

JAN-MATHIEU CARBON

A HELLENISTIC RITUAL CALENDAR FROM KYZIKOS

aus: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 47 (2014) 149–155

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

A HELLENISTIC RITUAL CALENDAR FROM KYZIKOS¹

A few years ago in these pages, M. Theotikou published a highly fragmentary new decree from Kyzikos (Belkıs).² The badly damaged stele (7 cm deep) was observed by E. Schwertheim in 1977, and the edition is based on his notes as well as his photograph. Regrettably, the stone is now presumed to be lost. As Theotikou observes, the top of the stone appears to be partially preserved above the beginning of line 1. The decree (lines 1–6) which comes first in the extant text is inscribed in large lettering (1.5 cm), while the remainder is in considerably smaller typography (0.6 cm); a faint dividing line has been incised to separate these two parts of the inscription (cf. p. 139 in Theotikou). Given the appearance of the letterforms, Wolfgang Blümel attractively suggests a date of the second half of the 4th century BC or the 3rd c. BC for the inscription; due to the presence of serifs and some distinctive letters, I would narrow this dating to ca. 325–250 BC.³

The author's publication discusses many aspects of the fragment, but it may still be possible to provide some small improvements. On the basis of the published photograph, I offer the following conservative reading, noting a few variations from the ed. pr.:

vacat

	[- - - - τ] ἦι βουλῆι· ΘΕΜ[- - -]
	[- - - -] δης ὁ Ἡγημ[- - - - -]
	[- αἰ σπ] ονδαὶ καὶ αἰ θυ[σίαι - -]
	[- - - -] .ιου τοῦ πρυτ[αν- - - - -]
5	[- - - -] \ΤΗΣ προστάξ[- - - - -]
	[- - - -] ἀναγραφῆι κα[ἰ - - - - -]
	[- - - -] .ΑΘΗΝ συντελε[- - - - -]
	[- - - -] Α τοῖς θεοῖς νννν
	[- - - -] ἸΡΙΩΝΟΣ νννννν
10	[- - - -] .Ι πόλις καθαιρετ[- - - - -]
	[- - - -] ἸΤΑΝΕΙΑΙ ΧΟ[- - - - -]
	[- - - -] ἸΝ Σ[- - - - -]

¹ I am very grateful to Riet van Bremen and Robert Parker for their valuable comments.

² M. Theotikou, Ein unpublizierter Ratsbeschluss aus Kyzikos, *EA* 44 (2011) 133–141, with photo. For a critical note on the publication, see P. Hamon in the *Bulletin épigraphique*, *REG* 125 (2012) 640 no. 348. On the epigraphy of Kyzikos, see now C. Habicht, Kyzikos: the epigraphical evidence, 167–178, in: M. Sève and P. Schlosser eds., *Cyzique, cité majeure et méconnue de la Propontide antique*, Metz 2014 (*non vidi*).

³ The presence of the four-bar *xi* is a particularly strong criterion for a date in the second half of the fourth or the first half of the third century BC. Good photographs of inscriptions dating to this period from Kyzikos are rare, but facsimiles of contemporaneously dated inscriptions (e.g. those cited in n. 5 below) appear to display similar letterforms (notably the four-bar *xi* in the inscription published by Mordtmann). The following general descriptions may be attempted for the present text: *alpha* generally with a straight horizontal bar, sometimes a bit curved downward; *mu* open rather than with straight verticals; *sigma* open, though sometimes very acute and compressed; only one instance of *omega*, in line 9, large and with small flaring base bars; *phi* rather squat with bulbous loops; smaller *theta* and *omicron*; and a fairly distinctive *upsilon* with right diagonal more curved and lower than the left. These letters are broadly characteristic of early Hellenistic inscriptions.

