

# From snout to tail

Exploring the Greek sacrificial animal  
from the literary, epigraphical,  
iconographical, archaeological,  
and zooarchaeological evidence

Edited by Jan-Mathieu Carbon  
& Gunnel Ekroth

## EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Prof. Henrik Gerding, Lund, Chairman  
Dr Mikael Johansson, Gothenburg, Vice-chairman  
Mrs Kristina Björkstén Jersenius, Stockholm, Treasurer  
Dr Susanne Carlsson, Stockholm, Secretary  
Prof. Gunnel Ekroth, Uppsala  
Dr Therese Emanuelsson-Paulson, Stockholm  
Dr Johan Eriksson, Uppsala  
Dr Ulf R. Hansson, Rome  
Prof. Christer Henriksen, Uppsala  
Dr Jenny Wallensten, Athens  
Mr Julian Wareing, Stockholm  
Dr Lewis Webb, Gothenburg

## EDITOR

Dr Julia Habetzeder, Stockholm

## SECRETARY'S & EDITOR'S ADDRESS

Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies  
Stockholm University  
SE-106 91 Stockholm  
secretary@ecsi.se | editor@ecsi.se

## DISTRIBUTOR

Eddy.se AB  
Box 1310  
SE-621 24 Visby

For general information, see <https://ecsi.se>  
For subscriptions, prices and delivery, see <http://ecsi.bokorder.se>

Published with the aid of grants from the Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities, Birgitta Bergquists stipendiefond and Vilhelm Ekmans Universitetsfond.

The English and French text was revised by Jan-Mathieu Carbon, Queen's University

ISSN 0586-0539

ISBN 978-91-7916-069-2

© Svenska institutet i Athen and authors

Printed by PrintBest (Viljandi, Estonia) via Italgraf Meda AB (Stockholm, Sweden) 2024

Cover and dust jacket: illustrations by Julia Habetzeder.

## ABSTRACT

Animal sacrifice fundamentally informed how the ancient Greeks defined themselves, their relation to the divine, and the structure of their society. Adopting an explicitly cross-disciplinary perspective, the present volume explores the practical execution and complex meaning of animal sacrifice within ancient Greek religion (c. 1000 BC–AD 200).

The objective is twofold. First, to clarify in detail the use and meaning of body parts of the animal within sacrificial ritual. This involves a comprehensive study of ancient Greek terminology in texts and inscriptions, representations on pottery and reliefs, and animal bones found in sanctuaries. Second, to encourage the use and integration of the full spectrum of ancient evidence in the exploration of Greek sacrificial rituals, which is a prerequisite for understanding the complex use and meaning of Greek animal sacrifice.

Twelve contributions by experts on the literary, epigraphical, iconographical, archaeological and zooarchaeological evidence for Greek animal sacrifice explore the treatment of legs, including feet and hoofs, tails, horns; heads, including tongues, brains, ears and snouts; internal organs; blood; as well as the handling of the entire body by burning it whole. Three further contributions address Hittite, Israelite and Etruscan animal sacrifice respectively, providing important contextualization for Greek ritual practices.

*Keywords:* Greek animal sacrifice, anatomy, division, butchery, body part, multi-disciplinary approaches, zooarchaeology, iconography, epigraphy, texts, cross-cultural comparisons

<https://doi.org/10.30549/actaath-4-60>

## BOOK EDITORS

Jan-Mathieu Carbon, Department of Classics, Queen's University  
501 Watson Hall, 49 Bader Lane, Kingston, ON, Canada K7L 3N6  
([jmc32@queensu.ca](mailto:jmc32@queensu.ca)) & Gunnel Ekroth, Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Uppsala University, Box 626, SE-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden ([gunnel.ekroth@antiken.uu.se](mailto:gunnel.ekroth@antiken.uu.se)).

## 8. Heads, tongues and the rest

### The *kephale* and its parts in the sacrificial practices

Pour François,  
φίλον παμφίλητον καὶ ἀλησμόνητον,  
*in memoriam*

#### Abstract

Based on literary and epigraphical evidence, this paper offers a reflection on the vocabulary which denotes the head of the sacrificial animal and its parts—especially the tongue. Terms such as *kephale*, *hemikraira* or *glossa* are taken into account, but also words such as *koryphaia*, *kephalaion* (the meaning of which is not clear), *egkephalos* (“brain”), *rynchos* (“snout”), *ota* or *ouata* (“ears”), and even *siagones* (“jawbones”). An effort is made to clarify the meaning of these terms and to understand how and to whom the relevant parts were distributed. At the same time, it is useful to verify the presence or the absence of these terms in Aristotle’s works on animals; and to examine the possible nuances of a word found both in literary and epigraphical sources (for example, the term *hemikraira*, which is found in Aristophanes and in Athenaeus, but also in the sacrificial regulations of the Phrearrhioi in Attica).\*

**Keywords:** Greek animal sacrifice, Greek literature, Greek inscriptions/epigraphy, head, half-head, tongue, brain, snout, ear, jaw, deity, priest, priestly perquisite

<https://doi.org/10.30549/actaath-4-60-08>

In order to form a preliminary idea about the use of the head and its parts in the sacrificial practices, I took as a principal source of material the three corpora of Franciszek Sokolowski (*LSAM*, *LSCG*, *LSS*) and the work of Eran Lupu on the so-called Greek “Sacred laws” (*NGSL*), as well as all the inscriptions referring to this subject, now selectively included in the very useful *Collection of Greek Ritual Norms* (*CGRN*).<sup>1</sup> In the majority of the commentaries, it is suggested that “the head or a half of it is a relatively common priestly prerogative”<sup>2</sup> sometimes accompanied by the feet (*podes*), or, more seldom, by a part of the *splanchna*, but also, in certain cases, by the skin. However, this kind of statement or listing of inscriptions referring to heads ignores the reasons for the attribution of this part of the animal. I am not sure that I will be able to treat this complicated question; nevertheless, before trying to “split” the sacrificial head into the different parts mentioned in the religious regulations, let us make some remarks gleaned particularly from literary evidence.<sup>3</sup>

It is true that, in these epigraphic corpora and in relation of our subject, the greater number of references concern the term “head” (*kephale*), closely followed by the “tongue” (*glossa*). However, a cursory glance at *The Deipnosophists* of Athenaeus shows that the word itself, *kephale*, is rarely mentioned for

\* I would like to express ένα μεγάλο εύχαριστώ to Gunnell Ekroth and Jan-Mathieu Carbon, my two precious friends and colleagues, for this marvelous and instructive Conference they had organized. I am deeply indebted to them for having improved my text, in different manners, thus making it more clear and comprehensive.

<sup>1</sup> On the conventional denomination “sacred laws”, which is not only inadequate but also erroneous, cf. Parker 2004; Georgoudi 2010; 2016, 209–211.

<sup>2</sup> See *infra*, with note 27.

<sup>3</sup> On the division, in general, of the sacrificial animal, cf. Ekroth 2008.

domestic animals, as if the “head” was not considered a usual type of food. A fragment of Aristophanes’ *Storks* (*Pelargoi*) refers, of course, to “heads of lamb and hams of kid (κεφαλὰς τ’ ἄρνων κωλᾶς τ’ ἐρίφων),”<sup>4</sup> but the context is missing. According to an etymology of the word *kephale*, the head is “very dry” and “bony”, despite the “brain” within it, the *egkephalos*, which was considered a white, soft, hot and fluid substance.<sup>5</sup> In this respect, we could cite the strange expression “the bones of the head” (τὰ ὀστᾶ τῆς κεφαλῆς), referring to pigs, in the *agoranomos* inscription from the Piraeus, to which we will return. As Georges Steinhauer, the editor of the inscription, thinks, we must recognize in this expression the “ears and the jawbones” (τὰ ὠτία καὶ αἱ σιαγόνες); I would add also the snouts (ρύγχοι), sometimes mentioned with the ears (Ath. 3.95a)—see *infra*.

In any case, according to Athenaeus (2.66c), “people regarded the head as sacred” (ῥτι δ’ ἱερὸν ἐνόμιζον τὴν κεφαλὴν), and this is “clear from the fact”—as he says—“that they swore by it and paid obeisance to the sneezes which came from it, as if they were sacred (πταρμούς προσκυεῖν ὡς ἱερούς).” Still according to Athenaeus, “we confirm our approval by nodding the head, even as the Homeric Zeus says: ‘Come now, I will bow my head in assent to you’ (εἰ δ’ ἄγε τοι κεφαλῇ ἐπινεύσομαι).”<sup>6</sup> This sacredness of the head was perhaps one of the reasons for considering the heads of sacrificial animals as an important priestly prerogative.

## A capital priestly prerogative

Actually, in many religious regulations, the *kephale* is given to the priest—but not only to him. I take this opportunity to note that we often speak of “priestly prerogatives” in general, without putting the accent on the similarities or the differences between priest and priestess, an important question from the point of view of gender.

The head can often be accompanied by other parts (as the feet and the skin, see *infra*), and figures also in the prerogatives of priestesses. At Chios, for example, in an unknown cult, the priestess (*hierea*) receives probably the head, but also three ribs (lines 6–7: κεφαλ[.] | [...] τρεῖς πλεόρας) and other parts which are difficult to identify owing to the fragmentary con-

dition of the inscription.<sup>7</sup> However, this text is, in my opinion, interesting also for another reason: it refers to the well-known and typical expression (even if reconstituted here), found also in other regulations of Chios (see *infra*), about the *splanchna* placed “in the hands and the knees” [of the divine statue], as offerings to the divinity (lines 1–3). Now, this significant part of the sacrificial animal would, very probably, be taken away later by the cult agent: here by the priestess, but in other cases by priests, such those, for example, of [Zeus] Pelinaios, or of an unknown divinity, still at Chios.<sup>8</sup> We will return to the latter two inscriptions, but let us notice that, from the point of view of gender, these precious portions can appear as perquisites of both sexes. It is worth adding here that, in some cults, a “quarter of the viscera” (τεταρτημορίδα σπλάγχνων) is a special portion given, for example, at Halikarnassos and at Theangela (near Halikarnassos), whether to priests<sup>9</sup> or to a priestess, as in the case of the *hierea* of Artemis Pergaia.<sup>10</sup> However, in these cases, the *splanchna* are not associated with the head, as happens in the cult of the Zeus Megistos at Iasos, where, a quarter of viscera is also awarded to the priest with the head and the feet of the animal: κεφαλὴν κα[.] πόδας καὶ σπλάγχνω[ν τ]έταρτομ μέρος.<sup>11</sup> Even if this *hiereus* receives also other perquisites, such as the leg (lines 1–2) or the skin (lines 5–6, but only from strangers, *xenoi*), we have here, as in other cults, a kind of enumeration of three parts of the sacrificial animal, offered to the cult-agent as *gera*, of which the *kephale* constitutes the standard element, whereas the two other parts can vary.

Nevertheless, the head, this “capital” part, is sometimes given—as mentioned above—with the feet and the skin. The recipient of this triple honor can be either a priestess, such as the *hiere* of Dionysos Thylophoros in Kos (see *infra*), or a priest, such as the *hiereus* of Apollo Dalios, also on Kos.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>7</sup> LSCG 120; CGRN 88 (c. 350–300 BC), lines 6–7 (on the question concerning the head, see the commentary, line 6); cf. Le Guen-Pollet 1991a, no. 45. Carbon (2016, 39–40) restores with much probability the term [γλωσσ]α, tongue (line 3), a common *geras* for priests and priestesses (see *infra*).

<sup>8</sup> See, respectively, LSS 129; CGRN 36 (end of 5th century BC), lines 4–6 (on this inscription and on Pelinaios, see *infra*, with note 90); CGRN 41 (c. 425–350 BC), lines 11–13; cf. particularly van Straten 1995, 131–133.

<sup>9</sup> Halikarnassos: LSAM 72; CGRN 104, lines 38–39 (cult of Poseidonios, see *infra*, with notes 32–33); Theangela: CGRN 119 (c. 250–200 BC, cult of Zeus Nemeios), lines 9–10.

<sup>10</sup> LSAM 73; CGRN 118 (c. 250–200 BC), lines 11–12.

<sup>11</sup> LSAM 59; CGRN 42 (c. 425–375 BC), line 3. See the detailed new edition of this inscription by Fabiani 2016.

<sup>12</sup> LSCG 156 + 157; IG XII.4 332; CGRN 85 (mid-4th century BC), B lines 58–59: ... γέρη φέρει ὁ ἱερεὺς] σκέλη, κεφαλ[άς], | πόδας καὶ τὰ δέρματα. This example, even if, in the current state of the evidence, is unique for a Koan priest, can somewhat rectify or nuance the affirmation that: “The honorary share attributed to the priest on Kos consisted almost invariably of the skin and the back leg (δέρμα καὶ σκέλος)” (Paul

<sup>4</sup> Ar., fr. 449 (Henderson 2007) *apud* Ath. 9.368e.

<sup>5</sup> *Etym. Magn. s.v.* κεφαλῇ: ὁ κατάξηρος τόπος καὶ ὀστώδης; and *s.v.* ἐγκέφαλος: λευκὸς καὶ μαλακὸς ... θερμὸς καὶ ὑγρὸς.

<sup>6</sup> Athenaeus is referring here to a verse of the *Iliad* (1.524), in a passage where Zeus, speaking to Thetis, continues: “for this from me is the surer token among the immortals; no word of mine may be recalled, nor is false, nor unfulfilled, to which I bow my head.” (*Il.* 1.525–527, transl. Murray 2003). However, in the Homeric passage, the verb used twice (v. 524 and 527) is κατατεύω, not ἐπινεύω.

