambridge.
- Day, J. W. 2010. *Archaic Greek epigram and dedication: representation and reperformance*. Oxford.
- De Jong, I. J. F. 1991. *Narrative in drama: the art of the Euripidean messenger–speech*. Leiden.
- Deubner, L. 1966. *Attische Feste*. Berlin.
- Deshours, N. 2011. *L'été indien de la religion civique: étude sur les cultes civiques dans le monde égéen à l'époque hellénistique tardive*. Paris.
- Detienne, M. 1977. *Dionysus mis à mort*. Paris.
- Dick, M. B. ed. 1999. *Born in heaven, made on earth: the making of the cult image in the ancient Near East*. Winona Lake.
- Dickie, M. W. 2011. "What Is a Kolossos and How Were Kolossoi Made in the Hellenistic Period?" *GRBS* 37: 237–57.
- Dignas, B. and Trampedach, K. eds. 2008. *Practitioners of the divine: Greek priests and religious officials from Homer to Heliodoros*. Cambridge.
- Dill, U. and Walde, C. eds. 2009. *Antike Mythen: Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen*. Berlin.
- Dillon, M. 1999. "Post–Nuptial Sacrifices on Kos (Segre, ed. 178) and Ancient Greek Marriage Rites." *ZPE* 124: 63–80.
- . 2002. *Girls and women in classical Greek religion*. New York.
- Dillon, S. 2010. *The female portrait statue in the Greek world*. New York.
- Dinsmoor, W. B. 1932. "The Burning of the Opisthodomos at Athens. II. The Site." *AJA* 36: 307–26.
- . 1950. *The architecture of ancient Greece: an account of its historic development*. New York.
- Dinsmoor, W. B. Jr. 1980. *The propylaia to the Athenian acropolis*. Vol. 1. Princeton.
- Dodd, D. B. 2003. "Adolescent Initiation in Myth and Tragedy." In Dodd, D. and Faraone, C. eds. 71–84.
- Dodd, D. B. and Faraone, C. eds. 2003. *Initiation in ancient Greek rituals and narratives: new critical perspectives*. New York.
- Dodds, E. R. 1960. *Euripides: Bacchae*. Oxford.
- Donnay, G. 1997. L'arrhéphorie: initiation ou rite civique? Un cas d'école." *Kernos* 10: 177–205.
- Donohue, A. A. 1988. *Xoana and the origins of Greek sculpture*. Atlanta.

- . 1997 “Greek Images of the Gods: Considerations on Terminology and Methodology.” *Hephaistos* 15: 31–45.
- . 2005. *Greek sculpture and the problem of description*. Cambridge.
- Dörig, J. 1977. *Onatas of Aegina*. Leiden.
- Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L. eds. *Cultural poetics in archaic Greece: cult, performance, politics*. Cambridge.
- Dowden, K. 1989. *Death and the Maiden: Girls’ Initiation Rites in Greek Mythology*. London.
- Downing, E. 1990. “Apatê, Agôn, and Literary Self-Reflexivity in Euripides’ *Helen*.” In Griffith, M. and Mastronarde, D. J. eds. *Cabinet of the muses: Rosenmeyer Festschrift*. Atlanta. 1–16.
- Ducat, J. 1976. “Fonctions de la statue dans la Grèce archaïque: kouros et kolossos.” *BCH* 100: 239–51.
- . 2006. *Spartan education: youth and society in the classical period*. Trans. by E. Stafford and A. Powell. Swansea.
- Dunand, F. 1978. “Sens et fonction de la fête dans la Grèce hellénistique: Les cérémonies en l’honneur d’Artémis Leucophryéné.” *DHA* 4: 201–18.
- Dunbabin, T. J. 1948. “Minos and Daidalos in Sicily.” *PBSR* 16: 1–18.
- Dundes, A. 2007. *The meaning of folklore: the analytical essays of Alan Dundes*. Logan.
- Dunn, F. M. 1996. *Tragedy’s end: closure and innovation in Euripidean drama*. Oxford.
- . 2000. “Euripidean Aetiologies.” *Classical Bulletin* 76: 3–27.
- Edmunds, L. 1996. *Theatrical space and historical place in Sophocles’ Oedipus at Colonus*. Baltimore.
- . 2007 “Helen’s Divine Origins.” *Electronic Antiquity* 10: 1–45.
- . 2016. *Stealing Helen: the myth of the abducted wife in comparative perspective*. Princeton.
- Easterling, P. E. 1988. “Tragedy and Ritual: Cry ‘Woe woe’ but May the Good Prevail!” *Mètis*. 3: 87–109.
- . 1993. “Gods on Stage in Greek Tragedy.” In Dalfen, J *et al.* eds. *Religio Graeco-Romana Festschrift für Walter Pötscher*. Graz. 77–86.
- . 1997. “Constructing the Heroic.” In Pelling, C. ed. 21–38.
- Eidinow, E. *et al.* eds. 2016. *Theologies of ancient Greek religion*. Cambridge.
- Eisner, R. 1980. “Echoes of the Odyssey in Euripides’ *Helen*.” *Maia* 32: 31–7.
- Ekroth, G. 2002. *The sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults in the archaic to the early hellenistic periods*. Liège.
- . 2003. “Inventing Iphigenia? On Euripides and the Cultic Construction of Brauron.” *Kernos* 16: 59–118.
- Elsner, J. 1996. “Image and Ritual: Reflections on the Religious Appreciation of Classical Art.” *CQ* 46: 515–31.
- Faraone, C. 1991a. “Binding and Burying the Forces of Evil: The Defensive Use of ‘Voodoo Dolls’ in Ancient Greece.” *CA*: 165–220.
- . 1991b. “The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells.” In Faraone, C. and Obbink, D. eds. *Magika hiera: ancient Greek magic and religion*. Oxford. 3–33.
- . 1992. *Talismans and Trojan Horses: guardian statues in ancient Greek myth and ritual*. Oxford.
- . 1993. “Molten Wax, Spilt Wine and Mutilated Animals: Sympathetic Magic in

- Near Eastern and Early Greek Oath Ceremonies." *JHS* 113: 60–80.
- . 2003. "Paying the Bear and the Fawn for Artemis: Female Initiation or Substitute Sacrifice?" In Dodd, D. and Faraone, C. eds. 43–68.
- Farnell, L. R. 1907. *The cults of the Greek states*. 5 vols. Oxford.
- . 1921. *Greek hero cults and ideas of immortality*. Oxford.
- Fearn, D. 2007. *Bacchylides: politics, performance, poetic tradition*. Oxford.
- Fehr, B. 1996. "The Greek Temple in the Early Archaic Period: Meaning, Use and Social Context." *Hephaistos* 14: 165–91.
- Felsch, R. C. S. 1980. "Apollo und Artemis oder Artemis und Apollon? Bericht von den Grabungen im neu entdeckten Heiligtum bei Kalapodi 1973–77." *AA* 95: 38–115.
- . 1981a "Mykenischer Kult im Heiligtum bei Kalapodi?" In Hägg, R. and Marinatos, N. eds. 81–9.
- Ferrari, G. 1994. "Héraclès, Pisistratus and the Panathenaea." *Mètis* 9: 219–26.
- . 2002. "The Ancient Temple on the Acropolis at Athens." *AJA* 106: 11–35.
- . 2003. "What Kind of Rite of Passage Was the Ancient Greek Wedding?" In Dodd, D. and Faraone, C. A. eds. 27–42.
- . 2008. *Alcman and the cosmos of Sparta*. Chicago.
- Figueira, T. J. 1991. *Athens and Aigina in the age of imperial colonization*. Baltimore.
- . 1993. *Excursions in epichoric history: Aiginetan essays*. Baltimore.
- . 2012. "The Aiakidai, the Herald-less War, and Salamis." In Bers, V. *et al.* eds. *Festschrift in Honor of Gregory Nagy*. Electronic Resource. Boston.
- Finglass, P. and Kelly, A. eds. 2015. *Stesichorus in context*. Cambridge.
- Finkelberg, M. 2006. "The City Dionysia and the Social Space of Attic Tragedy." In Davidson, J. ed. 17–26
- Finley, M. I. 1982. *Economy and society in ancient Greece*. New York.
- Fleischer, R. 1978. "Artemis von Ephesos und verwandte Kultstatuen aus Anatolien und Syrien." In Sahin, S., Schwertheim, E., and Wagner, J. eds. *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasien: Festschrift F.K. Dörner*. Leiden. 324–58.
- Foley, H. P. 1985. *Ritual irony: poetry and sacrifice in Euripides*. Ithaca.
- . 1992. "Anodos Dramas: Euripides' *Alcestis* and *Helen*." In Hexter, R. and Selden, D. eds. *Innovations of antiquity*. New York. 133–60.
- . 2001. *Female acts in Greek tragedy*. Princeton.
- . 2003. "Choral Identity in Greek Tragedy." *CP* 98: 1–30.
- Fontenrose, J. E. 1978. *The Delphic oracle, its responses and operations, with a catalogue of responses*. Berkeley.
- Ford, A. L. 2010. "A Song to Match My Song": Lyric Doubling in Euripides' *Helen*." In Mitsis, P. and Tsagalis, C. eds. *Allusion, authority, and truth: critical perspectives on Greek poetic and rhetorical praxis*. Leiden. 283–302
- Forrest, W. G. 1966. "Some Inscriptions of Chios." *BSA* 61: 197–206.
- Fowler, R. L. 1993. "The Myth of Kephalos as an Aition of Rain-Magic (Pherekydes *FGrHist* 3 F 34)." *ZPE* 97: 29–42.
- . 2013. *Early Greek mythography*. Volume 2. Oxford.
- Frapiccini, N. 1987. "L'arrivo di Cibele in Attica." *PP* 232: 12–26.
- Fraser, P. M. 1960. "Two Studies on the Cult of Serapis in the Hellenistic World." *Opuscula Atheniensi* 3: 1–54.
- . 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vol. Oxford.

