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

1. Contract for an Unknown Priestess
   (Haussoullier 1890: 210 no. 2; Ziehen, *LGS* II 114; Sokolowski, *LSCG* 120; Graf, I.Ch. 7).

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

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

---

1. Sincere thanks are extended to Drs. A.P. Matthaiou and G.E. Malouchou for their very helpful comments on these notes, as well as for kindly sharing drawings of both inscriptions with me. The inscriptions are located in the Museum of Chios (inv. nos. MX 59 and 3569, respectively; the drawing of the latter is thanks to G.E. Malouchou). The following abbreviated references are used here:
2. See notably many of the essays in the volume *Χιακόν σημάδιαν εἰς μνήμην W.G. Forrest*, 2006, cited n. above.
hands of the divine statue of various gods during the ritual; these portions would later be taken by the priestess or priest as their prerogative.3

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

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

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

---

3. Cf. Graf, I.Ch. 6 / LSS 77 : lines 6-7: σπλάγχνα τά ἵς [χξ]είρας καὶ γούνατα; I.Ch. 5 / LSCG 119, lines 3-4 and 7-8: σπλάγχνα τά ἵς χξερας. LSS 78, lines 5-7: σπλαγχνα τά ἵς γόνατα; I.Ch. 4 / LSS 129, lines 4-5: σπλαγχνα; Matthaiou 2006: no. 1, line 10: [σπ]λαγχνα [τά ἵς χξερας; cf. also LSS 76, lines 3-4: [σπλαγχνα]α τά ἵς γόνατα (καὶ χξερας?)]. A similar phrase is in doubt to be restored in LSS 130, line 4. The expression is muddled by Graf 1985, who usually adds an unnecessary comma after σπλαγχνα; but see esp. his p. 40-41 for discussions of scholarly interpretations on the subject. The one favoured here (and also by Graf) was first proposed by F. Puttkammer, Quomodo graeci victimarum carnes distribuierint, diss. Königsberg 1912: 21-22, citing notably Ar. Eccl. 779.

4. An option between ἵς and ἵς might even be possible in the restoration of line 2, though the latter is unlikely given the marked use of the Ionic dialect in the text: cp. esp. τά ἵς γόνατα[ς θατι] in the same line.
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to be missing (again, one must also remember that, where present, iota may or not have been inscribed outside of the bounds of the stoichedon grid). Additionally, in the text presented below, a choice has been made to treat the length of line 2 as stoichedon 26, though this is of course only one possibility.

Stoichedon min. 25 — max. 27.

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

[της(?) . . . 8-10. . . ]ς ἵερεις γίνεσθαι σπάλα—
[άγγισ τά ἐς κείρη σας καὶ τὰ ἐς γούρατ].
[α, . . 5-7, . . γλῶσσα]ς, θύα ἀπ’ ὄν ἄν [θύη],
[. . . .11-13. . . ] καὶ γέρας διεξιῶσι.

5
[. . . .11-13. . . ]Ν ποιήσε μοιρή[1.1-2].
[. . . .11-13. . . ]ομα διεξία, κεφαλ[.]
[. . . .12-14. . . ], τρεῖς πλεοράς, ὀμ—
[. . . .11-13. . . ]καὶ ἄλφιτων ἡμείς[u]—
[kτέως . . .7-9. . . ]θυ[ου]ντων εκτομω—
10
[. . . .14-16. . . ] λασχέτω καὶ Τ[. . ]
[. . . .14-16. . . ]οση ἀτελε[. . ]
[. . . .13-15. . . ]Ν γενεσ[ . . .5 . . ]
[. . . .15-17. . . ] NENT[ . . .6 . . ]

----------- min. v. I evanuerat ---------------


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

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

5. See esp. Graf, I.Ch. 5 / LSCG 119, lines 4-5 and 8-9; μερίδα δίκρεων; and I.Ch. 6 / LSS 77, lines 7-8: καὶ κρε[δων δύο μοιρῶν δ[][κρε]ως. Double portions represent a norm for priests on Chios: cf. LSS 76, line 7: [μ][οιράς δύο]; I.Ch. 4 / LSS 129, line 6: μοιράς δύο; and LSS 130, line 2: [μοί][ρας δύο].
[γλάσσα]σα (or, alternatively, Ionic [γλάσσα]σα), a restoration which also leaves a suitable 5-7 letters available for another portion to be restored in the lacuna. Tongues are extremely commonly found as priestly portions on Chios (cf. Lupu, NGSL, p. 310). It might be objected that the infinitive γίνεσθαι precludes a nominative in the list here, but some ritual norms from Chios in fact show that infinitives (including this verb) could on occasion be followed by nominatives, cf. e.g. LSS 78, lines 5-8: γίνεσθαι στηλάγγχα ... καὶ γλάσσαι | καὶ γέρας. The only secure accusative form in the inscription is πλεοφάς in line 7, but this seems to appear in a separate section beginning in line 5 (sc. [δεῖ] τοιῇ ἐμ. μόρη[ν], “when the sacrifice is performed in part(?)…”).

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

2. Contract for the Priestess of Eilethia
(Koumanoudis and Matthaiou 1985; SEG 35, 923; Lupu, NGSL 20A-B).^6^

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

---

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

^7^ As A.P. Matthaiou rightly points out to me, occasionally (but more rarely) τάδε may also stand for “the things at hand”, cf. e.g. the end of the Koan decree IG XII.4 27, lines 11-13: [καὶ τ]άδε άναλ[ι]σκεφθαι εἰς στάλ[α]ν [κ][α]ί [θ]ώ[ν] | ε]ν τ[άδε]ι ἑιρετί τῶν ΔΩδεκά[ς] Θε[ῶν].

^8^ However, the drawing of the stone by G.E. Malouchou reads the traces only as . . . ΛΑΔΕ.
portions for a meal.\textsuperscript{9} The remainder of the meat will implicitly have gone to those individuals offering the private sacrifices. Note that this clause will probably have had a general application and concerned all of the portions granted to the priestess, even those from civic sacrifices (the measures of barley and wheat mentioned in lines A1-4; the supplementary head granted in decree B, lines 15-19); cf. also esp. \textit{ταύτα ταύτα} in lines A10-11: the exact same privileges are to apply also during purifications of the sanctuary and during libations, both types of ritual gestures being accompanied by sacrifices.\textsuperscript{10} Indeed, in line A12, traces of all the letters for the first of the excellent restorations suggested by Koumanoudis and Matthaiou seemed to be visible on the stone, namely $\Sigma \Pi \Omega \Delta \Lambda \Sigma$.\textsuperscript{11} The line should therefore read: $\kappa \rho \iota \sigma \pi \rho \nu \delta \alpha \zeta \pi \rho [\iota \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota (?)]$.

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

The Saxo Institute, University of Copenhagen

Jan-Mathieu Carbon

\textsuperscript{9} See J.-M. Carbon, Review of Lupu NGSL, in \textit{BMCR} 2005.04.07. Cp. also Lupu’s translation in \textit{NGSL} 20: “These shall be consumed on the spot with the women who performed the sacrifices (or: rites)”.

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

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