Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 27 (1981)

Artikel: Human sacrifice in Greek religion : three case studies
Autor: Henrichs, Albert
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-661006

V

Albert Henrichs

HUMAN SACRIFICE IN GREEK RELIGION: THREE CASE STUDIES

The Greeks clearly preferred the fiction of human sacrifice to its reality. Scores of men and women are sacrificed to various gods and heroes in Greek myth. But the number of human victims ritually killed in Greek cult was doubtless considerably smaller, although nobody knows exactly how small [1]. Most authorities on Greek religion agree that human sacrifice occurred occasionally but existed nowhere as a regular cultic institution [2]. Not surprisingly, therefore, archaeologists have produced no remains that would point to the practice of human sacrifice in the archaic, classical or Hellenistic period [3]. Archaeological evidence for human sacrifice in the Bronze Age, though

[1] On the terminological distinction between 'human sacrifice' and 'ritual killing' see *infra* p. 213 n. 3.

[2] *E.g.* U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* I (Berlin 1931), 299 f.; M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* I (München ^{3}1967), 23, 133 and 400. W. Burkert, *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Stuttgart 1977), 107, 139 and 374 is even more cautious.

[3] On possible evidence for human sacrifice in several 8th century burials on Cyprus see M. Andronikos, *Totenkult*, Archaeologia Homerica III W (Göttingen 1968), 83 f.; W. Burkert, *Griech. Religion*, 297 n. 22.

far from negligible, has always been controversial [1]. The debate has just been reopened by Professor Sakellarakis who has found the alleged victim of a ritual murder in a temple at Arkhanes on Crete [2]. But as usual, there is room for disagreement, and the future will tell whether or not his archaeological data allow other interpretations that can do without the human sacrifice [3].

In other parts of the Mediterranean the situation is different. The most recent report on the excavations in the Tophet precinct at Carthage notes "that ca. 20,000 urns were deposited between 400 and 200 B.C., most of which contained the charred remains of humans a few months to three years old". The report concludes that "at the heights of urbanity, child sacrifice flourished as never before" [4]. This is shocking archaeological confirmation for the Punic child sacrifice denounced by Greek and Roman authors [5]. But the case of Carthage, and

[1] M. ANDRONIKOS, *Totenkult*, 82 ff. That one of the Pylos tablets refers to human victims is far from certain, *pace* J. CHADWICK, *The Mycenaean World* (Cambridge 1976), 91 f.; *infra* p. 232 n. 2 on archaeological evidence for Bronze Age cannibalism.

[2] Announced in the *New York Sunday Times* of Nov. 4, 1979; cf. *The Athenian, Greece's English Language Monthly*, March 1980, 22-30. I am very grateful to Professor Sakellarakis for oral, visual and written information on his spectacular discovery (see now *National Geographic* 159, 2, February 1981, 204-222).

[3] Four skeletons (one of them in a peculiar position which seems to suggest that the person's feet were bound), a blade, the clay feet of a cult statue, the cultic context in general and the destruction wreaked by the earthquake (which the human sacrifice, it is said, was supposed to prevent) are the known facts of the case.

[4] L. E. STAGER, in *Archaeological Institute of America, Abstracts* 4, Dec. 1979, 20 f.; Burkert, in this volume, p. 105 n. 2, pp. 120 n. 2 and 121 n. 1; see now L. E. STAGER, in J.G. PEDLEY (ed.), *New Light on Ancient Carthage* (Ann Arbor, Mich. 1980), 1-11.

[5] A. HENRICHS (ed.), *Die Phoinikika des Lollianos. Fragmente eines neuen griechischen Romans*, Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 14 (Bonn 1972), 12-16 (with bibliogr.); A.R.W. GREEN, *The Role of Human Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East*, American Schools of Oriental Research, Diss. Series, 1 (Missoula 1975), 179-187; P. MOSCA, *Child Sacrifice in Canaanite and Israelite Religion. A Study in Mulk and MLK* (Diss. Harvard University 1975); S. TLATLI, *La Carthage punique. Etude urbaine* (Paris/Tunis 1978), 190-200; Morton SMITH, « A Note on Burning Babies »,

similar Punic child burials on Sicily and Sardinia, are exceptions because they are so clear-cut [1].

Archaeology alone can provide tangible proof for the practice of human sacrifice in times so distant. But even where the archaeological evidence is undisputed, it cannot establish more than the fact and perhaps the material circumstances of the sacrifice as such while its religious intention remains unknown. Only written evidence gives us detailed descriptions of human sacrifice for the various periods of Greek religious history. But the written sources have their own problems. No authentic eyewitness report of human sacrifice or ritual murder exists in all of Greek and Latin literature. Different though they are, the known descriptions have one thing in common: their length and degree of graphic detail stand in reverse proportion to their credibility, historicity and factualness. For the limited purpose of my demonstration, I have selected three representative cases of reported human sacrifice from widely different periods: the myth of Iphigeneia at Aulis, which illustrates the importance of ritual alternatives to human sacrifice; the 'historical' account of human sacrifice before the battle of Salamis in 480 B.C., which shows how easily good fiction can be mistaken for fact; and finally, a fictitious case of ritual murder and cannibalism imbedded in a Greek novel of the second century A.D., which explains why pagans misunderstood the Christian eucharist as ritual infanticide. If seen

---

in *JAOS* 95 (1975), 477-479; D. WINSTON, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, The Anchor Bible, vol. 43 (Garden City 1979), 239 f. on the remarkable late Hellenistic passage *Sap.* 12, 3 ff., which uses the language of mystery religions to characterize the Canaanite Moloch sacrifice as ritual infanticide (τέκνων τε φονὰς ἀνελεήμονας) and cannibalism (καὶ σπλαγχνοφάγον ἀνθρωπίνων σαρκῶν θοῖναν καὶ αἵματος, cf. *infra* p. 225 nn. 1 and 4).

[1] On the Tophet precinct in Motya/Sicily see A. CIASCA, in *Mozia* I-IX (Roma 1964-1978) and in *Sicilia Archeologica* 1 (1971), 11-16. B. S. J. ISSERLIN and J. du PLAT TAYLOR, *Motya. A Phoenician and Carthaginian City in Sicily* I (Leiden 1974), 95 f. managed to discuss the religion of Motya without explicit reference to the child-sacrifice practiced on the island.

together rather than separately, my three case studies reveal a consistent Greek attitude toward human sacrifice which transcends the historical background, literary genre and religious identity that characterize each text individually.

I Iphigeneia and Animal Substitution

For more than two and a half millennia Iphigeneia has been the classic case of human sacrifice. With the exception of Abraham's attempt to sacrifice Isaac, which is of comparable antiquity and structurally similar, no other story of human sacrifice has exercised so many minds [1]. In the eyes of Lucretius, for instance, the ritual death of Iphigeneia illustrates the depraving influence of religion on human character: *tantum religio potuit suadere malorum* (I 101). But was Lucretius right and did Iphigeneia really die as a victim of Greek superstition? Before Lucretius, it was Aeschylus who implied, apparently for the first time, that Iphigeneia was actually killed at Aulis [2]. In his

[1] In the case of Iphigeneia the leitmotif of animal substitution (*Kypria*; Eur. *IT* and *IA*; Ov. *Met.* XII 27-34), though never completely ousted from literary tradition, was eventually challenged by the more severe motif of human sacrifice actually performed (Aeschyl. *Ag.*; Pindar; Lucretius). In Jewish narrative tradition, the story of Isaac underwent a similar evolution from would-be human sacrifice to the real thing. According to the Haggadah of the talmudic period, and contrary to what is written in the Torah (*Gen.* 22), Isaac's blood was actually shed, and he became the prototype of Jewish martyrs (S. Spiegel, *The Last Trial. On the Legends and Lore of the Command to Abraham to Offer Isaac as a Sacrifice: The Akedah* (New York 1967), esp. ch. VII). In both cases, the mitigating cultic mechanism of animal substitution was abandoned in the course of literary tradition because the human blood proved a more powerful symbol. A similar preference characterizes the literary sources (predominantly Greek) which bear on the Punic Tophet (holocaust) sacrifice. Whereas the archaeological and epigraphical evidence proves that animal substitution and actual child-sacrifice coexisted side by side from the seventh century B.C. to the second century A.D., literary tradition focused exclusively on the child-sacrifice in times of crisis and suppressed any reference to animal substitution (*supra* p. 196 nn. 4 and 5).

[2] Ed. Fraenkel (ed.), *Aeschylus, Agamemnon* II (Oxford 1951), 141 n. 3. Iphigeneia does die in Pindar's *Eleventh Pythian Ode*, written in 474 or 454 (so C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964), 404), i.e. either before the *Oresteia* or after the death

graphic description of the preparations for the sacrifice, which inspired Lucretius, Iphigeneia "is lifted like a goat above the altar, face downwards" [1]. The scene envisaged by Aeschylus is reminiscent of the sacrifice of Polyxena who has her throat cut by Neoptolemus on an archaic vase from the mid-sixth century, which is the earliest complete depiction of human sacrifice in Greek art [2]. The ritual death of Iphigeneia in the *Agamemnon* is a poetic necessity, a *felix culpa* from the dramatist's point of view which serves as the pivot for Agamemnon's moral dilemma and as the eventual cause of the king's downfall and murder. But Aeschylus' version eliminates the most conspicuous ritual feature of the Iphigeneia myth, which is not the perpetration of the human sacrifice, but rather its prevention and transformation into animal sacrifice.

In the two pre-Aeschylean versions of the Iphigeneia myth (A, B), and in a regional myth which follows a similar story pattern (C), a substitute dies in place of the human victim; in another regional myth (D) which is structured around the same motifs as C, the victim actually dies, but only after her transformation into animal shape. Despites their undeniable differences, these four myths can be reduced to an almost identical narrative core, as the following chart illustrates:

---

of Aeschylus. Like Aeschylus, Pindar emphasizes the moral consequence of Agamemnon's action, an emphasis which is irreconcilable with the divine rescue in the earlier versions.

[1] *Ag.* 232 ff. δίκαν χιμαίρας (*infra* p. 219 n. 3) ὕπερθε βωμοῦ/... προνωπῆ.

[2] Pictures of the black-figured neck-amphora in the British Museum can be found in H. B. WALTERS, in *JHS* 18 (1898), pl. 15; P. MAAS, in *CQ* N.S. 1 (1951), 94 = *Kleine Schriften* (München 1973), 42 (in connection with *Ag.* 232 ff.); E. VERMEULE and S. CHAPMAN, « A Protoattic Human Sacrifice ? », in *AJA* 75 (1971), 285-293 (publication of a fragment of a krater in Boston tentatively identified as the sacrifice of Iphigeneia), pl. 72 fig. 6; M. ROBERTSON, *A History of Greek Art* (Oxford 1975), II pl. 40 b; M. DETIENNE and J.-P. VERNANT (eds.), *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec* (Paris 1979), 159 fig. 3.

A *Kypria* [1]	1. Agamemnon killed deer/stag. 2. Artemis got angry. 3. Artemis demanded Iphigeneia's sacrifice. 4a. Artemis substituted hind for Iphigeneia. 4b. Artemis made Iphigeneia immortal and transported her to the land of the Taurians.
B Hesiod Fr. 23 Merkelbach-West	1. (omitted). 2. (omitted). 3. Iphimede to be sacrificed on altar of Artemis. 4a. Artemis substituted a double (εἴδωλον) for Iphimede. 4b. Artemis made Iphimede immortal as Artemis of the Cross-Roads.
C Attic myth [2]	1. Athenians killed she-bear. 2. Artemis got angry. 3a. Delphic oracle told Athenians to sacrifice a virgin [3].

[1] G. KINKEL (ed.). *Epic. Graec. fragm.* p. 19; T. W. ALLEN (ed.), *Homeri Opera* (OCT) V p. 104; E. BETHE, *Homer. Dichtung und Sage* II 2, 4 (Leipzig/Berlin ^{2}1929), 153 f. = *Der troische Epenkreis* (Stuttgart 1966), 5 f. Proclus' summary is essentially identical with Apollod. *Bibl. epit.* 3, 21-23. The surrogate bear and the location of Iphigeneia's sacrifice at Brauron (Phanodemus, *FGrHist* 325 F 14 and *Schol. Leid. ad* Aristoph. *Lys.* 645, ultimately from Apollodorus Π. θεῶν; Euphorio Fr. 91 Powell) are Brauronian variants designed to bring the Iphigeneia myth in line with the ἀρκτεία.

[2] Two versions are known, one connected with Brauron (*Schol. Leid.*/*Rav. ad* Aristoph. *Lys.* 645; *Suda*, *s.v.* Ἄρκτος ἢ Βραυρωνίοις, α 3958) and the other with Munichia (*Suda*, *s.v.* Ἔμβαρός εἰμι, ε 937, with Adler's testimonia), on which see A. BRELICH, *Paides e Parthenoi* I (Roma 1969), 242-279, esp. 247 ff. and W. SALE, in *RhM* 118 (1975), 265-284 (who impairs his argument by ignoring Brelich).

[3] Munichia version; see p. 201 n. 2.

3b. Artemis (or Delphic oracle) demanded that Athenian maidens "play the bear" [1].

4a. An Athenian substituted a goat dressed as a girl for his daughter [2].

4b. Athenians institute the "bear-ritual" (ἀρκτεία) [3].

D Arcadian myth [4]

1. Kallisto broke her vow of virginity.
2. Artemis got angry.
3. Artemis transformed Kallisto into a bear.
4. Kallisto as bear shot by Artemis.

In each case, an offense against Artemis in her two traditional roles as divine protectress of wildlife and of virginity triggers the wrath of the goddess, who demands satisfaction in

[1] Brauronian version.