- Frazer, J. G. 1965 *Pausanias's description of Greece*. 6 Vol. London.
- Fredricksmeier, E. A. 1979. "Divine Honors for Philip II." *TAPA* 109: 39–61.
- Friedman, R. 2007. "Old Stories in Euripides' New 'Helen': παλαιότης γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ γ' ἔνεστι τις (*Hel.* 1056)." *Phoenix* 61: 195–211.
- Friedrich, R. 1996. "Everything to do with Dionysus? Ritualism, the Dionysiac, and the Tragic." In Silk, M. ed. 257–83
- Gagné, R. 2009. "Mystery Inquisitors: Performance, Authority, and Sacrilege at Eleusis." *CA* 28: 211–47.
- . 2015. "Who's afraid of Cypselus? Contested theologies and dynastic dedications." In Eidinow, E. *et al.* eds. 62–88.
- Gagné, R. and Hopman, M. eds. 2013a. *Choral mediations in Greek tragedy*. Oxford.
- . 2013b. "Introduction: The Chorus in the Middle." In Gagné, R. and Hopman, M. eds. 1–33.
- Gaifman, M. 2005. *Beyond mimesis in Greek religious art: aniconism in the archaic and classical periods*. PhD diss. Princeton Univ.
- . 2012. *Aniconism in Greek antiquity*. Oxford.
- . 2015. "Theologies of Statues in Classical Greek Art." In Eidinow, E. *et al.* eds. 129–80.
- Galeotta Papi, D. 1987. "Victors and Sufferers in Euripides' *Helen*." *AJP* 108: 27–40.
- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek myth: a guide to literary and artistic sources*. Baltimore.
- Garland, R. 1987. *The Piraeus: from the fifth to the first century B.C.* Ithaca.
- Garwood, P. *et al.* ed. 1991. *Sacred and profane: proceedings of a conference on archaeology, ritual and religion*. Oxford.
- Gawlinski, L. C. 2012. *The sacred law of Andania: a new text with commentary*. Berlin.
- . 2015. "Securing the Sacred: The Accessibility and Control of Attic Sanctuaries." In Daly, K and Riccardi, L. A. eds. 61–87.
- Gentili, B. and Perusino, F. 2002. *Le orse di Brauron: un rituale di iniziazione femminile nel santuario di Artemide*. Pisa.
- Gerding, H. 2006. "The Erechtheion and the Panathenaic Procession." *AJA* 110: 389–401.
- Gernet, L. 1968. *Anthropologie de la Grèce antique: droit et institutions en Grèce antique*. Paris.
- . 1981. "'Value' in Greek Myth." In Gordon, R. L. ed. 111–46.
- Gesell, G. 1985. *Town, palace, and house cult in Minoan Crete*. Göteborg.
- . 2004. "From Knossos to Kavousi: The Popularizing of the Minoan Palace Goddess." *Hesperia Supplements* 33: 131–50.
- Gill, D. W. J. 2001. "The Decision to Build the Temple of Athena Nike (*IG* I³ 35)." *Historia* 50: 257–78.
- Gödecken, K. B. 1986. "Beobachtungen und Funde an der Heiligen Strasse zwischen Milet und Didyma 1984." *ZPE* 66: 217–53.
- Goff, B. 1999. "The Violence of Community: Ritual in the *Iphigenia in Tauris*." In Padilla, M. ed. 109–28.
- . 2000. "Try to Make It Real Compared to What? Euripides' *Electra* and the Play of Games." *Illinois Classical Studies* 24: 93–105.
- Golann, C. P. 1945. "The Third Stasimon of Euripides' *Helena*." *TAPA* 76: 31–46.

- Goldhill, S. 2000a. "Civic Ideology and the Problem of Difference: The Politics of Aeschylean Tragedy, Once Again." *JHS* 120: 34–56.
- . 2000b. "Greek Drama and Political Theory." In Rowe, C. and Schofield, M. eds. *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Cambridge. 60–88.
- . 2015. "Polytheism and Tragedy." In Eidinow, E. *et al.* eds. 153–75.
- Gordon, R. L. ed. 1981. *Myth, religion, and society: structuralist essays*. Cambridge.
- Gorogianni, E. 2011. "Goddess, Lost Ancestors and Dolls: A Cultural Biography of the Ayia Irini Terracotta Statues." *Hesperia* 80: 635–55.
- Gould, J. 1980. "Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens." *JHS* 100: 38–59.
- . 1996. "Tragedy and Collective Experience." In Silk, M. ed. 217–43
- . 2001. *Myth, ritual, memory, and exchange: essays in Greek literature and culture*. Oxford.
- Gow, A. S. F. 1952. *Theocritus*. Cambridge.
- Goward, B. 1999. *Telling tragedy: narrative technique in Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides*. London.
- Graf, F. 1979. "Das Gotterbild aus dem Taurerland." *Antike Welt* 10: 33–41.
- . 1985. *Nordionische Kulte: Religionsgeschichtliche und Epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulturen von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai, und Phokaia*. Rome.
- . 1996. "Pompai in Greece: Some Considerations about Space and Ritual in the Greek Polis." In Hägg, R. ed. 55–65.
- . ed. 1998. *Ansichten griechischer Rituale: Geburtstags-Symposium für Walter Burkert Castelen bei Basel 15. bis 18. März 1996*. Leipzig.
- . 2003. "Initiation: A Concept with a Troubled History." In Dodd, D. and Faraone, C. A. eds. 3–24.
- . 2010. "Gods In Greek Inscriptions: Some Methodological Questions." In Bremmer, J. and Erskine, A. eds. 55–80.
- . 2011. "Ritual Restoration and Innovation in the Greek Cities of the Roman Imperium." In Chaniotis, A. ed. 105–117.
- Gras, M. 1987 "Le temple de Diane sur l'Aventin." *REA* 99: 47–61.
- . 2006. "Statue, Cult and Reproduction." *Art History* 29: 258–79.
- Graziosi, B. and Haubold, J. 2010. *Iliad. Book VI*. Cambridge.
- Greimas, A. J. 1983. *Structural Semantics: An Attempt at a Method*. Trans. by D. McDowell. Baltimore.
- Gregory, J. 2002. "Euripides as Social Critic." *G&R* 49: 145–62.
- Griffin, J. 1998. "The Social Function of Attic Tragedy." *CQ* 48: 39–61.
- Griffith, J. G. 1953 "Some Thoughts on the *Helena* of Euripides." *JHS* 73: 36–41.
- Griffith, M. 1995. "Brilliant Dynasts: Power and Politics in the *Oresteia*." *CA* 14: 62–129.
- . 2002. "Slaves of Dionysus: Satyrs, Audience, and the Ends of the *Oresteia*." *CA* 21: 195–258.
- Gruen, E. 1992. *Culture and national identity in republican Rome*. Ithaca.
- Guépin, J-P. 1968. *The tragic paradox: myth and ritual in Greek tragedy*. Amsterdam.
- Gumpert, M. 2001. *Grafting Helen: the abduction of the classical past*. Madison.

- Hägg, R. 1981a. "Official and Popular Cults in Mycenaean Greece." In Hägg, R. and Marinatos, N. eds. 35–9.
- . 1981b "The House Sanctuary at Asine Revisited." In Hägg, R. and Marinatos, N. eds. 91–4.
- . ed. 1994. *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence*. Stockholm.
- . ed. 1996. *The role of religion in the early Greek polis*. Stockholm.
- . ed. 1999. *Ancient Greek hero cult*. Stockholm.
- Hägg, R. and Alroth, B. eds. 2005. *Greek sacrificial ritual, olympian and chthonian: proceedings of the sixth international seminar on ancient Greek cult*. Stockholm 2005.
- Hägg, R. and Marinatos, N. eds. 1981. *Sanctuaries and cults in the aegean Bronze Age*. Stockholm.
- . eds. 1993. *Greek sanctuaries: new approaches*. London.
- Hägg, R., Marinatos, N. and Nordquist, G. eds. 1988. *Early Greek cult practice*. Stockholm.
- Hall, E. M. 1987. "The Geography of Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians*." *AJP* 108: 427–33.
- . 1989. *Inventing the barbarian: Greek self-definition through tragedy*. Oxford.
- . 1997. "The Sociology of Athenian Tragedy." In Easterling, P.E. ed. *The Cambridge companion to Greek tragedy*. Cambridge. 93–126
- . 2013. *Adventures with Iphigenia in Tauris: a cultural history of Euripides' Black Sea tragedy*. Oxford.
- Hallager, B. 2009. "Domestic Shrines in Late Minoan IIIA2 – Late Minoan IIIC Crete: Fact or Fiction?" In D'Agata, A. L. and Van de Moortel, A. eds. 107–20.
- Hallett, C. H. 1986. "The Origins of the Classical Style in Sculpture." *JHS* 106: 71–84.
- Halleran, M. R. 1985 *Stagecraft in Euripides*. Kent.
- Ham, G. 1999. "The Choes and Anthesteria Reconsidered: Male Maturation Rites and the Peloponnesian War." In Padilla, M. ed. 201–20.
- Hamilton, R. 1985. "Euripidean Priests." *HSCP* 89: 53–73.
- . 1989. "Alkman and the Athenian Arkteia." *Hesperia* 58: 449–72.
- . 1992. *Choes and Anthesteria: Athenian iconography and ritual*. Ann Arbor.
- . 2000. *Treasure map: a guide to the Delian inventories*. Ann Arbor.
- Hammond, N. G. L. 1998. "The Branchidae at Didyma and in Sogdiana." *CQ*: 339–344.
- Harris, E. M. 2015. "Toward a Typology of Greek Regulations about Religious Matters. A Legal Approach." *Kernos*. 28: 53–83.
- Harris, D. 1995. *The treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion*. Oxford.
- Harrison, J. E. 1908. *Prolegomena to the study of Greek religion*. Cambridge.
- Hartigan, K. V. 1986. "Salvation via Deceit: A New Look at the Iphigenia at Tauris." *Eranos* 84: 119–25.
- . 1991. *Ambiguity and self-deception*. Bern.
- Hatzaki, E. 2009. "Structured Deposition as Ritual Action." In D'Agata, A. L. and Van de Moortel, A. eds. 19–30.
- Hawes, G. 2014. *Rationalizing myth in antiquity*. Oxford.
- Haysom, M. and Wallensten, J. eds. 2011. *Current approaches to religion in ancient Greece*. Stockholm.

