

THE ECONOMY OF PRIESTLY PERQUISITES IN ANCIENT GREEK CULT

By Anders Holm Rasmussen

Summary: The remuneration of priestesses and priests was closely linked to the performance of rituals in ancient Greek cult. The aim of this article is twofold: Firstly, to get an overview of the priestly perquisites mentioned in inscribed cult regulations. Secondly, to try to explore the value of these perquisites. Did the perquisites received by the priestess/priest represent a firm income, or were they just a small extra with only limited economic impact on the life of these people? Following these questions the article specifically discusses the sanctuaries as suppliers of meat to society and the values of hides. The conclusion is that priestly perquisites perhaps did not make the receiver rich, but was most likely a firm income which could make the office of priestess/priest attractive. The article ends with a catalogue of all the registered perquisites.

ἔπειτ' ἀναβλέψας ὄρω τὸν ἱερέα
τοὺς φθοῖς ἀφαρπάζοντα καὶ τὰς ἰσχάδας
ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῆς ἱερᾶς; μετὰ τοῦτο δὲ
περιῆλθε τοὺς βωμοὺς ἅπαντας ἐν κύκλῳ,
εἴ που πὸπανον εἶη τι καταλελειμμένον:
ἔπειτα ταῦθ' ἤγιζεν ἐς σάκταν τινά.

So I looked up, and what did I see but the priest
taking the cheese-cakes and figs
off the holy table; after which
he went round all the altars
seeing if anyone had left a cake there,
and he consecrated all of them by putting them into his bag.¹

1 Ar. *Pl.* 676-81. Trans. Sommerstein 1978: 294.

Introduction: A multitude of perquisites

This well-known passage from Aristophanes's *Wealth*, in which the slave, Carion, is giving an account of what he has experienced during a night in a sanctuary of Asclepius, is of course a satire: the greedy priest running around among the altars protected by the darkness of night seeing if he can find some leftovers for his bag. Greedy priests have always been targets for a good laugh.² But as is often the case with Aristophanes the scene is not necessarily far away from reality. It might well be that this priest is out on his round quite legitimately collecting his perquisites after a long day's work. The nightly scene in Aristophanes does not in itself contradict e.g., an inscribed cult regulation from Erythrai concerning the cult for Asclepius and Apollo, dated ca. 380-360 BCE, and thus contemporary with the Athenian comedy produced for the year 388 BCE. The cult regulation states a.o.: ὅσα δὲ ἐπὶ [τῆν] τράπεζαν παρατεθῆι, ταῦτα εἶναι γέρα τῶι ἱρεῖ.³

But if the act of the priest was just ordinary everyday business, why then make a joke out of it? Is it just because it is always funny to make jokes about the gods (plenty of them in Aristophanes!) and this also includes the servants of these gods? Or is it because the priests – and priestesses – were fairly wealthy people making quite a living out of doing almost nothing overlooking the rituals in the sanctuaries? At the very end of *Wealth* we meet a priest of Zeus Soter complaining that he has lost all his income and is nearly dying of starvation, because now – after the whole community has become rich – no one come to the sanctuary to sacrifice anymore. In Alan Sommerstein's free but great translation:

“In the old days, when they had nothing, you could count on a sacrifice from a merchant on his safe return from the voyage, or a defendant who had got off; or perhaps someone would have a grand sacrificial feast at home, and then naturally he'd invite me. But now nobody

2 Cf. Van Straten 1995: 154.

3 *CGRN* 76:23-25. “Whatever is placed upon [the] table will be perquisites for the priest” (trans. *CGRN*). For the date of *Wealth* cf. Sommerstein 1978: 267.

sacrifices at all. I never see a living soul, apart from a darn sight too many who think the temple is a gents' toilet.”⁴

The same theme – this time with a *chresmologos* extremely keen to lay his hands on those parts of the offerings which he thinks belong to him – runs through a scene in Aristophanes's *Peace*. The oracle-monger, Hierocles, almost attack a private sacrificial feast to *Peace* run by the elderly farmer Trygaeus in order to get his share. And he is of course also very eager to stop *Peace* from ruling because it will be bad for his business. A central passage from vv. 1104-19 – again in Sommerstein's translation – reads:

“Trygaeus: A drink-offering to the gods!

Hierocles: Aren't you going to give me any? And what about those of-fals (σπλάγχνα)?

Trygaeus: Not, not yet do the gods consent, for they strictly enjoin us first to pour our libation, and *you* to get out of it pronto! ... Our Lady of *Peace*, be with us and remain with us all our life long. Amen.

Hierocles: Could I have the tongue (γλώττα), please?

Trygaeus: You've got one already – so kindly take it away from here.

Hierocles: A drink-offering!

Trygaeus: Here, have something to go with! [*Throws some rubbish in his face*]

Hierocles: Is nobody going to give me any of the meat (σπλάγχνα)?

Trygaeus: Not yet is it lawful to do so, till that a wolf shall mate with a sheep.

Hierocles: I beg you, I beseech you!

Trygaeus: No good beseeching. ‘None can bring it about that the hedgehog should cease to be prickly.’ [*To the audience*] Come here, everyone, let's have a feast!

Hierocles: What about me?

Trygaeus: Oh, go and eat Sibyllines!

4 Ar. *Pl.* 1178-84: ὅτι πάντες εἰσὶ πλούσιοι· καίτοι τότε, ὅτ' εἶχον οὐδέν, ὁ μὲν ἂν ἦκων ἔμπορος ἔθυσεν ἱερεῖόν τι σωθεῖς, ὁ δέ τις ἂν δίκην ἀποφυγών, ὁ δ' ἂν ἐκαλλιερεῖτό τις κάμῃ γ' ἐκάλει τὸν ἱερέα· νῦν δ' οὐφ' εἰς θύει τὸ παράπαν οὐδὲν οὐδ' εἰσέρχεται, πλὴν ἀποπατησόμενοι γε πλεῖν ἢ μύριοι.

Hierocles: I swear I'm not going to let you eat the whole lot yourselves!
I'll get 'em, see if I don't!"⁵

The two specific items that Hierocles asks for here is σπλάγχνα and γλώττα, entrails and tongue. Both are parts of sacrificial animals which are commonly found in cult regulations to be given to the priests as perquisites.⁶

Reading through inscriptions with ancient greek cult regulations we find very many stipulations concerning the perquisites of priestesses and priests. The overall picture we get from these sources confirm all in all the satirical representations of the priests in Aristophanes: The priests get paid for their services by obtaining parts of the sacrificial victims, but also by receiving money in cash. The purpose of this article is thus two-fold: To get an overview of the priestly perquisites handed down to us through cult regulations preserved in inscriptions, and to explore the value some of these perquisites represented for the priestesses and priests receiving them. Had the priests in Aristophanes good reason to panic if their praxis went out of business or were the perquisites just a small extra income without much economic impact on the daily life of these people?

The source material for this investigation are all the documents published through the project *Collection of Greek Ritual Norms (CGRN)* on their magnificent website.⁷ The basis for *CGRN* is the inscriptions published in the three volumes from the 1950's and 60's by F. Sokolowski and the volume by E. Lupu in 2009.⁸ Moreover the *CGRN* have a number of inscriptions not published in any of these four volumes. According to the editorial guidelines of the *CGRN*-collection they have included inscriptions "relating to ancient Greek rituals, in particular ... the two large subjects

5 Ar. *Pax* 1104-1119. Sommerstein 1978: 136-37.

6 For references cf. the catalogue below in the appendix. I note that the hits in the catalogue under γλώσσα and σπλάγχνα all come from Asia Minor and some Aegean Islands. There are no hits from Attica or places further west.

7 <http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be>.

8 F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1955) (abbreviated *LSAM*), *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplement* (Paris 1962) (abbreviated *LSS*), *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris 1969) (abbreviated *LSCG*), E. Lupu, *Greek Sacred Law. A Collection of New Documents* (Leiden 2009) (abbreviated *NGSL*).

of sacrifice and purification”.⁹ In doing so, the *CGRN* hit on almost every inscription which contain information on priestly perquisites.¹⁰ This makes it clear that the remuneration of priestesses and priests was closely linked to the performance of the local ritual. Even though we find many local specialities in connection with cult activity, there seems nevertheless to have existed quite a firm structure throughout the ancient Greek world from archaic times down to the first centuries CE: The priestess or the priest of the sanctuary shall perform the sacrifice and for this receive perquisites of some kind.

The most common Greek word used in the sources for what we translate as “perquisites” is γέρα, the plural of τὸ γέρα, which in the literary texts has the basic meaning of gift of honour, a privilege or prerogative conferred on kings and nobles.¹¹ Often γέρα constructed with the verbs λαμβάνω (receive) or δίδωμι (give) clearly designates priestly income in general by referring to specific items to be received by the priestess or priest.¹² But γέρα is no straightforward technical term, and information about perquisites appear in many ways, and with the help of several terms. First, γέρας or γέρα can be a part of a list of perquisites, that is being a perquisite in it self.¹³ Secondly, γέρα is not so common in Attic

9 Cf. the “Guiding Principles” for the *CGRN* at: <http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be>.

10 There are some few texts in the three volumes of Sokolowski and *NGSL* relevant to my purpose here, which are not in the *CGRN*-collection. The reason seems to be that these texts often are so mutilated that it would make no sense to publish them in a collection on sacrifice and purification. But they might still contain some isolated words giving information on perquisites.