At Kyrene, a pregnant woman, before giving birth, must go to the sanctuary of Artemis, more precisely, to a place called νυμφῆιον, “bride-room”, and give to the priestess who is called “Bear”: “feet and the head and the skin”.<sup>13</sup> According to Noel Robertson, these three parts outline the animal’s form, thus reconstituting “the victim”, and, in this case, “probably the animal was flayed so that feet and head remained attached”. This is an attractive hypothesis, but I see here no “magical notion” in “the combination of feet, head, and skin”, as Robertson believes.<sup>14</sup> This type of skin flaying does not seem very unusual, as can be suggested by a lemma of Hesychius where the term *endrata* (and not *endora*, as is sometimes written) is explained by “what is wrapped in hide with the head and the feet” (τὰ ἐνδερόμενα σὺν τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ τοῖς ποσὶ).<sup>15</sup> Let me note here, in parentheses, that according to the specialists of images, “the inclusion of the head and feet with the rest of the hide” is not at all “often” depicted “in Greek iconography”, as has been asserted.<sup>16</sup> What is *often* represented is not these three parts together, but separately: the *bucranium*, the ox-head, or the leg with the thigh.<sup>17</sup>

There is another question to take in account: sometimes the cult agent receives the head of certain animals and not of others. From this point of view, the example concerning the priestess of Dionysos Thylophoros, from Kos, is very relevant. As gift of honor from the woman who offers the sacrifice, the priestess (ἡ ἱερῇ) takes the leg and the skin of full-grown (τελείων) sheep or of a bovine, but not the head. On the contrary, she can obtain the head and the feet of yearling animals

(ἐτέλων), or of a piglet. In any case, she is granted half of the offerings deposited by someone “on the table for the god” (ἐπὶ τὰν τράπεζαν τῷ θεῷ).<sup>18</sup> We do not know the nature of these offerings, but we can suppose that perhaps they included the heads of full-grown animals, placed—should the occasion arise—on the sacred table, and in that case, they could come back to the priestess. Anyway, the interest of this text relies also on the distinction between adult and young animals, a significant division in a sacrificial context, formulated by other terms or expressions.<sup>19</sup>

Sometimes the sanctuary itself could become the place where some offerings ought to be deposited. According to a fragmentary regulation concerning the cult of Dionysos Dasyllios at Kallatis, if the leg (σκέλος) of the sacrificed animal (perhaps a goat) must be put “on the table” (ἐπὶ τράπεζαν), “the skin with the head and [the feet ...]” should be placed in the sanctuary of the god, the *Dasyllieion*.<sup>20</sup> We can return to the hypothesis of Robertson, and consider that the skin was flayed in such a manner as to leave the head and the feet attached to it. This “reconstituted animal” could then be deposited in the sanctuary as a kind of commemoration of the sacrifice, much like the *bucrania*, as is rightly said in the commentary of the *CGRN*. However I disagree with the theory which searches to relate this kind of deposition with the old, doubtful and unproved theory of the “comedy of innocence”, developed, as it is known, particularly by Karl Meuli and Walter Burkert.<sup>21</sup> Nor can I follow Alexandre Avram, when he tries to transform Dionysos Dasyllios into a “chthonian” deity, an argument that finds no support in the context of this inscription.<sup>22</sup> As regards the hide, the different suppositions (sold for the benefit of the sanctuary, suggests Sokolowski, used to dress the statue of the god, or worn by the cult agent and even by the worshippers)<sup>23</sup> can constitute interesting suggestions, but remain impossible to prove in this context.

Occasionally, we remark a distinction between *public* and *private* sacrifice: at Chios, according to two decrees concerning the prerogatives of the priestess of Eleithie (form of the name

2013a, 270; the italics are mine; cf. Paul 2013b, 65, where this inscription is cited, without comments on the *kephalai*). The priest of Apollo Dalios also deserves the heads (and the feet).

<sup>13</sup> *LSS* 115 B; *CGRN* 99 (c. 325–300 BC), B lines 97–99: ... τὰ ἄρκω δωσεῖ πόδας καὶ | τὰν κεφαλὰν καὶ τὸ δέρμα.

<sup>14</sup> Robertson 2010, 335. Following the same kind of idea, Robertson (2010, 319) explains the name “Bear”, attributed to the priestess, by the fact that “the bear species beyond all others is strong and sure in producing and fostering its young”, a fact that would be “another case of magical analogy”. Nevertheless, neither the context of this inscription, nor what we know about some other “bears”, those of Brauron for example, seem to confirm such an interpretation.

<sup>15</sup> Hesychius, s.v. ἐνδρατα. The form ἐνδρα, meaning the offerings wrapped (i.e. in “hide”, δора), is found in some Koan inscriptions: cf. *IG* XII.4 278; *CGRN* 86 (c. 350 BC), A lines 47–48 (with the commentary); *IG* XII.4 274; *CGRN* 86, D lines 8–10 (stelai reordered by Carbon); *IG* XII.4 332; *CGRN* 85 (c. 350 BC), A lines 26–27; on *endora*, see Paul 2013b, 351–354. I am very grateful to Michel Casevitz for having confirmed (pers. comm.) that the term *endora* or *endrata* signifies “what is wrapped in hide or skin”, a sense based on the relation between the verbs δέπειν and \*δορόω (“mettre une peau, couvrir d’une peau”). Thus the compound “ἐνδρα, ce sont les peaux ... les matériaux qui couvrent”.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *CGRN* 169, commentary on lines 5–6 (on this inscription from Kallatis, see *infra*). For the feet and head being left attached to the skin, see also MacKinnon in this volume, Chapter 5.

<sup>17</sup> I own this precision to my unforgettable friend and colleague François Lissarrague.

<sup>18</sup> *LSCG* 166; *IG* XII.4 304 (c. 200–150 BC), lines 30–38. Cf. Paul 2013b, 119–121.

<sup>19</sup> I return thoroughly to this question in a work now in progress.

<sup>20</sup> *LSCG* 90; *CGRN* 169 (c. 200–100 BC), lines 3–6 (ἐν τῷ Δασυλλείῳ).

<sup>21</sup> As Avram 1995, 250–251, thinks (with references to these two scholars).

<sup>22</sup> Avram 1995, 246 (“un Dionysos à caractère profondément chthonien”). More probably, the epiclesis Dasyllios might be associated with the epithet δασύς, in the sense of “hairy, shaggy” related to the hide of the animals sacrificed to the god (cf. Hom. *Od.* 14.50–51: δέρμα ... μέγα καὶ δασύ, “skin ... large and hairy”, referring here to a shaggy wild goat). Chantraine (*DELG*, s.v. δασύς) also thinks of a bearded Dionysos.

<sup>23</sup> Sokolowski (*LSCG* 90, p. 179, comparing *LSAM* 74, line 45); *CGRN* 169, commentary on lines 6–8.



of the goddess Ilithyia in the inscription),<sup>24</sup> if a private person performs a sacrifice, the perquisites of the *hierea* include some portions of the animal and the tongue (γλῶσσαν),<sup>25</sup> but not the head (decree A). This implies that, in this case, the head could probably be taken away by the sacrificant. On the contrary, whenever the city performs a sacrifice, the priestess “will receive whatever is inscribed on the stele,”<sup>26</sup> and the head of the sacrificial animal will also be given to her” (decree B).<sup>27</sup> However, in this second decree it is also prescribed that if an *idiotes* “makes” (ποιῆι) a sacrifice, the priestess will receive “whatever is inscribed on the stele” (lines 7–9), which no doubt refers to the perquisites mentioned in the decree A. Another example, from Hyllarima in Karia, shows that, in the case of sacrifices performed by the community (*koinon*), or the people (*demos*), the priestly “honorific portions” (γέρα) are composed of the head and the feet.<sup>28</sup> Elsewhere, the city appears to be generous enough: the priestess of the Mother of Gods at Iasos can receive, during the public sacrifices, “the right leg and half of the head” (τῆς κεφαλῆς τὸ ἥμισυ), the tongue, the brain, the neck (*trachelos*), a shoulder-blade and portions of the side; whereas, in case of private sacrifices, she receives a ham (κωλέαν).<sup>29</sup> Yet this generosity, compared with the priestly *gera* at Chios, or at Hyllarima, seems less significant, if we take in account that, at Iasos, the priestess has a right to all these parts, enumerated in detail, as we have seen, but only from *one* of the animals sacrificed during the annual civic festival (ἐνὸς ἱερέ[ι]ου), even if this *hiereion* is of her choice.<sup>30</sup> This kind of restriction concerns also the private sacrifices (ἂν οἱ ἰδιῶται θύωσιν), where the *kolea* given to the priestess comes from a *single* animal (ἄφ’ ἐνὸς ἱερέ[ι]ου), as is carefully repeated (lines 15–16). By comparison, at Chios, there is no such a limitation, or at least it is not formulated as such, whereas at Hyllarima (*supra*, note 28),

it seems clear that the perquisites of the priest come from all the animals sacrificed by the *koinon*, or the *demos* (λήψεται δὲ γέρα τῶν θυομένων). Nevertheless, the *hiereia* of the Mother of Gods also has the privilege to take “all things placed on the table” (lines 16–17: τὰ παρατιθέμε[να] | πάντα ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζα[ν]), except those made of gold, of silver or of cloth—perhaps a manner of compensating for the restrictive *gera* awarded during the sacrifices of the *idiotai*. Anyhow, these documents suggest that the *kephale* is an important *geras*, granted to a priestess or a priest, in the case of public sacrifices.

However, priests and priestesses are not the only recipients of animals’ heads. A document from Ephesos, dated to the late 2nd or 3rd century AD, is entitled κεφάλαιον νόμου πατρί-ου, “chapter of an ancestral law.”<sup>31</sup> This “chapter” enumerates cult duties to be performed by the *prytanis* who must give to *hierophant* the “head and the tongue and the skin” (κεφαλὴν καὶ γλῶσσαν καὶ τὸ δέρμα) of any animal sacrificed to the gods, as a reward for “the experience and the greatness of his service.” We find here again the triple honor seen before, three parts of the animal given as *gera*, but instead of the feet, we have the tongue. However different the formulation of this order, the fact that the tongue is mentioned separately allows us to think that the head did not always and necessarily include the tongue, which, as we will see, can be “cut apart”. At Halikarnassos, in the context of the familial cult of Poseidonios, whereas the priest obtains “from each animal a ham (κωλῆν),”<sup>32</sup> a quarter-portion of the viscera and an equal share of the other parts, the officials called *epimenioi* can reserve “the heads and the feet” for themselves (τὰς δὲ κεφαλὰς καὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοὶ ἐχόντων).<sup>33</sup> In a regulation concerning the duties of certain officials at Chalketor near Mylasa, after having given the perquisites to the priestess (τὰ γέρα τῇ ἱερεῖαι ἀποδόντε[ς]), this group of officials distribute the remaining meat among the people, but “set aside the heads and the in-

<sup>24</sup> *NGSL* 20; *CGRN* 38 (c. 400 BC), A lines 4–7; B lines 3–7. Cf. also Koumanoudis & Marthaiou 1985, who erroneously qualify these inscriptions as “sacred laws”.

<sup>25</sup> The obligation to consume these perquisites “on the spot in the company of the women who performed the rites” (lines A 8–10), related to the role of the priestess, remains a subject of discussion: cf. *CGRN* 38, commentary on these lines, with references. On the tongue given separately, see *infra*.

<sup>26</sup> On the formula: τὰ ἐν τῇ στήλῃ γεγραμμένα (B lines 5–6, 8–9), and the importance of the stele as support of the writing in the religious regulations, cf. Georgoudi 2016, especially 217–222.

<sup>27</sup> On the head or the half of it as “a relatively common priestly prerogative”, see Lupu (*NGSL*), 312–313.

<sup>28</sup> *LSAM* 56; *CGRN* 193 (c. 198/197 or 197/196 BC), Ab lines 16–18; B lines 17–21 ([λή]ψεται δὲ γέ[ρ]α τῶν θυομέ[ν]ων ὑπὸ το δῆ[μ]ου κεφαλὰς | [κ]αὶ πόδας).

<sup>29</sup> *CGRN* 196 (c. 225–200 BC), lines 12–18; Maddoli 2015. On the sense of κωλῆ, see *infra*, note 32.

<sup>30</sup> As it has been noticed (cf. *CGRN* 196, commentary on lines 12–16), this possibility would allow the priestess “to select one of the largest or most beautiful animals in the procession, thus potentially increasing the size or quality of her share of meat”.

<sup>31</sup> *LSS* 121, lines 18–22; Lupu (*NGSL*), 312–313. In late Greek, the term κεφάλαιον designates rather a “chapter”, not a “summary” as Horsley 1987, 106, or Lupu in *NGSL* p. 54 translate (cf. *DELG*, s.v. κεφαλῆ; Georgoudi 1990, 36–37, 42).

<sup>32</sup> Many scholars translate κωλῆ by “thigh”. I prefer the translation “ham” (indicating especially the hind part of the thigh), because the word “thigh” designates, for me, the μηρός. Cf. Simms 1998, 94, who also translates the κωλῆ included in the priestly perquisites of the deme Phrearrhioi as “ham” (see *infra*); van Straten 1995, 155: “a ham (κωλῆ)”; Dimitrova 2008, 251–252: “ham”, for κωλῆ (no. 1), and κωλεῖον (no. 5); Carbon 2017, 161: “κωλῆ should always properly refer to a ham from a hind leg”. Lupu (*NGSL*, Indices, s.v. κωλῆ) translates mostly “thigh”, but “ham” in the regulations of Phrearrhioi (doc. 3, line 5), without any comment. I hope to reconsider elsewhere the crucial question of the significance of the words μηροί, μηρία, μηρία, translated, very often and without hesitation, by “thigh-bones”.