4]σίου Theotikou; traces of an upper serif, and perhaps of a lower diagonal hasta, which could also be from a large *kappa*; if only the serif is correctly read, however, then several other letters are possible. | 5 ἐ]κ τῆς προστάξ[εως T.; at the beginning, small trace of a lower diagonal hasta. | 7]ΑΘΗΝ συντελε[T.; at the beginning, indistinct traces of a letter, perhaps the lower half of a vertical hasta; at the end of the line, upper right corner of Γ, correctly interpreted as a trace of E by T. | 8 Λ lapis, but T. correctly interprets this as Α. | 9]ριῶνος T.; tentative trace of the upper portion of a vertical at the break, or at least no lower or upper traces of an angular letter possible at the break. | 10] ἡ πόλις καθαιρε[T.; at the beginning, only a vertical hasta is clearly visible, though there are possibly some earlier traces; at the end, an upper horizontal, almost certainly from *tau*, rightly also read by Hamon. | 11]TANEIAIXΩ[T.; at the beginning, perhaps a small upper serif or diagonal hasta, though it is not easy to distinguish this from the more visible upper portion of *tau*; the final trace of a rounded letter is almost certainly too small to be *omega* (cp. the one in line 9). | 12]Ν[T.; the traces of *nu* and the upper portion of a *sigma* are fairly clear on the photo; other possible traces to the left as T. notes, though much less clear.

The Decree (lines 1–6)

The editor well remarks that line 1 must preserve the prescript of a decree, and notes that the strong candidate for a restoration is [ἔδοξεν τ]ῆι βουλῆι, but oddly chooses not to restore this in her edition.⁴ Indeed, it seems clear that we have here the first bouleutic decree known from Kyzikos, since [ἔδοξεν τῶι δημῶι καὶ τ]ῆι βουλῆι would yield an impossible order. Perhaps the only other possibility is [δεδόχθαι τ]ῆι βουλῆι, a record of a bouleutic decree. Since the top of the stone is partially preserved, we are almost certainly at the first line and the beginning of text.

An invocation (θεοί), and/or a dating formula may have come in the lacuna to the left, but neither is attested around this time.⁵ Decrees of the *boule* and *demos* of Kyzikos in the early Hellenistic period, of which admittedly only a handful are known, begin immediately with ἔδοξεν, followed either by a simple mention of who made the proposition or a more elaborate indication of the officials involved.⁶ Indeed, it seems that we have such names, at least two officials, in the remaining traces in lines 1–2.⁷ Mention of which tribe held the prytany or another form of date remains possible in the lacunae, though not particularly likely. We should therefore consider that [ἔδοξεν / δεδόχθαι τ]ῆι βουλῆι is the minimal restoration in line 1, thus yielding

4 Hamon (op. cit.) similarly suggests restoring [ἔδοξε(v) τ]ῆι βουλῆι.

5 The earliest mention of the date with the eponymous *hipparchos* in the prescript is perhaps *CIG* 3658 (3rd or 2nd c. BC?), lines 1–3: μηνὸς Ταυρεῶνος τρίτηι ἀπιόντος, ἐπὶ ἱππάρχῳ Βόσπωνος, | ἔδοξεν τοῖς πολίταις.

6 E.g. *CIG* 3655 (3rd or 2nd c. BC?): ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ· Γοργόνικος | Διοκλέους εἶπεν. Other contemporaneous texts have more elaborate preambles: J. H. Mordtmann, *Zur Epigraphik von Kyzikos*, *MDAI(A)* 6 (1881) 121 no. 3(1) (3rd c. BC): [ἔδ]οξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ, | [Αθ]ήναιο[ς ἐπεσ]τάτει, γνώμη τῶ[ν πρυτάνεων καὶ τῶν] ἀρχόντων; C. G. Curtis and A. Aristarchis, *ANEKΔΟΤΟΙ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΑΙ ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΟΥ, Hellenikos Syllogos en Konstantinoupolei, Parartema* 16 (1885) 4–5 no. 2 (late 4th–3rd c. BC): [ἔδοξε]ν τῶι δήμῳ· Ἀργαδεῖς <ἐ>πρυ<τ>άνειυεν· | Δημήτ]ριος Διονυσ<ί>ο ἐπεστάτει· Θεμιστ[ιος] | . . .]ύλο ἐγραμμάτευεν.