- Herda, A. 2013. "Greek (and Our) Views on the Karians." In Mouton, A., Rutherford, I. and Yakubovich I, eds. *Luwian identities: culture, language and religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*. Leiden. 421–508.
- Henderson, J. 1987. *Aristophanes: Lysistrata*. Oxford.
- . 1998. *Aristophanes: Clouds, Waps, Peace*. Boston.
- Henrichs, A. 1969. "Die Maenaden von Milet." *ZPE* 4: 223–41.
- . 1978. "Greek Maenadism from Olympias to Messalina." *HSCP* 82: 121–60.
- . 1981. "Human Sacrifice in Greek Religion: Three Case Studies." In Rudhardt, J and Reverdin, O. eds. *Le sacrifice dans l'Antiquité. Fondation Hardt XXVII*. Geneva. 195–235.
- . 1994. "'Why Should I Dance?': Choral Self-Referentiality in Greek Tragedy." *Arion* 2: 56–111.
- . 1996. "Dancing in Athens, Dancing on Delos: Some Patterns of Choral Projection in Euripides." *Philologus* 140: 48–62.
- . 2000. "Drama and *Dromena*: Bloodshed, Violence, and Sacrificial Metaphor in Euripides." *HSPH* 100: 173–88.
- . 2003. "Writing Religion: Inscribed Texts, Ritual Authority, and the religious Discourse of the Polis." In Yunis, H. ed. *Written texts and the rise of literate culture in ancient Greece*. Cambridge. 38–58.
- . 2005. "Sacrifice as to the Immortals." In Hägg, R. and Alroth, B. 47–60.
- Herington, C. J. 1955. *Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias: a study in the religion of Periclean Athens*. Manchester.
- Hershkowitz, A. 2016. "Getting Carried Away With Theseus: The Evolution and Partisan Use of Athenian Abduction of Spartan Helen." In Figueira, T. ed. *Myth text and history at Sparta*. Piscataway. 169–285.
- Heubeck, A., West, S. and Hainsworth, J.B. eds. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Vol. I: Books I–VIII*. Oxford.
- Hicks, R. I. 1962. "Egyptian Elements in Greek Mythology." *TAPA* 93: 90–108.
- Hicks, B. 2013. "Roman *Religio* as a Framework at Tacitus' *Histories* 4.83–84." *JAH* 1: 70–82.
- Higbie, C. 2003. *The Lindian chronicle and the Greek creation of their past*. Oxford.
- Hill, D. K. 1944. "Hera, the Sphinx?" *Hesperia* 13: 353–60.
- Hollinshead, M. B. 1985. "Against Iphigenia's *Adyton* in Three Mainland Temples." *AJA* 89: 419–40.
- . 2015. "The North Court of the Erechtheion and the Ritual of the Plynteria." *AJA* 119: 177–90.
- Holmberg, I. E. 1995. "Euripides' *Helen*: Most Noble and Most Chaste." *AJP* 116: 19–42.
- Horster, M. and Klöckner, A. eds. 2012. *Civic priests: cult personnel in Athens from the hellenistic period to Late Antiquity*. Berlin.
- . 2013. *Cities and Priests: Cult Personnel in Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands from the Hellenistic to the Imperial period*. Berlin.
- Hose, M. 1990. *Studien zum Chor bei Euripides*. 2 vol. Stuttgart.
- Hughes, D. 1991. *Human sacrifice in ancient Greece*. London.
- Hunter, R. L. 1996. *Theocritus and the archaeology of Greek poetry*. New York.

- . 2015. “Sweet Stesichorus: Theocritus 18 and the *Helen* Revisted.” In Finglass, P. and Kelly, A. eds. 145–63.
- Hurwit, J. M. 1995. “Beautiful Evil: Pandora and the Athena Parthenos.” *AJA* 99: 171–86.
- . 2004. *The acropolis in the age of Pericles*. Cambridge.
- Huxley, G. L. 1969. *Greek epic poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis*. London.
- Intzésiloglou, C. 2002a. “The Archaic Temple of Apollo at Ancient Metropolis.” In Stamatopoulou, M. and Yeroulanou, M. eds. *Excavating classical culture: recent archaeological discoveries in Greece*. Oxford. 109–15.
- . 2002b. “A Newly Discovered Archaic Bronze Statue from Metropolis (Thessaly).” In Mattusch, C. ed. *Proceedings of the seventh international congress on ancient bronzes, Izmir*. Izmir. 65–8.
- Iversen, P. 2007. “The Small and Great Daidala in Boiotian History.” *Historia* 56: 381–418.
- Janko, R. 1992. *The Iliad: a commentary. Vol. IV: books 13–16*. Cambridge.
- Jeanmaire, H. 1939. *Couroi et courètes: essai sur l'éducation spartiate et sur les rites d'adolescence dans l'antiquité hellénique*. Lille.
- Jebb, R. C. 1905. *Bacchylides: the poems and fragments*. Cambridge.
- Jesi, F. 1965. “L’Egitto Infero nell’Elena di Euripide.” *Aegyptus* 45: 56–69.
- Jim, S. F. 2014. *Sharing with the gods: aparchai and dekatai in ancient Greece*. Oxford.
- Juffras, D. M. 1993. “Helen and Other Victims in Euripides’ *Helen*.” *Hermes* 121: 45–57.
- Kannicht, R. 1969. *Euripides: Helena*. Heidelberg.
- Kardara, C. 1960. “Problems of Hera’s Cult Images.” *AJA* 64: 343–58.
- Karetsou, A. 1981. “The Peak Sanctuary of Mt Juktas.” In Hägg, R. and Marinatos, N. eds. 137–53.
- Kavoulaki, A. 1999. “Processional Performance and the Democratic Polis.” In Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. eds. *Performance culture and Athenian democracy*. Oxford. 293–320.
- . 2011. “Observations on the Meaning and Practice of the Greek Pompe.” In Haysome, M and Wallensten, J. eds. 135–50.
- Kearns, E. 1989. *The heroes of Attica*. London.
- . 1998. “The Nature of Heroines.” In Blundell, S. and Williamson, M. eds. 96–110.
- Keesling, C. 2003. *The votive statues of the Athenian acropolis*. Cambridge.
- . 2005. “Patrons of Athenian Votive Monuments of the Archaic and Classical Periods: Three Studies.” *Hesperia* 74: 395–426.
- . 2012. “Syeris, Diakonos of the Priestess Lysimache on the Athenian Acropolis (*JG* II² 3464).” *Hesperia* 81: 467–505.
- Kennell, N. M. 1995. *The gymnasium of virtue: education and culture in ancient Sparta*. Chapel Hill.
- Kern, O. 1900. *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*. Berlin.
- Ketterer, R. 2013. “Skene, Altar and Image: Euripides’ *Iphigenia among the Taurians*.” In Harrison, G. ed. *Performance in Greek and Roman theater*. Leiden. 217–33.
- Kilian, K. 1988. “Zeugnisse Mykenischer Kultausbung in Tiryns.” In Hägg, R. and Marinatos, N. eds. 49–58.