<sup>33</sup> *LSAM* 72; *CGRN* 104 (c. 285–245 BC), lines 38–44. Cf. the detailed edition with translation and commentary of this inscription by Carbon, in Carbon & Pirenne-Delforge 2013, 99–114 (on the *epimenioi*, see in particular pp. 83–95).

nards for themselves” (ἀφ[αί]ρουντες ἑαυτοῖς τὰς τε κεφαλὰς καὶ τὰ ἐνδόσθια).<sup>34</sup> From this fragmentary regulation, we learn nothing about the name of the honored divinity, or the title of these officials. According to Sokolowski, it concerns perhaps the *hieropoioi*; on the contrary, Jan-Mathieu Carbon thinks that “this text probably referred to *neopoi* of a local Artemis.”<sup>35</sup> However that may be, I am not sure that these officials or civic agents, who often sit on a committee *ad hoc*, would have an ancillary role with regard to the priest, as some scholars suggest. These groups of officials, often instituted by the city, had the power to inspect, to supervise, and to intervene in the administration and the organization of cults; they would sometimes be in charge of different important questions concerning the rituals and other activities in Greek sanctuaries.<sup>36</sup>

Among other groups who can obtain this kind of animal part, I mention particularly the case of the smiths (*chalkeis*) and potters (*kerameis*) in the well known sacrificial calendar of the city of Kos, because to these groups is given not a *kephale*, but what is called *to kephalaion* (χαλκέων καὶ κερα[μέ]||ω]ν ἑκάτεροις τὸ κεφάλαιο[ν]).<sup>37</sup> What does the term *kephalaion* mean? For some scholars, this word signifies the *brain*, and they translate, as do Peter Rhodes and Robin Osborne, “to each of smiths and potters, the brain”, without further commentary. Others suppose that it indicates more probably “half of the brain”, and that the brain is called here *kephalaion*, “instead of the more usual *egkephalos*.” Finally, according to Stéphanie Paul, it means “une partie de la tête.”<sup>38</sup> I have some doubts about such interpretations. On the one hand, Aristotle, who goes fully into detail concerning the head, the *kephale*, does not mention the word *kephalaion* anywhere in his prolific works on animals and their parts. On the other hand, literary sources and especially certain passages attributed by

Athenaeus to various poets refer to the *kephalaion* of animals, but this word designates simply the head, never the brain. It is to be noticed that, from a grammatical point of view, the *kephalaion* is the neuter singular of the adjective *kephalaios* (“of the head”), a neuter used as a noun. Thus, Athenaeus speaks, for example, about the *kephalaion* of a kid (*eriphou*), “boiled whole and split open”, which was served with other meats.<sup>39</sup> Or he mentions the “head of a tuna”, together with other fish.<sup>40</sup> If this is so, we have no need to translate the plural *kephalaia* by “head parts” or “pieces ... cut near the head”, as in the Loeb translations of Athenaeus. *Glaukou kephalaia* or *goggrou kephalaia* mean merely “heads of grey-fish”<sup>41</sup> or of “conger”.<sup>42</sup> Returning to the inscription of Kos, I would like to add that the misleading sense attributed to the word *kephalaion* creates some problems of translation.

Let me be more explicit by means of three examples. The phrase χαλκέων καὶ κερα[μέ]ω]ν ἑκάτεροις τὸ κεφάλαιο[ν] is translated as follows: “to each of the smiths and potters, the brain”; “à chacun des forgerons et des potiers, une partie de la tête”; “à chacun des forgerons et des potiers, de la cervelle.”<sup>43</sup> However, the question here concerns the distribution of the parts of *one* animal, that is the ox sacrificed to Zeus Polieus, and I do not see how the “brain”, or “a part of the head” could be given to “each of the smiths and potters.”<sup>44</sup> I would suggest that the adjective *hekaterois* in this case means “both”, i.e. the one and the other, as sometimes the adverb *hekateros* does in Plato, for instance, or in an inscription of Priene, where we read that “the edict must be written in both”, τὸ διάταγμα ἑκατέρως γραφέν, that is in each of the two languages, Greek and Latin.<sup>45</sup> So it would be possible to translate: “to both smiths and potters, the head”, thus leaving to these two groups the task of distributing the head among them. Finally, we can

<sup>34</sup> *LSAM* 70; *CGRN* 183 (c. 330–100 BC), lines 4–8. I think that we must try to use the most accurate words in order to distinguish and to translate three Greek terms we find in religious regulations: σπλάγχνα, ἔντερα, ἐνδόσθια (or ἐνδόσθια in this inscription). In English, a possible translation could be the following: viscera, intestines, innards (or entrails).

<sup>35</sup> Sokolowski *LSAM* 70, p. 165; Carbon, in Carbon & Pirenne-Delforge 2013, 113.

<sup>36</sup> On these groups of officials, their action and responsibilities (*hieropoioi*, *hierothytai*, *hieromnemones*, *epimeletai*, *epistatai*, *epimenioi*, *naopoioi*, *neokoroi*, etc.) cf. Georgoudi, in Georgoudi & Pirenne-Delforge 2005, 31–60.

<sup>37</sup> *LSCG* 151 A–D; *IG* XII.4 278; *GHI* 62; *CGRN* 86 (c. 350 BC), A lines 54–55.

<sup>38</sup> Brain: Rhodes & Osborne in *GHI*, p. 303; “(half?) the brain”; *CGRN* 86, see commentary on A lines 47–58; Sokolowski, *LSCG* 151 A, p. 257: “Κεφάλαιον *est* probablement ‘cervelle’”; Le Guen-Pollet 1991b, 21 (who writes erroneously κεφαλαῖον, instead of κεφάλαιον): “la cervelle”; Svenbro 1987, 72: “la cervelle”; Paul 2013b, 39–40 with n. 50, who rightly criticizes the association proposed by Svenbro between this meaning (brain) and the birth of Athena from the head of Zeus.

<sup>39</sup> Philoxenos of Leukas (or of Cythera), dithyrambic poet (*floruit* c. 400 BC?), in *The Banquet* (Δείπνον), fr. 836b, 29 (Campbell 1993), *apud* Ath. 4.147d: καὶ κεφάλαιον ὅλον διαπτυχὲς ἐφθόν ... ἐρίφου παρέθηκε. In the same passage, Philoxenos enumerates “snouts, heads, feet” (ρύγχη, κεφάλαια, πόδες); for the plural *kephalaia*, see *infra*.

<sup>40</sup> Callias I, poet of Old Comedy (5th century BC), in *Cyclopes* (Κύκλωπες), fr. 6 (Storey 2011), *apud* Ath. 7.286b: θύννου τε κεφάλαιον τοδί.

<sup>41</sup> Sotades, poet of the Middle Comedy (4th century BC), in *Locked up* (Ἐγκλειόμεναι), fr. 1, 5 (Kassel & Austin), *apud* Ath. 7.293b: γλαύκου ... κεφάλαια παμμεγέθη δύο (cf. transl. C.D. Yonge: “two large heads of grayling”).

<sup>42</sup> Archedicos, poet of the New Comedy, in *The treasure* (Θησαυρός), fr. 3 (Kassel & Austin), *apud* Ath. 7.294b: γόγγρου κεφάλαια (cf. transl. C.D. Yonge: “a large conger’s head”).

<sup>43</sup> See respectively: Rhodes & Osborne in *GHI*, p. 303; Paul 2013b, 39; Svenbro 1987, 72.

<sup>44</sup> In the commentary of *CGRN* 86 (A lines 47–58) it is supposed that each group would “receive half of the head”, considering that κεφάλαιον means “half of the head ... or merely some parts of the head”.

<sup>45</sup> Pl. *Leg.* 10.895e: “in either case”; *I.Priene* 14, line 30 (Letter of Paulus Fabius Maximus, proconsul of Asia, c. 9 BC). On this meaning, see *Great dictionary of the Greek Language*, s.v. ἑκατέρως.

add to this section a fragment of the civic sacrificial calendar of Athens, where, according to the interpretation of Stephen Lambert, the herald (κῆρυξ) receives some “cash payments in lieu of the parts of the animal listed”, including the head (κεφαλῆς).<sup>46</sup>

Let me add *in fine* another term referring to the head. According to a regulation concerning sales of priesthood at Miletos, if one sacrifices an ox, those who “purchase the priesthoods” receive, with other parts of the animal, the *koryphaia* (neuter in plural).<sup>47</sup> This word does not mean simply “*des parts de tête*”,<sup>48</sup> or “head-parts”, as is sometimes translated following the *LSJ* (*s.v.* κορυφαῖον, II), but the term designates, in this case, “parts at the top of the head”,<sup>49</sup> according to the meaning of the adjective *koryphaios*, that is at the extremity of the head.

Finally, the head can sometimes be offered to gods with other parts of the sacrificial animal. According to an inscription recording the foundation of a sanctuary of the god Men by Xanthos, a Lycian slave employed in the Laurion silver mines in Attica, it is prescribed to “furnish for the god what is due, a right leg and the skin and a head and the feet and a small breast and oil on the altar and a lamp and faggots and a libation.”<sup>50</sup> Other offerings to god were deposited on the *trapeza*, and it is stated that if a person sacrifices to Men and “fills up the table for the god”, he can take half (of what is offered there).<sup>51</sup> Thus, there exist two places, distinctly separated: the altar (βωμός) for what is consecrated entirely to the god; and the table (τράπεζα), sometimes called *hiera* (sacred) *trapeza*, where substantial parts of the animal are offered to

the divinity. Later on, these parts can be taken away by the priest/priestess, other officials or the sacrificants, as is the case here in the sanctuary of Men (see *infra*, on *trapezomata*). If it is so, we must not confuse these two spaces and translate the word βωμός by “altar(-table)”, as does Robertson (*op. cit.*), considering that “all these things are consecrated to the god [I suppose on the “altar(-table)"] and thereby made available to be consumed or appropriated by the worshippers.” This opinion results perhaps from a fixed idea according to which the gods “do not eat”, but they are only satisfied with the smoke of the “femurs” (the “thigh-bones” of certain scholars, see *supra*, note 32), burned on the altar. One could suppose that this generosity of Xanthos towards Men would be an exceptional feature of a private cult foundation. However, the example from the Attic deme of Phrearrhioi (see *infra*) shows that the gods can receive significant parts of the animal on their altars.

## Splitting the head and its parts

It is well known that the sacrificial act is first of all an act of division and repartition. The animal is not only divided in its main parts, but each part is often divided in some pieces which no doubt had a meaning for the participants. So it is with the head. When it is only a question of a *kephale* in the religious regulations, without any other indication or precision, we can say that the whole head is given, deposited or offered. However, the head can be divided in two parts, and in this case, each part can be called κεφαλῆς τὸ ἥμισυ, “half of the head”, as we have seen at Iasos and we will see at Ialysos (see *infra*); this can be also called *hemikraira* in the feminine. We have a good example of this last term in the fragmentary sacrificial regulations concerning Eleusinian cults in the *demoi* of Phrearrhioi, in southern Attica, where a distinction seems to be drawn between portions given as priestly perquisites (*hierosyna*), and portions offered on the altars (*epi tous bomous*), in honor of the divinities, including μηρούς, μασχαλίσματα, ἡμικραιραν (“thighs, flesh cut off from the armpits,”<sup>52</sup> half the head”).<sup>53</sup> This last word also appears in literary sources, as, for example, in Ameipsias, a poet of the Old Comedy, who refers to *hemikrair’ aristera* (“left half of the head”), as part of priestly perquisites (*hierosyna*).<sup>54</sup> However, we must not, in

<sup>46</sup> *LSS* 10; Lambert 2002, group A, fragment 3, col. 2, lines 41–43 and 55–56, pp. 376–377. See now *CGRN* 45 (side A: 403/2–400/399 BC, side B: c. 410–404 BC).

<sup>47</sup> *LSAM* 44; *CGRN* 39 (c. 400 BC), lines 10–13.

<sup>48</sup> As Le Guen-Pollet 1991a, no. 44, p. 148, translates; but cf. a different and more appropriate translation by the same author, in Le Guen-Pollet 1991b, 20: “un morceau situé à l’extrémité de la tête.”

<sup>49</sup> This is also what proposes, but with hesitation and a question mark, the translation in *CGRN* 39 (see the commentary on lines 10–13). Cf. Lucian, *Lexiphanes* 5: τὴν κορυφαίαν (tuft on the crown of the head).  
<sup>50</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1366 (1st century AD); *LSCG* 55, lines 9–11: παρέχειν δὲ καὶ τῷ θεῷ τὸ καθήκον, δεξιὸν | σκέλος καὶ δορᾶν καὶ κεφαλὴν καὶ πόδας καὶ στηθύνιον καὶ ἔλαιον | ἐπὶ βωμὸν καὶ λύχνον καὶ σχίζας καὶ σπονδῆν (translation of Robertson 2010, 335, n. 55, slightly modified). Cf. Lupu (*NGSL*), 11–13 (on the analogies between Xanthos’ inscription and the documents from the Amphiarion and from the Thesmo-phorion in the Piraeus).

<sup>51</sup> Line 20: ἐὰν δὲ τις τράπεζαν πληρῶι τῷ θεῷ, λαμβανέτω τὸ ἥμισυ]. The phrase τράπεζαν πληρῶι τῷ θεῷ recalls the term τραπέζο-πλησία, “table-filling”, attested for the first time in the recently found inscription of Marmarini, where a “complete table-filling ritual for the goddess” is described in detail; see now *CGRN* 225 (c. 225–150 BC, edition of the text by Carbon and Crowther, with commentary and bibliography), B lines 44–45: ἂν δὲ τις τραπέζοπλησίαν βούληται ποιεῖν τῇ θεῷ. On the cult tables and the distinction between altar and *trapeza*, the study of Gill 1991 is always necessary. On the table of Men, cf., among others, Levick 1971.

<sup>52</sup> I translate μηρούς by “thighs” (and not by “thighs-bones”), in complete agreement with the translations of Simms 1998, 94 and Lupu (*NGSL*), 162 (but, in his commentary, lines 16–17, p. 166, Lupu seems to hesitate about the meaning of μηρούς, when he says: “thighs, *likely* thighbones”, without any explanation; italics are mine). On μασχαλίσματα, see Lupu 2003; cf. also Carbon 2017, 160, 168.

<sup>53</sup> *NGSL* 3; *CGRN* 103 (c. 300–250 BC), lines 5 and 19–20 (ιερώσυνα), and lines 15–21 (portions offered on the altars).