7 Given that prominent officials in Greek cities, especially members of the *boule*, often remained in a position of influence for some time, it is worth pointing again to the third inscription cited in the n. above. Θεμιστ[ιος] | . . .]ύλο, acting as secretary in more or less contemporary decree, might be suggested as a plausible proposer for the present inscription, or as an official involved in the passing of the decree. Cp. Θεμιστ[τιον] Δημοχάριδος[ς] in an inscription found at Hamamlı in the territory of Kyzikos: H. Lechat and G. Radet, *Inscriptions d'Asie Mineure*, *BCH* 12 (1888) 195–196 no. 5. As Theotikou notes, Themistagoras and Themistonax are also attested at Kyzikos (once each, in inscriptions of the Roman period; *LPGN* V.A s.v. Themison cites squeezes nos. 1788–91 (C.1) in the Fonds Louis Robert, unpublished decrees from Kyzikos of the late Hellenistic period). The other apparent fragments of a name, -]δης ὁ Ἥγημ[-, have an unusual or unexpected construction (ὁ + father's name); Theotikou explores the possibilities, none of which are compelling.

an approximate gap of ca. 7–9 letters to the left in lines 2–6, and perhaps much the same in lines 7–11, where the letters are smaller in width but where the break in the stone, albeit uneven, is less considerable.⁸

In lines 3–6, we seem to arrive at the substance of the decree. Since the lacuna to the left is a minimum of 7–9 letters, the start of line 3 marks the beginning of the considerations proper. As hinted by Theotikou, we could restore this as [ὅπως αἱ σπ]ονδαὶ καὶ αἱ θυ[σῖαι – (verb) –].⁹ The primary concern of the decree is therefore with libations, sacrifices, and perhaps with other rituals such as the purification mentioned in line 10, e.g. οἱ καθαρμοί, αἱ ἀγνείαι.¹⁰ Regrettably, what was decided in that regard remains largely obscure: we hear probably of the Prytaneion as a building in line 4; of a form of political command in line 5, and more expectedly, of the inscribing of the decree and its substance in line 6 (ἀναγραφῆι).¹¹

The Calendar (lines 7–12)

The phrase surrounding the verb ἀναγραφῆι probably explained that a copy not only of the bouleutic decree but also of the remainder of the inscription was to be written on the stele. This ‘remainder’ quite clearly appears to correspond with the phrase found in line 3, [ὅπως αἱ σπ]ονδαὶ καὶ αἱ θυ[σῖαι ...].¹² Indeed, what is inscribed below the decree, in smaller lettering, are elements of cult practice. Accordingly, it may be argued that this part of the fragmentary text is a ritual calendar, enacted by the decree above.¹³

8 On the monthly prytany at Kyzikos and other related features of the epigraphical evidence, see still F. W. Hasluck, *Kyzikos*, Cambridge 1910, 251–252. Cf. also P. J. Rhodes and D. M. Lewis, *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford 1997, 315–317, who include some of the significant formulae and view the alternance between ἔδοξεν and δεδόχθαι as not particularly significant “variations”.

9 Cp. the recurrent phrase ὅπως πολλῶ μᾶλλον αἱ τε θυσῖαι καὶ σπονδαὶ καὶ τὰλλα τὰ νομιζόμενα ... ἐπιτελεσθῆ in *Fayoum* 2, 112, 113 (both 93 BC) and 136 (*OGIS* 736, 69/8 BC); no. 112 is also cited by Theotikou (n. 14); she suggests, but does not implement, a similar restoration.

10 Cp. the preamble of the famous regulation from Cyrene, now *SEG* 50, 1638 (ca. 325–300 BC), lines 2–3: [ἐς ἀ]εὶ καθαρμοῖς καὶ ἀγνήϊαις κα[ὶ δεκατ]ήϊαις χρεϊμένως; and especially the casuistic regulation concerning purifications from Kos, *IG* XII,4 72 (ca. 240 BC), lines 5–7: ὅπως ταῖ τε ἀγνείαι καὶ τοῖ καθαρμοῖ – – κατὰ τοὺς ἐ[ι]ροὺς καὶ πατρίους νόμους συντελῶντα[ι, ν ἀγαθὰ τύχαι, ν δεδόχθαι τᾶι] | ἐκκλησίαι. The verb συντελῶνται is a plausible restoration in our text as well, especially given the appearance of another form of συντελέω in line 7.

11 Line 4: Hamon rightly criticises Theotikou’s notion that the traces]σιου τοῦ πρυτ[αν might be a temporal indication mentioning the individual holder of an eponymous office (]σιου τοῦ πρυτ[άνεως?; impossible at Kyzikos). The line is thus much more likely to refer to the Prytaneion as a structure or building. Line 5, the command: partly following Theotikou, Hamon plausibly thinks of an injunction of the *demos* motivating the actions of the *boule* and hesitatingly suggests [ἐ]κ τῆς προστάξ[εως τοῦ δήμου?]. However, I wonder if a form of the verb προστάσσω is not more likely than the epigraphically rare noun πρόσταξις. The parallels from Kyzikos which Hamon cites do include (late) instances of πρόσταξις, but also, more expectedly, of the verb, e.g. *SIG*³ 798 (37 AD), lines 15–16: ὁ ... δήμος ... προσέταξε τοῖς ἄρχουσι. Given the uncertainty of the reading of the *kappa*, a precise restoration remains elusive.

