

JAN-MATHIEU CARBON

Notes on Two Inscriptions from Chios¹

The important work undertaken by the team of the *Inscriptiones Graecae* towards new editions of the inscriptions of Chios (*IG* XII, 6.3) has already produced numerous useful outcomes in the form of revisions and preliminary publications of the material; its final results remain eagerly anticipated.² As a small contribution to this ongoing effort, I propose the following short notes on two inscriptions from Chios concerned with ritual norms.

1. Contract for an Unknown Priestess

(Haussoullier 1890: 210 no. 2; Ziehen, *LGS* II 114; Sokolowski, *LSCG* 120; Graf, I.Ch. 7).

The hitherto uncertain length of the stoichedon writing presented in this inscription may be clarified, though it remains difficult to ascertain in absolute terms. Haussoullier's edition, seemingly based on a drawing, presents only a majuscule copy of the inscription and erroneously reports it as "complète à gauche seulement". Sokolowski working with a copy and a photograph by W.G. Forrest, offers a copiously restored text, apparently with stoichedon 27, though he does not provide an account of this. Graf's autoptical revision of the stone presents a generally more careful, but also substantially different layout of the lines from Sokolowski; no precise length of the stoichedon is given.

One key to the puzzle of the length of the lines is noting how the portions offered to members of the priestly personnel on Chios were remarkably uniform, though of course we have interesting variations here and there. In lines 2-3 in Graf's text, we find the common expression [. . . τὰ ἐξ χεῖρ]ας καὶ τὰ ἐξ γόυ|[ατα], as restored by Sokolowski. The missing substantive here can only be σπλάγχνα, without the article, as Sokolowski also restored in fact. Abundant evidence from Chios attests to this phrasing, namely to the placement of the entrails from the sacrificial animal on the knees and/or in the

1. Sincere thanks are extended to Drs. A.P. Matthaïou and G.E. Malouchou for their very helpful comments on these notes, as well as for kindly sharing drawings of both inscriptions with me. The inscriptions are located in the Museum of Chios (inv. nos. MX 59 and 3569, respectively; the drawing of the latter is thanks to G.E. Malouchou). The following abbreviated references are used here:

Haussoullier 1890 = B. Haussoullier, "Bulletin épigraphique", *REG* 3 (1890) 205-213.

I.Ch. = F. Graf, *Nordionische Kulte*, Rome 1985: App. "Inscripfen von Chios".

LGS II = L. Ziehen, *Leges graecorum sacrae e titulis collectae*, vol. 2, Leipzig 1906.

LSS = F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques, Supplément*, Paris 1962.

LSCG = F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*, Paris 1969.

Koumanoudis and Matthaïou 1985 = S.N. Koumanoudis and A.P. Matthaïou, "Δύο ἱεροὶ νόμοι Χίου", *HOPOS* 3 (1985) 105-111.

Matthaïou 2006 = A.P. Matthaïou, "Τρεῖς ἐπιγραφεὶς Χίου", in: Georgia E. Malouchou and A.P. Matthaïou eds., *Χιακὸν συμπόσιον εἰς μνήμην W.G. Forrest*, Athens 2006: 103-116.

NGSL = E. Lupu, *Greek Sacred Law, A Collection of New Documents*, Rev. Ed., Leiden/Boston 2009 [2005].

2. See notably many of the essays in the volume *Χιακὸν συμπόσιον εἰς μνήμην W.G. Forrest*, 2006, cited n. above.

hands of the divine statue of various gods during the ritual; these portions would later be taken by the priestess or priest as their prerogative.³