11 Thus *LSJ*.

12 Cf. e.g. *CGRN* 98 (Erythrai c 350-300 BCE) lines 10-15, though heavily restored it is clear that γέρα here are both money and parts of sacrificial animals; *CGRN* 124 (Pergamon c 250-200 BCE) lines 4-9, here δέρμα and κωλῆ together with money; *CGRN* 193 (Hyllarima 196 BCE) lines Ab16-Ab18 and B17-21, here κεφαλή and πούς; *CGRN* 194 (Magnesia-on-the-Maiander c. 197/6 or 180 BCE) lines 53-54 where it relates to the usual grants without any specification; *CGRN* 206 (Pergamon 2nd cent. BCE) lines 12-15, where it relates to natural goods.

13 We have four examples from Chios: *CGRN* 36 (end of fifth cent. BCE) line 4, where it occurs second in a list after γλάσσαι; *CGRN* 38 (c. 400 BCE) lines 4-7. This decree is concerned with the priestess of Ilithyia: ἦν δὲ ἰδιώτης ποι[ῆι], δίδοσθαι ἀπὸ τῶ

inscriptions even though the term occurs in two important sources, in both cases with reference to grants in money.¹⁴ Very often in Attica the word τὰ ἱερωσύνα is used to designate priestly perquisites.¹⁵ As with γέρα, ἱερωσύνα refers to grants in both money and in kinds.¹⁶ But in

ἰε|ρ[ὸ], ὥστε ἐς [τὸ] λ[ί]κνον ἐνθει[ν]αι,| [μ]οῖραν καὶ γέρας καὶ γλώσσαν (“If a private person performs (a sacrifice), a portion, a honorific portion, and the tongue shall be given from the sacrificial animal.” Trans. from *CGRN*). Here γέρα is translated “honorific portion.” What this portion was we cannot know, but it definitely was something different from the tongue. Carbon 2017: 173 mentions this inscription in connection with the question of the tongue, but he does not discuss γέρα; *CGRN* 88 (c. 350-300 BCE) line 4. The text is very damaged, but we have in line 4 [... c. 12 ...] καὶ γέρας δεξιό[ς] (“and a right prerogative.” Trans. *CGRN*). We cannot be absolutely sure that the adjective δεξιός is attached to γέρας, because the beginning of the next line of the text has been lost. But if δεξιός qualifies γέρας, this must be some specific part of a sacrificial animal. See also *CGRN* 170 (fifth cent. BCE), one of the earliest known sales contracts for a priesthood (here male). From Priene two examples from the same inscription, *CGRN* 175 (2nd cent. BCE), lines 8-9, where the priestess of Meter Phrygie shall receive from what is sacrificed the hides and half the γέρα. The other part of the γέρα shall be distributed among the women present together with the rest of the meat. In lines 16-18 the same priestess shall receive a third of the γέρα and the skin from the animal, which shall be sacrificed when women are initiated into the cult. *LSAM* 65 is very damaged but has ὁ ἱερεὺς γέρας in l. 6. See also *Mylasa* 350 (*PHI*).

- 14 *CGRN* 52/*SEG* 21:541 (The Erchia calendar, c. 375-350 BCE) in lines E53-59: τούτ[ω] ἱερωσθ[α]ι τὸν κήρυκα καὶ τὰ γέ[ε]ρα λαμβάνειν καθάπερ ὁ | δήμαρχος Δ (“the herald performs this sacrifice and receives perquisites like the demarch would, 10 dr.” Trans. from *CGRN*). γέρα is here money, but it is uncertain what the stipulation refers to. *CGRN* 84/*SEG* 21:527 (The regulations of the *genos* of the Salaminioi in Attica 363/62 BCE) in lines 27-28: τοῖς δὲ ἱερεῦσι καὶ ταῖς ἱερείαις ἀποδιδόναι τὰ γέρα τὰ γεγραμμένα (“to the priests and priestesses shall be given the perquisites prescribed here.” Trans. from *CGRN*). What follows is money.
- 15 τὰ ἱερωσύνα is a special form we find in Attic inscriptions. It is the same word as τὰ ἱερωσύνα. It derives from the adjective ἱερώσυνος, simply meaning priestly, belonging to priests.
- 16 Cf.. e.g.. *CGRN* 45 (the civic sacrificial calendar of Athen, c. 410-404 and 403/2-400/399 BCE); *CGRN* 55 (calendar from the deme of Teithras, c. 400-350 BCE); *CGRN* 57 (accounts for priestly perquisites et al. from the deme Aixone, c. 400-375 BCE); *CGRN* 74 (from the Attic phratry of the Demotionidai, 396/5 BCE); *CGRN* 84 (regulations of the *genos* of the Salaminioi, 363/2 BCE); *IG II²* 1361 (decree of the orgeones of Bendis, c.330-324/3); *CGRN* 94 (sacrificial calendar of the deme of Eleusis, c 330-270 BCE); *CGRN* 103 (regulations from the deme of Phrearrhioi, c. 300-250 BCE).

very many cases the grants of perquisites are not qualified by a special terminology. The texts simply say what the priestesses or priests are to be given for their services in the cult.¹⁷

When looking at the catalogue of perquisites in the appendix from pp. 36-50 below, various things become clear. The most obvious is perhaps the number of different perquisites and how specific some of them are. It is also easily perceived that a few items stand out as the most common. A table with the items sorted by the number of hits gives this picture:

Perquisites received	Number of hits
Money	78
δέρμα (hide, skin)	65
σκέλος (leg)	46
κωλῆ (thighbone)	25
γλῶσσα (tongue)	22
σπλάγχνα (entrails)	17
πλευρόν (rib)	14
κεφαλή (head)	13
γέρας/γέρα (honorific portion/prerogative/perquisite)	12
κρέας (meat)	11
ἀπόμετρα (priestly prerogative)	9
ἱερά μοῖρα (sacred portion)	9
πούς (foot)	9
χορδή (intestine)	9
ἄτελής (freedom from liturgies or taxes)	8
ἄρτος (bread)	7
οἶνος (wine)	6
τραπεζώματα (things on the table)	6
ῶμος/ῶμοπλάτη (shoulder/shoulder blade)	6
ἄλφιτον (barley-groats)	4

17 E.g. IG I³ 35/OR 137 (Athens, c. 450/438).

νεφρός (kidney)	4
σκολίον (intestine)	4
θύα ἀφ' ὧν ἄν θύῃ (burnt-offerings from which one makes smoke)	3
κώιδιον (sheep skin)	3
ὄσφυς (loin)	3
οὔς (ear)	3
αἰμάτιον (blood-sausage)	2
βραχίων (shoulder)	2
ἰσχίον (hip)	2
πρότμησις (portion from the waist)	2
σπύρος (wheat)	2
τὰ ἐπὶ κωλῆν νεμόμενα (the portions distributed on the thigh)	2
χέλυς (chest)	2
ἄκρῖσχιον (end of hip)	1
γαστρίον (stomach, or little stomach)	1
γνάθος (jaw)	1
δεῖπνον (meal)	1
ἐγκέφαλος (brain)	1
ἔλαιον (olive oil)	1
ἐλατήρ (cake)	1
ἐνθρύπτως (a kind of cake?)	1
ἐρμέα (Hermes-cake)	1
καρπεύεσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ ἱερόν (have the usufruct of the sanctuary)	1
κεφάλαιον (a part of the head)	1
κοιλία (belly)	1
κορυφαῖα (parts of the (top of the?) head)	1
μνοῦς (soft down)	1
νώτον (back)	1
ὄπλή (hoof ? (of oxen))	1

πλάτη (shoulder blade)	1
πόκος (wool, fleece)	1
πυρός (wheat)	1
ρύγχος (snout of swine)	1
σῖτος (?) (grain)	1
τὰ λοιπὰ ἱερά (the sacred rest)	1
ταρσός (shank)	1
τράχηλος (throat)	1
ὑπώμια (armpits)	1
φθόϊς (cake)	1
χόλικες (bowels from ox)	1
ῶρη (foreleg or tail?)	1

Money is by far the most common item, followed by only nine other items that can show more than 10 hits, δέρμα and σκέλος taking a clear lead. But against this seemingly uniform impression, it is worth pointing out that items with one to ten hits are still making up 35% of the total registered perquisites. Very many of these items with only one or few hits are of course special cuts from a sacrificial animal, which could be gathered under the heading: meat from ox, sheep or goat.¹⁸ Others are different kinds of bakery. All in all, it confirms the view of how diverse local practice was in the many cults spread out across the ancient Greek world, but it also shows a common structure in which the most frequently given perquisites are found all over the Greek areas.¹⁹

I shall in what follows try to look into the question of how much a priestess or priest could earn from their business, especially when it comes to the received foodstuff and the hides. Were the priestesses' and priests' share of the sacrificial animal only a small supply to use for themselves and their families, or did they achieve a surplus they could subsequently sell? A number of variables have to be taken into consideration here: How large was the sanctuary in which the priestess or priest served? How many people attended the cult? Did the priestess or priest

18 For many of these see Ekroth 2007, 2008, 2011, 2013, and Carbon 2017.

19 On this question cf. Parker 2018.

serve at large public sacrificial festivals, and how often did these events occur in the given sanctuary? We know for example that the priestess of Athena Nike in Athens was to receive legs and hides from the public sacrifices. But how many legs and hides did that produce? How much money could she make from selling the legs and hides she received and thus add to the 50 drachmas that she also received each year as a firm salary?²⁰ And the 50 drachmas, were they only what she received from the public sacrifices? Did private persons come to the sanctuary of Athena Nike to sacrifice besides the public events, and if they did, what should they pay for the service? These questions are not easily answered, at least not in detail.