[2] Munichia version. Cf. A. BRELICH, in *Myths and Symbols. Studies in Honor of Mircea Eliade*, ed. by J. M. KITAGAWA and C. H. LONG (Chicago 1969), 195-207, at 202: "The human sacrifice ordered by the oracle is 'replaced' not by one, but by two rituals, the goat sacrifice and the *arkteia* of the young girls" (argued in more detail in *Paides e Parthenoi* I 256 ff.).

[3] Brauronian version; see *supra* n. 2.

[4] Cf. W. BURKERT, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley 1979), 6 f.; A. STENICO, in *Quaderni Ticinesi di Numismatica e Antichità Classiche* 6 (1977), 73-86 (punishment of Kallisto on a 4th century Apulian krater). For her myth, see Hes. Fr. 163 M.-W. (Kallisto lost her viriginity and was punished by Artemis who transformed her into a bear; her ultimate fate in Hesiod's version is unknown); Apollod. *Bibl.* III 8, 2, 4 (Kallisto lost her virginity and was shot by Artemis); *Schol. D* (*A*) *ad* Hom. *Il.* XVIII 487 (= Call. Fr. 632 Pfeiffer) and Paus. VIII 3, 6 (Kallisto lost her virginity and was punished by Hera who transformed her into a bear and had her shot by Artemis); Ov. *Met.* II 401-530 and *Fast.* II 153-192 (Kallisto transformed into a bear by Hera and almost shot by her son Arkas). It is a reasonable inference that in the Hesiodic version Kallisto was not only transformed into a bear by Artemis but also shot as a bear by the same goddess, *pace* W. SALE, « Callisto and the Virginity of Artemis », in *RhM* 108 (1965), 11-35 (esp. 29: "It is generally agreed that the form in which she was both changed *and* shot was late"). Paus. I 43, 1 refers to an Arcadian version of the Iphigeneia myth but does not elaborate.

the form of the life of a virgin but settles in the end for the life of a surrogate victim, usually an animal.

Differences between the closely related versions A, B and C can be explained as multiple attempts to adapt the basic story pattern so as to suit particular interests. For instance, the two categories of substitute victims—a human double or phantom in version B and various animals in versions A and C—reflect the difference between full-fledged, ritually oriented myths (A, C) on the one hand which emphasize the interchangeability of man and animal, and an abbreviated myth (B) on the other hand in which a poet exclusively interested in the ultimate fate of the heroine dropped the cultic mechanism of animal substitution and replaced the sacrificial animal with a phantom human victim. Another peculiar detail in versions A 4b and B 4b is the formal deification of Iphigeneia which has to do with the fact that she was worshipped as a deity in her own right and a cultic hypostasis of Artemis in various regional cults [1]. Unlike the epic and panhellenic versions A and B, version C is a regional variant in which the story is detached from the Trojan War and Iphigeneia replaced by a nameless Athenian girl.

The Kallisto myth (D) shares with A and C the combined motifs of Artemis' wrath and of the interchangeability of man and animal. In addition, D shares with C an emphasis on virginity (C) or its loss (D) as well as on punitive bear-disguise (C) or bear-transformation (D). In C and D, bears and virgins are treated as interchangeable, and become objects of Artemis' protection as well as her victims. These close structural resemblances are perhaps best explained by the assumption that the Kallisto myth is a narrative crystallization of the same ancient initiation patterns which survived in the Brauronian cult (C) and in which Artemis was perceived as a jealous goddess who

[1] U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, in *Hermes* 18 (1883), 257 = *Kleine Schriften* VI (Berlin 1972), 202 f.; L. R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford 1921), 55-58.

protected and, if necessary, destroyed the game of the hunt and girls of marriageable age, two favorite targets of male aggression [1]. But the Kallisto myth conceals its cultic origin in one important respect. Whereas animals die in place of human victims in A and C, it is Kallisto herself who dies in D, but only after her transformation into animal shape. While Kallisto's animal metamorphosis repeats a familiar mythological motif that has no direct ritual reference [2], the reverse process of animal substitution in connection with human sacrifice is by its very nature ritualistic, and reflects actual cult practices.

What exactly is the ritual connection of the Iphigeneia myth? Generations of classical scholars have drawn the facile conclusion that the Iphigeneia myth in its pre-Aeschylean form exemplifies the Greek rejection of human sacrifice and its replacement with animal sacrifice [3]. On that theory, human victims were sacrificed in the Bronze Age, either as wind-charms to ensure safe sailing, or as scapegoats to avert military disaster, or even as first-fruit offerings to deflect divine envy [4]. Animal substitution in the Iphigeneia myth would thus represent a secondary development, a conscious attempt to human-

[1] See A. BRELICH, *Paides e Parthenoi* I 263 n. 69 for a similar suggestion.

[2] The closest analog is Actaeon's transformation into a stag by Artemis and his subsequent death, which was also narrated in the *Ehoiai* (T. RENNER, in *HSCP* 82 (1978), 282 ff.).

[3] *E.g.* L. PRELLER/C. ROBERT, *Griech. Mythologie*[4] II 3 (Berlin 1923), 1095; E. BETHE, *op. cit.* (*supra* p. 200 n. 1), 241 = 93; L. R. FARNELL, *Greek Hero Cults*, 57; G. MURRAY, *The Rise of the Greek Epic* (Oxford [4]1934), 130 ff.; P. CLEMENT, « New Evidence for the Origin of the Iphigeneia Legend », in *AC* 3 (1934), 393-409, esp. 408. Against the interpretation of mythical cases of human sacrifice as survivals of such practices in the past see A. BRELICH, *art. cit.* (*supra* p. 201 n. 2), esp. 195 n. 1; F. GRAF, in *Studi storico-religiosi* 2 (1978), 66.

[4] All three motivations are applicable in the case of Iphigeneia. Iphigeneia sacrificed as a wind-charm: Aeschyl. *Ag.* 214 f.; 1418; Soph. *El.* 570 ff.; Eur. *IA* 1575; as first-fruit offering: Eur. *IT* 20 f., cf. W. BURKERT, *Structure and History*, 52 ff. On Attic maidens sacrificed to prevent or win wars, see Fr. SCHWENN, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, RGVV 15, 3 (Giessen 1915), 129 ff.

ize a crude story inherited from distant times. By letting Iphigeneia die, Aeschylus would have revived the more primitive and original form of her myth.

The assumption that moral considerations introduced the concept of animal substitution into the myth of Iphigeneia is highly improbable. It would invest the poet of the *Kypria* with a moral aversion to human sacrifice in the heroic age which was neither shared by the poet of *Iliad* XXIII nor by the Greeks of the archaic period in general whose myths admit cases of human sacrifice and even cannibalism, for example Polyxena, Pelops and the children of Thyestes. It also neglects the possibility that any moral objection could have been answered more effectively either by the total suppression of the Iphigeneia myth (which does not occur in the Homeric poems), or by more drastic changes in the myth itself, such as the reinterpretation of the human sacrifice as self-sacrifice which Euripides introduced into the story of Iphigeneia [1].

Scholars who read the Iphigeneia myth as if it were a monument of Greek humanity fail to do adequate justice to the complexities of the mythical and ritual traditions which surround the enigmatic figure of Iphigeneia. It is conceivable that the story of her death crystallized around a historical nucleus of human sacrifice of unmarried girls practiced in the Bronze Age. But it is equally conceivable, and perhaps more likely, that the Iphigeneia myth in its extant epic form was not shaped by actual memories of real bloodshed in the remote past but by traditional patterns of myth and ritual which are as much rooted in human imagination as in actual events. We should desist from seeing human sacrifice and animal substitution as two *separate* steps in a historical evolution which supposedly led from inhumanity to humanity in ritual matters.

[1] J. Schmitt, *Freiwilliger Opfertod bei Euripides*, RGVV 17, 2 (Giessen 1921); S. K. Williams, *Jesus' Death as Saving Event. The Background and Origin of a Concept*, Harvard Dissertations in Religion, 2 (Missoula 1975), 153-160.

Comparison with the history of human sacrifice in Semitic religion is instructive. Early Israelite cult knew the sacrifice of the firstborn of both man and animal (*Ex.* 13, 1 f. and 22, 28). Eventually the human sacrifice was discontinued (*Num.* 3, 12 f.) while the sacrifice of firstborn animals continued (*Ex.* 12). The historical circumstances which led to the abolition of human sacrifice are unknown, and obscured by the myth of Isaac's sacrifice which forbids it [1]. The Punic Moloch sacrifice is historically related to the Israelite practice, and was interpreted as a firstborn sacrifice by Philo of Byblos [2]. Its history is well-documented and shows that animal substitution existed at an early time in Carthage but did not fully replace the child-sacrifice until the second century A.D. [3]. The case of Carthage suggests that the idea of linear and virtually automatic progression from human sacrifice to animal substitution is a highly artificial construct which is out of touch with historical reality.

In established Greek religion, the myth of human sacrifice and the practice of animal substitution must be seen as two complementary aspects of the same ritual mechanism, by which a divine claim to a human life is settled without actual loss of human life, either by a token shedding of human blood or more often by sacrificing an animal instead of the ideal human victim [4]. Apart from Iphigeneia replaced by a deer, bear or

[1] S. SPIEGEL, *The Akedah* (*supra* p. 198 n. 1), 51 ff.

[2] *FGrHist* 790 F 3 b; cf. H. W. ATTRIDGE and R. A. ODEN (eds.), *Philo of Byblos: The Phoenician History. Introduction, Critical Text, Translation, Notes*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 9 (Washington, D.C. 1980).

[3] *Supra* p. 196 nn. 4-5, and p. 198 n. 1.

[4] On sacrificial substitution ('Ersatzopfer') of animals see P. STENGEL, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer* (München ^{3}1920), 132; W. BURKERT, in *GRBS* 7 (1966), 112 f. and *Homo Necans. Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen*, RGVV 32 (Berlin 1972), 29 n. 34; *Griech. Religion*, 115; S. SPIEGEL, *The Akedah* (*supra* p. 198 n. 1), 60-76; A. BRELICH, in *Myths and Symbols* (*supra* p. 201 n. 2); H. S. VERSNEL, « Polycrates and his Ring », in *Studi storico-religiosi* 1 (1977), 17-46, esp. 25-32; R. GIRARD, *La violence et le sacré* (Paris 1972), chs. 1 and x. Token shedding of blood: Paus. III 16, 9 ff. (human sacrifice for Artemis Orthia at Sparta commuted to ritual flagellation) and Eur. *IT* 1449-1461 (blood drawn from a man's

goat, comparable cases of animal substitution include the calf dressed as a child in a Dionysiac ritual on Tenedos, the goat which was sacrificed annually to Dionysos in Potniai in place of an adolescent boy, and the mare which died instead of a Boeotian girl before the battle of Leuctra in 371 B.C. [1] Invariably, the replacement occurs in the context of cult and sacrifice.

How can the life of an animal compensate for a human life? Jane Harrison claimed, typically for her time and mentality, that for the primitive mind "the line between human and animal 'sacrifice' is not sharply drawn" [2]. It is doubtful that the so-called primitive mind was ever so indifferent to such vital distinctions, especially if the "primitive society" which Miss Harrison had in mind turns out to be Greece in the early archaic period. We may safely assume that as far as the Greeks were concerned it made a distinct difference whether the victim in a sacrifice was a man or an animal. In the case of Iphigeneia, it certainly helped that Artemis was more indifferent than the Greeks, and easily satisfied with animals. Herself a "Mistress of the Wild" and a survival of a more primitive, pre-agrarian society of hunters, Artemis' role as protectress of wildlife is conceptually related to her domesticated function as protectress of young human life. Given her close original ties with

---

neck in the cult of Artemis Tauropolos at Halai considered a substitute for the sacrifice of Orestes to the Taurian Artemis). Although it is unlikely that either rite originated from actual human sacrifice (Fr. SCHWENN, *Menschenopfer*, 93-103), the fact that both rites evoked associations with human sacrifice shows how easily a few drops of human blood were accepted as a suitable substitute for a human life in periods of ritual license (cf. F. GRAF, in *Die antike Welt* 4 (1979), 33-41, esp. 37 ff.).

[1] Ael. *NA* XII 34 (Tenedos) and Paus. IX 8, 2 (Potniai); cf. A. BRELICH, in *Myths and Symbols* (*supra* p. 201 n. 2), 197 ff. On the Leuctrian Maidens see W. BURKERT, *Structure and History*, 74 f.; J. FONTENROSE, *The Delphic Oracle* (Berkeley 1978), 147 f.

[2] *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (Cambridge ^{3}1922), 110 f.; 114.

the animal world, it is easy to see how Artemis would be content to receive her favorite prey, a deer, bear or goat, as ritual surrogates for young girls.

In the Brauronian cult of Artemis, the Iphigeneia myth and animal substitution existed side by side as mutually supportive elements in a coming-of-age ritual in which preadolescent girls called 'bears' lived in seclusion in her temple [1]. At the end of their service, they would be released from the jurisdiction of the virgin-goddess and free to enter the married state. Instead of bears, which were unavailable in Attica, goats were sacrificed to Artemis at Brauron on behalf of the girls and in compensation for their lives, which belonged to the goddess [2]. The Brauronian ritual commemorated the preservation and continuation of human life at the cost of animal life, and in the context of the female sex and prepuberty. It is perhaps not too far-fetched to interpret the ἀρκτεία as a ritualized struggle for physical survival, with emphasis on the reconciliation of such fundamental opposites as life and death, man and animal, as well as male and female. Similar contradictions can be found in Artemis herself, who is both huntress and Mistress of Animals, a patroness of virgins and a bringer of death in childbirth, and the embodiment of both female domestication and male brutality. Iphigeneia too, herself a virgin like Artemis and occasionally Artemis' duplicate in cult, plays an equally ambiguous role: a would-be victim of human sacrifice in one myth, she slaughters human victims among the Taurians in another; the prototype of unmarried girls and of their potential role in human procreation,

[1] W. BURKERT, *Griech. Religion*, 236 f.; 395; L. KAHIL, in *Antike Kunst* 20 (1977), 86-98. As long as the Brauronian inscriptions remain unpublished, the ritual seclusion of the 'bears', which has been deduced from the local myth, is open to doubt (A. BRELICH, *Paides e Parthenoi* I 259 ff.). For the Brauronian version of the Iphigeneia myth see *supra* p. 200 n. 1.