- Kirk, G. S. 1990. *The Iliad: a commentary. Vol. II: books 5–8*. Cambridge.
- Kitto, H. D. F. 1956. *Form and meaning in drama; a study of six Greek plays and of Hamlet*. New York.
- Klein, N. and Glowacki, K. T. 2009. “From Kavousi Vronda to Dreros: Architecture and Display in Cretan Cult Buildings.” In D’Agata, A. L. and Van de Moortel, A. eds. 153–67.
- Knell, H. 1983. “Der Tempel der Artemis Tauropolos in Lutsa.” *AA* 1: 39–43.
- Knoepfler, D. 2001. “La fête des Daidala de Platées chez Pausanias: une clef pour l’histoire de la Béotie Hellénistique.” In Knoepfler, D. and Pierart, M. eds. *Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l’an 2000*. Geneva. 343–74.
- Koonce, K. 1988. “Agalma and Eikon.” *AJP* 109: 108–10.
- Korres, M. 1997. “Die Athena–Tempel auf der Acropolis.” In Hoepfner, W. I. ed. *Kult und Kultbauten auf der Acropolis*. Berlin. 218–43.
- Kosak, J. C. 2017. “Iphigenia in Tauris.” In McClure, L. ed. 214–27.
- Kovacs, D. 1983. “Euripides, Troades 95–7: Is Sacking Cities Really Foolish?” *CQ* 33: 334–38.
- . 2002. *Euripides: Helen. Phoenician Women. Orestes*. Boston.
- Kowalzig, B. 2006. “The Aetiology of Empire? Hero Cult and Athenian Tragedy.” In Davidson, J. et al. eds. 79–99.
- . 2007a. *Singing for the gods: performances of myth and ritual in archaic and classical Greece*. Cambridge.
- . 2007b. “‘And Now All the World Shall Dance!’ Dionysus’ Chorus between Drama and Ritual.” In Csapo, E. and Miller, M. eds. *The origins of theater in ancient Greece and beyond: from ritual to drama*. 221–51.
- . 2013. “Transcultural Chorality: Iphigenia in Tauris and Athenian Imperial Economics in a Polytheistic World.” In Gagné, R. and Hopman, M. eds. 178–211.
- Kretschmer, P. 1926. “Das Nt–Suffix.” *Glotta* 14: 84–106.
- . 1935. “Literaturbericht für das Jahr 1933.” *Glotta* 24: 56–113.
- Kroll, J. 1982. “The Ancient Image of Athena Polias.” In Thompson, A. ed. *Studies in Athenian architecture, sculpture and topography presented to Homer A. Thompson. Hesperia, Suppl. 20*. Princeton. 65–76.
- Kron, U. 1988. “Kultmahle im Heraion von Samos archaischer Zeit. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion.” In Hägg, R., Marinatos, N. and Nordquist, G. eds. 135–48.
- . 1993. “Priesthoods, Dedications and *Euergetism*: What Part Did Religion Play in the Political and Social Status of Greek Women?” In Alroth, B. and Hellström, P. eds. 139–83.
- . 1999. “Patriotic Heroes.” In Hägg, R. ed. 61–83.
- Kyriakou, P. 2006. *A commentary on Euripides’ Iphigenia in Tauris*. Berlin.
- Kyriakou, P. and Antonios, R. eds. 2016. *Wisdom and folly in Euripides*. Berlin.
- Kyrieleis, H. 1988. “Offerings of the ‘Common Man’ in the Heraion of Samos.” In Hägg, R., Marinatos, N. and Nordquist, G. eds. 215–21.
- . 1993. “The Heraion at Samos.” In Marinatos, N. and Hägg, R. eds. 125–53.
- Lamari, A. 2010. *Narrative, intertext, and space in Euripides’ Phoenissae*. Leiden.
- Lambert, S. D. 1998. *The phratries of Attica*. Ann Arbor.
- . 1999. “IG II² 2345, Thiasoi of Herakles and the Salaminioi Again.” *ZPE* 125: 93–130.

- . 2012. “The Social Construction of Priests and Priestesses in Athenian Honorific Decrees from the Fourth Century BC to the Augustan Period.” In Horster, M. and Klöckner, A. eds. 67–134.
- Langdon, S. 1987. “Gift Exchange in the Geometric Sanctuaries.” In Linders, T. and Nordquist, G. eds. 107–13.
- Lanza, D. 1989. “Una ragazza, offerta al sacrificio.” *Quaderni di Storia* 25: 5–22.
- Lapatin, K. 2001. *Chryselephantine statuary in the ancient mediterranean world*. Oxford.
- . 2010. “New Statues for Old Gods.” In Bremmer, J. and Erskine, A. eds. 126–51.
- Lape, S. 2010. *Race and citizen identity in the classical Athenian democracy*. Cambridge.
- Laffineur, R. and Hägg, R. eds. 2001. *Potnia: deities and religion in the Aegean Bronze Age*. Liège.
- Larson, J. L. 1995. *Greek heroine cults*. Madison.
- . 2001. *Greek nymphs: myth, cult, lore*. Oxford.
- Latacz, J. and Bierl, A. eds. 2000–16. *Homers Ilias, Gesamtkommentar: Basler Kommentar*. Munich. (BK)
- Lattimore, R. 1964. *Story patterns in Greek tragedy*. Ann Arbor.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. 1989 “‘Impiety’ and ‘Atheism’ in Euripides’ Dramas.” *CQ* 39: 70–82.
- . 2016. *Euripides and the gods*.
- Leitao, D. 2003. “Adolescent Hair-Growing and Hair-Cutting Rituals in Ancient Greece: A Sociological Approach.” In Dodd, D. and Faraone, C. A. eds. 109–29.
- Lefteratou, A. 2013. “Iphigenia Revisited: Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica* and ‘Der Tod und das Mädchen’.” In Oinheiro, M. et al. eds. *Intende, lector – echoes of myth, religion and ritual in the ancient novel*. Berlin. 200–22.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1955. “The Structural Study of Myth.” *Journal of American Folklore* 68: 428–44.
- Linders, T. 1972. *Studies in the treasure records of Artemis Brauronia found in Athens*. Stockholm.
- . 1987. “Gifts, Gods, Society.” In Linders, T. and Nordquist, G. eds. 115–22.
- . 2007. “The Location of the Opisthodomos: Evidence from the Temple of Athena Parthenos Inventories.” *AJA* 111: 777–82.
- Linders, T. and Nordquist, G. eds. 1987. *Gifts to the gods: proceedings of the uppsala symposium, 1985*. Stockholm.
- Lloyd, A. B. 1988. *Herodotus, Book II*. 3 Vol. Leiden.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1983. “Artemis and Iphigenia.” *JHS* 103: 87–102.
- . 1998. “Ritual and Tragedy.” In Graf, F. ed. *Ansichten griechischer Rituale: Geburtstags-Symposium für Walter Burkert, Castelen bei Basel, 15.–18. März 1996*. Leipzig. 271–96
- Lorton, D. 1999 “The Theology of Cult Statues in Ancient Egypt.” In Dick, M. ed. 123–210.
- Lougovaya–Ast, J. 2006. “Myrrhine, the First Priestess of Athena Nike.” *Phoenix* 60: 211–25.
- Louden, B. 2011. *Homer’s Odyssey and the Near East*. Cambridge.
- Lupu, E. 2005. *Greek sacred law: a collection of new documents*. Leiden.
- Luschnig, C. A. E. 1972. “Euripides’ Iphigenia among the Taurians and Helen: Così è, se vi pare!” *CW* 66: 158–63.
- Mac Sweeney, N. 2013. *Foundation myths and politics in ancient Ionia*. Cambridge.

- MacDowell, D. M. 1963. *Athenian homicide law in the age of the orators*. Manchester.
- Magie, D. 1954. *Roman rule in Asia Minor*. Princeton.
- Mallwitz, A. 1966. "Das Heraion von Olympia und seine Vorgänger." *JdI* 81: 310–76.
- Malkin, I. 1987. *Religion and colonization in ancient Greece*. Leiden.
- . 1990. "Lysander and Libys." *CQ* 40: 541–45.
- . 1991. "What Is an Aphidruma?" *CA* 10: 77–96.
- . 1994. *Myth and territory in the Spartan mediterranean*. Cambridge.
- . 1998. *The returns of Odysseus: colonization and ethnicity*. Berkeley.
- Mansfield, J. M. 1989. *The robe of Athena and the Panathenaic "Peplos"*. PhD. diss. U. Michigan.
- Marconi, C. 2011. "The Birth of an Image: The Painting of a Statue of Herakles and Theories of Representation in Ancient Greek Culture." *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 49: 145–67.
- Marinatos, N. 1993. *Minoan religion: ritual, image, and symbol*. Columbia.
- . 2004. "The Character of Minoan Epiphanies." *ICS* 29: 25–42.
- Marinatos, N. and Hägg, R. 1983. "Anthropomorphic Cult Images in Minoan Crete?" In Krzyszkowska, O. and Nixon, L. eds. *Minoan society: proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium, 1981*. Bristol. 185–96.
- Marincola, J. et al. eds. 2012. *Greek notions of the past in the archaic and classical eras: history without historians*. Edinburgh.
- Mark, I. S. 1993. *The sanctuary of Athena Nike in Athens: architectural stages and chronology*. Princeton.
- Markantonatos, A. 2002. *Tragic narrative: a narratological study of Sophocles' Oedipus at Colonus*. Berlin.
- . 2013. *Euripides' Alcestis: narrative, myth, and religion*. Berlin.
- Markantonatos, A. and Zimmermann, B. eds. 2011. *Crisis on stage: tragedy and comedy in late fifth-century Athens*. Berlin.
- Marshall, C. W. 2009. "Sophocles' Chryses and the date of Iphigenia in Tauris." In Cousland, J. R. C. and Hume, J. eds. 141–56.
- . 2014. *The structure and performance of Euripides' Helen*. Cambridge.
- Mastrorarde, D. J. ed. 1994. *Euripides: Phoenissae*. Cambridge.
- . 2000. "Euripidean Tragedy and Genre: The Terminology and its Problems." *Illinois Classical Studies* 24: 23–39.
- . 2010. *The art of Euripides: dramatic technique and social context*. Cambridge.
- Matthiessen, K. 1964. *Elektra, Taurische Iphigenie und Helena*. Göttingen.
- . 1968. "Zur Theoneszene der Euripideischen 'Helena'." *Hermes* 96: 685–704.
- Mazarakis-Ainian, A. J. 1988. "Early Greek Temples: Their Origin and Function." In Hägg, R., Marinatos, N. and Nordquist, G. eds. 105–19.
- McCauley, B. 1999. "Heroes and Power: The Politics of Bone Transferal." In Hägg, ed. 85–98.
- McClure, L. ed. 2017. *A companion to Euripides*. Chichester.
- McInerney, J. 2015. "'There Will Be Blood...': The Cult of Artemis Tauropolis at Halai Araphenides." In Daly, K. and Riccardi, L. A. eds. 289–320.
- McKenzie, J. S. and Gibson, S. 2004. "Reconstructing the Serapeum in Alexandria from the Archaeological Evidence." *JRS* 94: 73–121.
- Meiggs, R. 1972. *The Athenian empire*. Oxford.