Moreover, these questions also activate the topic of the supply of meat to the ancient communities. It is broadly agreed in scholarship that the bulk of the meat in circulation in ancient Greek society came from sacrifices. If the sanctuaries had a monopoly on delivering meat to society it must have had a considerable influence on the possible income for the priests selling their surplus of the acquired perquisites. And looking at our catalogue of acquired perquisites, the hides are equally brought to our attention. If the sanctuaries with their priestesses and priests had a near monopoly providing meat to the society, the same then must be the case for the hides.

The sanctuaries as sole suppliers of meat?

The understanding of the sanctuaries as the main suppliers of meat to the communities has a long standing in scholarship going back at least to P. Stengel.²¹ Some scholars even claim that the sanctuaries were the only suppliers of meat, at least that is Vincent J. Rosivach's argument in relation to Athens in the fourth century BCE. Rosivach moreover sees a division in the quality between what is kept in the sanctuaries for feasting or distribution and the parts ending up in the butchers' shops. At these shops only the odd parts of sacrificial victims were sold, that is those parts which could not easily be used for immediate cooking in the

20 Cf. *IG* I³ 35 & 36/*OR* 137 & 156.

21 Stengel 1920: 105-6; cf. Jameson 1988: 87, with note 1.

sanctuary.²² In a footnote, Rosivach mentions a couple of sources which relates to the selling of sacrificial meat, but he sees them as exceptions from the general rule.²³

There is no doubt that the sanctuaries must have produced a large quantum of the meat in circulation in their respective local societies. On the other hand, I am not convinced that the sanctuaries were the only suppliers. I think we are easily misled in this question – as in other questions when it comes to ancient history – if we interpret the randomly preserved source material as giving a one-to-one picture of life in the Greek past. What we know is that there existed a market for meat, and some of this meat came from sanctuaries and ended up in the butchers' shops. These shops certainly also sold meat from other sources or producers, but these producers have to a large extent escaped mentioning in our preserved evidence. Michael Jameson in relating to the question of sanctuaries as sole suppliers of meat stated rightly that “the bulk of the evidence is consistent with this view but [Arist.] *Oec.* 2.20e, 1349b distinguishes σφάζοντες ἐπώλουν from ἱερόθυστα ἐποίουν.”²⁴ In the Aristotelian text there is a clear division between the slaughter of livestock to meet the daily needs and the possibility to convert these animals to sacrificial victims if needed.

A passage from Saint Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians can perhaps support this point of view. In chapters eight to ten Paul treats the question whether the Christians in Corinth are allowed to eat meat

22 Rosivach 1994: 88: “In sum then, there is no evidence for animals being slain for their meat outside the framework of sacrifice; the meats available for sale from butchers appear always to be cuts that would be unsuited for sacrificial meals; and the fantasies of comedy seem always to associate private dining exclusively with these odd cuts. Each of these factors is most easily explained if we assume that animals were slain only for the purpose of sacrifice and that only those parts of the animals unsuitable for sacrificial meals were disposed of by butchers on the public market.” For the arguments that only odd parts were at sale in the butcher's shops, cf. pp. 85–87.

23 Rosivach 1994: 86 note 60. The exceptions mentioned are the fifth-century calendar from the deme Skambonidai (*IG I³ 244/CGRN 19* (without face B of the inscription)) and Theophrast *Char.* 22.4. Rosivach fails to mention the calendar from Thorikos (*NGSL 1/CGRN 32*), and if we leave Attica, we also have an example from Didyma (*LSAM 54*). See further below.

24 Jameson 1988: 87 with note 1.

which comes from sacrifices in the temples. Paul's answer is that the Christians are allowed to eat anything they buy on the meat market without further examination. And if the Christians are invited to dinner in the homes of non-Christians, they can eat anything put on the table without further examination. But if the host tells the Christian guest that the meat on the table comes from sacrifices, the Christian shall refrain from eating it. Why this is so has to do with Paul's rather complicated arguments concerning what is allowed versus what is good to do as a Christian. But this just underlines my point: Why should the host suddenly tell the guest that the meat comes from sacrifices if all meat always did that? From the context it must be clear, that the market contained both meat from sacrifices and meat supplied from elsewhere.²⁵ But apart from stating that the sanctuaries with their priestesses and priests did not have a monopoly delivering meat to the local society, it is not possible to conclude anything more specific about the value of the meat the priestesses and priests received. We do not have prices for meat cuts preserved in our sources. And the two calendars from Attica mentioning the sale of meat – from the demes Skambonidai and Thorikos – have no prices at all. What matters in the two regulations is that the meat must be sold as both calendars are connected to the yearly rendering of accounts through the *euthynai*.²⁶ We have of course a number of prices connected to sacrificial victims in the preserved cult calendars, but that does not help us here.²⁷ The fragment from Didyma just say that the meat must be sold by weight.²⁸

25 1 Cor. 10.25-28. Πᾶν τὸ ἐν μακέλλῳ πωλούμενον ἐσθίετε μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν. ... εἴ τις καλεῖ ὑμᾶς τῶν ἀπίστων καὶ θέλετε πορεύεσθαι, πᾶν τὸ παρατιθέμενον ὑμῖν ἐσθίετε μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν. ἐὰν δέ τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ τοῦτο ἱερόθυτὸν ἐστίν, μὴ ἐσθίετε δι' ἐκεῖνον τὸν μηνύσαντα καὶ τὴν συνείδησιν.

26 Skambonidai: CGRN 19 face C: 17-18; 21-22. Thorokos: CGRN 32: 9; 11-12; 23; 26; 35.

27 Thorikos (ca. 440-430/380-375): CGRN 32; Teithras (ca. 400-350): CGRN 55; Marathonian Tetrapolis (ca. 375-350): CGRN 56 (all the perquisites listed here are money); The Nicomachus Calendar (403/2-400/399): Lambert 2002, CGRN 45; Erchia (ca. 375-30): CGRN 52; The Salaminioi *genos* (363/2): CGRN 84, RO 37; Eleusis (ca. 330-270): CGRN 94.

28 LSAM 54. The text *in tuto* reads: ἐν τῇ σκην[ῆι...]ν. εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἐξε[ῖ]ναι τῶι βουλομένῳ λαμβάνειν | πωλεῖσθαι δὲ πάντα σταθμῶι | τῶν δὲ ῥυγγέων καὶ [τ]ῶν ἀκροκωλίων

This rather meagre amount of direct source material for the sale of sacrificial meat – not to mention the lack of exact prices – is definitely not representative for the past reality. There has been a lot of meat at the sanctuaries, and this meat has been used in different ways. Some of it has been sold directly, some of it has been distributed among the community for free and some of it has been consumed in the sanctuary at a sacrificial feast. But what about the priest's share? It is reasonable to imagine, that the parts the priestesses and priests could not use herself/himself also were sold. This cannot be proved, but I think it is a qualified guess. To imagine priestesses and priests continually during the year receiving perquisites in kind of meat, perhaps taking what they could eat themselves on the day or the day after and then leaving the rest to rot in the sanctuary I find hard to believe.

The value of hides

When looking at the received perquisites in kind, the hides constitute the largest group. In a fairly large part of the inscriptions the kind of hides or skin are either not specified in the text or lost on the stone. But generally, the evidence show that the priestesses and priests received hides from all the most common sacrificial animals as ox, sheep, goat and pigs with sheep not surprisingly in the lead.²⁹ As with the meat the priestesses and priests must continually have had quite a stock of animal hides much more than they could use themselves, unless they joined the

ὕπολογίζεσθαι τὸ τρίτον | μέρος. [ὕ]πὲρ τῶν κεφαλῶν τῶν | προβατείων. τοὺς δὲ μαγεῖρ[ους] | πωλεῖν τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν [προβά]των καθάραντας - - - - ("... in the tent ..., but if not, the one who wish can take: sell it all from weight. From the snouts and from the other cut-aways a third portion must be included. Concerning the heads of the flocks: The butchers shall sell the heads from the animals cleaned ..."). Sokolowski gives no date. Rehm 1958, no. 482 has a slightly different reading. See the commentary on this topic in *NGSL*: 71-72.