[2] Hesych., *s.v.* Βραυρωνίοις, β 1067 provides singular but reliable evidence for the goat sacrifice at Brauron.

the Brauronian Iphigeneia received the clothes worn by women who had died in childbirth [1].

Artemis personifies the natural supply of young life and the dangers which threaten its survival. The myth of Iphigeneia, and the ritual mechanism reflected in it, articulate this ambiguity, and create the impression of catastrophe survived. Animal substitution was the chief ritual means by which the Greeks created this cultic illusion of death without actual loss of human life, an illusion which reinforced man's most vital instinct, that of survival.

II Human Sacrifice at Salamis

Erich Bethe, a specialist in early Greek epic, wrote in 1929 while discussing the earliest version of the Iphigeneia myth in the *Kypria*: "Human sacrifice was an ancient and widespread custom whenever someone embarked upon a dangerous enterprise. In fact three captured Persian priests were reportedly sacrificed by the Athenians as late as 480 B.C. before the battle of Salamis, according to the story told by Phanias of Eresos, a pupil of Aristotle" [2].

With this alleged parallel to the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, we turn from myth to recorded history and to the only case of human sacrifice known from 5th century Athens. The incident, if historical, took place outside the city limits at the seashore in the early fall. The scene was one of high historical drama, a classical example of desperate but successful resistance in the

[1] J. C. G. Strachan, « Iphigeneia and Human Sacrifice in Euripides' *Iph. Taur.* », in *CPh* 71 (1976), 131-140. Artemis Parthenos: Hdt. IV 103, 2; Paus. I 43, 1; Strab. VII 4, 2, p. 308; Syriskos of Chersonesus, *FGrHist* 807 T 1 (Hellenistic inscription from the Crimea). Death in childbirth and Iphigeneia: Eur. *IT* 1464 ff.; A. Brelich, *Paides e Parthenoi* I 274 f.

[2] E. Bethe, *op. cit.* (*supra* p. 200 n. 1), 240 = 92. In Bethe's version, Phainias' three Persians of royal blood emerge as « drei gefangene Perserpriester ».

face of reckless foreign aggression. The Athenians who confronted the Persian enemy on that fateful day were less concerned with future glory than sheer survival. In the words of Aeschylus, an eyewitness, everything that mattered was at stake: the freedom of their country, their wives and children, the shrines of their ancestral gods, and the tombs of their forefathers [1]. It is this moment of intense crisis before a decisive battle which provides the historical framework and sets the emotional tone for the following description of human sacrifice in Plutarch's *Life of Themistokles*:

> "Themistokles was preparing the battlefield sacrifice by the flagship when three prisoners were led before him who were strikingly beautiful in appearance and conspicuous in their decorative dress and gold jewellery. They were said to be the sons of Sandake, the [Persian] king's sister, and of Artayktes. The moment the seer Euphrantides laid eyes on them, two things happened simultaneously: a huge and widely visible flame shone forth from the burning sacrifice, and a sneeze signified its omen from the right. Thereupon the seer clasped Themistokles' hand and bade him consecrate the young men as sacrificial victims and sacrifice all of them to Dionysos the Raw-Eater. For this would bring about both salvation and victory for the Greeks. Themistokles was shocked by the gravity and enormity of the seer's interpretation. But as it often happens in moments of great crisis and dire circumstance, the crowd expected salvation to come from irrational rather than rational means. While invoking the god in unison, they dragged the prisoners to the altar and insisted that the sacrifice should be carried out in the manner prescribed by the seer. This, then, is how it happened according to Phainias of Lesbos, a man of

[1] Aeschyl. *Pers.* 403-405.

philosophical interests and not unfamiliar with historical literature [1]."

Did it really happen? Aeschylus and Herodotus do not mention the sacrifice. Their silence is momentous but perhaps understandable. More important is the fact that Aeschylus and Herodotus contradict Plutarch in an important matter of historical detail. In Plutarch's *Life of Aristides*, the three Persian brothers are captured by a Greek landing force on the islet of Psyttaleia *prior* to the naval battle and turned over to Themistokles, who sacrificed them to Dionysos the Raw-Eater when urged to do so by Euphrantides [2]. Against Plutarch and his source, however, stands the combined testimony of Aeschylus

[1] Plut. *Them.* 13, 2-5 = Phainias Fr. 25 Wehrli[2] : Θεμιστοκλεῖ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ναυαρχίδα τριήρη σφαγιαζομένῳ τρεῖς προσήχθησαν αἰχμάλωτοι, κάλλιστοι μὲν ἰδέσθαι τὴν ὄψιν, ἐσθῆτι δὲ καὶ χρυσῷ κεκοσμημένοι διαπρεπῶς. ἐλέγοντο δὲ Σανδάκης παῖδες εἶναι τῆς βασιλέως ἀδελφῆς καὶ Ἀρταΰκτου. τούτους ἰδὼν Εὐφραντίδης ὁ μάντις, ὡς ἅμα μὲν ἀνέλαμψεν ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν μέγα καὶ περιφανὲς πῦρ, ἅμα δὲ πταρμὸς ἐκ δεξιῶν ἐσήμηνε, τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα δεξιωσάμενος ἐκέλευσε τῶν νεανίσκων κατάρξασθαι καὶ καθιερεῦσαι πάντας ὠμηστῇ Διονύσῳ προσευξάμενον· οὕτω γὰρ ἅμα σωτηρίαν καὶ νίκην ἔσεσθαι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. ἐκπλαγέντος δὲ τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους ὡς μέγα τὸ μάντευμα καὶ δεινόν, οἷον εἴωθεν ἐν μεγάλοις ἀγῶσι καὶ πράγμασι χαλεποῖς, μᾶλλον ἐκ τῶν παραλόγων ἢ τῶν εὐλόγων τὴν σωτηρίαν ἐλπίζοντες οἱ πολλοὶ τὸν θεὸν ἅμα κοινῇ κατεκαλοῦντο φωνῇ καὶ τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους τῷ βωμῷ προσαγαγόντες ἠνάγκασαν, ὡς ὁ μάντις ἐκέλευσε, τὴν θυσίαν συντελεσθῆναι. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἀνὴρ φιλόσοφος καὶ γραμμάτων οὐκ ἄπειρος ἱστορικῶν Φανίας ὁ Λέσβιος εἴρηκε. Cf. Plut. *Arist.* 9, 2 (following note) and *Pelop.* 21, 3 (*infra* p. 221 n. 3). The tradition that the Greeks and specifically the Spartans sacrificed human victims before military engagements postdates Phainias (Phylarchus, *FGrHist* 81 F 80 and Apollodorus of Athens, *FGrHist* 244 F 125, both quoted by Porph. *Abst.* II 56, 7 and II 55, 4). In addition to Iphigeneia, cases of human sacrifice for military purposes include Hdt. VII 167 and Diod. XX 14, 4-7 (Carthaginians); Eur. *Heraclid.* 403 ff. and *Phoen.* 911 ff. (*infra* p. 213 n. 2); Plut. *Ages.* 6, 6-11 and *Pelop.* 21 (*infra* p. 213 n. 2 and p. 221 n. 3); and Paus. IV 9, 3-10 and IX 17, 1. The sacrifice is usually voluntary when girls are the victims (*supra* p. 203 n. 4 and p. 204 n. 1).

[2] *Arist.* 9, 2 (Aristides killed all the Persians captured on Psyttaleia ... πλὴν ὅσοι τῶν ἐπιφανῶν ζῶντες ἥλωσαν.) ἐν δὲ τούτοις ἦσαν ἀδελφῆς βασιλέως ὄνομα Σανδάκης τρεῖς παῖδες, οὓς εὐθὺς ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα, καὶ λέγονται κατά τι λόγιον, τοῦ μάντεως Εὐφραντίδου κελεύσαντος, ὠμηστῇ Διονύσῳ πρὸ τῆς μάχης καθιερευθῆναι. Only an author preoccupied with the need for human victims in a pre-battle sacrifice could have altered the attested course of events

and Herodotus who place the Greek victory on Psyttaleia *after* the battle proper and allow no Persian survivors [1].

Faced with such serious problems of source criticism, modern historians either explicitly stigmatize the incident as unhistorical [2], or omit it altogether from their discussions of the battle [3]. They are evidently right, from their point of view. For it would be uncritical to accept the historicity of the human sacrifice at Salamis as such while at the same time rejecting, as one must, the historical setting for it which Phainias provided [4]. Many students of Greek religion, however, tend to refer to Phainias' story with guarded optimism, for no better reason than that it exists and that it is too interesting ritually to be passed over in silence [5]. Some fifteen years ago, for instance, Walter Burkert concluded in his study of Greek sacrificial

---

(following note) so drastically as to put the capture of Psyttaleia before the battle and to contrive the survival of suitable Persians for the human sacrifice. That author was Phainias rather than Plutarch according to L. BODIN, in *REG* 30 (1917), 118-123.

[1] Aeschyl. *Pers.* 441-464; Hdt. VIII 95; cf. Aristodemus, *FGrHist* 104 F 1, §§ 1 and 4 (no survivors, but capture of Psyttaleia erroneously put before the naval battle; see N. G. L. HAMMOND, in *JHS* 76 (1956), 40 n. 28); Paus. I 36, 2. Diod. XI 57, 1 implies that the Persians in question died in combat rather than as sacrificial victims.

[2] *E.g.* C. HIGNETT, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece* (Oxford 1963), 20; A. R. BURN, *Persia and the Greeks* (London 1962), 474 f.; F. J. FROST, *Plutarch's Themistocles. A Historical Commentary* (Princeton 1980), 150.

[3] *E.g.* Ed. MEYER, *Geschichte des Altertums* IV 1 (Stuttgart ^{3}1939), 368 f.; N. G. L. HAMMOND, *art. cit.* (*supra* n. 1), 32 ff.

[4] A point emphatically made, albeit from prejudice, by U. v. WILAMOWITZ, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* I 299 f. n. 2.

[5] P. STENGEL, *Opferbräuche der Griechen* (Leipzig/Berlin 1910), 93 f. and 99 takes its historicity for granted (« Themistokles wird die Leichen der drei geschlachteten Perser ins Meer geworfen haben »); Fr. SCHWENN, *Menschenopfer*, 76 (« nicht ganz frei erfunden »), cf. *RE* XV 1 (1931), 951; A. B. COOK, *Zeus* I (Cambridge 1914), 657 (who recognized Phainias as a "painstaking historian" !); A. C. PEARSON, « Human Sacrifice (Greek) », in J. HASTINGS (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* VI (1914), 848 ("Whether it is credible or not, we are at least entitled to draw from it the inference that there were not wanting in the classical age those who still cherished a belief in the efficacy of human sacrifice"); S. EITREM, in

ritual that the human sacrifice before Salamis as reported by Phainias was "not mere phantasy" and "intrinsically probable" [1]. More recently, W. Kendrick Pritchett has made repeated use of the Phainias fragment in his discussion of military divination [2]. But any reliance on a description of human sacrifice which is ritually fascinating but historically suspect is premature as long as we lack a critical analysis of its religious substance. I suggest that we take a few minutes to remedy this omission before trying to make up our own mind about the incident at Salamis.

SO 18 (1938), 20 (« nach zuverlässiger Quelle », *i.e.* Phainias !); W. K. C. GUTHRIE, *Orpheus and Greek Religion* (London ²1952), 132 ("human sacrifice to Dionysos Omestes before the battle of Salamis, considered a terrifying notion but carried out"); J. RUDHARDT, *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce classique* (Genève 1958), 280 (« peut-être historique »); E. R. DODDS (ed.), *Euripides. Bacchae* (Oxford ²1960), XIX n. 2 ("Even if the story be false, it shows what fourth-century Greeks thought of Dionysus Omestes"); M. P. NILSSON, *Geschichte der griech. Religion* I³ (München 1967), 133 (Salamis incident quoted as proof that the Greeks "cannot be acquitted of such cruelty", *i.e.* of human sacrifice); A. BRELICH, in *Myths and Symbols* (*supra* p. 201 n. 2), 200 n. 7 (Phainias taken literally); W. FAUTH, in *Der Kleine Pauly* IV (1972), 309, *s.v.* « Opfer ». I note three exceptions. J. E. HARRISON, *Prolegomena* ³, 487 f. (followed by G. MURRAY, *The Rise of the Greek Epic* ⁴, 13-15) was more cautious than either Pearson or Dodds (above) when she concluded: "(Phainias') statement cannot be taken to prove more than that a very recent human sacrifice was among the horrors conceivably possible to a Greek of the 4th century B.C., especially if the victim were a 'barbarian' ". Wilamowitz (preceding note) denied the historicity of Phainias' report, though for irrelevant reasons (one of which was that the seer Euphrantides is not attested elsewhere). P. KETT, *Prosopographie der historischen griechischen Manteis bis auf die Zeit Alexanders des Grossen* (Diss. Erlangen-Nürnberg 1966) includes Euphrantides as no. 29 in his list of historical *manteis*. But Kett rejects the report as "embellished in the manner of the romance" and as unhistorical while admitting the possibility that the story still has a "historischer Kern", and that an actual human sacrifice may have preceded the battle after all (42 n. 2, cf. 118 f.). But whom did the Athenians sacrifice if it can be shown that they had taken no prisoners before the battle?