12 Hamon (op. cit.) suggests restoring [ὅπως ἂν (vel sim.)], followed by the subjunctives ἀναγραφῆι κα[ὶ (e.g.) ἀνατεθῆι κτλ.].

13 Theotikou errs in conceiving of the two texts as separate “Beschlüsse” (p. 139), as already well noted by Hamon (op. cit.): “Vient ensuite, gravé en lettre plus petites, un document qui, dépourvu de formule de sanction, n’est pas un décret.” He later cautiously asks: “Ne s’agit-il pas d’un calendrier cultuel, affiché au prytanée?” Note in addition that the hand inscribing both texts appears to be the same. On the content of sacrificial and other cult calendars, see E. Lupu, *New Greek Sacred Law (NGSL)*, Leiden/Boston 2009² [2005], 65–68; S. Paul, *Cultes et*

In lines 7–8, we have what appears to be the heading of this calendar, concluded by empty space after τοῖς θεοῖς at the end of line 8. The first trace of a word]ΑΘΗΝ is plausibly interpreted by Hamon as κ]αθ' ἦν, which would imply e.g. a γραφή or writ of the *boule* “according to which” things are to take place. Another possibility might be an invocation, i.e. [τύχην ἀγ]αθήν, though one which is fairly rare in the accusative and more commonly found in the dative.¹⁴ Due to the vicissitudes of epigraphic preservation, the titles of sacrificial and other ritual calendars are poorly understood. Phrases such as τάδε (τὸ ἕτερον ἔτος) θύεται, headed annual columns in some calendars from Attica.¹⁵ More elaborate but also relatively unique, is the detailed preamble of the sacrificial calendar of Mykonos, which explains that the *synoikismos* of the cities on the island motivated a recodification of the rites (τάδε ... ἱερ[ὰ] θύειν).¹⁶ At Kyzikos, the heading may also have contained a deictic, τάδε, perhaps agreeing with what appears to be a neuter plural ending preserved at the beginning of line 8 (]Α). As in other calendars, we would expect τάδε ἱερὰ, but a longer phrase, including for instance the common expressions τὰ νόμιζόμενα or (κατὰ) τὰ πάτρια, is probably to be presumed.¹⁷ This phrase formed the object of the verb, probably the infinitive συντελε[ῖν] or the passive συντελε[ῖται]. It would likely have contained other details about the character of these “(rites) ... to be performed”. Note that the verb συντελέω refers to the celebration and the fulfilment of rituals (*LSJ* s.v. 3). The text did not – or at least not solely – contain the verb θύω, which seems again to suggest that rites other than sacrifice, such as libations and purifications, were detailed within it. The calendar was thus not uniquely a *sacrificial* calendar. The general sense of this heading may have been: “(Writ) according to which the ... (rites) are to be celebrated ... for the gods”, or “With good fortune. The (following rites) ... are to be performed ... for the gods”.

As Theotikou discerned, line 9 preserves the end of the name of a month in the genitive. This is thus the first month listed in the calendar, and the line is concluded by empty space outlining that the column of text below refers to the month in question. No specific date is to be presumed here (*pace* Theotikou), especially if our assumption about the small extent of the lacuna to the left is correct. The calendar of Kyzikos is fully known, and generally conformed to that of Miletus except in one regard (Kyzikene Boudion = Metageitnion, month 5 at Miletus).¹⁸ Only

sanctuaires de l'île de Cos, Liège 2013, 328–332. The most basic structure expected of such calendars is: month (genitive) – date/festival (dative) – deity (dative) – offering (nominative or accusative); verbs and other syntactical details are often omitted, but many other details can of course be sporadically included.