29 In 18 cases the kind of hide is either not specified or lost on the stone. In 17 cases the priest is to receive hides from all sacrificed animals. In 16 cases hide from sheep are specified, in 8 cases oxen, in 5 cases goats, and in 2 cases pigs.

priestly services with a business as tanners. This is of course not an impossible thought (at least not for the priests), but to my knowledge we have no evidence for such a connection.

When it comes to the prices on hides we have perhaps a little more to go on compared to the meat. A connection between hides from sacrificial animals and prices is first and foremost seen in the so-called *dermatikon*-accounts dating from Lycurgean Athens in the 330s.³⁰ The inscription – originally in four columns – is heavily fragmented and must have contained various accounts. The best-preserved part of the text, though, gives us the account ἐκ τοῦ δερματικοῦ for the years 334/3 through 331/0.

The year 334/3 lists nine public sacrificial festivals with information on which board of magistrates was in charge of each festival and how much income in cash the sale of hides from the sacrificial victims had rendered. The board in charge of the sale seems to be the βωῶναι.³¹ The full sum from this year were 5,099 drachmas and 4 *obols*. The largest preserved sum collected from one of the nine festivals is from the sacrifice for Zeus Soter, giving 1,050 drachmas, the smallest sum is from the sacrifice to *Agathe Tyche*, giving 160 drachmas.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to link any of the cults mentioned in the *dermatikon*-accounts to documents regulating priestly perquisites to these same cults, at least not in detail. The closest we get is in the case of the Bendis cult. Stephen Lambert has commented on the *dermatikon*-accounts in comparison with a late 5th century document concerning the

30 IG II² 1496. Cf. Rosivach 1994: 48–67. Rosivach suggests that the selling of the hides from these festivals was not invented by Lycurgus, but that he had rationalised a pre-existing practice (p. 48 note 99), and it seems quite clear from what we know about the term that Lycurgus somehow were involved: For the meaning of *dermatikon* cf. Hapokration s.v.: Λυκοῦργος ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ ἀπολογισμῷ ὧν πεπολίτευται δερματικὸν ἂν εἶη λέγων ὁ ῥήτωρ τὸ ἐκ τῶν δερματίων τῶν πιπρασκομένων περιγινόμενον ἀργύριον (Lycurgus in the title “account to those who are governed”: *Dermatikon* is – according to the speaker – the surplus of the money coming from the sales of the hides). Apart from this and IG II² 1496, *dermatikon* is known only from IG II³ 1 445:42, ... τῶν θεῶν τὸ ἀργύριον [τ]ὸ ἐκ τοῦ δερματικοῦ ... The context is uncertain, but the text is from a law issued by Lycurgus.

31 For the βωῶναι cf. Dem. 21.171 and RO 81: B17–18. See also Rosivach 1994: 108–14. Hansen 1980: 163–64 gives an overview of the magistrates mentioned in IG II² 1496.

cult of Bendis in Athens, the earliest evidence we possess on this cult.³² In the *dermatikon*-accounts we have preserved under the year 334/3: ἐγ Βενδιδέων παρὰ ἱεροποι[ῶν] and the sum 457 drachmas. An identical line can be reconstructed in the following year, but here the sum of money is lost.³³ Is it at all possible to connect these 457 drachmas to the Bendis priestess?³⁴

The late fifth-century Bendis-document is unfortunately very damaged, and there is no clear reference to priests in the preserved text, but it is very likely that this cult regulation has contained information on priestly perquisites.³⁵ In l. 34 we read: [..c.7.. ἀπ]ὸ δέκα ἱιερείου· τὰ δὲ ἄλλα δέρματ[α ..c.28..].³⁶ To this Lambert has suggested that the text could have described a division between hides (from ten victims) going to the priestess and the hides from the rest of the victims going to be sold as we find it in the *dermatikon*-accounts. As Lambert puts it: “Skins (or in the case of mass sacrifices, as here, some skins) of sacrificial victims were commonly retained by the officiating priest or priestess as a fee (cf., e.g., SEG 54.214). Here a division is probably being made between skins going to the priestess and others which were to be sold to finance the cult.” It is this last part of the hides Lambert suggests we have represented in the *dermatikon*-accounts.³⁷

This is a plausible suggestion, but it is at the same time important to emphasize that the suggestion only hangs on the damaged line 34 of the Bendis inscription. We have no direct evidence in the preserved sources

32 IG I³ 136/CGRN 44 (413/2 BCE). Lambert’s comments are in *AIO* in connection with his translation of the document.

33 IG II² 1496: 86, 117.

34 On the question of both a priestess and a priest serving the Bendis cult cf. Lambert 2010: 161-163. See also Parker 1996: 170-75 on the establishment of the Bendis cult in Piraeus.

35 IG I³ 136/CGRN 44: 29-36. In l. 29 of the fragment, we read: [..c.13.] εἴτε χρὲ γυναῖκα ἱερεῖοσ[..c.30..]. In *AIO* Lambert translates l. 29: “... whether the wife of the priest (?) ought ...,” with the commentary to the translation: “The word translated here as “of the priest” may also be part of a longer verb, which would change the sense to “whether a woman should serve as priest.” This translation is preferred in *CGRN*. See in general Lambert’s translation and important commentaries in *AIO*. Cf. also Wijma 2014: 139-45.

36 Lambert trans.: “... from ten victims. The other hides ...”

37 Lambert in *AIO* note 10.

for the division of hides between the priestess or priest and the cult. The SEG 54.214 mentioned by Lambert refers to the so-called law from Aixone in Attica from ca. 400-375 (see also CGRN 57). Nowhere in this inscription is it stipulated that the skins are to be divided between the priest and cult. All the skins go to the relevant priest. Having no examples of such a division we have on the contrary some cases in which it is being specified that all the hides from public sacrifices shall go to the priestess or priest. From Athens most prominently perhaps the fifth-century decree establishing a cult for Athena Nike.³⁸ Looking beyond Attica we have examples in which the priestess or priest shall have all the hides from public sacrifices, but no hides from private sacrifices.³⁹ And we have quite a lot of cases just stating that the priestess or priest shall receive “the hides” in plural.⁴⁰ Judged from the preserved evidence the normal procedure thus seems to be that the priestesses or priests received all the hides from public sacrifices. And following this line we should perhaps conclude that the priestess of Bendis in the year 334/3 received 457 drachmas from the sale of the hides given to her during that year’s festival. And moreover, that all the numbers mentioned in the *dematikon*-accounts derived from the sale of hides given to priestesses or priests during a year’s public sacrifices.

In the chart below I have listed the preserved prices in the *dematikon*-accounts. Taken that all the sums come from public festivals held during a year, I have divided the sums with 365. The numbers in the brackets indicate thus how much the yearly sum equals in drachmas per day.

Cult / Sanctuary	334/3	333/2	332/1	331/0
Dionysos in Peiraios	311 dr. (0.85)			Lost
Dionysos at the Lenaia festival	Lost	106 dr. (0.29)		Lost
Agathe Tyche	160 dr. (0.44)	101 dr. (0.28)		

38 IG I³ 35/OR 137.

39 E.g. CGRN 39 (ca. 400, Milet), CGRN 118 (ca. 250-200, Halikarnassos), CGRN 119 (ca. 250-200, Theangela).

40 E.g. CGRN 57:5-6 (400-375, Aixone in Attica), CGRN 85 (325-300, Cos), CGRN 86 (ca. 350, Cos), CGRN 175 (2nd cent., Priene).

Asklepios	291 dr. (0.80)	225 dr. (0.62)		<i>Lost</i>
Asklepios			1,000 dr. (2.74)	<i>Lost</i>
Dionysos in the city	808 dr. (2.21)	306 dr. (0.84)		<i>Lost</i>
Olympieion at the <i>demos</i> ' gathering	671 dr. (1.84)	500 dr. (1.37)		
Hermes Hegemonios	<i>Lost</i>	<i>Lost</i>		
Bendis	457 dr. (1.25)	<i>Lost</i>		
Zeus Soter	1,050 dr. (2.88)	2,610 dr. (7.15)		
Eirene		874 dr. (2.39)	710 dr. 3 ob. (1.95)	
Ammon		44 dr. 4.5 ob. (0.12)		
Panathenaion		61 dr. 3 ob. (0.17)	<i>Lost</i>	
Panathenaion (?)		33 dr. 3 ob. (0.09)		
Daeira (+ others lost on the stone)		229 dr. 4 ob. (0.63)		
Eleusinion			<i>Lost</i>	
Demokratia			414 dr. 3 ob. (1.14)	
Theseus (?)			1,183 dr. (3.24)	<i>Lost</i>

If we look at the description in *Ath.Pol.* on payments for attending meetings and holding offices in Athens about the same time as that of the *dermatikon*-accounts, these varies from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $1\frac{1}{2}$ drachmas. And the wages for

unskilled labourers were around 1½ drachmas per day, while a skilled labourer could earn up to 2½ drachmas per day.⁴¹ Compared to this it makes good sense to interpret the sums in the *dermatikon*-accounts as yearly payments to the priestesses or priests for the festivals. It is only the sums from Zeus Soter in the year 333/2 with 2,610 drachmas that seems to stand out as extreme, but the year before the payment was in line with what could be expected. All in all, the trend seems to indicate wages in the lower end. But this is of course only payments from the sale of hides. The priestesses and priests had as we have seen also a whole range of other sources of income.⁴²

Wealthy priestesses and priests?