[1] *GRBS* 7 (1966), 113, but see *Griech. Religion*, 107 (« wird behauptet »).

[2] *The Greek State at War*, Part III: *Religion* (Berkeley 1979), 48 n. 4 (quoting Burkert for, and Burn against, the historicity of the sacrifice); 85; 126 f.

If read with the eyes and the special interests of a historian of Greek religion, Plutarch's longer version inspires no small degree of confidence in its ritual authenticity and its value as a source for sacrificial practice. Both the ritual mechanism of the sacrifice and the technical language in which it is couched are traditional. The animal sacrifice which occupied Themistokles as military commander when the three Persian prisoners appeared on the scene conforms to a common type of pre-battle blood-sacrifice called σφάγια, a term echoed in the verb σφαγιάζεσθαι of Plutarch's first sentence [1]. The σφάγια were conspicuously different from the regular Olympian sacrifice in that the officiant was not a priest (ἱερεύς) but a seer (μάντις) [2]; that they had, with a single exception, no divine recipient [3]; that the blood of the victim, which was drained and collected, was ritually more important than the victim's meat, which was neither carved nor eaten; and finally, that the battlefield sacrifice was often used to obtain favorable omens for the outcome

[1] On the *sphagia* see P. STENGEL, *Opferbräuche*, 92-102; *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer* [3], 61 f.; L. ZIEHEN, in *RE* III A 2 (1929), 1669-1679; S. EITREM, « Mantis und Sphagia », in *SO* 18 (1938), 9-30; J. CASABONA, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec* (Aix-en-Provence 1966), 180-193, esp. 189-191 (on the middle verb σφαγιάζεσθαι); W. BURKERT, *Griech. Religion*, 106 f.; W. K. PRITCHETT, *The Greek State at War* III 83-88.

[2] The controversial seer who prescribes human sacrifice as a ritual remedy for a crisis is also a literary figure; cf. Eratosthenes, *ap. Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* 240 ff., in *Homeri Opera*, ed. T. W. ALLEN, V p. 234 f. (the murderers of Hesiod "sacrificed [σφαγιασθῆναι] to the foreign gods" by the *mantis* Eurykles); the role of Kalchas in the *Kypria* and in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*; also Eur. *Heraclid.* 403 ff.; *Phoen.* 911 ff.; Plut. *Pelop.* 21, 2 (*infra* p. 221 n. 3; *Pelop.* 21, 2 : δεινοῦ δὲ καὶ παρανόμου τοῦ προστάγματος αὐτῷ φανέντος recalls *Them.* 13, 4 : ὡς μέγα τὸ μάντευμα καὶ δεινόν), and Paus. IV 9, 5.

[3] P. STENGEL, *Opferbräuche*, 100 f.; Fr. SCHWENN, in *ARW* 21 (1922), 66 f.; S. EITREM, in *SO* 18 (1938), 15-20; W. BURKERT, *Griech. Religion*, 107. Artemis Agrotera is the exception (*infra* p. 219 n. 3). Most types of human sacrifice have no divine recipient (*e.g.* the scapegoat; funeral, foundation and purification rites). Modern scholars usually refer to them as 'ritual killings' (*e.g.* Fr. SCHWENN, *Menschenopfer*, 9; A. BRELICH, in *Myths and Symbols* (*supra* p. 201 n. 2), 200 nn. 7-8). See Versnel on the 'anonymous gods' in rituals of self-sacrifice (in this volume).

of the battle, either from the color or consistency of the victim's blood, or from the intensity of the fire in which the gall-bladder and urinary bladder of the sacrificial animals were burned. This latter method of divination from the partially burnt σφάγια is a matter of minor controversy among modern specialists, but it is clearly adopted in Plutarch's description [1]. For it was the sudden surge of the sacrificial fire [2], combined with an auspicious sneeze [3] from a participant in the ceremony, two traditional portents, which signaled to the seer Euphrantides that the animal victims should be replaced with human victims.

The victims demanded by Euphrantides not only interrupted the ritual process of the σφάγια but duplicated it in a perverse manner and in remarkable departure from Greek sacrificial practice. While the substitution of animals for human victims was an established pattern of Greek myth and ritual, as we have seen in connection with Iphigeneia, the reverse process of a human victim butchered in place of an animal is abnormal and virtually unparalleled except for the mythical case of Neoptolemos at Delphi and the verbal metaphor of sacrifice for murder found in Attic tragedy [4]. How are we to explain the striking abnormality of the human sacrifice reported by Phainias?

[1] W. K. PRITCHETT, *The Greek State at War* III 84-87 versus P. STENGEL, *Opferbräuche*, 97-100 and *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer* [3], 61 f.

[2] The same sacrificial σημεῖον was taken to presage Cicero's consulship: Plut. *Cic.* 20, 1 (conceivably written *after* the Themistokles *vita*; see C. THEANDER, in *Eranos* 56 (1958), 12 ff.) φλόγα πολλὴν ἀνῆκε καὶ λαμπράν (Dio Cass. XXXVII 35, 4 and Serv. *Ecl.* VIII 105 describe the same event). P. STENGEL, *Opferbräuche*, 97 f. has Greek examples.

[3] W. K. PRITCHETT, *The Greek State at War* III 126 f.

[4] Neoptolemos: W. BURKERT, in *Gnomon* 38 (1966), 439 f.; *Homo Necans*, 136 f.; J. FONTENROSE, *The Cult and Myth of Pyrros at Delphi*, Univ. of Calif. Public. in Class. Archaeol., 4, 3 (Berkeley 1960), esp. 212-225; G. NAGY, *The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore 1979), 123-139, 284-286. (Ritual) murder described in the language of sacrifice: W. BURKERT, in *GRBS* 7 (1966), 116; F. I. ZEITLIN, in *TAPhA* 96 (1965), 463-508; 97 (1966), 645-653.

Phainias himself attempted an interesting answer which reflects the psychological speculation found in many of his anecdotes [1]. According to Phainias, the human sacrifice which Themistokles was loath to countenance was eventually forced upon him by a mob turned savage in a situation of extreme national crisis and exceptional trial (ἐν μεγάλοις ἀγῶσι καὶ πράγμασι χαλεποῖς). In other words, a crisis of nerves induced abnormal behavior which triggered an act of singular ritual violence. Whether true or not, the psychological chain reaction envisaged by Phainias is intrinsically plausible and may serve as a suitable starting point for the student of Greek ritual whose principal task is to identify ritual action and to explain the human behavior which underlies it [2]. Human sacrifice as a ritual solution to communal crisis—this is one possible explanation for the incident at Salamis, an explanation not only adopted by Phainias but also by modern students of religion [3]. In a recent study of human sacrifice in the ancient Near East, for instance, we read that "all evidence examined points to 'human sacrifice' during times of political or domestic crisis" [4]. In our case it is even possible to go a step further and to show that the brutalizing experience of battle and impending doom which Phainias held responsible for the human sacrifice at Salamis lies also at the root of the σφάγια sacrifice as such in its regular animal form. It is well known that the σφάγια required the wholesale slaugh-

[1] Phainias' anecdotes about Themistokles have been praised "as fine specimens of biographical style" (A. MOMIGLIANO, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, Mass. 1971), 77 f.). Their success stems from their tendency to treat history as "a handmaid to ethics" (A. R. BURN, *Persia and the Greeks*, 474). The story of the human sacrifice at Salamis was designed to illustrate the humanity of Themistokles, who opposed it (J. E. HARRISON, *Prolegomena* [3], 488, "from a hostile source", is obviously incorrect), and the depravity of the Athenian mob who carried it out. Here as elsewhere in Greek tradition, the practice of human sacrifice characterizes the "bad guys".

[2] Cf. W. BURKERT, *Structure and History*, 35-58.

[3] Fr. SCHWENN, *Menschenopfer*, 76; J. E. HARRISON, *Prolegomena* [3], 487.

[4] A. R. W. GREEN, *The Role of Human Sacrifice* (*supra* p. 196 n. 5), 202.

ter of animals which took place on the battlefield and often in the no-man's-land that separated the two opposing armies just before the fighting began when the passage of time seemed momentarily suspended and tensions were running high [1]. Every soldier has experienced similar moments of high suspense and dead silence, and every war movie exploits them [2]. The prevailing mood is one of uncertainty as to victory or defeat, and of possible transition from life to imminent death. In current anthropological jargon [3], the σφάγια sacrifice signaled a "liminal period" in which men at the threshold of hand-to-hand combat sought unusual ritual remedies in an effort to cope with extraordinary psychological strain, and with the threat to their lives. Sinister and different, the σφάγια anticipated the bloodshed of the battle and marked its ritual beginning [4].

The human sacrifice at Salamis can thus be seen as an exceptional prolongation of the liminal period and as a severe aggravation of the aggressive behavior released in pre-battle rites. Even though incorporated in the ritual of the battlefield sacrifice and its liminality, the incident at Salamis stands alone as an example of ritual overreaction, or of ritual that overreached itself by demanding human victims instead of animals. More specifically, it is a case of spontaneous ritual murder per-

[1] Like the military ἱερά, the σφάγια too could be repeated until the omens were favorable (implied by Hdt. IX 61, 2-3 and Xen. *An.* VI 5, 8).

[2] If the testimony of an eyewitness is needed, it can be found in J. G. GRAY, *The Warriors : Reflections on Men in Battle* (New York 1959; repr. 1967), chs. II ("The Enduring Appeals of Battle", esp. 32 f., 51 ff.) and IV ("The Soldier's Relations to Death", esp. 102 ff.).

[3] The most popular definition of 'liminality' is that of V. TURNER, *The Forest of Symbols* (Ithaca 1967), 93-110, who explicitly includes war among the rites of passage (94 f.). Burkert associates pre-battle σφάγια with « Ausnahmesituationen » und « Krisenbewältigung » (*Griech. Religion*, 106 and 400). For systematic application of the concept of 'liminality' to various Greek rites, see J. BREMMER, « Heroes, Rituals and the Trojan War », in *Studi storico-religiosi* 2 (1978), 5-38; F. GRAF, « Die lokrischen Mädchen », *ibid.*, 61-79.

[4] W. BURKERT, *Griech. Religion*, 107 (« Vorwegnahme der Schlacht »); *Homo Necans*, 78.

petrated by mob action. If Greek ritual in general can be defined as stereotyped and repeated action designed to communicate a particular message ostensibly and under an identical religious pretext [1], the human sacrifice at Salamis lacks the most conspicuous characteristic of ritual action, viz. repetition. If historical, it would have to be classified as a curious aberration from the norm.

Why were those particular Persian prisoners singled out for ritual execution? According to Phainias because they were three in number, of royal blood, good-looking and well-groomed. Although highly suspicious from a historical point of view, all of these qualities make perfect ritual sense by analogy with animal sacrifice. Animal victims selected for public sacrifice were distinguished by high breeding, absence of physical blemish, and elaborate decoration [2]. It is no accident either that the Persian victims are said to have been three in number. Triads of animal victims are attested for Greek and Roman cult [3], apart from the fact that triads are ubiquitous in magico-religious traditions in general. At least as important as the positive qualities of the victims is their alien status, their being Persian, non-Greek, barbarian. The social outsider and outcast was traditionally a more dispensable and thus more desirable candidate for ritual murder than a member of the

[1] Cf. W. BURKERT, *Structure and History*, 36 f., 57. Phainias' scenario illustrates a point Burkert makes on p. 49 f.: "It is possible that a single terrifying event may provoke certain avoidances; they become 'ritual' in the general sense if, and only if, they are transmitted to other persons".

[2] P. STENGEL, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer* [3], 108, 115, 121, 153 f. Nobility and beauty of mythical human victims: *e.g.* the Athenian tribute to the Minotaur (Catull. 64, 78); Iphigeneia and Makaria (Eur. *IT* 20 f.; *Heraclid.* 408 f.); οἱ κάλλιστοι τῶν αἰχμαλώτων sacrificed by Carthaginians (Diod. XX 65, 1); see Versnel (in this volume) on the status of voluntary human victims. The "sister's sons" were traditional favorites of their "mother's brother" (in this case the Persian king); see J. BREMMER, in *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 4 (1976), 65-78.

[3] P. STENGEL, *Opferbräuche*, 195 f.; *Kultusaltertümer* [3], 119, 153 f. on the *trittoia* or *trittya*, sacrifices of three male animals from various species, including the Greek equivalent of the *suovetaurilia*.

established group [1]. In biological terms, preference for human victims of foreign extraction reflects the widespread instinct against "intraspecific aggression". When explicitly addressing the problem of human sacrifice, most Greek intellectuals preferred to think of it as a decidedly non-Greek, barbarian and outlandish institution [2]. Human sacrifice was understandably felt to be as alien to the civilized habits of the Greek polis as the liminal state of war and the violence which it unleashed was felt to be opposed to the blessings of peace. This feeling of alienation when confronted with human sacrifice also explains why Greek scapegoats were sent across the border and executions took place outside the city limits [3].

So far the Phainias fragment has stood up surprisingly well to ritual scrutiny. Despite the undeniable irregularity of the human sacrifice as such, his account can be interpreted as a close-knit fabric of standard religious concepts, of attested ritual actions and of familiar behavioral patterns which create a seemingly genuine ambiance for the supreme sacrifice. But one disturbing problem remains to be taken up. The seer Euphrantides asked Themistokles "to consecrate the young men as sacrificial victims (κατάρξασθαι) and to sacrifice (καθιερεῦσαι) all of them to Dionysos the Raw-Eater". While the two verbs which describe the sacrifice and its preliminaries are standard sacrificial vocabulary [4], both the mention and the identity of

[1] Compare the 'Greeks and Gauls' buried alive as *pharmakoi* in Republican Rome on various occasions (Fr. SCHWENN, *Menschenopfer*, 148 ff.); *infra* p. 233 n. 1 and pp. 233-4 n. 4.