14 For an instance in the accusative, cf. the Amphiktyonic decree *CID* IV 6 (Delphi, ca. 350–300 BC; cp. perhaps the restoration in *SEG* 2, 330). However, this picture of paucity is now complemented by the highly numerous instances of the formula (whether in the nominative, accusative, or dative) in the new tablets from Dodona, though these are of course, for the most part, private rather than public documents: cf. S. Dakari et al., *ΤΑ ΧΡΗΣΤΗΡΙΑ ΕΛΑΣΜΑΤΑ ΤΗΣ ΔΩΔΩΝΗΣ*, Athens 2013, vol. 2, Index s.v. ἀγαθός.

15 State calendar of Athens, face of 403–399 BC: S. D. Lambert, *The Sacrificial Calendar of Athens*, *BSA* 97 (2002) 355–399, fr. 3, line 1; cp. S. D. Lambert, *The Sacrificial Calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis: A Revised Text*, *ZPE* 130 (2000) 43–70.

16 *LSCG* 96 (ca. 230–200 BC), lines 2–5: ὅτε | συνωικίσθησαν αἱ πόλεις, τάδε ἔδοξεν Μυκονίοις ἱερ[ὰ] | θύειν πρὸς τοῖς πρότερον καὶ ἐπηνορθώθη περὶ τῶν προτέλων.

17 Theotikou points in the right direction, suggesting various alternatives (some much less plausible).

18 Boudion: E. Schwertheim, *Versteigerungslisten aus Kyzikos*, *EA* 8 (1986) 11 no. 2 (with 13–14). For the calendar, cf. esp. C. Trümper, *Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Monatsnamen und Monatsfolgen*, Heidelberg

two of the months might be envisaged here: Apatourion and Anthesterion.¹⁹ According to my reading, the straight shape of the break and the possible trace of a vertical hasta preclude the *upsilon* of Apatourion; thus, only Anthesterion qualifies. That being said, it is surprising that the incipit of this particular calendar is Anthesterion (the 11th month at Miletus). The start of the calendar at Kyzikos in the Classical and Hellenistic periods is not precisely known, but is naturally presumed to be Taureon, as in Miletus and its colonies. A later inscription from Kyzikos indeed appears to confirm a new year beginning in Taureon.²⁰ Though Anthesterion contained the important Ionian festival of the Anthesteria (on the 12th and 13th), its appearance here as the first month in a probably larger calendar remains puzzling.²¹

The content of the calendar is poorly preserved. In the column introduced by the month name Anthesterion, it might be expected that individual dates would follow in the dative, perhaps at the left margin. There may be a trace of this at the beginning of line 10 (unless this is the article ἡ, as Theotikou reads; but articles are not always necessary in the pithy style of calendars). This first entry in the month presents an unusual but perhaps not wholly unexpected detail. A ritual purification must be undertaken, presumably “of the city” rather than “by the city”; the passive καθαίρετ[αι] is much to be preferred to the imperative καθαίρετ[ω] (the latter suggested by Hamon). Theotikou underlines the singularity of the phrase in the current epigraphical evidence, while aptly pointing to some literary parallels.²² Regular purifications of the city formed a part of its calendar and often anticipated important festivals. It might be thought that this ritual cleansing of the city at Kyzikos occurred early in the month, perhaps on the new moon.²³ It is unclear what precise mode of purification will have been envisaged on

1997, 91–92. The inscription attesting to Boedromion (in expected Milesian order before Kyaneption) is now in the Istanbul Museum, but still unpublished: L. Robert, *Hellenica* IX, Paris 1950, 5 n. 1.

19 So also (implicitly) Theotikou, and more clearly Hamon (op. cit.).

20 J. H. Mordtmann, *Zur Epigraphik von Kyzikos*, *MDAI(A)* 6 (1881) 43–46 no. 2 Ib (ca. 117–138 AD), lines 1–5: πρυτάνεις Αἰγικορεῖς οἱ πρυτα[νεύσαντες μήνα Ἰ]α[ρ]τεμισιώνα τὸν ἐπὶ Κλ[αυδίας] Βάσσης ἱπ[παρχούσης, γραμμ]ατέως βουλῆς Ποπλίου Φο[υλβίου καὶ καλλι]ιάσαντες τὸν Ταυρεῶνα ἐπὶ ἱπάρχου –]ου Διονυσίου. This prytany text thus appears to suggest a change from the Artemision of the previous year – *hipparchia* of Cl. Bassa – to the Taureon of the following, under a different *hipparchos* (x son of Dionysios). On the κάλλιον, see Hasluck (op. cit.), 251–252.