Following Sokolowski rather than Graf, we thus have a firm idea of what is probably the first set of portions listed as prerogatives for the priestess in lines 1-2. Yet matters are actually more complicated than they might seem from the editions currently available. A pair of drawings made by A.P. Matthaiou in 2007 show that the stone, broken to left and at the bottom, has an intact edge at the top, where the first line of the inscription is clearly preserved, as well as another, smaller intact edge on the right, only at lines 8-9 (an intact edge at the top and in line 9 was also observed by Graf). More specifically, in line 8, one letterspace is missing after ῥῆμισ[.]; in line 9, EKTOMO was read by earlier editors, but now only EKTOM[.] is apparently visible. Tracing back the *stoichoi* from lines 8-9 to lines 1-2 on the drawing, we therefore find that there are three letters missing after the letters ΓΟ in line 2, thus γό[νατ|α] should be restored, filling the line as well as one letterspace at the beginning of line 3; in line 1, there are five letterspaces missing after the traces ΓΙΝΕ: we might thus restore this simply as γίνε[σθαι .], leaving one *stoichos* to be filled at the end of the line. Another complication, however, is the fact that the cutter inconsistently inscribed the letter *iota* in between the *stoichoi*—i.e. ‘squeezed’ in between the preceding and following letters respectively; occasionally, however, *iota* took up its own *stoichos*. In fact, this ‘squeezing’ happened in all 3 cases where an *iota* is visible in line 1. Therefore, in line 1, we cannot be sure that only one letterspace was left after γίνε[σθαι .], since the *iota* at the end of the verb may have been inscribed in this manner, namely in between the *stoichoi*. Additionally, this uncertainty also applies the proposed restoration [χεῖρ]ας in line 2.

In short, though the restoration of a first portion in the list introduced in lines 1-2 is virtually assured, the minimum length of the stoichedon thus obtained must remain an estimate. Either the text originally read γίνε[σθαι σ|πλάγχχνα κτλ.] or γίνε[σθαι σπ|λάγχχνα κτλ.], the latter with both *iotas* in γίνε[σθαι] inscribed or ‘squeezed’ between the *stoichoi*. Accordingly, the beginning of line 2 should either be restored as [πλάγχχνα τὰ ἐς χεῖρ]ας or [λάγχχνα τὰ ἐς χεῖρ]ας, and it is also impossible for us to tell whether or not the *iota* in [χεῖρ]ας was inscribed between the *stoichoi*.⁴ In other words, this means that the stoichedon was of a minimum of 25 *stoichoi* (in a scenario where all the *iotas* discernible or restored in lines 1-2 were inscribed or ‘squeezed’ between the *stoichoi*), and a maximum of 27 (in a scenario where neither of the restored *iotas* was inscribed in this fashion, but where each took up its own letterspace).

Despite this remaining uncertainty, it is nevertheless possible to offer a better layout of the inscription than the ones available in previous editions. Here, the extent of the lacunae to the left and right is given as a series of approximations representing the number of *stoichoi* or letterspaces thought

3. Cf. Graf, I.Ch. 6 / LSS 77, lines 6-7: σπλάγχχνα τὰ ἐς [χ]εῖρας καὶ | γούνατα; I.Ch. 5 / LSCG 119, lines 3-4 and 7-8: σπλάγχχνα τὰ εἰς χεῖρας; LSS 78, lines 5-7: σπ|λάγχχνα τὰ ἐς γόν|ατα; I.Ch. 4 / LSS 129, lines 4-5: σπλάγχχνα | [ἐ]ς γόνατα; Matthaiou 2006: no. 1, line 10: [σπ]λάγχχνα [τ]ὰ εἰς χεῖρα[ς]; cf. also LSS 76, lines 3-4: [σπλάγ|χν]α τὰ ἐς γ[όν]ατα (καὶ χεῖρας?). A similar phrase is no doubt to be restored in LSS 130, line 4. The expression is muddled by Graf 1985, who usually adds an unnecessary comma after σπλάγχχνα; but see esp. his p. 40-41 for discussions of scholarly interpretations on the subject. The one favoured here (and also by Graf) was first proposed by F. Puttkammer, *Quomodo graeci victimarum carnes distribuerint*, diss. Königsberg 1912: 21-22, citing notably Ar. *Eccl.* 779.

4. An option between ἐς and εἰς might even be possible in the restoration of line 2, though the latter is unlikely given the marked use of the Ionic dialect in the text: cp. esp. τὰ ἐς γόυ|[ατ|α] in the same line.

to be missing (again, one must also remember that, where present, *iota* may or not have been inscribed outside of the bounds of the stoichedon grid). Additionally, in the text presented below, a choice has been made to treat the length of line 2 as stoichedon 26, though this is of course only one possibility.

Stoichedon min. 25 — max. 27.

NB ι indicates an *iota* inscribed or ‘squeezed’ between the *stoichoi*. Letters read by one of the previous editors, but apparently no longer visible on the stone according to the drawing of A.P. Matthaiou, are underlined>.

