hand there are a number of early demands for inner purity known (e.g. Pythagoras, Sophocles, Plato).

Thus, I cannot avoid the impression that, despite both considerable continuity and social or regional diversity, the main elements of the development of the collective mentality can be sketched. This will however require much research and this cannot be limited to the studying of a single ancient author or of a single inscription. Rather, "our endeavour should, indeed must be to study a series of documents in order to get at the common characteristics of the world of religious experience in a given society or group" (H. W. Pleket in Versnel (ed.), Faith, Hope and Worship, (152).

The encyclopedic work of Robert Parker has fulfilled this fundamental requirement. Thus he has made an important contribution to the 'Science of Division' in what is for us, and probably also was for the ancient believer, the chaotic world of pollution and purification in early Greek religion.
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In his well-written study, Mikalson investigates "what might be termed the consensus of popular religious belief, a consensus consisting of those beliefs which an Athenian citizen thought he could express publicly and for which he expected to find general acceptance among his peers "(p. 12). Moreover, the author is concerned first and foremost with "what the Athenians said about their religion and treats what they did only to the extent that it clarifies or illustrates what they said" (p. 6). To this end, he excludes from consideration poets and philosophers as being possibly too individualistic, and restricts himself virtually to the material supplied by the fourth-century orators, Xenophon, and inscriptions. In other words, this is a study of religion conçue rather than religion vécue.

This procedure is debatable. Participation in religious festivals, worship in great and small sanctuaries, and enjoyment of the stories of gods and heroes also, surely, formed part of Athenian popular religion. Moreover, the inclusion of comedy would at least have

Mnemosyne, Vol. XXXIX, Fasc. 3-4 (1986)
given many examples of what poets expected to be offensive or ridiculous in religious matters to their audience, cf., e.g., J.-M. Galy, *La critique religieuse dans la comédie grecque des Ve et VIe s.*, in: *Hommages à Pierre Fargues* (Paris 1974), 173-183. As such, this evidence cannot be omitted if we want to evaluate properly that which is *not* mentioned by orators.

In a series of short chapters we are introduced to ideas about the intervention of the divine in daily life, problems of justice, divination, piety, afterlife, social aspects of popular religion, and the historical development of Athenian religion in the fifth and fourth century. These discussions are helpful, lucid and well illustrated. Within the—admittedly—too narrow limits of his analysis, Mikalson has given us an attractive study which gives a good idea of the conceptual religious framework of the average Athenian.

One aspect of Athenian religion, the festivals, has now been studied again by the German archaeologist Erika Simon. This is the third such study in this century. In 1932, Deubner published his *Attische Feste*, a work based on a solid knowledge of the evidence but also fully steeped in the Frazer/Nilsson tradition. In 1977, H. W. Parke brought out his *Festivals of the Athenians*. He based his book on Deubner’s material and interpretational models but added some of the inscriptions found in more recent years. In two respects, Parke improved upon Deubner. He had an eye for the social aspects of the festivals whereas Deubner was mainly interested in the theological side, and he arranged the festivals not by gods, as Deubner did, but by months. This represented a marked improvement, since it now became possible to see the festivals in relationship to each other.

There is certainly room for a new study of the Athenian festivals. The recent work on Greek religion by Burkert, Detienne and others has fundamentally changed our views of the structure and function of the festivals. A fresh study along their lines would therefore be most welcome. Unfortunately, Simon’s book is not the one we are waiting for. Certainly, she helps to bring the archaeological evidence up to date, but otherwise we are disappointed. First, she once again discusses the festivals by gods. Second, she is more interested in the origin of the festivals than in their structure and function. This interest leads to debatable statements such as her observations on Apollo as a member of the Minoan (!)-Mycenean pantheon (p. 75). Third, she simply is not sufficiently aware of the relevant literature. One cannot discuss the Thesmophoria without...