Were the ancient Greek priestesses and priests wealthy people because of their position in the cults receiving perquisites for their services? It is often stated in scholarship that Greek priests did not make up a specific caste or class with a fixed position in society, and through many years it was also established knowledge that anyone could make a sacrifice in a Greek sanctuary without the involvement of a priestess or a priest.⁴³ Today this picture has been nuanced. First of all, there seems to be a general acceptance now that a Greek cult could not function without a priestess

41 [Arist.], *Ath. Pol.* 62.2. RO, xxiii with the references in note 17.

42 Payments to priests are examined by Loomis 1998: 76-86. In his conclusions p. 256 he states: "... I have isolated those figures that tell us what people really were paid for various kinds of work and allowances at various periods. ... The evidence for physicians, priests, oracles, seers, actors, writers and pimps is either not reliable or not useful for comparative purposes."

43 Thus e.g., Burkert 1985: 95: "Greek religion might almost be called a religion without priests: there is no priestly caste as a closed group with fixed tradition, education, initiation, and hierarchy, and even in the permanently established cults there is no *disciplina*, but only usage, *nomos*. The god in principle admits anyone, as long as he respects the *nomos*, that is, as long as he is willing to fit into the local community; ... among the Greeks, sacrifice can be performed by anyone who is possessed of the desire and the means, including housewives and slaves." But one can also refer to Stengel 1898: 31, or Ziehen 1913: col. 1411.

or a priest, not to mention the *polis* as such.⁴⁴ Secondly it is obvious from the investigation here that it was established as a fundamental rule that the priestesses and the priests should receive perquisites for their service to cult and *polis*.

Attending a cult was giving to the cult, whether it was the society – the *polis* – which attended or a private person: One gave some kind of sacrifice to the gods, one paid perhaps a fee for getting access to the cult, and one had to give perquisites to the priestess or priest who should perform the ritual. Something of what was given came back to society or the private individual. Sacrificial meat could be distributed to members of the society, or the sacrificial meat could be sold and thus enter a market.⁴⁵ The same could happen – as we have seen – with hides from sacrificial victims. And it is my suggestion here that also the priestesses and priests have been suppliers of meat and hides given the fact that they must have received far more than they were able to consume or use themselves. Did that make them rich? Not necessarily. But I am sure that income – large or small – floated to the priestesses or priests continuously during the year and thus made the basis for a firm income.

The role of the Attic *gene* with its exclusivity when it comes to supplying public cults with priestesses and priests could very well derive from the possibility of controlling the economy in certain cults. And it is a fact that a large part of our sources concerning cult regulations concentrate on economic matters – an obvious example being the arbitration in the *genos* of the Salaminioi.⁴⁶ The conflict in this case is clear: how were the cults administered by the *genos* to be financed, and who within the *genos* had a right to which priesthoods and how should the perquisites be divided? This is the expressed purpose of linking the result of the arbitration with a sacrificial calendar – the only surviving calendar where we can actually see from the preserved text on the stone why it was written

44 Cf. e.g., Parker 2011: 48-57. On the priest's role in the ritual cf. Rasmussen 2008. Important is also Blok 2017 establishing priestesses as citizens with very conspicuous roles in society.

45 As in the demes of Skambonidai (CGRN 19) and Thorikos (CGRN 32). But see also the law and decree on the Little Panathenaea from c. 335: RO 81: B1-29.

46 CGRN 84/RO 37.

up.⁴⁷ And one could also point to the contracts in connection with the sale of priesthoods in the eastern part of the Greek world. Some of these priesthoods were sold at very high prices, and perquisites such as exemption from liturgies – but also running income from other kinds of perquisites – is a central theme in these texts. We have of course also examples of priesthoods sold at more modest prices, but again, in the contracts the priestly income stand as a central and very important issue.⁴⁸

Appendix: A catalogue of perquisites

This section contains a catalogue of all the different items that priestesses and priests received as perquisites. Some of the grants are very specific and technical, and we have a lot of examples, with only one occurrence in the whole material, others we find frequently. It has not been the purpose here to go into the discussion of the exact meaning of these sometimes very specific parts of the sacrificial animals given as priestly perquisites. There exists much qualified work on this subject.⁴⁹ In the catalogue I have used the translations of the Greek terms found in *CGRN*. The catalogue lists the Greek terms in alphabetical order and the number of hits in the sources. In counting the number of hits, the approach has been to register perquisites in each cult. If e.g. one inscription deals with a number of cults, it can result in more than one hit for each perquisite in the same text. I give the reference to the sources below each lemma. Arabic numbers in italics alone refer to the inscription in *CGRN* followed by reference to line. If not anything else is noted all years are BCE.

47 *CGRN* 84/*RO* 37: 80-84.

48 Typical examples of contracts cf. *CGRN* 119 (Theangela near Halikarnassos, ca. 250-200) & 184 (from Kasossos, ca. 200-100). None of these have preserved the price paid for the priesthood, but *IErythrai* 201, ca. 300-260 lists the sale of public priest-hoods. The most expensive priesthood went for 4610 drachmas while the cheapest went for 10 drachmas. For this list see now the convenient set-up in Parker 2011: 98-102.

49 Fundamental now for the study of animal sacrifice in Greek cult is the work of Gunnel Ekroth. See especially Ekroth 2007, 2008a, 2008b, 2009, 2011, 2013. Important is also Carbon 2017.

αἱμάτιον (blood-sausage) **2**

39:10-13, Miletos c 400

86:A52f, Cos c 350

ἀκρίσχιον (end of hip) **1**

86:A52, Cos c 350

ἄλφιτον (barley-groats) **4**

56:II.45, 50, Marathonian Tetrapolis c 375-350

88, Chios c 350-300

156:14-15, Mykonos c 230-200

ἀπόμετρα⁵⁰ (priestly prerogative) **9**

25:A19-20, A23-24, A30-31, B2-3, B6, B13, B20, B24-25, B28-29, Attic deme of Paiania c 450-425

ἄρτος (bread) **7**

80, Erythrai c 350

84:43-46, Attica 363/2

ἀτελής⁵¹ (free from liturgies or taxes) **8**

49:3, Chios c 400-375

93:11, Xanthos 337/6

119:16, Theangela c 250-200

147:6-8, Cos c 250-200

164:12-13, Cos c 200-150

167:9-11, Cos 1st cent.

175:2-3, Priene 2nd cent.

50 Apart from the nine entries here, ἀπόμετρα always refers to payments of money to priestesses in Attica (see lemma 'money' below). In *CGRN* 25 (from the Attic deme Paiania) we have though the nine entries here in which ἀπόμετρα refers to a contribution of 'a quarter' (τεταρτεύς) to priestesses. What the quarter refers to is unclear.

51 This is of course not a direct perquisite, but I have included it in the list as an indirect income. In the sales contracts this seem to be one of the most important privileges of the priesthoods in question.

221:16-18, Cos c 125-100

βραχίων (shoulder) 2

156:8, 31-32, Cos c 325-300

γαστρίον (stomach, or little stomach) 1

39:2-10, Miletos c 400

γέρας / γέρα⁵² 12

36:1-7, Chios end of 5th cent.

38:A7, Chios c 400

88, Chios c 350-300

160:B9, Delos 181/0

170:4-8, Chios c 500-400

175:8-9, 14-15, Priene 2nd cent.

188:14, Cos 1st cent.

194:53, Magnesia-on-the-Maiander c 197/6 or 180s

246:8-20, Miletos 380/79 or 379/8

248:A28, B30-40, Miletos c 129

LSAM 65:6, Mylasa 2nd cent.

Mylasa 350:1 (*PHI*), Mylasa udat.

γλώσσα (tongue) 22

36:1-7, Chios end 5th cent.

38:A7, Chios c 400

39:2-10, Miletos c 400

41:9, Chios c 425-350

49:7, Chios c 400-375

50, Chios c 400-350

80, Erythrai c 350

88, Chios c 350-300

52 *CGRN* use three different translations according to context: “honorific portion” (36, Chios end of 5th cent.; 38, Chios c 400), “prerogative” (88, Chios c 350-300; 170, Chios c 500-400), “perquisite” (160, Delos 181/0; 175, Priene 2nd cent.; 188, Cos 1st cent.). *LSAM 65* and *Mylasa 350 (PHI)* both have γέρας in the singular, but the contexts are lost.