[2] P. STENGEL, *Kultusaltertümer* [3], 131 f.; W. BURKERT, *Griech. Religion*, 106; *infra* p. 233 n. 3.

[3] On the *pharmakos* see now W. BURKERT, *Griech. Religion*, 139-142; *Structure and History*, 59-77; H. S. VERSNEL, *art. cit.* (*supra* p. 205 n. 4), 37-42; on executions, see Fr. SCHWENN, *Menschenopfer*, 28 ff.

[4] C. Sintenis restored καθιερεῦσαι (as used in the parallel text Plut. *Arist.* 9, 2, quoted *supra* p. 210 n. 2) for the καθιερῶσαι of the MSS. On the difference between (καθ)ιερόω 'dedicate' and (καθ)ιερεύω 'sacrifice' see Ammonius *De adfin. vocab. diff.* 239 (ed. K. NICKAU (Leipzig 1966), p. 62). Καθιερεύειν was apparently

the divine recipient are highly problematic. Dionysos the Raw-Eater has been a notorious stumbling block for scholars who commented on the Phainias fragment. In 1915, Fritz Schwenn in his standard book on human sacrifice in Greek and Roman antiquity accepted the historicity of the incident at Salamis but found it incomprehensible that the divine recipient should be Dionysos who had no connections with warfare [1]. Sixteen years after Schwenn's book, the greatest Hellenist of modern times rejected the human sacrifice at Salamis as unhistorical primarily because of his prejudice that no Greek of the classical period would have ascribed the cruel desire for human victims to his morally refined gods [2]. But Wilamowitz overlooked the fact that pre-battle σφάγια ordinarily do not envisage or require a divine recipient.

Apart from Dionysos in the Phainias fragment, only one other Greek deity is mentioned in connection with sacrifices on the battlefield. Her name is Artemis Agrotera, or Artemis of the Wild, to whom the Spartans of the classical period slaughtered young she-goats before they engaged in battle [3]. The

---

more often used of human victims (*LSJ*, *s.v.*; add Plut. *Arist.* 9, 2) than of animals (F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément* (Paris 1962), n° 38, 23 f.; at Plut. *De Is. et Osir.* 73, 380 D καθιεροῦσι καὶ σφάττουσι, Reiske's conjectural καθιερεύουσι is hardly called for, even though the phrase αἱ δὲ τῶν τιμωμένων ζῴων καθιερεύσεις follows a few sentences later). In his description of the human sacrifice, Phainias adopts the regular terminology of animal sacrifice (βωμός and θυσία). The language of animal sacrifice of the 'Olympian' type is common in literary descriptions of human sacrifice: Aeschyl. *Ag.* 150, 232, 240 (θυσία, βωμός, θυτῆρες); Eur. *Erechth.* Fr. 50, 39 Austin = Fr. 10, 39 Carrara (θύειν), *HF* 995 (θῦμα); Plut. *Pelop.* 21, 5 (θυσία); Hdt. III 99, 2 and Plato *Lg.* VI 782 c 1 (θύειν).

[1] *Menschenopfer*, 76. Only S. Eitrem, in *SO* 18 (1938), 21 saw that Dionysos Omestes « klang gewiss fremdartig in athenischen Ohren ». But he did not make the connection between this epithet and Phainias' homeland (*infra* p. 222 nn. 3 and 4).

[2] U. v. Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* I 299 f.

[3] Fr. Schwenn, in *ARW* 21 (1922), 62-67; P. Stengel, *Kultusaltertümer* [3], 133; Ed. Fraenkel on Aeschyl. *Ag.* 232 (*supra* p. 199 n. 1); W. Burkert, *Griech. Religion*, 107; W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* III 84.

telling epithets of Artemis and Dionysos as recipients of blood-sacrifice in liminal periods of warfare are evidently significant, and worthy of attention. Dionysos the Raw-Eater and Artemis of the Wild seem to share a predilection for uncivilized manners. One is instantly reminded of Lévi-Straussian structuralism and its binary category of the raw versus the cooked, the antithesis of nature and culture. This pair of opposites was familiar to Greek scholars long before Lévi-Strauss popularized it, and its structuralist articulation has been profitably applied to classical Greek texts [1]. I submit that the Greeks, repelled by the inherent crudity of large-scale blood-sacrifice before military engagements, tended to shift responsibility to suitable divine recipients who seemed particularly savage and uncultivated. The concept of Artemis Agrotera as entertained by Spartan males is almost diametrically opposed to that of Artemis as a protectress of young girls and as helper in childbirth, two of her normal social functions in the world of Greek women [2]. Likewise, the concept of Dionysos the Raw-Eater, which raises the grim prospect of ritual omophagy and of the degeneration of human eating habits into the hunting habits of predators, is similarly opposed to the prevailing Greek idea of Dionysos as the god of wine who promotes happiness and civilization [3]. Such 'wild' divine epithets reflect the desire to deflect one's own uneasiness with inherited rituals that involved gross and aberrant behavior. The desire to invent divine ancestors for very human habits must have been particularly strong in the case of human sacrifice. Comparable cases of Greek gods with transparent names

[1] Especially by P. VIDAL-NAQUET, « The Black Hunter and the Origin of the Athenian Ephebeia », in *PCPhS* N.S. 14 (1968), 49-64; G. S. KIRK, *Myth. Its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and Other Cultures* (Berkeley 1970), 162-171 (Cyclopes); C. SEGAL, « The Raw and the Cooked in Greek Literature », in *Class. Journal* 69 (1974), 289-308.

[2] Aristoph. *Lys.* 1248 ff. captures the male conception of Artemis as seen through the eyes of Spartans who remember the war against Persia and invoke Artemis Agrotera as goddess of the hunt.

[3] M. DETIENNE, *Dionysos mis à mort* (Paris 1977), 142 ff., 150.

whose cults preserved the memories if not the practice of human sacrifice are Zeus the Wolf and Zeus the Devourer respectively [1].

From a structural point of view, therefore, the connection of Dionysos the Raw-Eater with the human sacrifice before the battle of Salamis is both intelligible and paralleled in established Greek cult. But alas, connections that are structurally meaningful are not necessarily historically true. Structuralism, if it is more than the creation of Lévi-Strauss and his predecessors, is a condition of the human mind, not a quality inherent in nature or history. Structuralists find identical patterns in man's path through history as well as in the products of man's imagination, whether myth, art or fiction. As one critic put it, structuralism is such that it is capable of making sense even of the unintelligible and the absurd [2]. As a historian of Greek religion, I am as much interested in the historical facts of a religious phenomenon as in their possible levels of meaning. Phainias' report is demonstrably meaningful religiously, but is it also factual? A possible answer will emerge once we collect and sift the known facts about Dionysos the Raw-Eater.

The epithet Ὠμηστής can be found seven times in all of Greek literature and is conspicuously absent in religious inscriptions. Five out of the seven attestations occur in Plutarch [3]. In three out of the five references in Plutarch, Dionysos as Raw-Eater is mentioned in connection with the alleged human sacrifice

[1] W. BURKERT, *Homo Necans*, 98 ff., 130 f.

[2] W. BURKERT, *Structure and History*, 14.

[3] *Them.* 13, 3 (*supra* p. 210 n. 1); *Arist.* 9, 2 (*supra* p. 210 n. 2) and *Pelop.* 21, 3 (earlier cases of human sacrifice discussed by Pelopidas' *manteis* before the battle of Leuktra; *supra* p. 206 n. 1) connect the Raw-Eater with the human sacrifice at Salamis. Omestes is mentioned in connection with more positive epithets of Dionysos in two other passages (*Ant.* 24, 5 and *De cohib. ira* 13, 462 B) which influenced Fr. Nietzsche's concept of Dionysos. While preparing the *Birth of Tragedy*, Nietzsche repeatedly returned to the idea of Dionysos' "Doppelnatur" (ἀγριώνιος and ὠμηστής, versus μειλίχιος) and quoted the sacrifice at Salamis as an illustration of the god's cruel side (cf. G. COLLI and M. MONTINARI (eds.),

at Salamis, evidently on the authority of Phainias of Eresos on Lesbos [1]. A sixth instance is a late poem which lists epithets of Dionysos in alphabetical order [2]. But the earliest and most important reference to the Raw-Eater came to light in a poem of Alcaeus written in the 7th century B.C. and published from an Oxyrhynchus papyrus in 1941 [3]. Alcaeus invokes the divine triad of Zeus, Aeolian Hera and Dionysos the Raw-Eater which was worshipped in his native island of Lesbos [4]. Later authors report that Dionysos Omadios (understood as the "Raw One" [5]) received human sacrifice on the island of Chios and Dionysos Anthroporrhaistes ("Render of Men") likewise on the island of Tenedos [6]. Tenedos and Chios flank the island of Lesbos to the north and south respectively. It follows that

---

Nietzsche's Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe III 3 (Berlin/New York 1978), 160 fr. 7 [61]; 165 fr. 7 [81]; 185, 26 ff. fr. 7 [123]). The unpublished *Index Verborum Plutarcheus*, compiled by W. HELMBOLD and E. O' NEIL, lists two more references under ὠμηστής (*Moralia* 114 A and 976 F), both in Homeric quotations. (H. D. Betz of the University of Chicago kindly consulted a copy of the *Index Plut.* for me.)

[1] *Supra* p. 210 nn. 1 and 2, and preceding note.

[2] *Anthol. Pal.* IX 524, 25; cf. Hesych., *s.v.* ὠμηστής, ω 189 Schmidt and Apostol. XVIII 59 (*Corpus Paroem. Graec.* II 735).

[3] *POxy.* (XVIII) 2165 (Pack^2 62) = Alcaeus Fr. 129, 9 Lobel-Page (Cf. Sappho Fr. 17 L.-P. for the same triad of Hera, Zeus and Dionysos).

[4] A. HENRICHS, in *HSCP* 82 (1978), 144; 150 f. on the Raw-Eater. Miraculously, R. VALLOIS, in *BCH* 55 (1931), 328 assigned Dionysos Omestes to Lesbos, apparently on no other evidence than Plut. *Them.* 13, 2-5 (which he mentions) and conceivably Clem. Al. *Protr.* III 42, 5 = Dosi(a)das, *FGrHist* 458 F 7 (human victims sacrificed to Dionysos on Lesbos; no details are given).

[5] *PLond.* 273 (Pack^2 343) = Dionysius, *Bassar.* Fr. 9 verso 34 Heitsch (*Die griech. Dichterfragm. der röm. Kaiserzeit* I ^{2} p. 66; D. L. PAGE (ed.), *Select Papyri* III, no. 134, 34) ὠμάδια κρέα θηρὸς ἀπὸ ζωοῖο φάγητε would seem to support the traditional interpretation of ὠμάδιος as 'raw' which is also implicit in Porphyry's source Euelpis (following note). Burkert (per litt.) suggests the derivation from ὦμος 'shoulder' (via ὠμαδόν), a prominent part of the victim in sacrificial ritual and maenadic sparagmos (Eur. *Ba.* 1127). P. CHANTRAINE, *Dictionnaire étym.* IV 2 (Paris 1980), 1301 f. omits ὠμάδιος as a Dionysiac term.

[6] Porph. *Abst.* II 55, 3 = Euelpis of Karystos, Fr. 1, *FHG* IV p. 408 Müller (Chios and Tenedos), cf. Ael. *NA* XII 34 (Tenedos; *supra* p. 206 n. 1); Fr. SCHWENN, *Menschenopfer*, 71-75; *RE* XV 1 (1931), 951. The alleged practice of

the worship of Dionysos the Raw-Eater was restricted to the earliest periods of Greek religion, and regionally confined to Lesbos and two adjacent islands. Athens and Attica have produced no trace of the Raw-Eater. How could the Persians at Salamis have been sacrificed to a god unknown in that part of the Greek world? They couldn't. Phainias of Lesbos, who was well versed in the antiquities of his native island, suitably resuscitated the man-eating Raw-Eater from ancient local tradition and restored him to new, if highly artificial life in a story of human sacrifice located in Attica where the Raw-Eater does not belong.

Despite its cohesive structure and intrinsic appeal, Phainias' report belongs to the realm of fiction. Its dubious place in the study of religion is comparable to the notorious case of the Bedouins of the Sinai peninsula and their sacrifice of a beautiful boy or a surrogate camel to the morning star which Pseudo-Nilus reports at great length and in lurid detail. Thanks to Robertson Smith, St. Nilus became a chief support for the ideology of the Cambridge School [1]. But later scholarship exposed his account as pure fiction in the tradition of the Greek novel [2]. If the Athenians before the battle of Salamis had taken no Persian prisoners and knew no Dionysos Omestes to sacrifice them to, it seems best to conclude that the alleged sacrifice did not take place except in the imagination of Phainias.

---

human sacrifice is a mere inference from the god's savage and vaguely cannibalistic epithets (*infra* pp. 225-6 n. 4 and pp. 230-1 n. 3) or from maenadic myth (M. P. NILSSON, *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung* (Leipzig 1906), 306).

[1] W. ROBERTSON SMITH, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (London [2]1894), ch. VIII; J. E. HARRISON, *Prolegomena* [3], 485 f. (where St. Nilus and Plut. *Them.* 13 are discussed in close conjunction). Cf. M. ELIADE, in J. M. KITAGAWA (ed.), *The History of Religions* (Chicago 1967), 26-28 (St. Nilus' camel described as "a cultural fashion in the History of Religions").

[2] J. HENNINGER, in *Anthropos* 50 (1955), 81-148; A. HENRICHS, *Phoinikika* (*supra* p. 196 n. 5), 53-56.

