ROBERT PARKER

Did Xenokrateia Found a Sanctuary (*IG* I³ 987)?

The large relief, apparently of the late fifth c., dedicated by Xenokrateia in the sanctuary of Kephisos at Echelidai near Phaleron deservedly enjoys a place of some honour in the National Archaeological Museum of Athens.[1] It shows a woman, no doubt Xenokrateia, whose small son is reaching out to a figure who should be Kephisos, amid ten other gods. The son is evidently being committed to divine care.[2] The view has often been held, and has lately become increasingly popular, that Xenokrateia not only dedicated this offering but actually claimed to have founded the sanctuary in which it was placed. Xenokrateia would then be a remarkable example of a woman who had both the will and, crucially, the financial freedom, to innovate in religion in this way.[3] This view, which, with regret, I wish to contest, is based on a questionable interpretation of the inscription that accompanies the relief. I give here the text as presented in *IG* I³ 987.

> Ξενοκράτεια Κηφισõ ἱερ-
> ὸν ἱδρύσατο καὶ ἀνέθηκεν
> ξυμβώμοις τε θεοῖς διδασκαλ-
> ίας τόδε δῶρον, Ξενιάδο θυγάτ-
> ηρ καὶ μήτηρ ἐκ Χολλειδῶν
> θύεν τῶι βουλομένωι ἐπὶ
> τελεστῶν ἀγαθῶν.

The sacrificial rule of the last two lines was added later, according to the editors of *IG* I³. It implies that the relief was accompanied by an altar, as does, from the same sanctuary, *IG* I³ 986, Κηφισόδοτος Δεμογένος Βουτάδης ἱδρύσατο καὶ τὸν βωμόν: this too was inscribed on a relief and gives Kephisodotos credit both for that and for the neighbouring altar.[4]

My concern here is with the two imperfect hexameters that separate Xenokrateia's name from her filiation. Written as verse they become:

---

2. For the abundant bibliography see the works cited in the following note; on the precise location of the shrine, E. Voutiras, Φροντίσματα: Το ανάγλυφο της Ξενοκράτειας και το ιερό του Κηφισού στο Νέο Φάληρο, in A. Delivorrias et al. (eds.), Ἔπαινος *Luigi Beschi*, *Μουσείο Μπενάκη. Παράρτημα* 7, Athens 2011, 49-57; on the character of the cult, R. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, Oxford 2005, 430-432.

3. See recently A. Purvis, *Singular Dedications. Founders and Innovators of Private Cults in Classical Greece*, New York, London 2003, 15-32; A. Williams, Xenocratia and the Hieron of Cephisus, in J. Bodel, Nora Dimitrova (eds.), *Ancient Documents and their Contexts*, Leiden 2015, 67-81.

4. For comparable cases see W. H. D. Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings*, Cambridge 1902, 283, nn. 3-7.

Κηφισο͂ ἱερὸν ἱδρύσατο καὶ ἀνέθηκεν
ξυμβώμοις τε θεοῖς διδασκαλίας τόδε δῶρον

Two renderings have been offered. Version (1), proposed by Guarducci[5] and endorsed by the editors of *IG* I³, runs, when translated into English and slightly expanded: '(Xenokrateia) set up and dedicated as sacred of Cephisus, and to the gods who share the same altar, this διδασκαλίας δῶρον.' Version (2), favoured for instance by Hansen in *CEG* 2, no. 744, goes '(Xenokrateia) founded a shrine of Cephisus and [to him] and to the gods who share the same altar dedicated this διδασκαλίας δῶρον'. διδασκαλίας δῶρον is a hard and much discussed expression: 'gift in gratitude for teaching'? But that need not concern us here. What matters is whether, as in version (2), the verbs ἱδρύσατο and ἀνέθηκεν belong to different clauses, govern two different objects (the first ἱερόν, a shrine, the second διδασκαλίας τόδε δῶρον), and describe two separate actions by Xenokrateia, or whether, as in (1), there is just one clause with two verbs describing the same action. On (2) Xenokrateia both founds the shrine and dedicates the surviving relief; on (1) she merely dedicates the relief.