<sup>54</sup> Ameipsias, fr. 7 (Kassel & Austin = Storey 2011), *apud* Ath. 9.368e: δίδεται μάλιστα ἱερώσυνα, κωλῇ, τὸ πλευρόν, ἡμικραιρ’ ἀριστερά. The



my opinion, confuse the ἡμίκραιρα of this document with the expression ἡμίκραιρα χορδῆς, which we find, for instance, in Athens, in two inscriptions: in a fragment from Athens about priestly portions and tariffs, and especially in the important inscription from the Attic *demos* of Aixone, referring to accounts for priestly perquisites and other sacrificial expenses.<sup>55</sup> This expression has been translated by certain scholars as follows: a) “a half-head [filled with entrails/sausage (?) ...]”; b) “a half-head stuffed with intestines (or half a ‘head’ of sausage?)”; c) “a half-*kraira* of blood sausage”; d) “a half-head of (that is, stuffed with?) sausage/tripe”; e) “probably a half head of the animal ... stuffed with intestines or sausage made from these (χορδῆ)”; f) “une moitié de tête farcie de boudin”; g) “une demi-tête farcie de boyaux (?)”.<sup>56</sup> I doubt the exactitude of these translations. On the one hand, it seems to me very strange to cut the head of the sacrificial animal in two halves, in order to stuff the one half with sausage, tripe, intestines or anything else, a procedure unknown until now among the variety of sacrificial practices—if I am not mistaken—even if we cannot exclude such a possibility. On the other hand, a “head” or “a half-head” can have here a metaphoric sense, as in modern Greek, where we can say a “head” of cheese, in order to indicate the spherical form of a cheese,<sup>57</sup> and in this case a “half-head” would be the *half* of this “round” cheese. There is even a kind of cheese called in modern Greek *kephalotyri*, “head-cheese”. Now, the editor of the inscription of Aixone, the Greek archaeologist Steinhauer, had perfectly rendered, in modern Greek, the sense of this peculiar expression: thus ἡμίκραιρα χορδῆς means, as he writes, μισὴ (half of) γαρδούμπα.<sup>58</sup> The γαρδούμπα is a kind of dish, sometimes presented in a round form, and made of the intestines of sheep or goats,

of their χορδαί.<sup>59</sup> So we could say, following Steinhauer, a “half” of γαρδούμπα, or a “half-head” of bowels.<sup>60</sup>

Before I try to examine, even briefly, two significant parts of the animal’s head, the brain and particularly the tongue, let us have a rapid glance at some other parts, more or less frequently mentioned in the religious regulations. First of all the snout, the ῥύγχος, of which we have at least two certain testimonies. According to a fragmentary inscription from Erythrai, the snout, with other portions, is placed on the altar (*epi tom bomon*), which shows that this “extremity” of the head, so to speak, could be considered an offering acceptable by the gods.<sup>61</sup> As has been noticed (cf. commentary in *CGRN* 80), the context of this sacrificial regulation is lost, and many things remain unclear. Nevertheless, if the fragment A refers to parts of the animal put on the altar (ἐπὶ τὸν βωμ[ὸν ...]), it is important to note, in my view, that these parts include not only the snout, but also the tongue and the head (l. 6: καὶ κεφα[λὴν ...]). Some scholars, probably not accepting the possibility to grant Greek gods substantial portions on the altar, give to *bomos* the sense of *trapeza*, on which the divine parts are deposited.<sup>62</sup> Or otherwise, they suppose that the offerings may go to the priest “perhaps placed on a cult table or possibly on an altar (though not in the fire).”<sup>63</sup> Instead of trying to invent different, tortuous solutions for this kind of problem, I think that it would be more judicious to admit that, in certain places and according local usages, Greek gods could sometimes enjoy more than the “thigh-bones” or the “tail vertebrae” of the sacrificial animals. Returning to the snout, according to a fragmentary inscription of Didyma, the ῥύνχοι and other “extremities” of the animal body (ἀκροκόλια) are

half-heads of some animals were particularly appreciated, such as those of a shoit, which was considered very “tender” (ἡμίκραιρα τακερὰ δέλφακος): Krobilos, poet of the New Comedy, in *The false supposititious* (Ψευδοποβολιμαῖος), fr. 6 (Kassel & Austin), *apud* Ath. 9.384c–d). Aristophanes uses this word, jokingly, with regard to a man’s head/face (*Thesm.* 227): τὴν ἡμίκραιραν τὴν ἐτέραν ψιλὴν ἔχων (“with your half-face shaven like that?”).

<sup>55</sup> Athens: *LSCG* 22; *CGRN* 61 (c. 350 BC), line 8: σκέλος, πλευρόν, ἡμίκραιρα[ν χορδῆς...]. Aixone: *LSCG* 28; *CGRN* 57 (c. 400–375 BC), lines 8–9: ἐπὶ δ[ὲ] τὴν τράπεζαν κωλῆν, πλε[υ]ρόν ισχίον, ἡμίκραι[ι]ραν χ[ορδ]ῆς (cf. the same phrase in lines 3–4, 10–11, 14–16, 18–19 and 22–23).

<sup>56</sup> See in this order: a) *CGRN* 61 (Athens); b) *CGRN* 57 (Aixone); c) Scullion 2009, 154; d) Parker 2010, 194; e) Carbon 2017, 167–168; f) Le Guen-Pollet 1991a, 152, no. 46; g) Ackermann 2007, 115.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. what is called in French *tête-de-Maure*, designating a cheese of round shape.

<sup>58</sup> Steinhauer 2004, 162.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Euboulos, poet of the Middle Comedy, in *The Laconians* or *Leda* (ἐν Λάκωνσιν ἢ Λήδῃ), fr. 63, 3 (Kassel & Austin), *apud* Ath. 7.330e: χορδαί τ’ ἐρίφων, “kids’ intestines”. More specifically, χορδαί in modern Greece refer to the thin intestines of sheep and goats; cf., in general, *Great dictionary of the Greek language*, s.v. χορδή.

<sup>60</sup> Thus, the guess of Scullion (2009, 154, n. 5) “that ἡμίκραιρα means a ‘half-measure’ of some kind”, a suggestion dismissed finally by the author, as by other scholars, seems to be, in my final analysis, a good intuition.

<sup>61</sup> *LSAM* 21 + 22; *CGRN* 80 (c. 350 BC), fragment A, lines 2–4; *IErythrai* 203 (fragment A) and 204 (fragment B).

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Sokolowski *LSAM* 21, p. 59. In order to justify this identification, Sokolowski refers to a decree concerning the priesthood of Asklepios at Pergamon (*LSAM* 13; *CGRN* 206); however, in this inscription, we are not in the same context: there is no altar, but only the term *trapezomata*, the offerings which are set on the cult-table for the gods, and which can often end up, partially or totally (as in this case), as the perquisite of the priest. In any case, I do not believe that Greeks would make such a confusion between these two words.

<sup>63</sup> As Lupu (*NGSL*), 320, thinks, comparing his document 21 (Thasos, fragmentary sacrificial regulations = *CGRN* 28) with *LSAM* 21 (italics are mine); cf. also Dimitrova 2008, 255 n. 55 (who follows Lupu): “Although it is unlikely that these were burnt.” The translation of the word βωμός by “altar(-table)”, in the cult foundation of Xanthos (Robertson 2010, 335, n. 55) indicates a similar point of view (see *supra*).

sold by weight, after having deducted the “third part” (τὸ τρίτον μέρος), reserved probably, according to Sokolowski, for the cult personnel.<sup>64</sup> We will return to this regulation which poses the question of the sale of sacrificial meat, but, before that, I would like to draw attention to a remark by Athenaeus about the term ῥύγχος. This word, he says, “is properly applied to swine”, but “it may be applied also to other animals ... and even be said playfully of the (human) face.” As proof of this, Athenaeus quotes Archippos, a comic poet, who speaks about a man saying: “And he, with a snout so long...” Even the gods will not escape this kind of irreverent joke: in fact, Athenaeus continues, Araros, another comic poet, refers to Adonis in these terms: “For the god is turning his snout toward us.”<sup>65</sup>

Athenaeus again (3.95a–e; 107c), quoting many comic poets, often mentions the snout, particularly that of a pig, with its ears, called ὠτία or ὠτάρια. However, in a few rare epigraphic references, these are named οὖς, or οὐατα in the plural. In the sacrificial calendar of the city of Kos, the priest who sacrifices for Demeter an adult male sheep and an adult pregnant (ewe) takes as perquisites only the ears (οὐατα), a very small, nearly symbolic portion, even if it is an edible one.<sup>66</sup> Anyway, I note that, on the stele A, it is the only sacrifice where the priest, who sacrifices and provides the *hieria*, obtains so little. At first sight, we may suppose that the reason for these negligible *gera* could be the fact that it is prohibited to “take away” the meat of these two sacrificial animals (line 61: τούτων οὐκ ἀποφορά). As a matter of fact, in all other sacrifices for Hestia, Zeus Polieus, or Athena Polias, where no such interdiction exists, the priest obtains as perquisites much more, that is the skin and a leg. The same *gera* are prescribed for the *hiereus*, even in the sacrifices of a piglet and a kid in honour of Dionysos Skyllitas, where it is prohibited to “take away” meat from only *one* of the two animals, namely the piglet.<sup>67</sup> We could thus make the hypothesis that in cases of absolute interdiction to “take-away”, such as for the two animals immolated to Demeter, *all* the meat ought to be

eaten *in situ*, leaving only a small part to priest. Anyway, if this hypothesis could be supported by the stele A, it comes up against a difficulty if we take in consideration the whole sacrificial calendar of Kos, because stele D mentions the sacrifice of a pregnant ewe to Rhea, with the interdiction to “take-away” (τούτων οὐκ ἀποφορά), but in this case the *hierēus* who sacrifices obtains as perquisites the skin ([γ]έρη λαμβάνει δέρμα).<sup>68</sup> Nevertheless, in favor of our hypothesis, we can remark that the *gera* here are limited to the skin, the *derma*: no edible part of the animal is given to the priest. I would like also to point out that even if, according to Carbon,<sup>69</sup> “one might view the ear as symbolizing a smaller portion of the head reserved for the priest”, nevertheless the *hiereus* of Demeter seems less privileged than the priest of Rhea, who could take more advantage of the skin.

Finally, we find again the ears in a long regulation of the phratry of the Demotionidai in Attica (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1237). The beginning of this substantial document alludes to two types of sacrifices concerning the *meion* and the *koureion*, the two rites concerning the induction of children (παῖδες: lines 70, 80–81) in the group of the phratry. Here, in *both* cases, the priest of Zeus Phratrios receives an ear, but, contrary to the priest of Demeter at Kos, he also obtains other portions of the sacrificial animal (a ham, a rib, but also a cake, some wine etc.), probably because, in this regulation, we are not dealing with the particular obligation of οὐκ ἀποφορά (“no take-away”).<sup>70</sup> We can suppose, following Herbert William Parke, that “the father [who introduced his children to the phratry] and its family and friends had the remainder of each victim for a feast with ... cakes and wine as the father could afford.”<sup>71</sup>

Athenaeus mentions different kinds of meat “prepared with water” (τῶν ἐξ ὕδατος κρεῶν πολλά), such as feet, heads, ears, tongues, guts, etc., but also σιαγόνες, jawbones. However, until now I have not found this part in the religious regulations, despite the fact that, according to this passage of Athenaeus, the *siagones*, as with the other meats, are sold in the so-called “boiled-meat shops” (ἐφθοπώλια), such as those in Alexandria.<sup>72</sup> It is well known that in Greece portions of

<sup>64</sup> *LSAM* 54 (c. 300–250 BC), lines 1–4. Robert 1945, 49–50. Cf. Carbon 2017, 171. See *IG* 482, lines 4–6: τῶν δὲ ῥυγχέων καὶ τῶν ἀκροκωλίων ὑπολογίζεσθαι τὸ τρίτον | μέρος.

<sup>65</sup> Ath. 3.95d–e: ὅτι δὲ κυρίως λέγεται ῥύγχος ἐπὶ τῶν σωῶν ... ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἐπ’ ἄλλων ζώων ... κατὰ παιδιᾶν εἴρηκε καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ προσώπου; Archippos, a poet of the Old Comedy, contemporary of Aristophanes, in *Amphitryon* (Ἀμφιτρυῶν), fr. 1 (Storey 2011), *apud* Ath. 3.95e: καὶ ταῦτ’ ἔχων τὸ ῥύγχος οὕτως μακρόν; Araros, poet of Middle Comedy, son of Aristophanes, in *Adonis* (Ἀδωνίς), fr. 1 (Kassel & Austin), *apud* Ath. 3.95e: ὁ γὰρ θεὸς τὸ ῥύγχος εἰς ἡμᾶς στρέφει.

<sup>66</sup> *CGRN* 86, A lines 60–62, month of Batromios (see *supra*, note 37): Δά[μ]ατρι οἷς τέλεως καὶ τελέα κυέσσα, τούτων οὐκ ἀποφορά ... | ... θύει ἱερεῖς [καὶ ἱερὰ] παρέχει γέρη δὲ οὐατα; cf. Paul 2013b, 379, 381.

<sup>67</sup> *CGRN* 86, A lines 58–60: Διονύσωι Σκυλλίται χοῖρος [καὶ] | ἔριφος, τοῦ χοίρου οὐκ ἀποφορά· θύει ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱερὰ παρέχει γέρη [λ]αμβάνει δέρμα καὶ σκέλος; cf. also lines 63–64.

<sup>68</sup> *CGRN* 86, D lines 3–5 (month of Karneios): Ῥέαι οἷς κυέσσα καὶ ἱερὰ ... | ... τούτων οὐκ ἀποφορά· θύει ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱερὰ παρέχει [γ]έρη λαμβάνει δέρμα.

<sup>69</sup> Carbon 2017, 169, in reference to the regulation of the Demotionidai (see *infra*).

<sup>70</sup> *LSCG* 19; *GHI* 5; *CGRN* 74 (396/395 BC), A lines 4–7: ἱερεῶσυνα τῶι ἱερεῖ διδόναι τ|άδε· ἀπὸ τοῦ μείου κωλῆν, πλευρόν, ὀ|ς, ... ἀπὸ τοῦ κορείου κωλῆ|ν, πλευρόν, ὄς ... Cf. Lambert 1993, esp. 285–293; Carbon 2017, 169. On the problematic sense of the two rites, μείον and κούρειον, cf., among others, the commentary in the *CGRN* (with references); Parker 2005, 458–460 (with bibliography).

<sup>71</sup> Parke 1977, 89. On the induction of the children to phratries by their fathers, cf. Isaeus, 8.19; *Souda* and *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Ἀπατοῦρια.