In the study of human sacrifice, fiction can easily acquire the status of fact, and an imagined sacrifice can tell us almost as much, or even more, about human habits as a real one, as long as we are fully conscious of the difference. If Iphigeneia was a case of catastrophe survived, the sacrifice at Salamis can be described as ritual murder to prevent catastrophe. In both cases, the victims are imaginary. But the human imagination which created them reflects a universal experience that is very real. When the existence of a social group was threatened, its members tried often to purchase their survival with someone else's life. Foreigners or social outcasts were sacrificed to the vital interests of the community; goats were butchered to make sure that young girls would reach adolescence, or that one's soldiers would win and live; and finally, by substituting material wealth for flesh and blood, Polykrates sacrificed his precious ring in a vain effort to save his own life. In each case, a possession that is potentially valuable and yet dispensable is voluntarily destroyed in order to forestall greater disaster.

III Cannibalism and the Eucharist

Human sacrifice is an ugly subject, but cannibalism is even uglier. Killing and eating are closely connected in the natural life cycle as well as in Greek ritual. Animal sacrifices supplied the Greeks with much of their meat. If treated on the analogy of meal sacrifice (θυσία), human sacrifice ceases to be a type of σφάγια (in which the victim is not eaten) and becomes cannibalism, as in two notorious Greek myths which picture the "Isle of Pelops" as a paradise for cannibals. In one myth, Zeus is invited to dinner by Lykaon who after sacrificing two kinds of victims, one regular and the other irregular, offers Zeus a mixture of human and animal flesh; and in the corresponding Arcadian ritual, worshippers of Zeus Lykaios pretended to eat

human flesh in ritual imitation of wolves [1]. According to the other myth, Demeter, the inventress of the tame cereal food which put an end to cannibalism, inadvertently ate a piece of Pelops' shoulder [2]. A generation later, Pelops' son Thyestes was served the flesh of his own children at a banquet given by his brother Atreus [3]. Both myths substitute human victims for sacrificial animals in the context of meal sacrifice, and demonstrate the perversion of animal sacrifice and meal fellowship into human sacrifice and cannibalism. Such a development from regular sacrificial practice to ritual cannibalism was not entirely confined to the realm of mere myth but had repercussions in actual cult, as the rites of Zeus Lykaios illustrate. It is remarkable, and psychologically revealing, that children are the preferred victims of Greek cannibalism, from the Hesiodic myth of Kronos—one thinks of Goya's horrifying visualization in the Prado—to the numerous later horror stories about child murder and cannibalism to which I will turn presently [4].

[1] G. PICCALUGA, *Lykaon. Un tema mitico* (Roma 1968); W. BURKERT, *Homo Necans*, 98 ff.; M. DETIENNE and J. SVENBRO, « Les loups au festin ou la Cité impossible», in *La cuisine du sacrifice* (*supra* p. 199 n. 2), 215-237. In the Lykaon myth, the human victim is, typically, a boy (παῖς), according to Apollod. *Bibl.* III 8, 1, 5 and Nikolaos of Damascus, *FGrHist* 90 F 38. Παῖδες as sacrificial victims occur also in Hdt. II 119, 3, Philo of Byblos, *FGrHist* 790 F 3 b (*supra* p. 205 n. 2), Arrian, *Anab.* I 5, 7, Paus. VII 19, 4; IX 8, 2; cf. A. HENRICHS, *Phoinikika*, 12 ff.; 31 ff., and *infra* n. 4.

[2] W. BURKERT, *Homo Necans*, 114 ff. On the role of cannibalism in Greek cultural theory and its abolition by Demeter see T. COLE, *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology* (1967), 103 f.; 154 f.; F. GRAF, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Berlin/New York 1974), 37 ff.; 160 ff.

[3] W. BURKERT, *Homo Necans*, 119 ff.

[4] Cf. G. DEVEREUX, «The Cannibalistic Impulses of Parents», in *The Psychoanalytic Forum* 1 (1966), 114-124 (a comparative study); J. KOTT, *The Eating of the Gods. An Interpretation of Greek Tragedy* (New York 1973), 199 f. (a Freudian approach to cannibalism in Greek myth). Cannibalized children in Greek myth include, apart from the Arcadian cases, Itys, Dionysos Zagreus and the children of various mythical maenads (*infra* pp. 230-1 n. 3). I can think of only one depiction of cannibalism in extant Greek art. On a late classical hydria in the British Museum (E 246), a male figure in Thracian dress is about to eat from a human limb torn from the body of a child which he is holding. The other figures are Dionysiac,

The Greeks of the classical period were both fascinated and repelled by cannibalistic myths. They passed this peculiar fascination on to the pagan philhellenes of the second century A.D. who compared the Christian eucharist with Thyestean banquets and charged the Christian communities of their time with ritual child murder and incest [1]. Their accusations recall similar charges brought against participants of the Roman Bacchanalia as well as against the Jews, Manichees and other religious minorities who led a marginal existence outside the mainstream of Greco-Roman society [2]. The eucharist remained a source of pagan suspicion and misunderstanding. Around 270 A.D., Porphyry the Neoplatonist circulated a pamphlet *Against Christianity* which was later excerpted by Macarius, bishop of Magnesia. Among these excerpts is the only extant comment on the Eucharist written by a pagan [3].

---

and the scene has been implausibly identified as the rending of Dionysos Zagreus (C. SMITH, in *JHS* 11 (1890), 343; A. B. COOK, *Zeus* I 654 f. with pl. XXXVI; W. K. C. GUTHRIE, *Orpheus* [2], 130 ff. with fig. 14). See *infra* p. 232 n. 2.

[1] A. HENRICHS, « Pagan Ritual and the Alleged Crimes of the Early Christians », in *Kyriakon. Festschrift J. Quasten* I (Münster 1970), 18-35, and *Phoinikika*, 34-37.

[2] Bacchanalia: Liv. XXXIX 8, 8 (*stupra et caedes*, Nietzsche's "witches' brew of sensuality and cruelty", *Birth of Tragedy* section 2, in the Kaufmann translation); Jews: E. BICKERMAN, « Ritualmord und Eselskult », in *Monatsschrift für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judentums* 71 (1927), 171 ff.; A. HENRICHS, *Phoinikika*, 33 f.; Manichees: A. ADAM (Hrsg.), *Texte zum Manichäismus*, Kleine Texte 175 (Berlin [2]1969), 77; Montanists: F. J. DÖLGER, « Sacramentum infanticidii » (*infra* p. 228 n. 2), 217 ff.; Mithraism: Fr. SCHWENN, *Menschenopfer*, 194; Turcan, in this volume at p. 350 nn. 6-7; cult of Bellona: Dio Cass. XLII 26, 2.

[3] Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* III 15, assigned to Porphyry by A. v. HARNACK, *Abh. der Königl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Berlin*, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1916, 1, 88 Fr. 69: πολυθρύλητον ἐκεῖνο τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ διδασκάλου ἐστίν, ὃ λέγει· « ἐὰν μὴ φάγητέ μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίητέ μου τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ». τοῦτο γὰρ οὐ θηριῶδες ὄντως οὐδ' ἄτοπον, ἀλλ' ἀτοπήματος παντὸς ἀτοπώτερον καὶ παντὸς θηριώδους τρόπου θηριωδέστερον, ἄνθρωπον ἀνθρωπίνων σαρκῶν ἀπογεύεσθαι καὶ πίνειν ὁμοφύλων αἷμα καὶ ὁμογενῶν καὶ τοῦτο πράττοντα ζωὴν ἔχειν αἰώνιον. ... ἡ ὀσμὴ τῆς λέξεως διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς εἴσω που παρελθοῦσα αὐτὴν ἐκάκωσε τὴν ψυχὴν τῇ ἀηδίᾳ ταράξασα, καὶ τῶν ἀποκρύφων τὸν λόγον ἐσίνωσεν ὅλον παρασκευάσασα σκοτοδινιᾶσαι τῇ συμφορᾷ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. For the first half of the quotation I adopt the translation of M. SMITH, *Jesus the Magician* (New York 1978), 66.

"Much discussed", he begins, "is the following word of the Teacher: 'Unless you eat my flesh and drink my blood, you have no life in yourselves' (*Jo.* 6, 53). This is not truly bestial (θηριῶδες) and absurd, but absurd beyond any absurdity, and bestial beyond every sort of bestiality, that a man should taste human flesh and drink the blood of men of his own genus and species, and by so doing should have eternal life!" Porphyry reads "my flesh" instead of "the flesh of the son of Man", a change which obscures the soteriological implications of John's text and increases its absurdity if taken literally. The mere notion of anthropophagy was so abhorrent to Porphyry, who would later write a treatise against animal sacrifice and in support of vegetarianism, that he was reluctant to consider its symbolical use. After a rhetorical display of erudition in which he musters examples from history, mythology and ethnography to show that no man has ever eaten willingly his own kin [1], he finally concedes the possibility of what he calls an "allegorical" or "mystical" meaning. "And yet the very stench of this text", he continues, "as it penetrates inside through the ear, corrupts and upsets one's very soul by its unpleasantness, and destroys the hidden meaning by causing his whole self to turn dizzy in the course of this experience". He concludes with the suggestion that the synoptic tradition omitted this particular saying of Jesus because the synoptics found it uncivilized and scandalous.

Porphyry's aversion to *John* 6, 53 must be seen against the background of the anti-Christian polemics of his own time when allegations of ritual murder were dying hard, as Origen attests [2]. Earlier references to "Thyestean feasts" and "Oedipean intercourse" in the Greek apologists of the second century barely illustrate the insidiousness of the pagan accusations. For

[1] Porphyry's two examples from myth are the "Thyestean banquet" and Tereus (Itys).

[2] *Cels.* VI 27 (in *GCS*, Origenes *Werke* II, ed. P. KOETSCHAU (1899), p. 97 f.).

a full description of the charges, one must turn to Tertullian's sarcastic account which recreates the weird atmosphere of ritual murder [1]. According to Tertullian, pagans believed that Christians murdered children in the course of an oath sacrifice and drank their blood during a banquet which culminated in a wild sex orgy. Most scholars ascribed these explicit details to Tertullian's own imagination, which would have exaggerated the pagan charges in order to make them appear absurd. But F. J. Dölger pointed out that the major ritual elements in Tertullian's account can be paralleled from reports of equally sinister cult practices on the pagan side, such as ritual infanticide for magical purposes and ritual murder in arcane oath-taking ceremonies [2]. Many of the descriptions of pagan ritual adduced by Dölger are probably fictitious. But whether fictitious or not, they are vivid proof that the pagan misconception of the eucharist was inspired by ritual patterns which were deeply imbedded in the pagan mind.

The pagan background of Tertullian's *sacramentum infanticidii* has been confirmed by the discovery of Lollianus' *Phoinikika*, a Greek novel of the second century A.D. which includes a detailed description of human sacrifice [3]. Virtually all the ritual elements which Dölger collected from dozens of pagan sources can be found on two fragmentary pages of the *Phoinikika*. The description centers around the sacrifice of a boy whose heart is removed, roasted, seasoned with oil and flour

[1] Tert. *Nat.* I 7, 23 f.; *Apol.* 8, 2 ff.; cf. Min. Fel. 9, 2 ff.

[2] F. J. Dölger, « Sacramentum infanticidii », in *Antike und Christentum* 4 (1934), 188-228. Cf. A. D. Nock, in *Gnomon* 4 (1928), 486 n. 2 = *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. by Zeph Stewart (Oxford 1972), I 170 n. 3: "There were no doubt sporadic survivals of human sacrifice under the Empire".

[3] Final publication in 1972 (*supra* p. 196 n. 5). Lollianus' novel is of course pure fiction. The degree in which his vivid imagination was ultimately inspired by real ritual practices remains controversial. See T. Szepessy, « Zur Interpretation eines neu entdeckten griechischen Romans », in *AAntHung* 26 (1978), 29-36, who sees in the sacrifice scene a purely literary device that has no religious substance ; also J. Winkler, in *JHS* 100 (1980), 155-181, and C. Jones, in *Phoenix* 34 (1980), 243-254.

and distributed to a group of participants called "initiands" (μυούμενοι), who can be identified as the Egyptian Boukoloi of the Nile delta. While they are holding the portions of the divided human heart in their hands, the initiands take an oath of allegiance which is reminiscent of Greek military oaths. A nauseating banquet follows next, during which the initiands eat from the boy's heart and drink either his blood, or, as a ritual substitute, wine. Some of them then have sex and get drunk. Others hold vigil over dead bodies, dress in white and black garments, paint their faces in matching colors, veil their heads and take a walk in the moonlight after midnight. The new text is not the pagan parallel to the eucharist which R. Reitzenstein and the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* had been waiting for. What it does provide, however, are structural elements of human sacrifice and meal fellowship which illustrate the final transformation and trivialization of ancient ritual patterns which had occupied the pagan mind for many centuries.

Despite its perversity, the pagan misrepresentation of the eucharist contains a small element of truth. Clement of Alexandria, in summarizing his view of certain pagan mysteries, stated that truth in simple terms. "These are the mysteries", he said, "to put it briefly, murder and burial" [1]. The Christian eucharist falls evidently into a comparable ritual category. It commemorates the suffering of Christ, whose death was a political execution which his followers interpreted as sacrifice. The principal religious roots of the earliest Christian interpretations of Jesus' violent death lie in Jewish animal sacrifice (with its characteristic emphasis on the separation of the victim's "flesh and blood" [2]), in the universal concept of the vicarious victim, and in Greek stories of patriotic self-sacrifice

[1] *Protr.* II 19, 2 (the motto which Burkert prefixed to his *Homo Necans*).