100, Miletos c 300-275
 120:7, Sinope c 350-250
 122:4-6, Thebes-on-the-Mykale c 350-250
 138, Miletos 275/4
 156:8, 31-32, 32-33, 33-34, Mykonos c 230-200
 170:4-8, Chios c 500-400
 176:8-10, Priene 2nd cent.
 196:12-18, Iasos c 225-200
 249:C5, Miletos 1st cent. CE
 LSS 121:17-22, Ephesos 3rd cent CE
 SEG 56:1037:3-6, Plakari 4th cent

γνάθος (jaw) 1

37:11, Chios c 425-375

δειπνον (meal) 1

49:10, Chios c 400-375

δέρμα (hide, skin) 65

14:5-6, Gortyn c 500-450;⁵³
 19:A14-15, Attic deme of Skambonidai c 460;⁵⁴
 26:B6-7, B16-18, Attica c 430
 30, Delphi c 450-375
 36:1-7, Chios end of 5th cent.
 39:2-10, Miletos c 400
 42:5-6, Iasos c 425-375
 44, Athens 413/2
 50:5, Chios c 400-350
 52:A22, A50-51, B39, Δ39-40, E8, Attic deme of Erchia c 375-350
 57:5-6, 10, 12, 20, 26-28, 28-29, 32-33, Attic deme of Aixone c 400-375
 61, Athens c 350
 80, Erythrai c 350
 84:31-33, 33, 37-39, Attica 363/2
 85:B58-59, Cos c 350

53 The entry has two hides: ἀμυνά (lambskin) and βοῖα (oxhide).

54 The hide belongs to the *demarch*.

- 86:A20-23, A45-47, A49-51, A56-58, A58-60, C2-3, C17-20, D2-3, D3-5, D5-8, D20-21, Cos c 350
 91:28-30, Eretria c 340
 96:39-41, Cos c 325-300
 99:98-99, Cyrene c 325-300
 100, Miletos c 300-275
 118:4-14, Halikarnassos c 250-200
 119:6-12, Theangela c 250-200
 120:6, Sinope c 350-250
 124:6, Pergamon c 250-200
 147:12, Cos c 250-200
 163:B14-16, Cos 1st cent.
 164:7-8, Cos c 200-150
 175:8-9, Priene 2nd cent.
 176:8-10, Priene 2nd cent.
 184:7-9, Kasossos c 200-100
 206:14, Pergamon 2nd cent.
 212:14, Pergamon aft. 133
 222:A83-89, Andania 23 CE(?)
 249:C7, Miletos 1st cent. CE⁵⁵
 IG I³ 35:11-12, Athens c 448
 LSAM 2:5, Chalkedon 3rd cent
 LSCG 45:2-6, Piraeus 4th cent.⁵⁶
 LSCG 89:8, Phanagoria 2nd cent. CE⁵⁷
 LSCG 164:4, Cos 2nd cent.
 LSS 121:17-22, Ephesos 3rd cent. CE
 SEG 56:1037:3-6, Plakari 4th cent.

ἔγκεφαλος (brain) 1

196:12-18, Iasos c 225-200

ἔλαιον (olive oil) 1

55 Have the word *δορά* instead of *δέρμα*.

56 The text mentions three donations of hides: One from a young victim, one from a full-grown victim, and one from an ox.

57 Have the word *δορά* instead of *δέρμα*.

80, Erythrai c 350

ἐλατήρ (cake) 1

74:7, Attica 396/5

ἐνθρόπτος (a kind of cake?) 1

42:4, Iasos c 425-375⁵⁸

ἐρμέα (Hermes-cake) 1

49:9, Chios c 400-375

θύα ἀφ' ὧν ἄν θύῃ (burnt-offerings from which one makes smoke) 3

36:1-7, Chios end of 5th cent.

41:13, Chios c 425-350

49:9, Chios c 400-375

ἱερά μοῖρα⁵⁹ (sacred portion) 9

29:25-28, Delphi c 425⁶⁰

38:A7, Chios c 400⁶¹

39:2-10, Miletos c 400

58 For the establishment of this text from two copies, cf. Fabiani 2016.

59 What the expression ἱερά μοῖρα covers has been widely discussed in scholarship. It is commonly accepted that it should be translated “sacred portion” or “divine portion”, but what it contained is unknown. A traditional view has linked it to another enigmatic term, *τραπεζώματα* (q.v.), “the things placed on the table,” cf. Sokolowski’s commentary at *LSAM* 21 & 37 and Gill 1974. Dimitrova 2008 suggested that ἱερά μοῖρα represented a specific part of the sacrificial animal and found that the ὀσφύς was a possibility. Carbon 2017 also argues for a specific perk but suggests – inspired by Ekroth 2013 – that it referred to parts connected with the foreleg of the animal.

60 The preserved text does not contain the expression ἱερά μοῖρα, but some kind of portion is given to a priest: *ὑπαρχέτο δὲ τὰ ἐξαιρέτα π[ε][λ]ανὸς τέσσαρας, μεταξέ[ν][ι]α δύο, ἱερεῖ ἕξ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἐ[κ][ατ]όμβης ἐκάστ[η]ς*. Cf. the commentary in *CGRN*.

61 The text just mentions a portion together with *gera* and tongue: *ἦν δὲ ἰδιώτης ποι[ῆ], δίδοσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱερ[ῶ], ὥστε ἐς [τὸ] λ[ί]κνον ἐνθεῖ[ν]αι, [μ]οῖραν καὶ γέρας καὶ γλώσσαν*.

119:11-12, Theangela c 250-200⁶²
 122:4-6, Thebes-on-the-Mykale c 350-250
 138, Miletos 275/4
 176:8-10, Priene 2nd cent.⁶³
 249:C5, Miletos 1st cent CE
 LSAM 63:5, Mylasa udat.

ἰσχίον (hip) 2

103:5, 20-21, Attic deme of Phrearrhioi c 300-250

καρπεύεσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ ἱερόν (have the usufruct of the sanctuary) 1

206:16, Pergamon 2nd cent.

κεφάλαιον (a part of the head) 1

86:A54-55, Cos c 350

κεφαλή (head) 13

30, Delphi c 450-375

38:B7, Chios c 400

42:1, Iasos c 425-375

45:A.3.43, A.3.56, Athens c 410-404 and 403/2-400/399

80, Erythrai c 350

85:B58-59, Cos c 350

88, Chios c 350-300

99:98-99, Cyrene c 325-300

104:33-40, Halikarnassos c 285-245

193:Ab16-17, B17-18, Hyllarima 196

196:12-18, Iasos c 225-200

LSS 121:17-22, Ephesos 3rd cent. CE.

κοιλία (belly) 1

85:A32, Cos c 350

62 The priest is to receive τὰ παρατιθέμενα τῷ θεῷ (the portions set aside to the god).

63 ... παρὰ βωμοῦ μοίρας.

κορυφαῖα (parts of the (top of the?) head) 1

39:10-13, Miletos c 400

κρέας (meat) 11

39:2-10, 10-13, Miletos c 400

49:7-8, Chios c 400-375

50, Chios c 400-350

57:6, 13, 16-17, 20-21, Attic deme of Aixone c 400-375

76:19-21, Erythrai c 380-360

80, Erythrai c 350

84:33, Attica 363/2⁶⁴

86:A52-54, Cos c 350

160:B7, Delos 181/0

215, Attica 1st cent.

LSS 130, Chios 4th cent.⁶⁵

κώιδιον (sheep skin) 3

98:B5, Erythrai c 350-300

104:33-40, Halikarnassos c 285-245

122:4-6, Thebes-on-the-Mykale c 350-250

κωλῆ⁶⁶ (thighbone) 25

25:B32-35, Attic deme of Paiania c 450-425

45, Athens c 410-404 and 403/2-400/399

57:4, 8, 10-11, 15-16, 18-19, 22-23, Attic deme of Aixone c 400-375

74:5, 6-7, Attica 396/5

100, Miletos c 300-275

103:5, Attic deme of Phrearrhioi c 300-250

104:33-40, Halikarnassos c 285-245

118:4-14, Halikarnassos c 250-200⁶⁷

64 The text has σάρξ in stead of κρέας.

65 κρέας is not preserved on the stone, just ... μοῖρας δύο.

66 For a discussion of κωλῆ in relation to σκέλος cf. Carbon 2017: 152-56.

67 The passage contains the expression: "... a thigh, and a portion distributed on the thigh ..." (trans. in CGRN); the Greek text in context: λήψεται τῶν θυομένων δημοσίαι

119:6-12, Theangela c 250-200⁶⁸
 122:4-6, Thebes-on-the-Mykale c 350-250
 124:6, Pergamon c 250-200
 156:14, Mykonos c 230-200
 160:B3, Delos 181/0
 184:6-7, Kasossos c 200-100
 196:12-18, Iasos c 225-200
 LSAM 2:5, Chalkedon 3rd cent.
 LSAM 63:5, Mylasa no date
 IG II² 1361:2-6, Peiraeus c 330-324/3
 SEG 56:1037:3-6, Plakari 4th cent.