<sup>72</sup> Ath. 3.94c; a brief fragment of comedy gives the impression that the “jawbones of an ox” were appreciated; see Cratinos, poet of Old Comedy,

meat distributed after the sacrifice could be sold, as was shown by Guy Berthiaume and as we see in an important inscription of Bargylia, concerning the oxen sacrificed to Artemis Kindyas: after having removed the parts reserved for the priest and other magistrates, as well as those distributed among the citizens, “by tribes” (κατὰ φυλάς), the skins and the other parts that “remained” (τὰ περιγενόμενα) are to be sold.<sup>73</sup> I will merely return to the fragmentary regulation of Didyma (see *supra*, note 64), which orders the sale by weight of snouts and extremities, as we have seen, but also devotes a particular section to the “heads of the sheep”<sup>74</sup>: after having cleaned these heads and cut off the horns, the butchers, the *mageiroi*, will put them up for sale (πωλεῖν: line 8). So, for the Greeks, the sale and eating of heads and other parts of sacrificial animals posed no problem, contrary to the Egyptians who, according to Herodotus (2.39), had a horror of such heads. In fact, when the Egyptians sacrifice, “they cut the throat (σφάζουσι) of the sacrificial animal (ἱερίου), and having done so they sever the head from the body. They flay the carcass of the beast (κτίνεος), then invoke many curses on its head (κεφαλῇ δὲ κείνῃ πολλὰ καταρυσάμενοι), which they carry away. Where there is a market, and Greek traders in it, the head is taken to the market and sold; where there are no Greeks, it is thrown into the river. The imprecation which they utter over the heads is that whatever ill threatens those who sacrifice, or the whole of Egypt, “may fall upon that head” (ἐς κεφαλὴν ταύτην τραπεύσθαι). For this reason, “no Egyptian will taste of the head of anything that had life” (οὐδὲ ἄλλου οὐδενὸς ἐμψύχου κεφαλῆς γεύσεται Αἰγυπτίῳ οὐδεῖς), contrary to the Greeks who enjoy this dish even if, for a physician such as Mnesitheus of Athens, the head and feet of a pig, for example, “contain little nourishment or fat”.<sup>75</sup>

Now, if the term *siagones*, jawbones, seems to be absent from religious regulations, we can at least find another possibly related word, *gnathos*, in a contract for the sale of a female priesthood at Chios, in an unknown cult, an inscription that was meticulously published by Robert Parker.<sup>76</sup> More precisely, if one offers a sacrifice, one must give to the priestess, among other parts, “a left *gnathos*” (<γ>νάθον εὐ[ὼ]νυμο[ν.?.], line 11). The word *gnathos* generally means “jaw”, as for example in the *Art of Horsemanship* of Xenophon (1.9), where the

author says that a good horse must not have “unequal jaws” (μὴ ὁμοίας τὰς γνάθους), but one must notice whether *both* jaws are soft or hard, or only one. However *gnathos* also means “cheek”, with regard to humans and animals, for example in Aristotle’s *Historia Animalium*, or in Hippocrates’ *Ancient Medicine*.<sup>77</sup> So, the priestess probably received “the left cheek”, as Parker precisely remarks. However, I am not sure that the expression “left *gnathos*” could mean that she possibly obtained “the whole *left side of the head*”, as Parker also supposes, considering that there is “a similarity in meaning between ἡμίκραϊρα, ‘half of the head or face’ and *gnathos*”.<sup>78</sup> The term ἡμίκραϊρα is composed of ἡμι- + κραῖρα (“head, top, extremity”); and even if it would be associated with κάρα, this word, in relation with humans or animals, means “head”, not “face”.<sup>79</sup> From this point of view, the reference to ἡμίκραϊρ’ ἀριστερά (“left half of the head”), mentioned by the poet Ameipsias as part of *hierosyna* (see *supra*, with note 54), does not help, in my opinion, to establish a similarity with the “left *gnathos*”.

Referring to pig’s brains (ἐγκέφαλοι χοίρειοι), Athenaeus says that the philosophers do not allow to eat them, considering that those who partake of them act as if they eat beans, which is an abomination equal to that of eating the heads of one’s parents. We recognize here certain philosophical doctrines to which Plutarch, for example, refers, when he says that the Orphics or the Pythagoreans held the egg to be taboo, as “some hold the heart and brain”, because they thought it “to be the first principle of creation” (ἀρχὴν ... γενέσεως). “At any rate”, continues Athenaeus, “none of the ancients had ever eaten pigs’ brains, because they were the seat of nearly all senses” (τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἀπάσας σχεδὸν ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι). And Apollodorus the Athenian even says that “none of the ancients (τῶν παλαιῶν) ever named the brain”, preferring, as Sophocles did in his *Trachiniae* (781), to use the word “white marrow” (οὐκ ὀνομάσαι ἐγκέφαλον, ἀλλὰ λευκὸν μυελόν).<sup>80</sup>

However that may be, this kind of prohibition did not prevent the Greeks from eating the brain of animals, which indicates that the impact of certain philosophical beliefs or movements on the cult practices of Greek cities is very questionable.

in *Wealth-Gods* (Πλοῦτοι), fr. 174 (Storey 2011), *apud* Ath. 3.94e: περὶ σιαγόνος βοείας μαχόμενος (“fighting for the jawbone of an ox”).

<sup>73</sup> Berthiaume 1982, in particular 62–70. The inscription of Bargylia consists of three decrees (late 2nd–1st century BC), of which the first ψήφισμα refers to the sale of sacrificial meat: SEG 45, 1508 A; Deshours 2011, 263–275, no. 24, Texte A lines 9–15 (with previous bibliography).

<sup>74</sup> *I.Didyma* 482, lines 6–7: [ὕ]περ τῶν κεφαλῶν τῶν | προβατείων.

<sup>75</sup> Mnesitheus (early 4th century BC), *On edible substances* (Περὶ ἐδεστών), fr. 40 (Bertier), *apud* Ath. 3.96d: οὐ πολὺ τὸ τρόφιμον καὶ λιπαρὸν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἔχουσι.

<sup>76</sup> Parker 2006; CGRN 37 (c. 425–375 BC).

<sup>77</sup> Arist. *Hist. an.* 1.13.493a 29 and 3.11.518a 2 (humans), 3.12.519a 22 and 6.25.578a 8 (animals). Hippoc. *Anc. Med.* 19.

<sup>78</sup> Parker 2006, 76. This supposition is due perhaps to the fact that certain dictionaries (cf. *LSJ s.v.*) give to the word ἡμίκραϊρα the sense of “half the head *or* face” (italics are mine). But when a comic poet, such as Aristophanes, can joke by identifying *hemikraira* with “half the face” (see *supra*, note 54), he refers to a man, not to an animal.

<sup>79</sup> See *DELG s.v.* κάρα. As for ἡμίκραϊρα, it is possible to give to the word κάρα the metaphorical sense of “face”, as in Soph. *El.* 1310, or *OC* 285–286; but, here again, this concerns humans, not animals. Moreover, as Chantraine notes, κάρα, with the genitive, can indicate, in tragedy, the person; as an example, cf. Soph. *Ant.* 1: Ἰσμήνης κάρα, with the commentary of Jebb 1902: “κάρα: the periphrasis (as with κεφαλῇ) usu. implies respect, affection or both”.

<sup>80</sup> Ath. 2.65f–66a; Plut. *Quest. conv.* 3.1 (*Moralia* 635c).

I do not think either that the rare mentions of the brain in the religious regulations are due to this type of philosophical reflection, as Lupu supposes, claiming that it “may be ascribed to a prohibition against eating the brain or even mentioning it by name.” Anyway, even if Lupu recognizes *in fine* that this “prohibition was nevertheless ignored”, he concludes, following Brigitte Le Guen-Pollet, that “brain-eating was practiced and tolerated even in cases when *explicit reference to it was avoided*.”<sup>81</sup> Instead, it is very probable that when the head was given as part of the honorific perquisites, without other precisions, there was no need to mention separately the brain or other parts of the *kephale*. Yet why, in this case, in two inscriptions also cited before, from Iasos and Ialysos respectively, is the *egkephalos* mentioned separately? In fact, at Iasos, in a contract for the sale of the priesthood of the Mother of Gods, it is prescribed that the priestess will receive the “right leg and half of the head and the tongue and the brain”, and other parts from one of the animals sacrificed by the city, choosing the *hierieion* she wants.<sup>82</sup> At Ialysos, we have a very enigmatic short fragment of a sacrificial regulation, in the context of an unknown cult, where some sacrificial portions are enumerated, and in the second line, “half of the head, a tongue, a brain” are mentioned.<sup>83</sup> In the two inscriptions, the *egkephalos* thus appears with the “half of the head”, with τὸ ἡμῖσις of the κεφαλῇ. So, it is reasonable to infer that whoever obtains a half of a head—when it is divided in two parts—will also take the tongue and the brain, cut out of this head, two head-portions which could eventually, in other circumstances, be reserved for another recipient. I note, by the way, that, as has been rightly remarked in the commentary of the Ialysos’ regulation in the *CGRN*, these sacrificial parts were very probably priestly prerogatives, but that “there is ... a possibility that the portions were also, or at least partially, meant as a divine offering, to be burned on the altar.” I think that this is a very plausible supposition corroborated by other examples which show, as is noted also in that commentary, that “several of the portions, mentioned in the list” of Ialysos are found in other regulations as divine offerings, for example, in the regulation of the *demos* of Phrearrhioi (see *supra*, with note 53).

To this small dossier of the brain, I add finally an important document, which constitutes a valuable proof of the sale and, consequently, of the eating of the brain, among other animal parts. This is an inscription found in the Piraeus, known as the *agoranomic* inscription, and dating in the 1st century BC. It

was dedicated by an unknown *agoranomos* named Aeschylus, son of Aeschylus, and concerns the sale of certain parts of pigs, goats, sheep, or cattle, such as heads, feet, liver, lungs, etc., but also brain. We know from the *Athenian constitution* of Aristotle (51.1), that the *agoranomoi* were “Market-controllers ... elected by lot, five for Piraeus and five for the city.” Their duty, assigned by the laws, was the “superintendence of all merchandise” in order “to prevent the sale of adulterated and spurious articles.” I will not go here into the details of this interesting inscription, edited with much care by Steinhauer.<sup>84</sup> I note only that the brain (ἐγκέφαλος, as is written here) is mentioned for *each* of the four animal species; for the pigs: [ύείων], lines A 1 and B 8 (ύείων); for goats: αἰγείων, line A 12; for bovines: βοείου, lines A 24 and B 23; for goats and sheep: αἰγείων ἢ προβ]ατείων, line B 16 (I follow the numbering of Bresson). According to Steinhauer (p. 64), in this document, the price of the brain is the lowest of all portions, thus reflecting “*des conceptions philosophiques et diététiques antiques concernant ce plat*.” It is true that a medical writer, Oribasius (4th century AD), quoted by Steinhauer, consider the brain as a food “hard to digest” and “bad for the stomach”, although, he adds: “if it is well cooked, it gives to the body a fairly good nourishment.”<sup>85</sup> However, we must not give an absolute value to this kind of information: the brain of sacrificial (or non-sacrificial) animals was eaten by people and accepted by gods.

## Tongues/the tongue

To cap this description of the sacrificial head, albeit inevitably incomplete, I would like to make some remarks about the tongue, the *glossa*, an important part mentioned most often, after the head, in our epigraphic corpora.<sup>86</sup> In the majority of the regulations, the tongue is included among the perquisites with other parts of the animal where, however, the *kephale* is absent. I have found, for the moment, only five cases where *kephale* (or half of it) and *glossa* are mentioned together: in the two regulations of Iasos and Ialysos, where the tongue is cited between the half-head and the brain (see *supra*, with notes 82 and 83); in the two decrees concerning the priesthood of Eleithie at Chios (see *supra*, with notes 24–27), where however, as we have seen, the tongue and the head do not concern

<sup>81</sup> *NGSL*, p. 313 (italics are mine); Le Guen-Pollet 1991b, 21.

<sup>82</sup> Maddoli 2015; *CGRN* 196 (225–200 BC), lines 13–14: σκέλος τὸ δεξιὸν καὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς τὸ ἡμῖσις καὶ γλῶσσαν καὶ ἐγκέφαλον ... See also *supra* with note 29.

<sup>83</sup> Pugliese Carratelli 1955–1956, 14 (p. 164); *LSS* 93; *CGRN* 180 (c. 300–150 BC), line 2: κεφαλᾶς ἡμισυ (sic), γλῶσσαν, ἐγκέφαλον. Cf. also Carbon 2017, 167.

<sup>84</sup> Steinhauer 1994; *SEG* 47, 196 A + B. See now Bresson 2000, esp. chap. 8: ‘*L’inscription agoranomique du Pirée et le contrôle des prix de détail en Grèce ancienne*’.

<sup>85</sup> Oribasius, *Collectiones medicae* (Ιατρικαὶ Συνταγαί) 2.35: δύσπεπτον ... καὶ κακοστόμαχον ὁ ἐγκέφαλος ... εἰ μέντοι καλῶς πεφθειρή, τροφήν ἀξιόλογον δίδωσι τῷ σώματι.