[τῆι(?)8-10. . . .]ης ἱερέαι γίνεσ[θ]α[ι σπλ]-
 [άγχνα τὰ ἐς χεῖρ]ας καὶ τὰ ἐς γόν[ατ]-
 [α, . . .5-7. . . , γλῶσ]σα, θύα ἀπ’ ὦν ἄν [θύη],
 [.11-13.] καὶ γέρας δεξιῶ[ς .]
 5 [.11-13.]N ποιῆι ἐμ μοίρη[ι .1-2.]
 [.11-13.]ομα δεξιὰ, κεφαλ[.]
 [.12-14.], τρεῖς πλεοράς, ὦμ-
 [.11-13. κα]ῖ ἀλφίτων ἡμυσ[υ]-
 [κτέως7-9. . . . θυ]όντων εκτομο-
 10 [.14-16.] λαχέτω καὶ T[. .]
 [.14-16.]οση ἀτελε[. . .]
 [.13-15.]N γενεσ[. .5. . .]
 [.15-17.]NENT[. . .6. . .]
 ----- min. v. I evanuerat -----

2 γόν[ατα] Graf: γο[ύνατα] Sokolowski. || **3** [γλῶσ]σα Carbon: [δίκρεων μερί]δα Forrest ap. S., [μερί]δα G. || **6** ΟΟΜΑ dr., sc. -θομα?: [ἐκτ]ομα Haussoullier, [ἡμί]τομα δεξιὰ κεφαλῶν Ziehen. || **7** Ω/ Η.: ὦ[μ]οπλάτην S., ὦ[μ]ον G. || **8** ἡμυσ[υ]κτέως C., cf. Koumanoudis and Matthaiou 1985, line A3, and their sugg. rest. in *LSS* 76, line 8: ἡμυσ[υ] S., G. || **9** [θυ]όντων ἔκτομο[ν] Z., ἔκτομό[ριον] S.

In conclusion, I offer here a few further comments on specific lines; for a more detailed commentary on this inscription, see the forthcoming *CGRN* 88 (*Collection of Greek Ritual Norms*, website of the University of Liège).

Line 3: Forrest here made the very attractive proposal of restoring [δίκρεων μερί]δα, a “double portion of meat”, another priestly perquisite which is amply corroborated on Chios, albeit less formulaically so.⁵ However, the drawing appears to show a small trace of a diagonal hasta in the lower register which does not seem to belong to delta (an angular trace would have been expected), but which might belong to lambda or sigma. I therefore suggest that this may be the ending of the word

5. See esp. Graf, *I.Ch.* 5 / *LSCG* 119, lines 4-5 and 8-9: μερίδα δίκρεων; and *I.Ch.* 6 / *LSS* 77, lines 7-8: καὶ κρεῶν δύο μοίρας δ[ί]κρεως. Double portions represent a norm for priests on Chios: cf. *LSS* 76, line 7: [μ]οίρας δύο; *I.Ch.* 4 / *LSS* 129, line 6: μοίρας δύο; and *LSS* 130, line 2: [μ]οίρας δύο.

[γλῶσ]σα (or, alternatively, Ionic [γλάσ]σα), a restoration which also leaves a suitable 5-7 letters available for another portion to be restored in the lacuna. Tongues are extremely commonly found as priestly portions on Chios (cf. Lupu, *NGSL*, p. 310). It might be objected that the infinitive γίνεσθαι precludes a nominative in the list here, but some ritual norms from Chios in fact show that infinitives (including this verb) could on occasion be followed by nominatives, cf. e.g. *LSS* 78, lines 5-8: γίνεσθαι σπλ|άγχνα ... καὶ γλάσσαι | καὶ γέρας. The only secure accusative form in the inscription is πλεοράς in line 7, but this seems to appear in a separate section beginning in line 5 (sc. [ὄτα]ν ποιῆι ἐμ μοίρη[ι], “when the sacrifice is performed in part(?)...”).