μνοῦς (soft down) 1

LSAM 66:11-12, Mylasa no date

money⁶⁹ 78

26:B10, B11-13, Attica c 430
 41:10, Chios c 425-350
 42:8, Iasos c 425-375
 45:A.3.4, 3.23, 3.39, 3.52, 3.76, 5.11, 6.3, 6.6, 12.7, B.1.10, 4.17, 5.13, 5.15, Athens c
 410-404 and 403/2-400/39;
 49:11-12, Chios c 400-375
 52:E47-58, Attic deme of Erchia c 375-350

ἀφ' ἐκάστου ἱερείου κωλῆν καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ κω^λῆνι νεμόμενα καὶ τεταρτημορίδα σπλάγχων καὶ τὰ δέρματα, τῶν δὲ ἰδιωτικῶν λ'ήψεται κω^λῆν καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ κω^λῆνι νεμόμενα καὶ τεταρτημορίδα σπλάγχων (ll. 9-14). See the commentary in *CGRN* and Parker 2010.

68 The inscription has the same wording as *CGRN* 118, cf. n. 65 above.

69 This is a collected entry for all the examples found in which money is paid to the priestess/priest as a perquisite. In some cases – especially in Attica – the term ἱερώσυνα is used when the grant is money, but there are also many cases with just a neutral verbal expression that money is going to be paid to the priestess/priest. *CGRN* 26 from Attica use the term ἀπόμειτρα. We have two examples of the use of the term γέρα, one from the Attic deme of Erchia (*CGRN* 52) and one from Erythrai (*CGRN* 98). According to A. Chaniotis there is no reason to pay much attention to these different expressions as τὰ ἱερώσυνα is just a short form for τὰ ἱερώσυνα γέρα (*EBGR* 2002.32).

55:5, 10, Attic deme of Teithras c 400-350
 56:II.8, 9, 12, 15, 16, 20-21, 22, 28, 28-29, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 42, 43-45, 46, 47, 48-49,
 49-50, 51-52, Marathonian Tetrapolis c 375-350
 57:5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 16, 20, 24, 26-28, 28, 32, Attic deme of Aixone c 400-375
 74:6, 8, Attica 396/5
 76, Erythrai c 380-360
 84:28-30, 34-36, Attica 363/2
 94:A15, A25, Eleusis c 330-270
 98:A10-15, B10-11, Erythrai c 350-300
 103:20-21, Attic deme of Phrearrhioi c 300-250
 118:23-28, Halikarnassos c 250-200
 124:7, Pergamon c 250-200
 138, Miletos 275/4
 142:A20-23, Cos c 100-50
 187, Magnesia-on-the-Maeander beg. 2nd cent.
 220:8-9, Cos late 2nd cent.
 222:A83-89, Andania 23 CE(?)
 IG I³ 35+36, Athens c 448 and 424/3
 IG II² 1361:2-6, Piraeus 4th cent.

νεφρός (kidney) 4

39:2-10, Miletos c 400
 122:4-6, Thebes-on-the-Mykale c 350-250
 138, Miletos 275/4
 249:C5, Miletos 1st cent. CE

νώτον (back) 1

45:A.3.41, Athens c 410-404 and 403/2-400/399

οἶνος (wine) 6

34:9, 27-28, Epidauros end 5th cent
 56:II.45, 50, Marathonian Tetrapolis c 375-350
 74, Attica 396/5
 156:14-15, Mykonos c 230-200

ὄπλή (hoof ? (of oxen)) 1

86:D18-20, Cos c 350

ὀσφῦς⁷⁰ (loin) 3

42:1, Iasos c 425-375

100:2, Miletos c 300-275

156:14, Mykonos c 230-200

οὔς (ear) 3

74:5-6, 7, Attica 396/5

86:A60-62, Cos c 350

πλάτη (shoulder blade) 1

129:5, Patara c 300-200

πλευρόν (rib) 14

25:B32-35, Attic deme of Paiania c 450-425

57:4, 8-9, 10-11, 15-16, 18-19, 22-23, Attic deme of Aixone c 400-375⁷¹

61:8, Athens c 350

74:5, 7, Attica 396/5

88:7, Chios c 350-300⁷²

103:5, 20-21, Attic deme of Phrearrhioi c 300-2501

196:12-18, Iasos c 225-200

πόκος (wool, fleece) 1

98:A12, Erythrai c 350-300

πούς (foot) 9

30:A5, B2, Delphi c 450-375

42:1, Iasos c 425-375

45:A.3.43, 56, Athens c 410-404 and 403/2-400/399

85:B58-59, Cos c 350

99:98-99, Cyrene c 325-300

193:Ab16-17, B17-18, Hyllarima 196

70 For a discussion of the term cf. Carbon 2017: 158.

71 In the law from Aixone the expression is *πλευρόν ισχίο* throughout.

72 Spelled: *πλεόρας*.

πρότμησις (portion from the waist) 2

37:11, Chios c 425-375

120:7, 8,⁷³ Sinope c 350-250**πυρός** (wheat) 1

37:13, Chios c 425-375

ρύγχος (snout of swine) 1

80, Erythrai c 350

σίτος (?) (grain) 1

38:A3-4, Chios c 400

σκέλος⁷⁴ (leg) 46

22:B15, Argos c 450;

26:16, 19, Attica c 430

30:B3, Delphi c 450-375

34:9-10, 11-13, 28-30, 30-31, Epidauros end 5th cent.

37:10, Chios c 425-375

39:2-10, Miletos c 400

42:1, Iasos c 425-375

45:A.3.54, Athens c 410-404 and 403/2-400/399

61:5, Athens c 350

84:31-33, 37-39, Attica 363/2

85:B55, 58-59, Cos c 350

86:A20-23, 45-47, 49-51, 56-58, 58-60, C2-3, 17-20, D2-3, 5-8, 21, Cos c 350

96:39-41, Cos c 325-300

98:A15, B5, Erythrai c 350-300

104:33-40, Halikarnassos c 285-245

138:17-18, Miletos 275/4⁷⁵

147:12, Cos c 250-200

73 CGRN 120:8 has: πρότμησις ἢ ὠμοπλάτη (portion from the waist or shoulder blade).

74 For a discussion of σκέλος in relation to κωλιῆ cf. Carbon 2017: 152-56.

75 The passage reads: σκέλος εἰς κοτυληδὸνα [ἐκ τ]ετμημένον (a leg cut into (i.e. at) the hip-joint (CGRN trans.)).

163:B14-16, Cos 1st cent.
 164:7-8, Cos c 200-150
 176:8-10, Priene 2nd cent.
 184:7-9, Kasossos c 200-100
 187:10-11, Magnesia-on-the-Maeander beg. 2nd cent.
 188:1, Cos 1st cent.
 196:12-18, Iasos c 225-200
 206:14, Pergamon 2nd cent.
 212:14, Pergamon aft. 133
 249:C5, Miletos 1st cent. CE
 IG I³ 35:11-12, Athens c 448

σκολίον (intestine) 4

39:2-10, Miletos c 400
 122:4-6, Thebes-on-the-Mykale c 350-250
 138:17, Miletos 275/4
 249:C5, Miletos 1st cent. CE

σπλάγχνα (entrails) 17

36:1-7, Chios end 5th cent.
 39:2-10, Miletos c 400
 41:12, Chios c 425-350
 42:1, Iasos c 425-375
 49:6, Chios c 400-375
 50:7, Chios c 400-350
 76:19-21, Erythrai c 380-360
 88:1, Chios c 350-300
 104:33-40, Halikarnassos c 285-245
 118:4-14, Halikarnassos c 250-200
 119:6-12, Theangela c 250-200
 138:16, Miletos 275/4
 170:4-8, Chios c 500-400
 188:3-5, Cos 1st cent.
 249:C4, Miletos 1st cent. CE
 LSAM 66:11-12, Mylasa udat.
 LSS 130, Chios 4th cent.

Halikarnassos 118:9 (PHI), undat. (L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris 1937), 466-468

σπύρος (wheat) 2

34:8-9, 26-27, Epidauros end 5th cent

τὰ ἐπὶ κωλῆν νεμόμενα (the portions distributed on the thigh) 2

118:11, Halikarnassos c 250-200

119:7-8, Theangela c 250-200

τὰ λοιπά ἱερά (the sacred rest) 1

249:C7, Miletos 1st cent. CE

ταρσός (shank) 1

86, Cos c 350

τραπεζώματα⁷⁶ (things on the table) 6

76:23-25, Erythrai c 380-360⁷⁷

188:2, Cos 1st cent.⁷⁸

195:B2.15-20, Minoa on Amorgos 1st cent.⁷⁹

196:16-17, Iasos c 225-200⁸⁰

206:15, Pergamon 2nd cent⁸¹

222:A83-89, Andania 23 CE(?)⁸²

76 Cf. note 52 above. The standard works on *τραπεζώματα* are still Gill 1974 and Gill 1991.

77 The wording here is ὅσα δὲ ἐπὶ [τὴν] τράπεζαν παρατεθῆι, ταῦτα εἶναι γέρα τῶι ἱεῖ (whatever is placed upon the table will be perquisites for the priest (trans. from *CGRN*)).