[2] Cf. *1 Cor.* 5, 7 τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός. J. JEREMIAS, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu* (Göttingen [4]1967), 211-216 has shown that the key terms "my flesh

on behalf of others [1]. By contrast, the startling idea that the ritual practice of the eucharist constitutes a symbolic theophagy —an idea which is at most implied by Paul (*1 Cor.* 11, 23 ff.) and in the synoptic gospels but made emphatically explicit in the "deliberately strong language" of *Jo.* 6, 53 [2]—is unparalleled outside Christianity [3]. Yet if seen in the wider context of the history of ritual in antiquity, the Christian eucharist in its extreme Johannine articulation may be regarded as the ultimate religious sublimation of those violent and cannibalistic instincts

---

and my blood" as used in the words of institution (*1 Cor.* 11, 23 ff.; *Mc.* 14, 22 ff.; *Mt.* 26, 26 ff.; *Lc.* 22, 15 ff.; cf. *Jo.* 6, 51) echo Jewish sacrificial language (both Hebrew and Greek).

[1] S. K. WILLIAMS, *Jesus' Death as Saving Event* (*supra* p. 204 n. 1), 230 ff.; R. D. RICHARDSON in his appendix (1979) to H. LIETZMANN, *Mass and Lord's Supper* (Leiden 1972), 471 ff. The concept of expiatory self-sacrifice as applied to the death of Jesus appears to be of Greek rather than Jewish origin (Williams), and is particularly strong in the Eastern liturgies (Richardson).

[2] A. D. NOCK, in *Mnemosyne* S. IV, 5 (1952), 199 = *Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background* (New York 1964), 131 = *Essays* II 809. In the most recent assessment of the eucharist in early Christian practice, G. KRETSCHMER describes even the synoptic words of institution (*supra* pp. 229-30 n. 2) as "anstössig" (« Abendmahl III/1 : Alte Kirche », in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* I (Berlin/New York 1977), 58-89 espec. 65 and 69).

[3] So far scholars have produced two pagan 'parallels' for the eucharist. (1) The first is Dionysiac, and twofold. Both the omophagy ('eating raw') of maenadic myth (whose victims are either animals or human beings such as Pentheus, Orpheus and the children of the Argive women or the Minyads) and the myth of Dionysos Zagreus (according to which the child Dionysos was dismembered and eaten by the Titans) have been compared to the eucharist (most recently and imaginatively by J. KOTT, *The Eating of the Gods*, 186-230; 309-322). It is doubtful, however, that maenadic omophagy or the Zagreus myth were reenacted in pagan cult. Furthermore, it can be shown that the most influential sacramental interpretations of Dionysiac omophagy, those of Jane Harrison and E. R. Dodds, are themselves influenced by modern sacramental theories about Semitic sacrifice as well as by Christian sacramentalism. (2) Potentially more relevant to the original conception of the eucharist are various homeopathic love-charms in magical papyri from Egypt in which wine is ritually identified with "the head of Athena" and "the entrails of Osiris/Iao" (*PMag.* VII 644 f., 3rd century A.D.), or with "the blood of Osiris" for which the magician's own blood is the ritual substitute (demotic papyrus of the early imperial period edited by F. L. GRIFFITH and H. THOMPSON, *The Demotic Magical Papyrus of London and Leiden* I (London 1904),

which in Greek tradition had time and again been released in real or symbolic reenactment of human sacrifice and anthropophagy [1].

For all its radical theology, John's interpretation of the eucharist as a spiritual form of cannibalism still captures the Christian imagination. As recently as 1972, sixteen Uruguayans whose plane had crashed in the Argentine Andes near the Chilean border survived for seventy-two days in the snow by cannibalizing the bodies of their dead fellow passengers [2]. Being devout Catholics they reluctantly accepted their cannibalistic diet because they managed to think of it as the reincarnated body and blood of Christ [3]. After the rescue, church officials sanctioned the practice of anthropophagy *in extremis* but rejected any comparison between cannibalism and Holy

---

XV 1 ff.). Both texts were first adduced in connection with the eucharist by R. REITZENSTEIN, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (Leipzig ^{3}1927), 80. On the basis of these two texts, Jesus' words over the bread and cup (reduced to their 'original' core, "this is my body, this is my blood") have been taken to be a magical formula in a "magical rite of union" by Morton SMITH (*Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge, Mass. 1973), 218; *Jesus the Magician*, 111; 122 f.). But it remains questionable that magical texts from Egypt can be profitably applied to the Palestinian milieu. Even if applicable, they would only illuminate the ritual drinking of blood (unknown in Judaism, although occasionally found in Greco-Roman rituals) but would not sufficiently explain the eucharistic bread-body analogy, whith its implication of cannibalism.

[1] Cf. C. H. DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1953), 339 n. 1 (on *John* 6, 53): "At most, it seems to me that theophagy belongs to a deep stratum of primitive thought and practice which, lying submerged in our minds, generates a natural and more or less universal symbolism; and such symbolism is capable of being re-vivified upon a higher level." R. BULTMANN, *Das Johannesevangelium* (Göttingen 1950), 175 n. 6 uses the term "anthropophagy" in connection with *John* 6, 52 ff. (which he considers interpolated).

[2] R. CUNNINGHAM, *The Place Where the World Ends. A Modern Study of Cannibalism and Human Courage* (New York 1973); P. P. READ, *Alive. The Story of the Andes Survivors* (Philadelphia/New York 1974).

[3] R. CUNNINGHAM, *op. cit.*, 135 and 201; P. P. READ, *op. cit.*, 91, 99, 239, 323 and 338.

Communion [1]. Porphyry would have been pleased with the church's position [2].

IV Epilogue

Was there a consistent Greek attitude toward human sacrifice? Three cases are perhaps too small a basis to support valid conclusions. Yet some consistent patterns have emerged which can claim general validity. Human victims in Greek religion are primarily an ideal construct of the imagination. They represent the most extreme form of sacrifice, which was rarely if ever realized. Whether actually practiced or merely imagined, human sacrifice was invariably considered abnormal and deviant, and was kept at a safe distance. In actual cult, animals were generally substituted for human victims, while stories were told which recalled the time when human blood

[1] R. Cunningham, *op. cit.*, 199 f.; P. P. Read, *op. cit.*, 330 and 340 f.

[2] While rejecting the literal meaning of *John* 6, 53, Porphyry seems prepared to condone a Greek case of cannibalism *in extremis*, that of Poteidaia (Thuc. II 70, 1). Cannibalism under extenuating circumstances, especially in times of war and famine, is surprisingly well attested for all periods of modern history. For antiquity, see Jos. *BJ* V 10, 4 (=440) and VI 3, 4 (=201 ff.) (siege of Jerusalem); Val. Max. VII 6, ext. 2-3 (Spanish towns under siege); Dio Cass. LXVIII 32 and *PGiess.* 24 = *Corpus Pap. Jud.* II 437 (Jewish revolt under Trajan; cf. A. Henrichs, *Phoinikika*, 33 f.). Cannibalism *in extremis* is by definition unrelated to human sacrifice, and human sacrifice does not normally involve anthropophagy in Greek tradition (as Porph. *Abst.* II 53-58 points out). It is all the more remarkable that most Greek stories of ritual infanticide (including child-murder for magical purposes) are cannibalistic, whereas the Semitic and especially the Punic child-sacrifice (*supra* pp. 196-7 n. 5) excluded cannibalism. Is it conceivable that the Greeks had cannibalistic ancestors in the Bronze Age? Peter M. Warren's current excavations at Knossos in Crete have produced the first evidence for Bronze Age cannibalism. He reports (*University of Bristol, Newsletter* 10, 8, 10 January 1980, 1 f.) the discovery "of unburnt human bones and skulls, 208 bones in all and coming from eight to eleven children, provisionally aged under ten to fifteen years." "After washing some 11% were found to have fine knife marks, exactly comparable to butchery marks on animal bones, resulting from the removal of meat. Cannibalism seems clearly indicated." Ritual cannibalism or cannibalism *in extremis* (famine rather than siege) are among the possible interpretations considered by Professor Warren.

was still spilled. But the practice of human sacrifice was occasionally revived as a rite of appeasement for dead persons of high status [1]. In Greek imagination, where human sacrifice was more common, the ideal human victims were children or foreigners, in other words social groups which were dispensable and unprotected by the law. They were usually made to die in the public interest, to save the fathers and mothers who controlled and perpetuated the polis society. According to the same construct, human sacrifice was to be reserved for special purposes, preferably as a last resort in times of national crisis.

Greek authors credited the mythical period or the remote past more readily with the practice of human sacrifice than their own contemporaries or immediate ancestors [2]. On the whole, however, they preferred to look for human sacrifice among the 'barbarians' rather than the Greeks. From the classical period onward, human sacrifice was identified as a non-Greek and foreign institution [3]. In Greek ethnography, foreign nations portrayed as practitioners of human sacrifice include the Scythians and Egyptians, the Phoenicians, Carthaginians and Cypriotes, the Celts and Germans, and various Arab tribes [4].

[1] Iustin. XI 2, 1 (Alexander ordered the accomplices in Philip's assassination slain over his father's grave in 336 B.C.); Plut. *Philop.* 21, 5 (Messenian prisoners stoned at Philopoimen's tomb in 183 B.C.). In both cases, the victims are social outcasts (*infra* n. 4). Cf. Hom. *Il.* XXIII 173 ff.

[2] Cf. Porph. *Abst.* II 53, 3 (οἱ πάλαι) and II 56, 2 (τὸ παλαιόν).

[3] In literary tradition, the Egyptian Busiris and the Taurian Artemis were the main foreign promoters of human sacrifice Cf. Paus. VII 19, 8 (θυσία ξένη) and Liv. XXII 57, 6 (*minime Romano sacro*). A similar attitude prevailed in 19th century scholarship when many Hellenists believed that human sacrifice in Greece had been imported from Phoenicia in post-Homeric times. The last defender of this view was P. Stengel, « Die Einführung der in homerischer Zeit noch nicht bekannten Opfer in Griechenland », in *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 127 (1883), 361-379 esp. 362-369, rejected by Fr. Schwenn, *Menschenopfer*, 14 ff.

[4] Scythians: Hdt. IV 62, 3 f. Egyptians: J. G. Griffiths, « Human Sacrifice in Egypt: The Classical Evidence », in *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Egypte* 48 (1948), 409-423. Phoenicians: *supra* pp. 196-7 n. 5 (holocaust sacrifice). Cyprus: Porph. *Abst.* II 54 f. (holocaust sacrifice). Celts: Strab. IV 4, 5, p. 198; Diod. V 31, 3; Strab. IV 4, 6, p. 198 = Poseidonios Fr. 276 Edelstein-Kidd = *FGrHist* 87 F 56

During the Hellenistic and Roman period, when religious allegiance tended to be a more powerful mark of differentiation than national identity, religious minorities too were often believed to practice ritual murder [1].

The message is clear. According to Greek tradition, ritual killing is something which uncivilized men inflict upon one another but which no Greek in his right mind would ever contemplate. Its ideal practitioners and victims are never members of the social group with which a given author identifies but always somebody else. It remains to ask, although I shall forgo the answer, why Greeks of so vastly different periods and backgrounds were so preoccupied with the notion of human sacrifice, even though they repudiated its practice. I suspect that the proper answer would have to do no less with human nature in general than with the Greeks as such [2].

(Celtic Namnites); Diod. V 32, 6 (Britanni); Caes. *Gall.* VI 16 ("wickerman" sacrifice). Germans: Strab. VII 2, 3, p. 294 = Poseidonios, *FGrHist* 87 F 31 (Cimbri). Arabia: Porph. *Abst.* II 56, 6 (people of Duma); Ps. Nilus, in *PG* LXXIX 612 C ff. (bedouins of the Sinai; *supra* p. 223 n. 1). Cf. Hdt. III 99 (endocannibalism described as 'sacrifice' among the Indian Padaei); Strab. III 3, 6, p. 154 (Lusitania) and XI 4, 7, p. 503 (Albania). The victims were usually prisoners (among the Scythians, Lusitanians, Cimbri and Boukoloi of the Nile delta), foreigners (in Egypt and among the Taurians) or social outcasts ("Sethians" in Egypt, runaway temple slaves in Albania, and criminals among the Britanni and Gauls). Human sacrifices were reportedly performed for the purpose of divination from the blood of the victims (Celts and Cimbri) or from their death throes (Celts, Lusitanians and Albanians); cf. A. SCHROEDER, *De ethnographiae antiquae locis quibusdam communibus observationes* (Diss. Halle 1921), 12-15. For non-ritual cannibalism in Greek ethnography see *e.g.* Hom. *Od.* IX 287 ff. (Cyclops); Hdt. IV 106; Arist. *EN* VII 5, 1148 b 21 ff.; M. DETIENNE, *Dionysos mis à mort*, 142 f.

[1] *Supra* p. 226 nn. 1 and 2.

[2] In his scathing demolition of anthropological 'evidence' for cannibalism, and of current opinion on who ate whom, W. ARENS exposes modern prejudices and attitudes which are remarkably close to the Greek notion of human sacrifice. Three quotations from his *The Man-Eating Myth: Anthropology & Anthropophagy* (New York 1979) must suffice: "Rumors, suspicions, fears and accusations abound, but no satisfactory first-hand accounts" (p. 21); "Cannibalism becomes a feature of the faraway or foregone" (19); "The idea of 'others' as cannibals,

rather than the act, is the universal phenomenon. The significant question is not why people eat human flesh, but why one group invariably assumes that others do" (139).

For advice, references and corrections in matters of scholarly substance I am indebted to Ernst Badian, J. N. Bremmer, Walter Burkert, Helmut Koester, Thomas Martin, Gregory Nagy, Kendrick Pritchett, J. A. Sakellarakis, Zeph Stewart, Richard Thomas, Emily Vermeule, H. S. Versnel and Peter Warren, many of whom had not seen this paper when they responded to my queries, and may conceivably disagree with much of it.