<sup>86</sup> It seems that Aristophanes opposes the “oily things” (τὰ λιπαρά) which can render someone sick, to the tongue, but also to the flank, spleen or the tripe of a young boar, perhaps lighter and more digestible parts: cf. *Fry-cooks* (Ταγηνιστᾶι), fr. 520 (Henderson 2007), *apud* Ath. 3.96c.



the same sacrifice: the γλώσσα is given to the priestess in the case of a private sacrifice, while the κεφαλή will be added to the perquisites in the case of a public sacrifice performed by the city; finally, in a fragmentary inscription of the 2nd century AD, from Phanagoria at Black Sea, where the words *kephale* and *glossa* are partially restored, in an ambiguous cult context. This last document, in spite of its state of uncertainty, seems to refer to a sacrifice (but to which divinity?), where thighs and perhaps the head would be “burnt whole” (εἰς ὀλοκαύστησιν), while the priest would receive “legs [completely restored] and tongue and the skin”—another possible example for substantial offerings to gods.<sup>87</sup> All that seems to reinforce the idea that the tongue can “be cut apart, separately” (ἡ γλῶττα χωρὶς τέμνεται), as Aristophanes says in *Peace* and in *Birds*, where he adds that this is a usage practiced “everywhere in Attica” (πανταχοῦ τῆς Ἀττικῆς).<sup>88</sup>

According to all the other regulations which I have explored until now, the tongue is particularly given to a priest, and we can remark its prevalence as a priestly portion at Chios. In fact, some inscriptions from Chios, but also from Miletos, mention the tongue in the plural, γλώσσαι, which may mean that the priest will receive the tongue of every animal, independently of the number of the sacrificants or the nature of the sacrifice, be it private or public. I would like to particularly point out four examples:

Firstly, the contract concerning the priesthood of Herakles or of other gods at Chios, in the context of cults administrated by a *genos*, where it is prescribed to give “the tongues” (γλώσσας) to the priest of Herakles, “whenever the *genos* sacrifices” (ὅταν τὸ γένος θύῃ) or “if an individual” (ἰδιώτης) makes a sacrifice.<sup>89</sup>

Secondly, the contract concerning the perquisites of the priest of Pelinaios, that is of Zeus honored with this toponymic epiclesis on the highest mountain of Chios, called Pellinnaion (not Pelinaios, as it has been written).<sup>90</sup> It seems that this text refers to private sacrifices, because it is prescribed that if the priest is absent and does not appear after been called out three times by the sacrificant (lines 8–9: βωσάτω [ἐ] | τρίς),

this person can finally make the sacrifice himself—a prescription found also in the preceding contract with regard to sacrifices by individuals. These examples, which are not unique, show that, in reality, speaking in general of “private” sacrifices is quite misleading. Of course, we can say that the *idiotes* who sacrifices at home, by the hearth of the household, performs a “private” sacrificial act. But he often leads his animal to the sanctuary, that is to a public space of cult, where, in the absence of the priest, he can even accomplish the sacrifice, put the sacred portions on the altar and “pray himself for himself” (αὐτὸν ἑαυτοῖ κατεύχεσθαι), as, for example, the worshipper who wants to honor Amphiaraios must do at the sanctuary of Oropos.<sup>91</sup> That is another, very eloquent example, of this interconnection between private and public spheres, which characterizes Greek cult, a fact that pleads against the usual tendency to establish clear-cut oppositions.<sup>92</sup>

Thirdly, a regulation concerning sales of priesthood at Miletos: to those who purchase the priesthoods must be given certain portions and “all the tongues”, not only from the animals sacrificed by the city, but also from those offered privately (except the skins), as it is prescribed (lines 13–15).<sup>93</sup>

Fourthly, two inscriptions, from Chios and from Miletos, where it is specified that one must give to the priest the tongue (here: in the singular) and other parts, in the case of one or more sacrifices: this signifies that the *hiereus* will receive the γλώσσαν “from each sacrificial animal”.<sup>94</sup>

Finally, I add to these examples another document from Chios, concerning a male priesthood of an unknown cult, where the γλάσσαι (in plural), given to the priest, show precisely the obligation to cut separately the tongue of any sacrificial animal, “whether one or many are offered”.<sup>95</sup>

I note that having the tongue is not an exclusively male privilege as shown through the cases of the priestesses of Eleithie at Chios and of the Mother of Gods at Iasos (as we

<sup>87</sup> LSCG 89, lines 6–8: εἰς ὀλοκαύστησιν· μηρ[οῖ] | [...στέαρ εἰς] κάλυψιν τὸ ἄρκοῦν, κεφα[λ]ή· τῷ ἱερεῖ πόδες καὶ γλῶσσ[α] καὶ ἡ δορά. On the term ὀλοκαύ(σ)τησις, cf. an inscription from the Asklepieion of Epidaurus, where it is more clearly specified: εἰς τὴν ὀλοκαύτησιν τῷ θεῷ (Peck 1969, no. 43; IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 97, lines 2, 23 and 26; 3rd century BC). On the μηρία burnt in honor of Apollo Parrhasios, near the Mount Lykaion, in Arcadia, cf. Paus. 8.38.8; Pirenne-Delforge 2008, 215.

<sup>88</sup> Ar. Pax 1060; Av. 1704–1705, with the commentary of Dunbar 1995, 743–744. Cf. NGS, p. 312–313.

<sup>89</sup> LSCG 119; CGRN 50 (c. 400–350 BC), lines 1–3 (sacrifices of a *genos*); lines 6–7 (sacrifices of individuals). Cf. also Kadletz 1981, 26; Le Guen-Pollet 1991a, no. 42.

<sup>90</sup> LSS 129; CGRN 36 (end of 5th century BC), lines 1–3: [τῷ] ἱερέω Πελινναί[ο] δ[ι]δοσθαι γλάσι[σα]ς. About the mountain Πελινναῖον, cf. Ael. NA 16.39.

<sup>91</sup> LSCG 69; CGRN 75 (c. 386–374 BC), lines 25–28; but in the case of public sacrifices, the priest himself must pray (lines 28–29): τῶν δὲ δη|μορίων τὸν ἱερέα. Cf. Sineux 2007, 139–142.

<sup>92</sup> On this question, cf. Georgoudi 1998.

<sup>93</sup> LSAM 44; CGRN 39 (c. 400 BC), lines 7–8: καὶ τὰς γλώσσας πά[σ]ας; lines 13–15: ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἱδ[ι]ώ[τ]ων | [σύμ]παντα γίνεσθαι πλ[ὴν] τῶν δερμάτων. Cf. Kadletz 1981, 26; Le Guen-Pollet 1991a, no. 44.

<sup>94</sup> Chios: CGRN 41 (fragment relating to a male priesthood, c. 425–350 BC), lines 11–12: [δῖ]δοσθαι τῷ ἱερεῖ γλῶσσ[αν] ἀπ’ ἐκά[σ]του | [στο]ν ἱερέου. Miletos: LSAM 46; CGRN 100 (concerning the priest of Apollo [Delphinios], c. 300–275 BC), lines 1–3: ἢν ἐν θ[ύ]η|ται, λά[ψ]ει|ται γλῶσσ[αν] ... ἢν δὲ πλέω θύηται, λάψεται ἀπ’ ἐκάστου ... | ... καὶ γλῶσσαν. Cf. Kadletz 1981, 27.

<sup>95</sup> LSS 78; CGRN 170 (c. 500–400 BC), line 7 (with the commentary); cf. Plassart & Picard 1913, 224–228, no. 31. For the Ionic form γλάσσα (= γλῶσσα), attested also in Herodas (Μιμιάμβοι 3.84: γλάσσων, ed. Mandilaras, Athens, 1986), cf. DELG, s.v. γλῶχες.



have seen above),<sup>96</sup> but also by the perquisites obtained by the prominent priestess of Dionysos at Miletos. Actually, if a woman wants to sacrifice to Dionysos, she must give to the *hiereia* a list of *gere* including the tongue.<sup>97</sup> It is true, however, that most often the regulations refer to priests, as some indicative examples show: the *hiereus* of Dionysos Phleas at Priene, who takes, from what the city sacrifices, a tongue, γλώσσα, among other portions (but nothing is said of eventual sacrifices by individuals); or the priest of Poseidon Helikonios at Sinope, where however he can only receive the tongues of animals sacrificed publicly, not of those offered privately;<sup>98</sup> or else, the one who seems to combine the priesthoods of Zeus, Helios, and Poseidon at Thebes-on-the-Mycale, and obtain as perks of his office some parts of the sacrificial animals including the tongue;<sup>99</sup> or finally, the priest of an unknown divinity (possibly Hermes?) at Chios, who will receive γλώσσαν among other parts and special Hermes-cakes (ἐρμέας; line 9, in the shape of a herald's wand according Hesychius).<sup>100</sup>

To these regulations may be added a law (νόμος) from Miletos concerning the sale of the priesthood of Asklepios *pro poleos* and of “all the gods sharing his *temenos*” (καὶ τῶν ἐντεμενίων αὐτοῦ θεῶν πάντων; A, lines 6–8). The tongue is included among a list of perquisites given to the priest by the *paidonomoi*, the supervisors of education, who sacrifice “for the health of the children” (ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑγίας τῶν παίδων).<sup>101</sup> Lastly, I note the important sacrificial calendar of Mykonos,<sup>102</sup> where the *glossa* is given to the priest of Poseidon Temenites (line 8), and also to the *hiereus* of Apollo Hekatombios. This last case offers interesting details, although not very clear. It is prescribed that a bull and ten lambs must be sacrificed to the

god (line 30: ταῦρος καὶ δέκα ἄρνες). Now, from the bull, the tongue is given to the priest (lines 31–32: τῷ ἱερεῖ τοῦ ταύρου δίδοται γλώσ|σα), but the tongue of the lambs which the boys (παῖδες) and the bridegrooms (νυμφίοι) sacrifice, poses a problem of understanding. The lines in question run as follows (32–34): τῶν ἀρ[ν]ῶν ὧν οἱ παῖδες θύουσιν, ἱερεῖ γλῶ[σ]|σα καὶ τῷ παιδὶ γλῶσσα ἐκατέρῳ· ὧν οἱ νυμφίοι θύ[ου]σιν, | τῶν ἀρ[ν]ῶν τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ τῷ νυμφίῳ γλῶσσα ἐκατέρῳ. Edward Kadletz translates this text in that manner: “from the sheep which the youths sacrifice, a tongue to the priest and a tongue to each youth; from the sheep which the bridegrooms sacrifice, a tongue to the priest and a tongue to each bridegroom”.<sup>103</sup> Carbon, in his meticulous edition of the inscription, proposes the following translation: “from the lambs which the boys sacrifice, a tongue is given alternately to the priest or to a boy; from the lambs which the bridegrooms sacrifice, a tongue is given alternately to the priest or to a bride-groom”. I wonder if we could not understand this passage in another way. Firstly, the adjective ἐκάτερος means normally “each of the *two*”, it presupposes two parties.<sup>104</sup> Thus, it could not signify “to each youth” (or bridegroom), as Kadletz writes. Secondly, I am not sure that it implies the notion of alternation, a sense that, if I am not mistaken, it is not supported by philological sources. I would say then, that a tongue is given “to each” (of the two), that is to the priest and to the boy, and the same distribution would be repeated in the case of the priest and the bridegroom. If this is so, we could suppose that one boy and one bridegroom act as responsible of their group, and by virtue of this function, they may receive a *geras*.<sup>105</sup> Anyway, this inscription raises many questions impossible to examine here, such as, for example, the character of the two groups of young people who offer the sacrifice of the lambs,<sup>106</sup> the nature of this Apollo Hekatombios, or the fact that the tongue can sometimes be granted to other persons than the priest/priestess, as we saw before in the case of the *hierophant* in Ephesos.<sup>107</sup>

Before closing this inevitably incomplete discussion about tongues as priestly perquisites, I would like to make an obser-

<sup>96</sup> Chios: CGRN 38 (*supra*, with note 24); Iasos: CGRN 196 (*supra*, with note 82). We can add here another fragmentary inscription found also at Chios, where, according to a new reading of Carbon, the tongue (γλώσση) seems to be part of the perquisites due to the priestess (ἱερεῖα): LSCG 120; CGRN 88 (c. 350–300 BC), lines 1–3.

<sup>97</sup> LSAM 48; CGRN 138 (275/274 BC), lines 15–17: ἐὰν δὲ τις θύειν βούλ[ηται] | [τῷ] Διονύ[σῳ] γυνή, διδόντω γέρη τῇ ἱερείᾳ ... | ... γλώσσαν.

<sup>98</sup> Priene: LSAM 37; CGRN 176 (2nd century BC), lines 8–9: λήψεται δὲ ὧν | πόλις θύει σκέλος γλώσσαν δέρμα ... Sinope: LSAM 1; CGRN 120 (c. 350–250 BC), lines 5–7: καὶ λήψεται τῶν ἱερείων τῶν | δημοσίων θυομένων ... | γλώσσαν· τῶν δὲ [ιδιωτικῶν] ... On Dionysos Φλέας (or Φλεῖος), cf. Graf 1985, 283–284.

<sup>99</sup> LSAM 40; CGRN 122 (c. 350–250 BC), line 4: λαμβάνων γλώσσαν.

<sup>100</sup> LSS 77; CGRN 49 (c. 400–375 BC), line 7: καὶ γλῶ[σ]|σαν (on the hypothetical association with Hermes, cf. the commentary). See Plassart & Picard 1913, 194–202. On ἐρμέας: Hesychius, s.v. Ἑρμῆς· καὶ πέμμα-τος εἶδος κρηκ(ει)οειδές; but see also the variant ἐρμητής: CGRN 76 (Erythrai, cult of Asklepios and Apollo, c. 380–360 BC), lines 12–13 and 22 (see *infra*, n. 104).

<sup>101</sup> LSAM 52 B, lines 3–8 (early 2nd century AD, according to Lupu, NGSL, 51; cf. 248, n. 34, on the term of ἐντεμενίοι).

<sup>102</sup> LSCG 96; CGRN 156 (c. 230–200 BC): revised edition, with translation and a detailed commentary by Carbon.

<sup>103</sup> Kadletz 1981, 27. I remark here for the moment that the sacrificial animals in this passage are not “sheep”, as translates Kadletz, but “lambs”, ἄρνες in Greek.

<sup>104</sup> See DELG, s.v. ἕκαστος. Cf. CGRN 76 (*supra*, note 100), lines 22–23: ... καὶ ἐρμητὴν π[αρατι]|θέτω τῷ θεῷ ἐκατέρῳ (“... and a Hermes-cake for each of the two gods”).

<sup>105</sup> As is also casually suggested by Sokolowski (LSCG 96, p. 187), without further remarks.

<sup>106</sup> I do not think that we have to do here with “*couples de jeunes mariés*”, as Jaillard 2007, 159 n. 130, translates (cf. the commentary of Carbon in CGRN 156, lines 29–39).