I submit that the little particle τε decisively favours (1). τε here can have no other function than to link ξυμβώμοις θεοῖς to Κηφισο͂; it thereby proves that we are dealing with one clause, not two. The case would have been different if the stone had read ἀνέθηκεν αὐτῷ ξυμβώμοις τε θεοῖς; in that event τε would not have linked back to Κηφισο͂ but to αὐτῷ and we would have had two clauses. This is why Hansen supplies, in square brackets, [to him] in his rendering. Hansen is aware that to suppose a syntactically crucial word to be missing is problematic; he explains the difficulty by the artlessness of the composer, shown also in the poor metrics. Poor metre is one thing:[6] it is much harder to ascribe to a native speaker the postulated insensitivity to the basic structure of the language. The need mentally to supply αὐτῷ condemns the interpretation. Without it the Greek becomes, on this interpretation, as unlike anything a native speaker could ever write as version (2) becomes in English without 'to him'.

The other view may seem also to face difficulties, but they are either unreal or less acute. The opening four words, taken by themselves, could, certainly, be translated 'Xenokrateia founded a sanctuary of Kephisos', and forms of the verb ἱδρύω are most commonly used for, indeed, founding a sanctuary or at least setting up an object, such as an altar or herm, that would actually be used in, or receive, cult.[7] But e.g. *IG* II² 3474, Παλλὰς Ἐρεχθειδᾶν ἀρχαγ[έτι, σὸ]ν κατὰ ναόν / ἅδε τοι ἱδρύθη Φιλτέρα ἱρ[οπόλ]ος is a clear case in verse where a dedication, in this case a portrait statue, is referred to. *IG* I³ 986, quoted above, is another example: ἱδρύσατο is felt appropriate for both dedications, the relief and the altar. Any readers who supposed from the first four words that Xenokrateia was claiming to have founded a sanctuary would, on reading on, have corrected the misleading first impression; they would have had the relief itself, signalled as the real focus of interest by the deictic τόδε, straight in front of them. It is admittedly confusing that Xenokrateia switched from 'sacred **of** Kephisos' to 'and **to** the gods who share his altar'. But both genitive and dative were regular

5. Margherita Guarducci, L'Offerta di Xenokrateia nel Santuario di Cefiso al Falero, in D. W. Bradeen, M. F. McGregor (eds.), *ΦΟΡΟΣ, Tribute to Benjamin Dean Meritt*, Locust Valley 1974, 57-66, at 58.
6. Gregory Hutchinson in fact suggests that the mason should have carved θεοῖσι, which would mend the metre of line 2.
7. Williams, op. cit., 72, n. 34.

in connection with ἱερός,[8] and we must allow that the two constructions have been mixed, if for no obvious reason.[9] For adjectival ἱερὸν combined with a verb of dedicating cf. e.g. *IG* I³ 755, Σπο[ῦ]δις ⋮ Λαισ[ποδίας ⋮ ʰι]έρον ἀν[έθεσαν].[10]

Who founded the sanctuary we do not know. In what sense we can speak of the 'foundation' of a humble open-air sanctuary is anyway unclear. All her inscription tells us is that Xenokrateia brought thither a magnificent thank-offering.

---

8. Maria Letizia Lazzarini, Le formule delle dediche votive nella Grecia archaica, *Memorie Lincei* s. VIII, v. 19.2, Roma 1976, 60, 254-259.

9. Angelos Matthaiou points out to me that the first editor, B. Staes, Ἀναθηματικὸν ἀνάγλυφον ἐκ Φαλήρου, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφημ.* 1909, 247, interpreted Κηφισδ as the dative Κηφισῶι, supposing the iota omitted before that of ἱερὸν and a failure to replace old Attic o with Ionic ω: for 'Vestiges of Attic Script after 403' see L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, I. *Phonology*, Berlin 1980, 49-51. But the consistent use of ω in the rest of the text works against this approach.

10. For a few more examples of this uncommon combination see Lazzarini, op. cit., 284-285, nos. 754-755, 756bis, 762.