78 ...καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιτιθεμένων ἐπὶ vacat τὴν τράπεζαν ταῖ θεῶι τὰ τέταρτα μέρηι.

79 Fragmented, but wording close to *CGRN* 188, cf. note 76 above.

80 ... καὶ τὰ παρατιθέμε[να] πάντα ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζα[ν] ἢ ἱέρεια πλὴν χρυσοῦ ἢ ἀργυρ[ίου ἢ] [i]ματισμοῦ.

81 ... καὶ τᾶλλα τραπεζώματα πάντα τὰ παρατιθέμε[να] ...

82 ... καὶ ὅσα κα οἱ θύοντες ποτὶ ταῖ κράναι τραπεζῶντι [...] λαμβανέτω Μνασίστρατος. For a discussion on the identity of *Mnaistratos* cf. the commentary in *CGRN*.

τράχηλος (throat) **1**

196, Iasos c 225-200

ὑπώμια (armpits) **1**

86:A52f, Cos c 350

φθόις (cake) **1**

188:3-5, Cos 1st cent.

χέλυς (chest) **2**

45:A.3.42, Athens c 410-404 and 403/2-400/399

86:51, Cos c 350

χόλικες (bowels from ox) **1**

39:10-13, Miletos c 400

χορδή (intestine) **9**

39:10-11, Miletos c 400⁸³

57: 4-5, 9, 10-11, 15-16, 18-19, 22-23, Attic deme of Aixone c 400-375

SEG 56:1037:3-6, Plakari 4th cent.

ῥῶμος / ῥωμοπλάτη (shoulder / shoulder blade) **6**

45:A.3.42, Athens c 410-404 and 403/2-400/399

75:32-36, Oropos c 386-374

86:D18-20, Cos c 350

120:7, 8,⁸⁴ Sinope c 350-250

165, Cos c 200-150

196:12-18, Iasos c 225-200

ῶρη (foreleg or tail?) **1**

100:5-6, Miletos c 300-275

83 The terminology is here χορδίων (a large intestine) and χόλιξ (bowel from ox).

84 CGRN 120:8 has: πρότμησις ἢ ῥωμοπλάτη (portion from the waist or shoulder blade).

ABBREVIATIONS

- AIO = Athenian Inscriptions Online (<https://www.atticinscriptions.com>).
- AIUK = Attic Inscriptions in UK Collections (<https://www.atticinscriptions.com>).
- CGRN = Collection of Greek Ritual Norms (<http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be>).
- EBGR = Epigraphic Bulletin for Greek Religion (in the periodical *Kernos*).
- IErythrai = Engelmann, H. & R. Merkelbach 1972-1973. *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 1-2)*. Bonn.
- IG I³ = Lewis, D.M. (ed.) 1981. *Inscriptiones Graecae I*, 3rd edition. Fasc. 1. Berlin + D.M. Lewis & L. Jeffery (eds.) 1994. *Inscriptiones Graecae I*, 3rd edition. Fasc. 2. Berlin.
- IG II² = Kirchner, J. (ed.) 1913-1940. *Inscriptiones Graecae II-III*, 2nd edition. Berlin.
- IG II³ = *Inscriptiones Graecae II-III*, 3rd edition.
- LSAM = Sokolowski, F. 1955. *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*. Paris.
- LSCG = Sokolowski, F. 1969. *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*. Paris.
- LSJ = Liddell, H.G. & R. Scott 1940. *Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed., rev. H. Stuart Jones. Oxford.
- LSS = Sokolowski, F. 1962. *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplement*. Paris.
- NGSL = Lupu, E. 2009. *Greek Sacred Law. A Collection of New Documents*. Leiden.
- OR = Osborne, R. & P.J. Rhodes, 2017. *Greek Historical Inscriptions 478-404 BC*. Oxford.
- PHI = Searchable Greek Inscriptions. The Packard Humanities Institute (<https://epigraphy.packhum.org>).
- RO = Rhodes P.J. & R. Osborne 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404-323 BC*. Oxford.
- SEG = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Blok, J. 2017. *Citizenship in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
- Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*. Oxford.

- Carbon, J.-M. 2017. 'Meaty Perks: Epichoric and Topological Trends' in S. Hitch & I. Rutherford (eds.) *Animal Sacrifice in the Ancient Greek World*. Cambridge, 151-77.
- Daux, G. 1983. 'Le calendrier de Thorikos au musée J. Paul Getty' *AC* 52, 150-74.
- Dimitrova, N. 2008. 'Priestly Prerogatives and *hiera moira*' in A.P. Matthaiou & I. Polinskaya (eds.) *Μικρός Ίερομνήμων. Μελέτες εἰς μνήμην Michael H. Jameson*. Athens, 251-57.
- Ekroth, G. 2007. 'Meat in Ancient Greece: Sacrificial, Sacred or Secular?' in W. van Andringa (ed.) *Sacrifice et marché de la viande dans le monde romain: Rituel, commerce et pratiques alimentaires*. *Food and History* 5, 249-72.
- Ekroth, G. 2008a. 'Meat, Man and God: On the Division of the Animal Victim at Greek Sacrifices' in A.P. Matthaiou & I. Polinskaya (eds.) *Μικρός Ίερομνήμων: Μελέτες εἰς μνήμην Michael H. Jameson*. Athens, 259-90.
- Ekroth, G. 2008b. 'Burnt, Cooked or Raw? Divine and human culinary desires at Greek animal sacrifice' in E. Stavrianopoulou, A. Micheals & C. Ambos (eds.) *Transformations in Sacrificial Practices: From Antiquity to Modern Times*. Berlin, 87-111.
- Ekroth, G. 2011. 'Meat for the gods' *Kernos Supplément* 26, 15-41.
- Ekroth, G. 2013. 'Forelegs in Greek cult' in A-L. Schallin (ed.) *Perspectives on Ancient Greece. Papers in celebration of the 60th anniversary of the Swedish Institute at Athens* (Skrifter utgivna av svenska institutet i Athen, 8^o, 22). Stockholm, 113-34.
- Fabiani, R. 2016. '*I.Iasos* 220 and the regulations about the priest of Zeus Megistos' *Kernos* 29, 159-83.
- Gill, D. 1974. 'Trapezomata: A Neglected Aspect of Greek Sacrifice' *HThR* 67, 117-37.
- Gill, D. 1991. *Greek Cult Tables*. New York & London.
- Hansen, M. H. 1980. 'Seven Hundred *Archai* in Classical Athens' *GRBS* 21, 151-73.
- Humphreys, S.C. 2004. *The Strangeness of the Gods: Historical Perspectives on the Interpretation of Athenian Religion*. Oxford.
- Jameson, M. H. 1988. 'Sacrifice and Animal Husbandry in Classical Greece' in C.R. Whittaker (ed.) *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, 87-119.

- Lambert, S.D. 2000. 'The Sacrificial Calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis: A Revised Text' *ZPE* 130, 43-70.
- Lambert, S.D. 2010. 'A Polis and its Priests: Athenian Priesthoods before and after Pericles' Citizenship Law' *Historia* 59, 143-75.
- Lambert, S.D. 2019. *Attic Inscriptions in UK Collections. British Museum. Cult Provisions* (AIUK, vol. 4.1).
- Loomis, W.T. 1998. *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens*. Ann Arbor.
- Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. 2005. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. 2010. 'A Funerary Foundation from Hellenistic Lycia' *Chiron* 40, 103-21.
- Parker, R. 2011. *On Greek Religion*. Ithaca.
- Parker, R. 2018. 'Regionality and Greek Ritual Norms' *Kernos* 31, 73-81.
- Rasmussen, A.H. 2008. 'Priest and Ritual in Ancient Greek Cult' in A.H. Rasmussen & S.W. Rasmussen (eds.) *Religion and Society. Rituals, Resources and Identity in the Ancient Graeco-Roman World. The BOMOS-Conferences*. Rome, 71-80.
- Rehm, A. 1958. *Didyma II: Die Inschriften*. Berlin.
- Rosivach, J. V. 1994. *The System of Public Sacrifice in Fourth-Century Athens*. Atlanta.
- Sommerstein, A. 1978. *Aristophanes. The Birds and Other Plays*. London.
- Stengel, P. 1898. *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer* (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 5/3). Munich.
- Stengel, P. 1920. *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*. 3rd ed. Munich.
- Straten, F.T. van. 1995. *Hiera kala: Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Leiden, New York & Köln.
- Whitehead, D. 1986. *The Demes of Attica 508/7-ca. 250 B.C.* Princeton.
- Wijma, S.M. 2014. *Embracing the Immigrant: The Participation of Metics in Athenian Polis Religion (5th-4th c. B. C.)* (*Historia Einzelschriften* 1, 233). Stuttgart.
- Ziehen, L. 1913. 'Hiereis' in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* VIII,2. Stuttgart.