<sup>107</sup> See *supra*, with note 31. On the sacrificial regulations of Mykonos, cf. the commentary of Carbon (CGRN 156) and the bibliography referring to different aspects of this inscription.

vation, but without being able to find a satisfactory explanation of the facts. We have mentioned, at the beginning of this paper, the recurrent expression about the *splanchna* placed “in the hands and the knees” [of the divine statue], as offerings to the divinity, which could be recovered afterwards by the cult agents. As it is often remarked, this expression characterizes a certain number of sacrificial regulations from Chios. Without trying to be exhaustive on the subject, I will enumerate seven Chian inscriptions referring to this matter, which I have more or less examined throughout this paper: CGRN 36, 41, 49, 50, 66, 88 and 170.<sup>108</sup> Of these seven, nos. 36, 49 and 88 (and very probably no. 66, very fragmentary) cite this standard expression, mentioning both the hands and the knees, for example no. 49: σπλάγχνα τὰ ἐς [χ]εῖρας καὶ | γούνατα (lines 6–7). On the contrary, nos. 41 and 50 curtail this phrase, so to speak, mentioning only the hands, while no. 170 refers only to the knees.<sup>109</sup> Why these differences? If we follow Folkert van Straten, they were probably due to the form of the divine statue: the *splanchna* placed on the knees “require a seated cult image”, while they can be placed conveniently “into the hands”, when they are put into the bowl (φιάλη) which many statues of gods or goddesses held in their “outstretched right hand”.<sup>110</sup> What interests me in this context is a perceptible relation between this kind of sacrificial prescriptions and the *tongue*. Except the extremely fragmentary no. 66, which does not allow us to verify the presence or not of the word γλώσσα, in all the other six inscriptions, the tongue or tongues are always present, constituting with the *splanchna*, and eventually with other portions, the perquisites owed to the priest or, in an exceptional case (no. 88), to the priestess.<sup>111</sup> Does this “proximity” between σπλάγχνα and γλώσσα in Chios have a particular meaning? It may have to do with the inclusion of the tongue as part of the set of σπλάγχνα in other, later sources.<sup>112</sup> But I am not sure that we can find a definitive answer to this question. Perhaps we are condemned to accept our ignorance in the face of such local associations between different parts of the animal body, with regard to the priestly prerogatives.

It remains to be seen very briefly whether the tongue constitutes a pleasant offering for the gods, or likewise for heroes,<sup>113</sup> such as, for example, the Archegetes who seems to be the eponymous hero of an Attic tribe, or of a trittys (a third

of a tribe), though the reading is not very sure.<sup>114</sup> It is well known how the Homeric gods, in the *Odyssey*, take delight in the tongues thrown upon the fire (see *infra*). However, before trying to explore some literary sources, in order to perceive and to grasp the meaning, or at least certain aspects, of this kind of offering, I would like to note that the practice of placing the tongue of a sacrificial animal “on the altar”, though very rare, is not absent from the epigraphic evidence. We have seen the fragmentary inscription from Erythrai, where, among the portions placed ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμ[όν] ..., the tongue (καὶ γλ[ῶσσαν ...]) is mentioned before the snout and the head.<sup>115</sup> In any event, there is also another manner to dedicate the *glossa*—and other parts of the animal—to the gods: by depositing it on the *trapeza*,<sup>116</sup> even if afterwards it could be taken away by the servants of the divinity. This is the case at Minoa on Amorgos, where, according to a decree concerning the cult of Meter, the officials called *epimenioi* have the obligation to place aside, “on the table for the goddess” (τῇ θεῷ ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν), different portions of the sacrificial animals including the tongue (γλώσσαν); a part of these offerings explicitly belongs to the priestess (... μέ[ρο]ς τῆς ἱερείας).<sup>117</sup> I would like to note here that even if afterwards the *trapezomata* are recovered by the officiating agents, this practice must not diminish the importance of the dedicatory act, the fact that the principle aim, the main intention of the worshippers was to honor the divinity: gods came first.

Now, a rapid view of the literary sources show that, from its earliest mention in *Odyssey*, the tongue would not be considered a neglected part of the sacrificial animal, far from it.<sup>118</sup> Athena herself, with the voice of Mentor, recommends old Nestor to “cut out the tongues (τάμνετε ... γλώσσας)” and to “mix the wine” in order “to pour a libation to Poseidon and

<sup>108</sup> I follow the publication of these inscriptions in CGRN, having in mind that this expression is sometimes reconstituted.

<sup>109</sup> Hands: cf. CGRN 50 (σπλάγ[χ]να τὰ εἰς χεῖρας, lines 3–4). Knees: CGRN 170 (σπλ[ά]γχνα τὰ ἐς γόν[α]τα, lines 5–7).

<sup>110</sup> van Straten 1995, 132–133.

<sup>111</sup> Concerning this case, see *supra*, note 96.

<sup>112</sup> On this subject, see Pirenne-Delforge’s paper in this volume, *Chapter 10*.

<sup>113</sup> This question certainly deserves a more substantial development, in another context.

<sup>114</sup> LSCG 11; CGRN 26 (c. 423/422–404/403 BC), B lines 7–9: παρ[ε] | [χε...?.. γλῶτ]ταν δὲ τοῖ Ἀρχεγέτε[ι] [u...?..].

<sup>115</sup> See *supra*, with note 61. About the sacrificial portions (“half of head, a tongue, a brain”) liable to be burned on the altar at Ialysos, see *supra*, with note 83.

<sup>116</sup> We have to do here with the well known *trapezomata* (cf. Gill 1991, esp. 11–23), a term mentioned for example in a decree concerning the priesthood of Asklepios at Pergamon. The person “who holds the priesthood in turn ... will take as parts of honor (γέρα) from all the animals sacrificed in the sanctuary the right leg and the skins (σκέλος δεξιὸν καὶ τὰ δέρματα) and all the other offerings set on the table (καὶ τὰλλα | τραπεζώματα πάντα τὰ παρατιθέμεν[α])”: LSAM 13; CGRN 206 (2nd century BC), lines 12–15. Cf. Edelstein & Edelstein 1945, I, 280–282, no. 491.

<sup>117</sup> LSCG 103; CGRN 195 (1st century BC), fragment B2, lines 15–20. Cf. Kadletz 1981, 27–28. On the *epimenioi*, see more recently Carbon & Pirenne-Delforge 2013, 83–95.

<sup>118</sup> Philochorus, the most famous of the Attidographers, considered, in *On sacrifices* (Περὶ θυσιῶν), that the tongue “is the best and the first [organ] of the body” (τὸ κάλλιστον τοῦ σώματος καὶ πρωτεύων ἐστί): *FGHHist* 328, F 80 (Jacoby), *apud* schol. Ap. Rhod. *Vetera* 516–518c (Wendel).

the other immortals” (ὄφρα Ποσειδάωνι καὶ ἄλλοις ἄθανάτοισι σπείσαντες): we are on the seashore of Pylos, where Nestor and his people are preparing to sacrifice “all-black bulls” (ταύρους παμμέλανας) in honor of the “Earth-shaker [Poseidon], the dark-haired” (Ἐνοσίχθονι κυανοχαίτη). Harkening to her voice, “they cast the tongues upon the fire (γλώσσας δ’ ἐν πυρὶ βάλλον) and, rising up, poured the libation upon them.”<sup>119</sup>

It is true that the scholia on this Homeric passage do not mention Poseidon, but Hermes, making first a general statement: “it was a custom for those turning themselves to sleep, to cut off the tongues of the sacrificial animals and to burn them for the gods who take care of speech.” Therefore, they sacrificed the tongues dedicating them to Hermes as the “overseer”, the “dispenser of speech”.<sup>120</sup> Discussing these scholia in relation with other sources referring to tongues or to Hermes, Kadletz, more or less following Paul Stengel and adopting an evolutionistic view, establishes a distinction between “heroic times”, when the tongue would be burned “as a final gift to the gods”, and “the Classical period”, when “tongues were used solely as the prerogative of the priest.” And he concludes: “There is no evidence that tongues were ever offered especially to Hermes or to heralds.”<sup>121</sup> We cannot go through this rather “stiff” discussion here, which all too rapidly purges any relation between Hermes, the heralds and tongues, and this, despite the testimony of certain sources and scholia that we have no valuable reasons to reject.<sup>122</sup>

As a matter of fact, if the sacrifice accomplished by Nestor and his people at Pylos suggests that the tongues can be an acceptable offering for any god, it is true that later sources associate the γλώσσα particularly with Hermes or the κήρυκες: with Hermes, as messenger of the gods, as a divine herald, act-

ing as mediator of the language, as the god who “traditionally is speech” (Ἑρμῆς λόγος εἶναι παραδεδόται);<sup>123</sup> with heralds, as messengers of humans, masters of the spoken word, who hold as their patron Hermes, and employ his tool, the κηρύκειον, the herald’s wand.<sup>124</sup> In order to defend his thesis, Kadletz remarks that the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius’ *Argonautica* (1.516–518b) refers to Hermes, as recipient of tongues, whereas Apollonius himself mentions, in these verses, Zeus: the evening before their expedition to Colchis, Jason and the Argonauts, after having enjoyed a rich banquet with vast stores of food and sweet wine and before going to sleep, “mixed libations in honor of Zeus as is customary ... and poured them upon the burning tongues”.<sup>125</sup> In consequence, this divergence between the author and his scholiast would invalidate the reference to Hermes in the scholia. Nevertheless, it must be noticed that the mention of Zeus is a natural conclusion of the cosmogonic hymn sung by Orpheus, just before the libations, in honour of the child Zeus and his renown (κῦδος).<sup>126</sup> Anyway, this presence of Zeus would not prevent the scholiast of the *Argonautica* from referring to a probably well-known tradition associating Hermes with the tongue: Hermes, he says, “is speech” and “the organ of speech is the tongue” (ὄργανον δὲ αὐτοῦ ἡ γλώσσα), which is at rest when sleep falls (upon us); thus, “it is reasonable that they sacrifice it [sc. the tongue] to Hermes”.<sup>127</sup> Moreover, it is not perhaps by accident that Athenaeus, commenting the uses and habits of the Homeric heroes, puts forward Hermes, when he

<sup>119</sup> Hom. *Od.* 3.5–6 and 3.331–341. As the “only” other example of this practice (“placing the tongue on the altar”), Kadletz (1981, 28) cites a Megarian myth transmitted by the Megarian historian Dieuchidas, *FGrHist* 485, F 10 (Jacoby), *apud* schol. Ap. Rhod. *Vetera* 516–518c (Wendel): Alkathous, son of Pelops, “conquers by a struggle” (καταγωνίζεται) a lion which was ravaging Megara, and brings its tongue to the king, as proof of his exploit; then the king, after sacrificing to gods, “placed the tongue last upon the altars” (ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸ τελευταῖον τὴν γλῶσσαν ἐπέθηκεν τοῖς βωμοῖς), and since then this has remained a custom for the Megarians. However, contrary to the sacrifice of Nestor, this concerns the tongue of a *wild* animal, which raises, as is known, serious sacrificial problems, even if one could suppose that, afterwards, the Megarians would burn on their altars the tongues of *domesticated* animals. For experiments with burning tongues, see Morton in this volume, *Chapter 2*.

<sup>120</sup> Schol. Hom. *Od.* 3.332 (Dindorf): ἔθος ἦν τρεπομένοις πρὸς τὸ καθεῦδειν τῶν ἱερῶν τὰς γλῶσσας ἀποτέμνειν καὶ καίειν τοῖς θεοῖς τοῖς λόγου ἐπιμελομένοις ... τὰς γλῶσσας γὰρ τῷ Ἑρμῇ ἀνετίθουν ὡς ἐφόρων τοῦ λόγου ... ὡς λόγου δοτήρι.

<sup>121</sup> Kadletz 1981 (citations, p. 29); cf. Stengel 1910, 172–177, on which see the pertinent critical note of Berthiaume 1982, 52, 113 n. 73.

<sup>122</sup> As remarks also rightly Jaillard 2007, 158–159 with n. 130.

<sup>123</sup> Schol. Ap. Rhod. *Vetera* 516–518b (Wendel), to which we will return. According to Cornutus (*Theol. Graec.* 16.2), Hermes is called διάκτορος (messenger), because he carries over our thoughts (νοήματα) to the souls of people who are close (εἰς τὰς τῶν πλησίων ψυχάς): “wherefore, they consecrate to him the tongues” (καθὸ καὶ τὰς γλῶττας αὐτῷ καθιεροῦσιν); cf. Nesselrath 2009.

<sup>124</sup> Hermes: Ar. *Plut.* 1110: ἡ γλῶσσα τῷ κήρυκι τούτων τέμνεται (“the tongue is cut out for the herald [sc. Hermes] of these things”). The fact that certain scholars, such as Kadletz, prefer the reading γ[ι]νεται, according to a manuscript, instead of τέμνεται, does not abolish the obvious relation between Hermes and the tongues, which is also confirmed by the scholia to Ar. *Plut.* 1110 (Dübner): ἡ γλῶσσα τῶν θυομένων τῷ Ἑρμῇ δίδεται, ἐπειδὴ τῶν λόγων δεσπότης ἐστίν (“the tongues of the sacrificial animals are given to Hermes, because he is master of speech”). The same scholia quote the Alexandrian scholar Kallistratos who “says that the tongues of sacrificial animals are assigned to heralds” (τῶν θυομένων φησὶ τὰς γλῶσσας τοῖς κήρυξιν ἀπονέμεσθαι); for this reason, continue the scholia, the tongue “is given to you [sc. Hermes] who are herald and servant of the gods” (ἀποδίδεται γὰρ σοὶ τῷ ὄντι κήρυκι τῶν θεῶν καὶ ὑπηρέτῃ).

<sup>125</sup> Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.516–518: κερασσάμενοι Διὶ λοιβάς, ἢ θέμις ... ἐπὶ γλώσσησι χέοντο αἰθομέναις.

<sup>126</sup> This *kūdos* would be bestowed on the god thanks to the arms given to him by the “earth-born Cyclopes”, that is “the bolt, with thunder and lightning” (*Argon.* 1.494–511).

<sup>127</sup> Schol. Ap. Rhod. *Vetera* 516–518b (Wendel): εἰκότως τῷ Ἑρμῇ αὐτὴν θύουσιν. On the polyvalent association of Hermes with the tongue, speech, silence or sleep, see Buffière 1956, 294–296.

says that, at the end of the dinners, they poured libations to Hermes, “not, as in later times to Zeus Teleios”: for Hermes is regarded as “patron of sleep” (ὑπνου προστάτης); but “they pour libations also to him, over the tongues, on leaving the dinners”, for “the tongues are assigned to him, because of the interpretation” (προσνέμονται δ’ αὐτῷ αἱ γλῶσσαι διὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν).<sup>128</sup>

However, closing this brief review of the relation between Hermes and the tongue, we must note that this relation is not verified, for the moment, in the religious regulations, at least as far as a search in the instructive *CGRN* can show.<sup>129</sup> Nevertheless, this kind of gap between literary texts and epigraphic documents is not rare, a fact that incites us to always take into consideration both types of sources, in order to avoid hasty generalizations.