21 On the Anthesteria, see *SEG* 28, 953 (ca. 25–50 AD), a decree on a public funeral, lines 51–53: τοὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις τοὺς πρυτανεύοντας τὸν μήνα τὸν Ἀνθεστηριῶνα ἰ στεφανοῦν αὐτὴν ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔ[το]ς ἐν τοῖς Ἀνθεστηρίοις τῇ δωδεκάτῃ ἰ καὶ τῇ τρισκα[ιδ]εκάτῃ χρυσῶ στε[φά]νῳ. Cf. the wider discussion in M. Sève, *Un décret de consolation à Cyzique*, *BCH* 103 (1979) 327–359; Hasluck (op. cit.), 233–234, on the cult of Dionysus at Kyzikos.

22 Theotikou (op. cit.), 139 n. 53, citing Lysias 53.3 and Hipponax fr. 5 (to these pre-Hellenistic sources, add Pl. *Pol.* 293d: καθαίρωσιν ἐπ’ ἀγαθῶ τὴν πόλιν). A more concrete case for a purification of the city occurring during a periodic ritual celebration is Apollodorus fr. 82 (Diogen. Laert. II.44), describing the day preceding the Thargelia in Athens: Θαργηλιῶνος ἕκτη, ὅτε καθαίρουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν Δῆλιοι γενέσθαι φασίν. For the purification of the *boule* and *ekklesia* before meetings at Athens, perhaps thereby purifying “the city”, see R. C. T. Parker, *Miasma*, Oxford 1996 [1983], 21 (and the same work for detailed discussions of the various rituals of purification).

23 Household shrines were traditionally cleaned in purification rituals at the end of a month, immediately prior to the new moon: cf. K. F. Smith, *Hekate’s Suppers*, 57–63 in: S. Ronan ed., *The Goddess Hekate*, Hastings 1992. Different dates of course remain possible: for instance, there is some (tentative) evidence for regular purifications (καθαρμοί) and ritual ‘turnings’ (ἀποτροπαί) on the 18th and 19th of the month in Athens, cf. J. D. Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year*, Princeton 1975, 21.

this date. Some of the rituals (washing, sacrifice, even expulsion of a *pharmakos*?) may have been mentioned in the lacuna afterward, but more probably this brief mention of the necessary purification sufficed (religious tradition or priests knew the relevant details). This epigraphic attestation of city purification is highly interesting and one can now only wish for further information about the subject.

In the next and last intelligible line, still thinking of a cult calendar, we read traces which strongly suggest a feminine dative singular ending. The letters -τανείαι must be from the epithet Prytaneia, which is virtually exclusive to the goddess Hestia.²⁴ The role of this goddess, as keeper of the hearth in the Prytaneion and focus of worship in this establishment, is amply recognised, though the practicalities of her cult are not particularly well understood.²⁵ In another Milesian colony, Sinope, an inscription attests to the appropriate homage paid to Hestia Prytaneia by *prytaneis* who have served their month in office.²⁶ Here, we almost certainly have a sacrifice for the goddess: a piglet, χο[ίρος] or χο[ίρον], was offered (or perhaps multiple piglets). Offerings to Hestia are seldom mentioned in any detail, but the calendar of Kyzikos now appears to provide us with a case for a small sacrifice at the hearth of the Prytaneion, perhaps carried out by the *prytaneis* themselves.²⁷

Proposed Text

To conclude, I offer the following revised text:

vacat

[ἔδοξεν τ]ῆι βουλῆι· Θεμ[ίστιος? - - - - -]
 [...ca.8. . .]δης ὁ Ἡγημ[- - - - -]
 [ὅπως αἰ σπ]ονδαὶ καὶ αἰ θυ[σῖαι - συντελῶνται κατὰ? -]
 [. .ca.6. . .]ίου τοῦ πρυτ[ανείου - - - - -]
 5 [...ca.6. . .].ΤΗΣ προστάξ[- - - - -]
 [. .ca.6. . .] ἀναγραφῆι κα[ὶ - - - - -]
 [. .ca.6. . .].ΑΘΗΝ συντελε[- - τάδε τὰ / τὰ - - - - -]
 [. .ca.6. . .]α τοῖς θεοῖς νννν [- - - - -]
 [Ἀνθεστη]ριώνος νννννν [- - - - -]
 10 [. . .ca.8. . .].Ι· πόλις καθάιρετ[αι - - - - -]
 [Ἐστῖαι Πρυ]τανείαι χο[ίρος - - - - -]
 [. . . .ca.12. . . .].ΙΝ Σ[- - - - -]