Addendum. — I noticed too late for consideration on p. 222 n. 3 that the relevance of Alcaeus Fr. 129 for Phainias' story had already been recognized by R. HAMPE, *Kult der Winde in Athen und Kreta*, Sitzungsber. d. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., 1967.1, 8. Apart from the merit of making this connection, Hampe's functionalist approach to human sacrifice in general and to the Salamis case in particular, which he interprets as a possible wind-charm, has nothing to recommend itself.

DISCUSSION

M. Burkert: Zwei Bemerkungen zu den vier in Parallele gesetzten Versionen des Mädchenopfers: ich würde den Ersatz durch ein Tier und durch ein εἴδωλον noch strenger scheiden. Dort wird ein reales Tieropfer mythisch übersteigert; hier wird nicht das gleiche 'abgekürzt', vielmehr das vollzogene Opfer vorausgesetzt und zum 'Schein' erklärt, ähnlich wie gnostisch-häretische Christen behauptet haben, nur ein Schein-Christus sei am Kreuz gestorben. Der *Ehoiai*-Version ähnlich ist Kallim. Fr. 461 Pfeiffer: eine getötete Frau wird zu Hekate.

Der Kallisto-Mythos hat im Rahmen dessen, was ich 'Mädchentragödie' nenne, Elemente mit dem Iphigenie-Mythos gemeinsam, hat aber ein ganz anderes Ziel und insofern andere Funktion: Kallisto ist in erster Linie die Mutter des Arkas, d.h. der Arkader; also ein Stammesmythos von der Bärenmutter und göttlicher Zeugung. Von eigentlicher Opferung ist auch nur in wenigen Versionen die Rede. Übrigens stellt sich für jede Deutung der Rituale von Brauron das Problem, dass die bei den Ausgrabungen gefundenen Inschriften noch immer unveröffentlicht sind.

M. Henrichs: Die präzisierenden Bemerkungen von Herrn Burkert bestätigen die vom Ritual ganz abgelöste Funktion der *Ehoiai*-Version und des Kallisto-Mythos, die rein poetischen bzw. propagandistischen Zwecken dienen. Entsprechend habe ich sie auch lediglich zum Kontrast herangezogen, um so den rituellen Bezug der beiden anderen Versionen deutlicher zu machen. Trotzdem steht der Kallisto-Mythos in einem thematischen Zusammenhang mit der ἀρκτεία in Brauron, da es in beiden Fällen um den Übergang von der Mädchen- in die Frauen- bzw. Mutterrolle geht.

M. Rudhardt: Les sacrifices du type 'sacrifice d'Iphigénie' ne sont pas seulement des sacrifices humains; ce sont plus précisément des

sacrifices de jeunes filles. Pourquoi? N'y aurait-il pas une relation entre ces sacrifices et le mariage?

Question incidente à M. Versnel: on connaît des femmes qui se sacrifient pour leur mari. Connaît-on des maris qui se sacrifient pour leur femme?

M. Henrichs: Die geplante Heirat zwischen Iphigenie und Achill ist natürlich nur eine List Agamemnons (von der Achill nichts weiss) und deshalb kaum mehr als ein Erzählungsmotiv. Über dem Grab Achills wird Polyxena als 'Totenbraut' geopfert und nicht Iphigenie. Die Brauronia betonen zwar die Jungfrauenrolle der Mädchen, die mit der Initiation sozusagen heiratsfähig werden, aber eine Brücke zu Achill/Iphigenie lässt sich nicht schlagen.

Die Frage, warum Jungfrauenopfer im griechischen Mythos so häufig sind, beantwortet am besten Herr Burkert.

M. Burkert: Mädchenopfer vor dem Krieg wiederholen sich im griechischen Mythos immer wieder; im Kult entsprechen Opfer an 'Jungfrauen' beim Auszug der Krieger. Nach meiner Deutung (*Homo Necans*, 77 ff.) signalisiert dies die Trennung, die Abwendung der Jungmannschaft von Mädchen und Hochzeit um des Krieges willen.

M. Versnel: I do not recall any explicit case of a man sacrificing himself for the life of his wife. If there are instances they must form a negligible minority. Of course we have cases of either partner refusing to live after the other has died both in literature and in epigraphic evidence (*non superstes esse*) and in the *Laudatio Turiae* the husband certainly makes a sacrifice by remaining devoted to a wife who did not give him any children but all this is of a different order. Anyhow, the value-systems of the ancient world, as worded by Eur. *IA* 1394: εἷς γ' ἀνὴρ κρείσσων γυναικῶν μυρίων ὁρῶν φάος, do not leave much room for optimism in this regard.

M^me Piccaluga: C'è la possibilità di inquadrare il sacrificio di Iphigenia (che non ha effettivamente luogo) sullo sfondo del con-

cetto di morte rituale (cf. i *riti di margine* secondo van Gennep) che dovrebbe trasformare l'adolescente prossima alle nozze in donna. Questo, soprattutto, perchè, dopo l'episodio del mancato sacrificio (in cui sarebbe stata vittima passiva), troviamo Iphigenia ormai sacerdotessa e a sua volta sacrificatrice di vittime umane nel paese dei Tauroi (vale a dire, ormai inserita in un nuovo *status* in cui è attiva). Ben diverso è il caso di Polyxene, per molti versi formalmente analogo a quello di Iphigenia (entrambe dovrebbero sposare Achilleus): in questo la ragazza è veramente uccisa, su un piano non sacrificale, e Artemis non svolge alcun ruolo. Ma Polyxene non è greca, nè muore in Grecia: per questo la cultura ellenica — che ormai respinge il sacrificio umano sia nella sfera del mito che ai margini dell'ordine greco — può benissimo farla morire.

M. Henrichs: The Iphigeneia myth, at least in its application to Brauron, has evidently to do with an initiation-like change of *status*, and the prevented sacrifice fits this pattern. It is equally evident that Polyxena is a different case altogether—a 'marginal' victim who serves as a funerary sacrifice (see my nn. 1 and 4 p. 233 *supra*). Phainias among others confirms that non-Greeks were favorite victims of human sacrifice. Returning to Iphigeneia, I must admit that I fail to understand the Greek mind when it comes to her paradoxical role as both sacrificial victim and sacrificer.

M. Burkert: Für die Realität eines Mädchenopfers vom Polyxena-Typ haben wir den Bericht eines arabischen Gesandten von den 'Rus' an der Wolga (engl. Übers. in *Antiquity* 8 (1934), 58-62).

M. Kirk: Perhaps we cannot after all 'understand the Greek mind', on the evidence available, over matters like the alteration in Iphigeneia from sacrificial victim to sacrificer. There are so many possibilities of thematic and narrative conflation in the development of a mythical tradition; and some of those may be realized independently of ritual aspects (which certainly exist in this case), and in an even more indeterminable fashion.

M. Vernant: Est-il nécessaire d'admettre que l'immolation des trois Perses ne fait que continuer le rituel de type σφάγια, en substituant des humains aux victimes animales? Le sacrifice préliminaire au combat a déjà été accompli puisque les ἱερά brûlent sur l'autel: c'est dans l'ampleur et l'éclat de leurs flammes que le devin voit un des 'signes' vouant les Perses à la mort. Ne peut-on donc penser qu'il s'agit d'un nouveau sacrifice, destiné cette fois à une divinité précise — sacrifice dont le caractère peut être discuté, mais dont on notera qu'il est appelé, à la ligne 17, θυσία?

M. Henrichs: It is true that σφαγιάζομαι on the one hand and θυσία/βωμός on the other hand are technical terms which are usually found in connection with two different types of sacrifice. It is also true that the combined rites of ἱερὰ θύειν and σφάγια, in that order, were performed by Greek μάντεις before military engagements. But I know of no case in which a σφάγια-sacrifice would be followed by a θυσία. I consider it unlikely that Phainias invented a sequence of sacrifices which would have been in conflict with ritual practice. It is much easier to assume that he used θυσία in such a general sense that it became interchangeable with σφάγια. Phainias' terminology is literary rather than cultic, and perhaps influenced by Greek tragedy. Human sacrifices occurred rather frequently in 5th century tragedy, and although the correct terminolgy (σφάττειν) prevails, the language of ordinary sacrifice (θύειν, θυσία) on an altar (βωμός) is occasionally used in connection with human sacrifice (Aeschyl. *Ag.* 150; 232; Soph. *El.* 576; Eur. *Hec.* 223; *IA* 358; 530 f., 1555; cf. ἀνθρωποθυσία in post-classical authors, and *supra* n. 4, pp. 218-9). It is more than likely that the terminological reinterpretation of the human sacrifice as a θυσία made it easier to introduce a divine recipient.

M. Rudhardt: D'après Plutarque, Thémistocle accomplit un sacrifice avant d'engager la bataille, selon le rituel ordinaire en pareille circonstance (σφαγιάζεσθαι). Un tel sacrifice est un sacrifice mantique, mais il fournit des réponses simples, du type: il est oppor-

tun — ou inopportun — d'engager le combat. Dans le cas particulier, le devin, considérant ce sacrifice (et d'autres signes connexes, il est vrai), y déchiffre un enseignement supplémentaire. C'est inhabituel, et cela pourrait justifier votre scepticisme quant à l'historicité de l'épisode.

Cependant, même si le récit est le produit d'une invention de Phainias, ni celui-ci ni Plutarque ne peuvent y employer le vocabulaire rituel d'une facon complètement arbitraire. C'est pourquoi il me semble comprendre que, selon eux, le sacrifice ordinaire allant se terminer, le devin aurait prescrit à Thémistocle d'en faire un second, dont les jeunes captifs seraient les victimes, en accomplissant les gestes inauguraux requis (κατάρξασθαι) et selon un rituel indiqué par le verbe καθιερεῦσαι. Celui-ci implique une consécration complète de la victime, dont rien ne doit rester à l'usage des hommes. Il en résulte que le mot θυσία, qui apparaît ensuite dans notre texte pour désigner le second sacrifice, y est employé dans un sens très étendu, comme le verbe θύειν l'est d'ailleurs souvent.

M. Henrichs: The fact that Phainias' account is fictitious does make a distinct difference in one's approach to its ritual terminology. Phainias was describing something that neither he nor his readers had ever seen in real life.

The transition from animal sacrifice to human sacrifice is doubtless marked by the change in cultic vocabulary. But the change as such reflects literary convention, as I have suggested, and does not imply that the human sacrifice was essentially different in purpose from the animal sacrifice. In both cases, sacrificial victims are killed (but not necessarily 'completely destroyed'), and their bodies abandoned, before a battle—in one word, σφάγια.

M. Kirk: I am greatly attracted by Henrichs' demonstration of the artificiality of much of the Phainias-based passage of Plutarch. Is it possible that among its conventional elements there is also a memory of the most notorious of all Greek cases of ritual murder, that by Achilles of the twelve Trojan captives on the pyre of Patroclus

(*Il.* XXIII 175 f.)? The occasion is different, admittedly, but the literary prototype must have been as well known in Lesbos as Dionysos Omestes was. Such a prototype would suggest a different valuation of the three Persian victims: not that they were foreigners, or marginal particularly, but simply that they were (like the twelve Trojans) *the enemy*.

M. Henrichs: It so happens that both the Greeks at Troy and the Athenians at Salamis were fighting a *foreign* enemy, a coincidence which made it easier to connect stories of human sacrifice with both events. But *the enemy* as such, whether foreign or Greek, is 'marginal' by definition because he is different from the society which he opposes in battle. This would explain why Greeks occasionally resorted to the ritual killing of *Greek* prisoners of war (*supra* p. 233 n. 1). In other words, a foreign enemy is an outsider in more than one way, and therefore doubly dispensable.

M^me Piccaluga: La particolarità del sacrificio studiato (oscillante tra θυσία e σφάγια) può essere valorizzata come ambiguità voluta, sullo sfondo della mitizzazione del periodo delle guerre persiane (rinvio, al riguardo, al mio contributo alla *XXV^e Rencontre Assyriologique* di Berlino, attualmente in corso di stampa), nel quale la cultura greca ambienta accadimenti 'impossibili' in altre epoche. In questo periodo, e solo a spese dei Persiani, può aver luogo anche un sacrificio umano, vale a dire un tipo di rituale che i Greci penseranno possibile solo nel tempo del mito ormai chiuso per sempre, oppure ai margini del loro mondo e in zone arretrate di questo (p. es. in Arcadia), mentre lo taglieranno fuori dalla loro realtà storica.

M. Henrichs: Human sacrifice (whether real or imagined) is often connected with situations of communal crisis, especially war, in Greek tradition. The case of Salamis fits this pattern; it is *not* a special case.

M. Turcan : Vous rejetez en bloc le témoignage de Phainias en particulier à cause de la mention de Dionysos *Ômestès* qui ne s'explique pas en Attique, mais qui s'expliquerait en fonction des attaches de Phainias avec un secteur géographique où son culte est attesté. Je conçois que vous suspectiez l'*interprétation* de Phainias quant au destinataire de l'immolation, mais est-on forcé de rejeter du même coup le *fait* du sacrifice ? Autrement dit ne faut-il pas faire une distinction entre la donnée à l'état brut (l'exécution des Perses) et le traitement de cette donnée par Phainias (référence au culte de Dionysos *Ômestès*) ?

Il pourrait s'agir d'une mise à mort réinterprétée comme un sacrifice (on en a d'autres exemples).

M. Henrichs : This is merely a theoretical possibility (already suggested by Kett, see pp. 211-2 n. 5) and a very remote one at that. As far as we know, the Athenians kept no Persian prisoners at Athens, and did not execute any. Diodorus (cf. p. 211 n. 1) implies that three Persians who fit Phainias' description died during the actual battle, and that Themistokles was later held responsible for their death by their Persian mother. The version in Diodorus could thus be taken to suggest that the story of the human sacrifice was a secondary development in a narrative tradition in which the death of three Persian noblemen had become attached to anecdotes about Themistokles.