At the end of this excursus through the meanders of the *kephale*, I am aware of the fact that what I have presented is sometimes limited to the description of different cult variants concerning the distribution of the head and its parts to human agents or divine powers. I am not sure that we can *always* find a sound explanation and give a sense to this kind of attribution, since the regulations often seem to depend on local usages or represent variations from different historical periods. However, in the continuation of this research, it remains worth trying to get to a deeper investigation and analysis of these ritual facts.

STELLA GEORGOUDI

École pratique des hautes études, sciences religieuses,  
Unité de recherche ANHIMA, Paris  
stella.georgoudi@ehess.fr

<sup>128</sup> Ath. 1.16b–c. Hermes is considered as the god of interpretation. The word ἐρμηνεία takes, in this passage, the sense of “expression, style” (cf. *DELG*, s.v. ἐρμηνεύς), of skilful and eloquent speech. I note that Athenaeus refers here to Homer, not to the *Argonautica* of Apollonius, as Kadletz 1981, 23, writes.

<sup>129</sup> As Carbon suggests to me, if *CGRN* 49 (Contract of the sale of a priesthood on Chios) belongs to the cult of Hermes (see *supra*, with note 100), the tongue given to the priest (line 7) could be expected by the god. However, he agrees also that this is far from sure. In fact, the mention of “Hermes-cakes” (line 9: ἐρμείας), received also by the priest, does not guarantee that the god was Hermes, because this kind of cake could be found in other cults, such as that of Asklepios and Apollo at Erythrai, where a Hermes-cake is set aside for each of the two gods (see *supra*, notes 100 and 104). My warmest thanks to Jan-Mathieu Carbon for his careful reading and suggestions.

## Bibliography

- Ackermann, D. 2007. ‘Rémunération des prêtres et déroulement des cultes dans un dème de l’Attique. Le règlement religieux d’Aixônè’, *EtCl* 75, 111–136.
- Avram, A. 1995. ‘Un règlement sacré de Callatis’, *BCH* 119:1, 235–252.  
<https://doi.org/10.3406/bch.1995.6996>
- Berthiaume, G. 1982. *Les rôles du mâgeiros. Étude sur la boucherie, la cuisine et le sacrifice dans la Grèce ancienne* (Mnemosyne Supplement, 70), Leiden.  
<https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004327894>
- Bresson, A. 2000. *La cité marchande*, Bordeaux.  
<https://doi.org/10.4000/books.ausonius.7659>
- Buffière, F. 1956. *Les mythes d’Homère et la pensée grecque*, Paris.
- Campbell, D.A. 1993. *Greek lyric*. vol. 5. *The new school of poetry and anonymous songs and hymns* (Loeb Classical Library, 144), Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Carbon, J.-M. 2016. ‘Notes on two inscriptions from Chios’, *ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΙΟΝ* 5, 37–41.
- Carbon, J.-M. 2017. ‘Meaty perks: Epichoric and topological trends’, in *Animal sacrifice in the ancient Greek world*, eds. S. Hitch & I. Rutherford, Cambridge, 151–178.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139017886.007>
- Carbon, J.-M. & V. Pirenne-Delforge 2013. ‘Priests and cult personnel in three Hellenistic families’, in *Cities and priests. Cult personnel in Asia Minor and the Aegean islands from the Hellenistic to the Imperial period* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, 64), eds. M. Horster & A. Klöckner, Berlin & Boston, 65–119.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110318487.65>
- CGRN* = *Collection of Greek ritual norms*, eds. J.-M. Carbon, S. Peels & V. Pirenne-Delforge, Liege, 2017–  
<http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be>  
<https://doi.org/10.54510/CGRN0>
- DELG* = P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris 1968–1980.
- Deshours, N. 2011. *L’été indien de la religion grecque. Étude sur les cultes civiques dans le monde égéen à l’époque hellénistique tardive* (Scripta antiqua, 30), Bordeaux.  
<https://doi.org/10.4000/books.ausonius.14553>
- Dimitrova, N. 2008. ‘Priestly prerogatives and *hiera moira*’, in *Μικρός Ιερομνήμων. Μελέτες εις μνήμην Michael H. Jameson*, eds. A.P. Matthaiou & I. Polinskaya, Athens, 251–257.



- Dunbar, N. 1995. *Aristophanes. Birds* (ed. with introduction and commentary), Oxford.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oseo/instance.00232966>
- Edelstein, E. & L. Edelstein 1945. *Asclepius. A collection and interpretation of the testimonies*, vols. 1–2, Baltimore.
- Ekroth, G. 2008. 'Meat, man and god. On the division of the animal victim in Greek sacrifices', in *Μικρός Ιερομνήμων. Μελέτες εις μνήμην Michael H. Jameson*, eds. A.P. Matthaiou & I. Polinskaya, Athens, 259–290.
- Fabiani, R. 2016. 'I.Iasos 220 and the regulations about the priest of Zeus Megistos: A new edition', *Kernos* 29, 159–183.  
<https://doi.org/10.4000/kernos.2396>
- Georgoudi, S. 1990. *Des chevaux et des bœufs dans le monde grec. Réalités et représentations animales à partir des livres XVI et XVII des Géoponiques*, Paris & Athens.
- Georgoudi, S. 1998. 'Sacrifices dans le monde grec : de la cité aux particuliers. Quelques remarques', in *Public et privé en Grèce ancienne : lieux, conduites, pratiques. Actes du Colloque International Paris, 15–17 mars 1995* (Ktêma 23), eds. P. Schmitt-Pantel & F. de Polignac, Paris, 325–334.
- Georgoudi, S. 2010. 'Comment régler les *theia pragmata*. Pour une étude de ce qu'on appelle *lois sacrées*', *Mêtis* N.S. 8, 39–54.  
<https://doi.org/10.4000/books.editionschess.2510>
- Georgoudi, S. 2016. 'L'écriture en action dans des règlements religieux des cités grecques', *Mêtis* N.S. 14, 209–244.  
<https://doi.org/10.4000/books.editionschess.4241>
- Georgoudi, S. & V. Pirenne-Delforge 2005. 'Personnel de culte : monde grec', *ThesCRA* V, 1–60.
- GHI = P.J. Rhodes & R. Osborne, eds. 2003. *Greek historical inscriptions 404–323 BC*, Oxford.
- Gill, D. 1991. *Greek cult tables*, New York & London.
- Graf, F. 1985. *Nordionische Kulte. Religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulturen von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia* (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana, 21), Rome.
- Great dictionary of the Greek language* = D. Dimitrakos, ed. 1964. *Great dictionary of the Greek language*, Athens.
- Henderson, J. 2007. *Aristophanes. Fragments. Edited and translated* (Loeb Classical Library, 502), Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Horsley, G.H.R. 1987. *New documents illustrating Early Christianity. A review of the Greek inscriptions and papyri published in 1979*, North Ryde.
- I.Didyma = T. Wiegand & A. Rehm 1958. *Didyma II. Die Inschriften*, Berlin.
- I.Erythrai = H. Engelmann & R. Merkelbach 1973. *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai* vol. 2 (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 2), Bonn.
- I.Priene = F. Hiller von Gaertringen & C. Friedrich 1906. *Inschriften von Priene* (Königliche Museen zu Berlin, Priene, 2), Berlin.
- Jaillard, D. 2007. *Configurations d'Hermès. Une 'théogonie hermaïque'* (Kernos supplément, 17), Liège.  
<https://doi.org/10.4000/books.pulg.210>
- Jebb, R.C. ed. 1902. *The Antigone of Sophocles*, Cambridge.
- Kadletz, E. 1981. 'The tongues of Greek sacrificial victims', *HTR* 74:1, 21–29.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0017816000028509>
- Koumanoudis, S.N. & A.P. Matthaiou 1985. 'Δύο ιεροί νόμοι Χίων', *Horos* 3, 105–111.
- Lambert, S.D. 1993. *The phratries of Attica*, Ann Arbor.  
<https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.13495>
- Lambert, S.D. 2002. 'The sacrificial calendar of Athens', *BSA* 97, 353–399.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0068245400017433>
- Le Guen-Pollet, B. 1991a. *La vie religieuse dans le monde grec du V<sup>e</sup> au III<sup>e</sup> siècle avant notre ère. Choix de documents épigraphiques traduits et commentés*, Toulouse.
- Le Guen-Pollet, B. 1991b. 'Espace sacrificiel et corps des bêtes immolées. Remarques sur le vocabulaire désignant la part du prêtre dans la Grèce antique, de l'époque classique à l'époque impériale', in *L'espace sacrificiel dans les civilisations méditerranéennes de l'Antiquité. Actes du colloque tenu à la Maison de l'Orient, Lyon, 4–7 juin 1988* (Publications de la bibliothèque Salomon-Reinach, 5), eds. R. Etienne & M.-T. Le Dinahet, Lyon & Paris, 13–23.
- Levick, B. 1971. 'The table of Mên', *JHS* 91, 80–84.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/631371>
- LSAM = F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure* (École française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires, 9), Paris 1955.
- LSCG = F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (École française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires, 18), Paris 1969.



- LSS = F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément* (École française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires, 11), Paris 1962.
- Lupu, E. 2003. 'Μασχαλισματα: A note on SEG XXXV 113', in *Lettered Attica. A day of Attic epigraphy. Proceedings of the Athens symposium, 8 March 2000* (Publications of the Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens, 3), eds. D.R. Jordan & J.S. Traill, Athens, 69–77.
- Maddoli, G. 2015. 'Iasos: vendita del sacerdozio della Madre degli dei', *Epigrafi di Iasos. Nuovi supplementi* vol. 2 (Studi classici e orientali, 61), Pisa, 101–118. <https://doi.org/10.12871/97888674154965>
- Murray, A.T. 2003. *Homer. Iliad. With English translation. Revised by W.F. Wyatt* (Loeb Classical Library, 170), Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Nesselrath, H.-G., ed. 2009. *Die griechischen Götter. Cornutus—Ein Überblick über Namen, Bilder und Deutungen*, Tübingen.
- NGSL = E. Lupu, *Greek sacred law. A collection of new documents (NGSL)* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, 152), Leiden & Boston 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047405801>
- Parke, H.W. 1977. *Festivals of the Athenians*, London.
- Parker, R.C.T. 2004. 'What are sacred laws?', in *The law and the courts in ancient Greece*, eds. E.M. Harris & L. Rubinstein, London, 57–70. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472540966.ch-002>
- Parker, R.C.T. 2005. *Polytheism and society at Athens*, Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199216116.001.0001>
- Parker, R.C.T. 2006. 'Sale of a priesthood on Chios', in *Χιακόν συμπόσιον εις μνήμην W.G. Forrest*, eds. G.E. Malouchou & A.P. Matthaiou, Athens, 67–79.
- Parker, R.C.T. 2010. 'New problems in Athenian religion: The 'sacred law' from Aixone', in *Myths, martyrs and modernity. Studies in the history of religions in honour of Jan N. Bremmer* (Numen Book Series. Studies in the History of Religions, 127), eds. J.H.F. Dijkstra, J.E.A. Kroesen & Y. Kuiper, Leiden & Boston, 193–208. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004193659\\_014](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004193659_014)
- Paul, S. 2013a. 'Roles of civic priests in Hellenistic Cos', in *Cities and priests. Cult personnel in Asia Minor and the Aegean islands from the Hellenistic to the Imperial period* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, 64), eds. M. Horster & A. Klöckner, Berlin & Boston, 247–277. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110318487.247>
- Paul, S. 2013b. *Cultes et sanctuaires de l'île de Cos* (Kernos supplément, 28), Liège.
- Peek, W. 1969. *Inschriften aus dem Asklepieion von Epidauros*, Berlin.
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. 2008. *Retour à la source. Pausanias et la religion grecque* (Kernos supplément, 20), Liège. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.pulg.1007>
- Plassart, A. & C. Picard 1913. 'Inscriptions d'Éolide et d'Ionie', *BCH* 37, 155–246. <https://doi.org/10.3406/bch.1913.3133>
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1955–1956. 'Nuovo supplemento epigrafico rodio', *ASAtene* 33–34, N.S. 17–18 & 157–181.
- Robert, L. 1945. *Le sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa* vol. 1. *Les inscriptions grecques*, Paris.
- Robertson, N. 2010. *Religion and reconciliation in Greek cities. The sacred laws of Selinus and Cyrene*, Oxford.
- Scullion, S. 2009. 'Sacrificial norms, Greek and Semitic: Holocausts and hides in a sacred law of Aixone', in *La norme en matière religieuse en Grèce ancienne* (Kernos supplément, 21), ed. P. Brulé, Liège, 153–169. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.pulg.563>
- Simms, R.M. 1998. 'The Phrearrhian lex sacra: An interpretation', *Hesperia* 67:1, 91–107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/148422>
- Sineux, P. 2007. *Amphiaraios. Guerrier, devin et guérisseur*, Paris.
- Steinhauer, G. 1994. 'Inscription agoranomique du Pirée', *BCH* 118:1, 51–68. <https://doi.org/10.3406/bch.1994.1659>
- Steinhauer, G. 2004. 'Ἱερὸς νόμος Αἰξωνέων', in *Ἀττικά ἐπιγραφαί. Πρακτικά συμποσίου εις μνήμην Adolf Wilhelm (1864–1950)*, eds. A.P. Matthaiou & G. Malouchou, Athens, 155–173.
- Stengel, P. 1910. *Opferbräuche der Griechen*, Leipzig & Berlin.

Storey, I.C. 2011. *Fragments of Old Comedy* vol. 1-3. *Edited and translated* (Loeb Classical Library, 513–515), Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Svenbro, J. 1987. 'Le partage sacrificiel selon la loi sacrée de Cos (IV siècle avant J.-C.)', in *La découpe et le partage du corps à travers le temps et l'espace* (Anthropozoologica. Numéro spécial), 71–76.

*ThesCRA* = *Thesaurus cultus et rituum antiquorum*, Los Angeles 2004–2014.

van Straten, F.T. 1995. *Hiera kalá. Images of animal sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, 127), Leiden.