- Meltzer, G. S. 1994. "Where Is the Glory of Troy? *Kleos* in Euripides' *Helen*." *CA* 13: 234–55.
- Meinel, F. 2015. *Pollution and crisis in Greek tragedy*. Cambridge.
- Merkelbach, R. 1972. "βρέτας." *ZPE* 9: 84.
- . 1996. "Gefesselte Götter." In Merkelbach, R. and Wolfgang, B. eds. *Hestia und Erigone: Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Stuttgart. 17–31.
- Meuli, K. 1975. *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol 2. Basel.
- Michelini, A. N. 1987. *Euripides and the tragic tradition*. Madison.
- Mikalson, J. D. 1991. *Honor thy gods: popular religion in Greek tragedy*. Chapel Hill.
- . 2016. *New aspects of religion in ancient Athens: honors, authorities, esthetics, and society*. Leiden.
- Miles, M. M. 1998. *The city eleusinion*. Princeton.
- . 2008. *Art as plunder: the ancient origins of debate about cultural property*. Cambridge
- . 2016. "The Interiors of Greek Temples." In Miles, M. ed. *A companion to Greek architecture*. London. 206–22.
- Mirto, M. S. 1994. "Salvare il γένος e riformare il culto. Divinazione e razionalità nell' *Ifigenia Taurica*." *MD* 32: 55–98.
- Mitchell, B. M. 1975. "Herodotus and Samos." *JHS* 95: 75–91.
- Morgan, C. 1993. "The Origins of Pan–Hellenism." In Hägg, R. and Marinatos, N. eds. 18–45.
- Morgan, K. A. 1994. "Socrates and Gorgias at Delphi and Olympia: Phaedrus 235D6 236B4." *CQ* 44: 375–86.
- Morris, C. 2009. "Configuring the Individual: Bodies of Figurines in Minoan Crete." In D'Agata, A. L. and Van de Moortel, A. eds. 179–89.
- Morris, I. 1986. "Gift and Commodity in Archaic Greece." *Man* 21: 1–17.
- Morris, S. P. 1995. *Daidalos and the origins of Greek art*. Princeton.
- Mountjoy, P. A. 1995. *Mycenaean Athens*. Stockholm.
- Muecke, F. 1982. "I Know You – By Your Rags: Costume and Disguise in Fifth–Century Drama." *Antichthon* 16: 17–34.
- . 1986 "Plautus and the Theater of Disguise." *CA* 5: 216–29.
- Munn, M. 2006. *The mother of the gods, Athens, and the tyranny of Asia: a study of sovereignty in ancient religion*. Berkeley.
- Murnaghan, S. 2013. "The Choral Plot of Euripides' *Helen*." In Gagné, R. and Hopman, M. eds. 155–78.
- Murnane, W. J. 1979. "The Bark of Amun on the Third Pylon at Karnak." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 16: 11–27.
- Murphy, J. 1998. "Ideologies, Rites and Rituals: A View of Prepalatial Minoan Tholoi." In Branigan, K. ed. *Cemetery and society in the Aegean Bronze Age*. Sheffield. 27–40.
- Mylonopoulos, J. ed. 2010a. *Divine images and human imaginations in ancient Greece and Rome*. Leiden.
- . 2010b "Divine Images versus Cult Images. An Endless Story about Theories Methods and Terminologies. In Mylonopoulos, J. ed. 1–19.
- . 2011. "Divine Images Behind Bars: The Semantic of Barriers in Greek Temples." In Haysom, M. and Wallensten, J. eds. 269–91.

- . 2013. “Commemorating Pious Service: Images in Honor of Male and Female Priestly Officers in Asia Minor and the Eastern Aegean in Hellenistic and Roman Times.” In Horster, M. and Klöckner, A. eds. 121–45.
- Nagy, G. 1979. *The best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore.
- . 1990. *Pindar’s Homer: the lyric possession of an epic past*. Baltimore.
- . 2009. *Homer the classic*. Cambridge.
- . 2010. *Homer the preclassic*. Berkeley.
- . 2013. “The Delian Maidens and Their Relevance to Choral Mimesis in Classical Drama.” In Gagné, R. and Hopman, M. eds. 227–42.
- Nagy, B. 1979. “The Naming of Athenian Girls: A Case in Point.” *CJ* 74: 360–4.
- . 1991. “The Procession to Phaleron.” *Historia* 40: 288–306.
- Naiden, F. S. 2006. *Ancient supplication*. Oxford.
- . 2013. *Smoke signals for the gods: ancient Greek sacrifice from the Archaic through Roman periods*. New York.
- Neils, J. ed. 1992a. *Goddess and the polis: the Panathenaic festival in ancient Athens*. Princeton.
- . 1992b. “The Panathenaia: An Introduction.” In Neils, J. ed. 13–28.
- . ed. 2005. *The Parthenon: from antiquity to the present*. Cambridge.
- . 2009. “Textile Dedications to Female Deities: The Case of the Peplos.” In Prêtre, C. and Huysecom–Haxhi, S. eds. 135–47
- Neer, R. 2010. *The emergence of the classical style in Greek sculpture*. Chicago.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1916. “Die Prozessionstypen im griechischen Kult.” *JDAI* 31: 309–39.
- . 1950. *The Minoan–Mycenaean religion and its survival in Greek religion*. Second edition. New York.
- . 1955. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. Vol. 1. Munich.
- . 1957. *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der Attischen*. Stuttgart.
- Nick, G. 2002. *Die Athena Parthenos: Studien zum griechischen Kultbild und seiner Rezeption*. Mainz.
- Nowicki, K. 2001. “Minoan Peak Sanctuaries: Reassessing Their Origins.” In Laffineur, R. and Hägg, R. eds. 31–36.
- Ober, J. 1985. *Fortress Attica: defense of the Athenian land frontier, 404–322 BC*. Leiden.
- O’Brien, M. J. 1988. “Pelopid History and the Plot of Iphigenia in Tauris.” *CQ* 38: 98–115.
- O’Byrhim, S. 2000. “The Ritual of Human Sacrifice in Euripides’ *Iphigenia in Tauris*.” *CB* 76: 29–37.
- O’Connor–Visser, E. 1987. *Aspects of human sacrifice in the tragedies of Euripides*. Amsterdam.
- Oliver, J. H. 1980. “From Gennêtai to Curiales.” *Hesperia* 49: 30–56.
- Olson, S. D. 1989. “The Stories of Helen and Menelaus (*Odyssey* 4.240–89) and the Return of Odysseus.” *AJP* 110: 387–94.
- . 1998. *Aristophanes: Peace*. Oxford.
- Osborne, R. and Rhodes, P. J. eds. 2017. *Greek historical inscriptions, 478–404 BC*. Oxford.

- Padel, R. 1974. "'Imagery of the Elsewhere' Two Choral Odes of Euripides." *CQ* 24: 227–41.
- Padilla, M. ed. 1999. *Rites of passage in ancient Greece: literature, religion, society*. London.
- Paga, J. L. 2012. "Architectural Agency and the Construction of Athenian Democracy." PhD. diss. Princeton University.
- Palagia, O. 1980. *Euphranor*. Leiden.
- . 1984. "A Niche for Kallimachos' Lamp?" *AJA* 88: 515–21.
- . 2008. "Classical Athens." In Palagia, O. ed. *Greek sculpture: function, materials and techniques in the archaic and classical periods*. Oxford. 119–63.
- Panagiotaki, M. 1999. *The central palace sanctuary at Knossos*. London.
- Panzanelli, R. et al. eds. 2008. *The color of life: polychromy in sculpture from antiquity to the present*. Los Angeles.
- . 2008. "Beyond the Pale: Polychromy and Western Art." In Panzanelli, R. et al. eds. 2–17.
- Papadopoulos, J. 1980. *Xoana e sphyrelata: testimonianze delle fonti scritte*. Roma.
- Papillon, T. 1996. "Isocrates on Gorgias and Helen: The Unity of the Helen." *CJ* 91: 377–91.
- Parke, H. W. 1977. *Festivals of the Athenians*. Ithaca.
- Parke, H. W. and Wormell, D. E. 1956. *The Delphic oracle*. Oxford.
- Parker, L. P. E. 2016. *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma: pollution and purification in early Greek religion*. Oxford.
- . 1988. "Were Spartan kings heroized?" *LCM* 13: 9–10.
- . 1996. *Athenian religion: a history*. Oxford.
- . 1997. "Gods Cruel and Kind: Tragic and Civic Theology." In Pelling, C. ed. 143–60.
- . 2005. *Polytheism and society at Athens*. Oxford.
- . 2008. "Religion and the Athenian Empire." In Low, P. ed. *The Athenian empire*. Edinburgh. 146–59.
- . 2015. "Substitution in Greek Sacrifice." In Bonnechere, P. and Gagné, R. eds. *Sacrifices humains. Perspectives croisées et représentations – Human Sacrifice. Cross-cultural perspectives and representations*. Liege. 145–52.
- . 2017. *Greek gods abroad: names, natures, and transformations*. Berkeley.
- Patera, I. 2015. "Objects as Substitutes in Ancient Greek Ritual." *Religion in the Roman Empire* 1: 181–200.
- Peatfield, A. 1983. "The Topography of Minoan Peak Sanctuaries." *ABSA* 78: 273–79.
- . 1990. "Minoan Peak Sanctuaries: History and Society." *OpAth* 18: 117–132.
- . 1996. "After the 'Big Bang' – What? Minoan Symbols and Shrines beyond Palatial Collapse." In Alcock, S. E. and Osborne, R. eds. 19–37.
- . 2001. "Divinity and Performance on Minoan Peak Sanctuaries." In Laffineur, R. and Hägg, R. eds. 51–5.
- . 2009. "The Topography of Minoan Peak Sanctuaries Revisited." In D'Agata, A.L. and Van de Moortel, A. eds. 251–9.
- Pelling, C. ed. 1997. *Greek tragedy and the historian*. Oxford.
- Peltenburg, E. J. 1985. *Lemba Archaeological Project: excavations at Lemba Lakkous, 1976–1983*. Göteborg.