Line 9: As with the traces that remain difficult at the beginning of line 6, the interpretation of this phrase is still problematic. Neither Ziehen’s proposal ἔκτομον (a plant or stone, so *LSJ*⁹ s.v.), nor Sokolowski’s sixth part or measure (unattested, but plausibly from ἐκτημόριον/ἐκτήμορος), are really suitable as the object of the verb θύω. Instead, an expected substantive would probably be ὁ ἔκτομίας, a castrated animal: cf. *LSJ* s.v. citing Arist. 897b27 and Antiph. fr. 133 [K-A]; cp. also the τομίας now attested epigraphically in R. Parker, “A Funerary Foundation from Hellenistic Lycia”, *Chiron* 40 (2010) 103-121, col. B, line 18. While tempting, however, a restoration such as [ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν θυ]όντων ἔκτομ<ι>ῶ[ν] would no doubt represent an excessive correction of the reading on the stone. A good solution thus remains elusive.

2. Contract for the Priestess of Eilethya

(Koumanoudis and Matthaïou 1985; *SEG* 35, 923; Lupu, *NGSL* 20A-B).⁶

Revisiting this inscription in the Museum of Chios in the summer of 2015, where it is on display, it seemed that several small improvements to the readings could be made to both decrees (A and B; specifically, proposals of the Boule) inscribed on the stone. In line A8, Koumanoudis and Matthaïou restored [καὶ] τὰδε ἀναλ[ί]σκεσθαι, separating this clause from the preceding list of portions to be placed in the λ[ί]κνον in the case of a private sacrifice (lines A4-7). But τὰδε is usually prospective rather than retrospective, and so it is unclear what it might point to, since no further portions are listed after this part of the inscription.⁷ At the beginning of line A8, I thought I could read fairly good traces of ΤΛΥΤΛΔΕ, and this would agree with a proposal I made earlier for the beginning of a new clause here, after a high stop in line A7.⁸ Thus, one may propose to read τὰδε ἀναλ[ί]σκεσθαι in line A8, i.e. the aforementioned perquisites—including an equitable portion of meat, a traditional perquisite (γέρας), and a tongue, all placed in the basket (liknon)—are to be consumed on the spot by the priestess in the company of the women who perform the rituals, who presumably also received meat or other

6. The inscription is also to be included as *CGRN* 38 (*Collection of Greek Ritual Norms*, website of the University of Liège).

7. As A.P. Matthaïou rightly points out to me, occasionally (but more rarely) τὰδε may also stand for “the aforementioned” or perhaps “the things at hand”, cf. e.g. the end of the Koan decree *IG* XII.4 27, lines 11-13: [καὶ τ]ὰδε ἀναγ[ράψ]αι εἰς στάλαν [κ]αὶ [θ]έμ[εν | ἐ]ν τ[ῶ]ν ἱερῶν τῶν Δώδεκα Θε[ῶν].

8. However, the drawing of the stone by G.E. Malouchou reads the traces only as . . . ΙΛΔΕ.

portions for a meal.⁹ The remainder of the meat will implicitly have gone to those individuals offering the private sacrifices. Note that this clause will probably have had a general application and concerned all of the portions granted to the priestess, even those from civic sacrifices (the measures of barley and wheat mentioned in lines A1-4; the supplementary head granted in decree B, lines 15-19); cf. also esp. τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων in lines A10-11: the exact same privileges are to apply also during purifications of the sanctuary and during libations, both types of ritual gestures being accompanied by sacrifices.¹⁰ Indeed, in line A12, traces of all the letters for the first of the excellent restorations suggested by Koumanoudis and Matthaïou seemed to be visible on the stone, namely ΣΠΟΝΔΑΣ.¹¹ The line should therefore read: κ|αὶ σπονδὰς πο[ιέωνται (?)].

In particular, the decipherment of decree B on the stone may yet progress in interesting directions; for instance, lines B22-23, hesitatingly restored in Koumanoudis and Matthaïou, or lines B24-25, need to be carefully revised. This process would probably benefit from recent techniques of digital photography and imaging. In any case, a new edition in the forthcoming IG corpus is a desideratum.

The Saxo Institute, University of Copenhagen

Jan-Mathieu Carbon

9. See J.-M. Carbon, Review of Lupu *NGSL*, in *BMCR* 2005.04.07. Cp. also Lupu's translation in *NGSL* 20: "These shall be consumed on the spot with the women who performed the sacrifices (or: rites)".

10. For rules concerning the eating of sacrificial meat "on the spot", see Gunnel Ekroth, *The sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults in the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods*, Liège 2002: 313-325, with further discussion.

11. With the exception of the final trace of *sigma*, this is also confirmed in the drawing made by G.E. Malouchou.