24 Differently, Hamon (op. cit.), essentially following Theotikou, thinks of the institution of the prytany: “[πρυ]-τανείαι *vel* [πρυ]τανείαι”. To my knowledge, there are no instances of this epithet attributed to other goddesses (male instances relate to Hermes and a few other gods). For the central place of Hestia in the *prytaneion*, cf. also Hermeias ap. Athen. 149d–e (Hestia Prytanitis at Naukratis) and *IC* I ix 1, lines 15–16 (Hestia ἐμ πρυτανείωι, oath at Dreros, 3rd–2nd c. BC); for the epithet Prytaneia in the Hellenistic Aegean, see *IG* XI,2 117 (Delos, mid-3rd c. BC), lines 5 and 19.

25 In addition to the items cited in the n. above, see esp. the study of R. Merkelbach, *Der Kult der Hestia im Prytaneion der griechischen Städte*, *ZPE* 37 (1980) 77–92 (*Hestia und Erigone*, Stuttgart/Leipzig 1996, 52–66).

26 *IK Sinope* 7 (4th c. BC); the *prytaneis* of the month Panemos make a dedication τ[ῆι] Ἐστῖαι Πρυ[τανείαι] (line 3), and this is followed by a list of their names.

27 In the State Calendar of Athens, Lambert (op. cit.), fr. 3, line 79, Hestia receives a sheep in the company of Athena, the Charites, and Hermes En[agonios], within a wider Eleusinian context: Δ†† Ἐστῖ[αι οἶς]; a piglet is mentioned in the preceding line (probably used as part of a preliminary purification).

1 or [δέδοχθαι τ]ῆι. | 5 ἐ]κ τῆς προστάξ[εως Theotikou, ἐ]κ τῆς προστάξ[εως τοῦ δήμου?] Hamon. | 6 [ὅπως ἄν?] ἀναγραφῆι κα[ὶ ἀνατεθῆι?] sugg. H. | 7 [κ]αθ' ἣν συντελε[- H.; e.g. [γραφῆ κ]αθ' ἣν συντελε[ῖν τὰ], or [τύχην ἀγ]αθῆν· συντελε[ῖται τάδε τὰ. | 10 e.g. [νουμηνία]ι. | 11 or χο[ῖρον, etc.

Many questions still remain. What was the extent of the ritual calendar issued on this stele? Was it selective, since it began in Anthesterion instead of the ‘Schaltmonat’ Taureon, or did it cover the whole cultic year? The empty space following the name of the month in line 9 suggests that this was only a first rubric, probably followed by others below or perhaps to the right.²⁸ What motivated the *boule* of Kyzikos to write up this calendar in the early Hellenistic period? Did the calendar propose a new ‘code’ or a traditional arrangement of the rites? Or was it perhaps a calendar of the rites specific to the *boule* and the *prytaneis*? The latter seems to me a plausible option and might begin to explain many of the particularities of the inscription.

Özet

Makalede, M. Theotikou tarafından yayınlanan (*EA* 44, 2011, s. 133–141) ve erken Hellenistik döneme ait olan ve Kyzikos meclisinin (*boule*) libasyon ve kurban törenlerine ilişkin bir karar ile ilgili yazıt parçası üzerinde durulmaktadır. Yazara göre, dekretin alt kısmında meclisin aldığı kararla bağlantılı olarak bir dinsel takvim yer almaktadır. Makalede, yazıtın yeni bir restorasyonu önerilmekte ve yazıttan, Anthesterion ayında Kyzikos’ta resmi bir arınma ve Tanrıça Hestia Prytaneia’ya bir kurban töreni düzenlediği anlaşılmaktadır. Bu fragmentin tam içeriği ve takvimin boyutu bilinmese de, Kyzikos’daki dinsel törenlerin Meclis (*boule*), Yönetici (*prytanis*) ve Yönetim Binası (*prytaneion*) ile yakın bir ilişki içinde oldukları ileri sürülebilir.

Saxo Institute, University of Copenhagen

Jan-Mathieu Carbon

²⁸ Cp. already Hamon (op. cit.): “le document devait être organisé en rubriques mensuelles”.