- Peppas Delmousou, D. 1988. "The Theoria of Brauron." In Hägg, R., Marinatos, N. and Nordquist, G. eds. 255–7.
- Petridou, G. 2015. *Divine epiphany in Greek literature and culture*. London.
- Petrovic, I. 2010. "The Life Story of a Cult Story as an Allegory: Kallimachos' Hermes Perpheraios." In Mylonopoulos, J. ed. 205–24.
- Philipp, H. 1968. *Tektonon Daidala. Der bildende Künstler und sein Werk im vorplatonischen Schrifttum*. Berlin.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. 1968. *The dramatic festivals of Athens*. Oxford.
- Pilz, O. 2011. "The Performative Aspect of Greek Ritual: The Case of the Athenian Oskophoria." In Haysome, M. and Wallensten, J. eds. 151–67.
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. 2010. "Greek Priests and 'Cult Statues'" In Mylonopoulos, J. ed. 121–42.
- Platnauer, M., 1938. *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris*. Oxford.
- Platt, V. J. 2011. *Facing the gods: epiphany and representation in Graeco-Roman art, literature and religion*. Cambridge.
- Pleket, H. W. 1981. "Religious History as the History of Mentality." In Versnel, H. S. ed. 152–88.
- Podlecki, A. J. 1970. "The Basic Seriousness of Euripides' *Helen*." *TAPA* 101: 401–18.
- . 1971. "Cimon, Skyros, and Theseus' Bones." *JHS* 91: 141–3.
- Pohlenz, M. 1930. *Die griechische Tragödie*. Göttingen.
- Polignac de, F. 1995. *Cults, territory, and the origins of the Greek city-state*. Trans. by J. Lloyd. Chicago.
- Polinskaya, I. 2003 "Liminality as Metaphor: Initiation and the Frontiers of Ancient Athens." In Dodd, D. and Faraone, C. A. eds. 85–106.
- Post, L. A. 1964. "Menander and the *Helen* of Euripides." *HSCP* 68: 99–118.
- Power, T. 2000. "The 'Parthenoi' of Bacchylides 13." *HSCP* 100: 67–81.
- . 2011. "Cyberchorus: Pindar's κληιδόνες and the aura of the artificial." In Athanassaki, L. and Bowie, E. eds. 67–114.
- Prent, M. 2005. *Cretan sanctuaries and cults: continuity and change from Late Minoan IIIc to the archaic period*. Leiden.
- Prêtre, C. 2009. "La donatrice, L'offrande et la déesse: actions, interactions and réactions." In Prêtre, C. and Huysecom–Haxhi, S. eds. 7–27.
- . 2011. "Les mots et les choses: de l'offrande d'un bouclier crétois a délos." In Haysom, M. and Wallensten, J. eds. 227–38.
- Prêtre, C. and Huysecom–Haxhi, S. eds. 2009. *Le donateur, l'offrande et la déesse: systèmes votifs dans les sanctuaires de déesses du monde grec*. Kernos supplément 23. Liège.
- Price, T. H. 1971. "Double and Multiple Representations in Greek Art and Religious Thought." *JHS* 91: 48–69.
- Primavesi, O. 2003. "Farbige Plastik in der Antiken Literatur." In Brinkmann, V. ed. *Die Polychromie der Archaischen un Frühklassischen Skulptur*. München. 91–106.
- Propp, V. 1968. *Morphology of the folktale*. Trans. by L. Scott. Austin.
- Pucci, P. 1977. "Euripides: the Monument and the Sacrifice." *Arethusa* 10: 165–95.
- . 1980. *The violence of pity in Euripides' Medea*. Ithaca.
- . 1997. "The Helen and Euripides' 'Comic' Art." *Colby Quarterly* 33: 42–75.
- . 1998. *The song of the sirens: essays on Homer*. Ithaca.

- Raaflaub, K. A. 2000. "Zeus Eleuthereus, Dionysius the Liberator, and the Athenian Tyrannicides. Anachronistic Uses of Fifth-Century Political Concepts." In Flensted-Jensen, P. *et al.* eds. *Polis and politics: studies in ancient Greek history*. Copenhagen. 249–76.
- Rabinowitz, N. S. 1993. *Anxiety veiled: Euripides and the traffic in women*. Ithaca.
- Rau, P. 1967. *Paratragodia: Untersuchungen einer komischen Form des Aristophanes*. München.
- Redfield, J. 1982. "Notes on the Greek Wedding." *Arethusa* 15: 181–201.
- . 1990. "From Sex to Politics: The Rites of Artemis Triklaria and Dionysus Aisymnêtês at Patras." In Halperin, D., Winkler, J. J. and Zeitlin, F. eds. *Before sexuality: the construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*. Princeton. 115–134.
- Renhan, R. 1985. "Review Article: A New Commentary on Euripides." *CP* 80: 143–75.
- Renfrew, C. 1981. "The Sanctuary at Phylakopi." In Hägg R. and Marinatos, N. eds. 67–80.
- . 1985. *The archaeology of cult: the sanctuary at Phylakopi*. Oxford.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1981. *A commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford.
- Richer, N. 2012. *La religion des Spartiates*. Paris.
- Richardson, N. J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford.
- Richter, G. 1960. *Kouroi: archaic Greek youths: a study of the development of the kouros type in Greek sculpture*. London.
- Ridgway, B. S. 1977. *The archaic style in Greek sculpture*. Berkeley.
- . 1992. "Images of Athena on the Acropolis." In Neils, J. ed. 120–7.
- Rigsby, K. J. 1997. *Asyilia: territorial inviolability in the Hellenistic world*. Berkeley.
- . 2003. "Chryso gone's mother." *Museum Helveticum* 60: 60–4.
- Ringer, M. 2016. *Euripides and the boundaries of the human*. Lanham.
- Robert, L. 1965. *Hellenica 13*. Paris.
- . 1968–90. *Opera Minora Selecta: épigraphie et antiquités grecques*. Amsterdam.
- . 1977. "Documents d'Asie Mineure." *BCH* 101: 43–132.
- Robertson, M. 1984. "The South Metopes: Theseus and Daidalos." In Berger, E. ed. *Parthenon-Kongress Basel: Referate und Berichte*. Mainz. 206–8.
- Robertson, N. 1987. "Government and Society at Miletus, 525–442 BC." *Phoenix* 41: 356–98.
- . 1993. "Athens' Festival of the New Wine." *HSCP* 95: 197–250.
- . 1996. "The Ancient Mother of the Gods: A Missing Chapter in the History of Greek Religion." In Lane, E. N. ed. *Cybele, Attis and related cults*. Leiden. 239–304.
- . 1998. "The City Center of Archaic Athens." *Hesperia* 67: 283–302.
- . 2002. "The Religious Criterion in Greek Ethnicity: the Dorians and the Festival Carneia." *AJAH*: 5–74.
- . 2004. "The Praxi ergidae Decree (IG I³ 7) and the Dressing of Athena's Statue with the Peplos." *GRBS* 44: 111–61.
- Robinson, D. B. 1979. "Helen and Persephone, Sparta and Demeter: The 'Demeter ode' in Euripides' *Helen*." In Bowersock, G. W. *et al.* eds. *Arktouros: Hellenic studies presented to B. M. W. Knox on the occasion of his 65th birthday*. Berlin. 162–79.

- Rogers, L. J. 2011. *Statues in Euripides: staging, character, structure, and metaphor*. PhD. diss. U. Florida.
- Roller, L. E. 1996. "Reflections on the Mother of the Gods in Greek Tragedy." In Lane, E. ed. *Cybele, Attis and related cults*. Leiden. 305–22.
- . 1999. *In search of god the mother: the cult of Anatolian Cybele*. Berkeley.
- Romano, A. 2012. "Euripidean Explainers." In Marincola, J. et al. eds. 127–43.
- Romano, I. B. 1980. *Early Greek cult images*. Ph.D diss. Pennsylvania.
- . 2002. "The Dreros Sphyrrelata: A Re-Examination of Their Date and Function." In Mattusch C. C. ed. 2002. *From the parts to the whole: acta of the 13th international bronze congress*. Portsmouth. 40–50.
- Rouse, W. H. D. 1902. *Greek votive offerings*. New York.
- Roux, G. 1960. "Qu'est-ce qu'un κολοσσός? Le colosse de Rhodes; Les colosses mentionnés par Eschyle, Hérodote, Théocrite et par diverses inscriptions." *REA* 62: 5–40.
- Rutherford, I. 2013. *State pilgrims and sacred observers in ancient Greece: a study of theoria and theoroi*. Cambridge.
- Rutkowski, B. 1973. "Cult Images in the Aegean World." *Archaeologia Polona* 14: 53–7.
- . 1986. *Cult places in the Aegean*. New Haven.
- . 1991. *Petsophas: a Cretan peak sanctuary*. Warsaw.
- Rutledge, S. 2007. "The Roman Destruction of Sacred Sites." *Historia* 56: 179–95.
- Said, S. 1987. "Deux noms de l'image en grec ancien: idole et icône." *CRAI* 131: 309–30.
- . 2002. "Greeks and Barbarians in Euripides' Tragedies: The End of Differences?" In Harrison, T. ed. *Greeks and barbarians*. Edinburgh. 62–100.
- Sale, W. 1975. "The Temple-Legends of the Arkteia." *RhM* 16: 265–84.
- Sanders, G. D. R. 2009. "Platanistas, the Course and Carneus: Their Places in the Topography of Sparta." In Cavanagh, W. G., Gallou, C., and Georgiadis, M. eds. *Sparta and Laconia from prehistory to pre-modern*. London. 195–203.
- Sanders, J. 1992. "The Early Lakonian Dioskouroi Reliefs." In Catling, H. W. and Sanders, J. M. eds. 205–10.
- Sansone, D. 1975. "The Sacrifice-Motif in Euripides' *IT*." *TAPA* 105: 283–95.
- . 1981. *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris*. Leipzig.
- . 1985. "Theonoe and Theoclymenus." *Symbolae Osloenses* 60: 17.
- Saunders, T. 1990. "Plato and the Athenian law of Theft." In Cartledge, P. et al. eds. *Nomos: essays in Athenian law, politics, and society*. Cambridge. 63–82.
- Seaford, R. 1981. "Dionysiac Drama and the Dionysiac Mysteries." *CQ* 31: 252–75.
- . 1989. "Homeric and Tragic Sacrifice." *TAPA* 119: 87–95.
- . 1994. *Reciprocity and ritual: Homer and tragedy in the developing city-state*. Oxford.
- . 2000. "The Social Function of Attic Tragedy: A Response to Jasper Griffin." *CQ* 50: 30–44.
- . 2009. "Aitiologies of Cult in Euripides: A Response to Scott Scullion." In Cousland, J. R. C. and Hume, J. eds. 221–34.
- Segal, C. 1971. "The Two Worlds of Euripides' *Helen*." *TAPA* 102: 553–614.
- . 1986. "Greek Tragedy and Society: A Structuralist Perspective." In Euben, P. ed. *Greek tragedy and political theory*. Berkeley. 43–75.
- Schachter, A. 1981. *Cults of Boiotia*. Vol. 1. London.

- Scheafer, H. 1957. "Das Eidolon des Leonidas." In Langlotz, E. and Schauenburg, K. eds. *Charites: Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft*. Bonn. 223–3.
- Scheer, T. S. 2000. *Die Gottheit und ihr Bild*. Munich.
- Schmiel, R. 1972a. "Telemachus in Sparta." *TAPA* 103: 463–72.
- . 1972b "The Recognition Duo in Euripides' *Helen*." *Hermes* 100: 274–94.
- Schwab, K. A. 2002. "The Palladion and its Multiple Functions in the Parthenon North Metopes." In Clark, A. J. et al. eds. *Essays in honor of Dietrich von Bothmer*. Amsterdam. 293–6.
- . 2005. "Celebrations of Victory: The Metopes of the Parthenon." In Neils ed. 159–99.
- Scodel, R. 1996. "Δόμων ἄγαλμα: Virgin Sacrifice and Aesthetic Object." *TAPA* 126: 111–28.
- . 2002. *Listening to Homer: tradition, narrative, and audience*. Ann Arbor.
- Scullion, S. 2000. "Tradition and Invention in Euripidean Aitiology." *Illinois Classical Studies* 24: 217–34.
- . 2005. "Tragedy and Religion: The Problem of Origins." In Gregory, J. ed. *A companion to Greek tragedy*. London. 23–38.
- Sfyrsoeras, P. 1993. "Fireless Sacrifices: Pindar's *Olympian* 7 and the Panathenaic Festival." *AJP*: 1–26.
- Shapiro, H. A. 1983. "Hērōs Theos': The Death and Apotheosis of Herakles." *CW*: 7–18.
- . 1989. *Art and cult under the tyrants in Athens*. Mainz.
- Shaw, M. C. 2004. "The 'Priest-King' Fresco from Knossos: Man, Woman, Priest, King, or Someone Else?" In Chapin, A.P. ed. *XAPIΣ: Essays in honor of Sara A. Immerwahr*. Princeton. 66–84.
- Shear, I. M. 1999. "The Western Approach to the Athenian Acropolis." *JHS* 119: 86–127.
- Sider, D. 1989. "The Blinding of Stesichorus." *Hermes* 117: 423–31.
- Silk, M. ed. 1996. *Tragedy and the tragic*. Oxford.
- Skutsch, O. 1987. "Helen, Her Name and Nature." *JHS* 107: 188–193.
- Slawisch, A. and Wilkinson, T. 2018. "Processions, Propaganda, and Pixels: Reconstructing the Sacred Way Between Miletos and Didyma." *AJA* 122: 101–43.
- Snodgrass, A. M. 1980. *Archaic Greece: the age of experiment*. Berkeley.
- . 1989. "The Economics of Dedication at Greek Sanctuaries." In Bartoloni G. et al. eds. *Anathema: regime delle offerte e vita dei santuari nel Mediterraneo antico*. Rome. 15–18.
- Snell, B. ed. 1955. *Lexikon des Frühgriechischen Epos*. 4 Vol. Göttingen (*Lfgre*).
- Solmsen, F. 1934. "Onoma and Pragma in Euripides' *Helen*." *CR* 48: 119–121.
- Sommerstein, A. H. 2010. *The tangled ways of Zeus: and other studies in and around Greek tragedy*. Oxford.
- Sosin, J. D. 2009. "Magnesian Inviolability." *TAPA* 139: 369–410.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1988. *Studies in Girls' transitions: aspects of the Arkteia and age representation in Attic iconography*. New York.
- . 1991. *Reading Greek culture: texts and images, rituals and myths*. Oxford.
- . 1994. "Something to Do with Athens: Tragedy and Ritual." In Lewis, D. M. et al. eds. *Ritual, finance, politics: Athenian democratic accounts presented to David Lewis*. Oxford. 270–91.

- . 1997. “Tragedy and Religion: Constructs and Readings.” in Pelling C., ed. 161–86.
- . 2003a. *Tragedy and Athenian religion*. New York.
- . 2003b. “Herodotus (and others) on Pelasgians: Some Perceptions of Ethnicity.” In Derow, P. and Parker, R. eds. *Herodotus and his world: essays from a conference in memory of George Forrest*. Oxford. 103–44.
- . 2004. “Reading a Myth, Reconstructing its Constructions.” In Bouvrie, S. des ed. *Myth and symbol II: symbolic phenomena in ancient Greek culture*. Bergen. 141–79.
- . 2005. *Hylas, the Nymphs, Dionysus, and others: myth, ritual, ethnicity*. Stockholm.
- . 2011. *Athenian myths and festivals: Aglauros, Erechtheus, Plynteria, Panathenaia, Dionysia*. Oxford.
- Stavrianopoulou, E. 2011. “Promises of Continuity: The Role of Tradition in the Forming of Rituals in Ancient Greece.” In Chaniotis, A. ed. 85–103.
- de Ste. Croix, G.E.M. 1961. “Notes on Jurisdiction in the Athenian Empire. II.” *CQ* 11: 268–80.
- Stafford, E. 2010. “Herakles between Gods and Heroes.” In Bremmer, J. and Erskine, A. eds. 228–44.
- Steiner, D. T. 2002. *Images in mind: statues in archaic and classical Greek literature and thought*. Princeton.
- . 2011. “Dancing with the Stars : Choreia in the Third Stasimon of Euripides’ *Helen*.” *CP* 106: 299–323.
- Stewart, A. 1998. “Nuggets: Mining the Texts Again.” *AJA* 102: 271–82.
- Stieber, M. 1994. “Aeschylus’ *Theoroi* and Realism in Greek Art.” *TAPA* 124: 85–119.
- . 1999. “A Note on Aesch. *Ag.* 410–28 and Eur. *Alc.* 347–56.” *Mnemosyne* 52: 150–8.
- . 2011. *Euripides and the language of craft*. Leiden.
- Stinton, T. C. W. 1976. “Iphigenia and the Bears of Brauron.” *CQ* 26: 11–13.
- Strachan, J. C. G. 1976. “Iphigenia and Human Sacrifice in Euripides’ *Iphigenia Taurica*.” *CP* 71: 131–40.
- Sutton, D. F. 1972. “Satyric Qualities in Euripides’ *Iphigenia at Tauris* and *Helen*.” *RSC* 20: 321–30.
- Swift, L. A. 2009a. “How to Make a Goddess Angry: Making Sense of the Demeter Ode in Euripides’ *Helen*.” *CP* 104: 418–38.
- . 2009b. “Sexual and Familial Distortion in Euripides’ *Phoenissae*.” *TAPA* 139: 53–87.
- . 2010. *The hidden chorus: echoes of genre in tragic lyric*. Oxford.
- . 2015. “Stesichorus on Stage.” In Fingalss, P. and Kelly, A. eds. 125–144.
- Taplin, O. 1977. *The stagecraft of Aeschylus: the dramatic use of exits and entrances in Greek tragedy*. Oxford.
- Thalmann, W. G. 1998. *The swineherd and the bow: representations of class in the Odyssey*. Ithaca.
- Themelis, P. 2002. “Contribution to the Topography of the Sanctuary at Brauron.” In Gentili, B. and Perusino, D. eds. 103–16.
- Thompson, H. A. and Wycherley, R. E. 1972. *The agora of Athens: the history, shape, and uses of an ancient city center*. Princeton.

- Tomlinson, R. A. 1969. "Two Buildings in Sanctuaries of Asklepios." *JHS*: 106–117.
- . 1976. *Greek sanctuaries*. New York.
- . 1992. "Menelaion and Spartan Architecture." In Catling, H. W. and Sanders, J. M. eds. 247–55.
- Torrance, I. 2009. "On Your Head Be It Sworn: Oath and Virtue in Euripides' *Helen*." *CQ* 59: 1–7.
- . 2011. "In the Footprints of Aeschylus: Recognition, Allusion, and Metapoetics in Euripides." *AJP* 132: 177–204.
- Travlos, J. 1974. "The Lawcourt ΕΠΙ ΠΑΛΛΑΔΙΩΝ." *Hesperia* 43: 500–11.
- Tsantsanoglou, K. 2012. *Of golden manes and silvery faces: the Partheneion 1 of Alcman*. Berlin.
- Turner, J. A. 1983. *Hiereiai: acquisition of feminine priesthoods in ancient Greece*, Ph.D diss. UCSB.
- Tzanetou, A. 2000. "Almost Dying, Dying Twice: Ritual and Audience in Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris." *Illinois Classical Studies* 24: 199–216.
- . 2002. "Something to Do with Demeter: Ritual and Performance in Aristophanes' *Women at the Thesmophoria*." *AJP* 123: 329–67.
- Vallois, R. 1922. "L'agalma des Dionysies de Délos." *BCH* 46: 94–112.
- van Gennep, A. 1909. *Les rites de passage: étude systématique des rites de la porte et du seuil, de l'hospitalité, de l'adoption, de la grossesse et de l'accouchement, de la naissance, de l'enfance, de la puberté, de l'initiation, de l'ordination, du couronnement des fiançailles et du mariage, des funérailles, des saisons, etc.* Paris.
- van Leuven, J. C. 1981. "Problems and Methods of Prehellenic Naology." In Hägg R. and Marinatos, N. eds. *Sanctuaries and cults in the Aegean Bronze Age*. 11–26.
- van Straten, F. T. 1981. "Gifts for the Gods." In Versnel, H. S. ed. 65–102.
- . 2000. "Votives and Votaries in Greek Sanctuaries." In Buxton, R. ed. 191–226.
- Vernant, J. P. 1981. "The Myth of Prometheus in Hesiod." In Gordon, R. L. ed. 43–56.
- . 1990. "Figuration et Image." *Mètis* 5: 225–38.
- . 1991. *Mortals and immortals: collected essays*. Princeton.
- Verrall, A. W. 1905. *Essays on four plays of Euripides: Andromache; Helen; Heracles; Orestes*. Cambridge.
- . 1913. *Euripides the rationalist: a study in the history of art and religion*. Cambridge.
- Versnel, H. S. ed. 1981. *Faith, hope and worship: aspects of religious mentality in the ancient world*. Leiden.
- . 2011. *Coping with the gods: wayward readings in Greek theology*. Leiden
- . 2014. "What's Sauce for the Goose Is Sauce for the Gander: Myth and Ritual, Old and New." In Edmunds, L. ed. *Approaches to Greek myth*. Baltimore. 84–151.
- Vickers, M. 1989. "Alcibiades on Stage: *Thesmophoriazousae* and *Helen*." *Historia* 38: 41–65.
- Vidal-Naquet, P. 1998. *The black hunter: forms of thought and forms of society in the Greek world*. Trans. by Szegedy-Maszak. Baltimore.
- Viscardi, G. P. 2010. "Artemide Munichia: aspetti e funzioni mitico-rituali della dea del Pireo." *DHA* 2.31–60.

- . 2015. *Munichia: la dea, il mare, la polis: configurazioni di uno spazio artemideo*. Ariccia.
- von den Hoff, R. 2008. "Images and Prestige of Cult Personnel in Athens between the Sixth and First Centuries BC." In Digne, B. and Trampedach, K. eds. 107–44.
- von Reden, S. 1995. "The Piraeus – A World Apart." *G&R* 42: 24–37.
- Walbank, M. B. 1981. "Artemis Bear–Leader." *CQ* 31: 276–81.
- Walker, C. and Dick, M. B. 1999. "The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Mesopotamian *mīs pī* Ritual." In Dick, M. ed. 55–122.
- Warford, E. 2015. *The multipolar polis: a study of processions in classical Athens and the Attic countryside*. Ph.D diss. SUNY Buffalo.
- Warren, P. 1986. *Myrtos: an Early Bronze Age settlement in Crete*. London.
- Waugh, N. 2009. "Visualizing Fertility at Artemis Orthia's Site." *BSA* 16: 159–67.
- Weilhartner, J. 2013. "Textual Evidence for Aegean Late Bronze Age Ritual Processions." *Opuscula* 6: 151–173.
- Wescoat, B. D. and Ousterhout, R. eds. 2014. *Architecture of the sacred: space, ritual, and experience from classical Greece to Byzantium*. Cambridge.
- West, M. L. 2001. "The Fragmentary Homeric Hymn to Dionysus." *ZPE*: 1–11.
- . 2003. *Homeric hymns, Homeric apocrypha, lives of Homer*. Boston.
- . 2007. *Indo–European poetry and myth*. Oxford.
- . 2011. *Hellenica: selected papers on Greek literature and thought*. Vol 1. Oxford.
- . 2013. *The Epic Cycle: a commentary on the lost Troy epics*. Oxford.
- West, S. 1982. "Proteus in Stesichorus' *Palinode*." *ZPE* 47: 6–10.
- . 2003. "The Most Marvellous of All Seas: The Greek Encounter with the Euxine." *Greece & Rome* 50: 151–67.
- Whitehouse, R. D. 1996. "Ritual Objects: Archaeological Joke or Neglected Evidence?" In Wilkins, J. ed. *Approaches to the study of ritual: Italy and the ancient Mediterranean*. London. 9–30.
- Whitman, C. H. 1974. *Euripides and the full circle of myth*. Boston.
- Whittaker, H. 1997. *Mycenaean cult buildings: a study of their architecture and function in the context of the Aegean and the eastern Mediterranean*. Athens.
- Wickkiser, B. 2008. *Asklepios, medicine, and the politics of healing in fifth-century Greece: between craft and cult*. Baltimore.
- Wide, S. 1893. *Lakonische kulte*. Berlin.
- Wildberg, C. 2000. "Piety as Service, Epiphany as Reciprocity: Two Observations on the Religious Meaning of the Gods in Euripides." *Illinois Classical Studies* 24: 235–56.
- Willink, C. W. 1989. "The Reunion Duo in Euripides' *Helen*." *The CQ* 39: 45–69.
- . 1990. "The Parodos of Euripides' *Helen* (164–90)." *CQ* 40: 77–99.
- Wilson, P. 2000. *The Athenian institution of the khoregia: the chorus, the city, and the stage*. Cambridge.
- Wilson, P. and Hartwig, A. 2009. "IG I³ 102 and the Tradition of Proclaiming Honours at the Tragic Agon of the Athenian City Dionysia." *ZPE* 169: 17–27.
- Wohl, V. 1998. *Intimate commerce: exchange, gender and subjectivity in Greek tragedy*. Austin.
- . 2015. *Euripides and the politics of form*. Princeton.
- Wolff, C. 1973. "On Euripides' *Helen*." *HSCP* 77: 61–84.

- . 1992. “Euripides’ Iphigenia among the Taurians: Aetiology, Ritual, and Myth.” *CA* 111: 308–34.
- Woodbury, L. 1967. “Helen and the Palinode.” *Phoenix* 21: 157–76.
- Worman, N. 1997. “The Body as Argument: Helen in Four Greek Texts.” *CA* 16: 151–203.
- Wright, J. C. 1994. “The Mycenaean Entrance System at the West End of the Acropolis of Athens.” *Hesperia* 63: 323–60.
- . 1996. “The Spatial Configuration of Belief: The Archaeology of Mycenaean Religion.” In Alcock, S. E. and Osborne, R. eds. 37–78.
- Wright, M. E. 2005. *Euripides’ escape-tragedies: a study of Helen, Andromeda, and Iphigenia among the Taurians*. Oxford.
- Wycherley, R. E. 1957 *Literary and epigraphical testimonia*. Princeton.
- Zaccarini, M. 2015. “The Return of Theseus to Athens: A Case Study in Layered Tradition and Reception.” *Histos* 9: 174–98.
- Zeitlin, F. I. 1965. “The Motif of the Corrupted Sacrifice in Aeschylus’ *Oresteia*.” *TAPA* 96: 463–508.
- . 1970. “The Argive Festival of Hera and Euripides’ *Electra*.” *TAPA* 101: 645–69.
- . 1978. “The Dynamics of Misogyny: Myth and Mythmaking in the *Oresteia*.” *Arethusa* 11: 159–94.
- . 1981. “Travesties of Gender and Genre in Aristophanes’ *Thesmophoriazousae*.” *CI* 2: 301–27.
- . 1994. “The Artful Eye: Vision, Ecphrasis, and Spectacle in Euripidean Theater.” In Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. eds. *Art and text in ancient Greek culture*. Oxford. 138–96.
- . 1996. *Playing the other: gender and society in classical Greek literature*. Chicago.
- . 2005. “Redeeming Matricide?: Euripides Rereads the *Oresteia*.” In Pedrick, V. and Oberhelman, S. eds. *The soul of tragedy: essays on Athenian drama*. Chicago. 199–225.
- . 2010. “The Lady Vanishes: Helen and Her Phantom in Euripidean Drama.” In Mitsis, P. and Tsagalis C. eds. *Allusion, authority, and truth: critical perspectives on Greek poetic and rhetorical praxis*. Leiden. 263–82.
- . 2011. “Sacrifices Holy and Unholy in Euripides’ *Iphigenia in Tauris*.” In Prescendi, F. and Volokhine, Y. eds. *Dans le laboratoire de l'historien des religions: mélanges offerts à Philippe Borgeaud*. Geneva. 449–66.
- Zuntz, G. 1960. “On Euripides’ Helena: Theology and Irony.” In Reverdin, O. ed. *Euripide. Fondation Hardt VI*. Geneva. 199–242.
- . 1963. *The political plays of Euripides*. Manchester.
- Zweig, B. 1999. “Euripides’ *Helen* and Female Rites of Passage.” In Padilla, M. ed. 158–82.