

Agra and Agrai

Robert Simms

AGRAI (or Agra) was a verdant suburb of Athens on the Ilissos River, the environs of which are charmingly portrayed by Plato in the *Phaedrus*.¹ It possessed a wealth of local cults—we hear of Artemis Agrotera,² the Great Mother (IG I³ 369.91), Zeus Meilichios,³ Eileithyia,⁴ Pan,⁵ and Poseidon Helikonios⁶—but was especially renowned as the site of the Lesser Mysteries of Demeter and Kore, rites which in classical times were prefixed to the Mysteries at Eleusis as a required

¹229C ἢ πρὸς τὸ τῆς Ἄγρας διαβαίνομεν. Whether the locus of this dialogue is actually Agrai, or a stade or more upstream, has been disputed (Agrai: W. H. Thompson, *The Phaedrus of Plato* [London 1868] 9; upstream: R. E. Wycherley, *Phoenix* 17 [1963] 92–95, accepted by J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* [New York 1971: hereafter TRAVLOS] 112–113, 289–290). The singular and plural forms Agra and Agrai appear, as far as our evidence extends, to be equally early: -α IG I³ 369.91 (426/5 B.C.); -αι 386.146 (408/7).

²*Loc. class.*: Paus. 1.19.6 διαβάσι δὲ τὸν Ἰλισὸν χωρίον Ἄγραι καλούμενον καὶ ναὸς Ἀγροτέρας ἐστὶν Ἀρτέμιδος· ἐνταῦθα Ἄρτεμιν πρῶτον θηρεῦσαι λέγουσιν ἐλθοῦσαν ἐκ Δήλου, καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα διὰ τοῦτο ἔχει τόζον.

³BCH 87 (1963) 606 A.38–44 [SEG XXI 541; Sokolowski, *LSCG* 18].

⁴Kleidemos *FGrHist* 323 F 1, τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄνω τὰ τοῦ Ἰλισσοῦ πρὸς Ἄγραν Εἰλειθυία, could possibly make the seat of Eileithyia seem to have been outside Agrai; but IG II² 5099, ἐρσηφόροις Β' Εἰλιθυία(ς) ἐν Ἄγραι[ς], firmly establishes her there. A column dedication to Eileithyia (IG II² 4682, III B.C.) from the Ilissos area names one Εὐκολίνη on the abacus. Jacoby *ad loc.* (p.63), following O. Jessen, *RE* 6 (1907) 1055, identifies this as an epithet of Eileithyia: the name, however, is inscribed in the nominative, while that of Eileithyia in the next line is dative. *Eukolinê* is an epithet of Hekate in Callim. fr.17 Pf.

⁵A rock-cut shrine of Pan is still visible: G. Rodenwaldt, *AM* 37 (1912) 141–150. Its location next to the church of St Photini (Travlos fig. 154) places it very near or in the assumed area of Agrai.

⁶This god had an *eschara* atop a local hill (mod. Ardettos?): Kleidemos F 1 (*Anecd.Bekk.* 326.24), *Lex.Seg.* (10.3) Ἄγραι (*Anecd.Bach.* I 9.24–26). For all these cults see also K. Wachsmuth, *RE* I (1894) 887–888; H. Möbius, *AM* 60/1 (1935/6) 234–268; Nilsson, *GGR* I² 667–669.

preliminary for all initiates,⁷ and were characterized as a προκάθαρσις καὶ προάγνευσις τῶν μεγάλων (μυστηρίων).⁸

As early as the fourth century B.C. the alternate forms Agrai/Agra had attracted scholarly attention. Despite ancient and modern attempts to attach one of the two forms to a distinct part of the area,⁹ the totality of our evidence makes clear that, in practice, the two terms were alternatives for naming the entire district.¹⁰

Despite, however, this ancient equivocation of Agra and Agrai as simple variants of a place-name, one peculiarity in the use of the singular can suggest a different interpretation: certain of the local cults—the Mysteries, and the cults of Meter and Zeus Meilichios—are identified in inscriptions and other sources

⁷Pl. *Grg.* 497C and schol.; Plut. *Dem.* 26.1–5; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 4.1.3, 5.11.71; schol. Ar. *Plut.* 845; Eust. *Il.* 2.852 (I 568 van der Valk).

⁸Schol. Ar. *Plut.* 845; cf. Polyaen. *Strat.* 5.17. Archaeology, unfortunately, does not contribute much to the discussion of this site: modern development covers most of the area which will have included ancient Agrai, and what remains is incompletely excavated (A. Skias, *Prakt.* 1897, 73–85). A solitary major landmark, the Ionic “Ilissos temple,” was razed in 1778. It dates to ca 435–430 (M. Miles, *Hesperia* 49 [1980] 309–325), and must have housed one of the divinities named for the site: its remains, however, are too sparse for trustworthy conclusions. Foundations probably belonging to this temple and its terrace retaining wall, respectively, were excavated in 1897 and 1962 (Travlos 112 and fig. 154). For a history of the site and references to modern speculation, see Travlos 112–113.

⁹Kleidemos (F 1) refers to “Agra” as a hill, formerly named Helikon, and containing on its summit a precinct of Poseidon: later (F 9) he uses the plural Agrai in referring to the local Metroion. Jacoby concluded that Agra was the hill (Helikon) only, and Agrai the district as a whole.

¹⁰Agra singular is associated with the Metroion in an Attic inscription (*IG I³* 369.91), contradicting Kleidemos; the Lesser Mysteries, likewise, appear to have been designated by either the singular (*Anecd.Bekk.* 326.24, cf. Eust. *Il.* 2.852) or the plural (*IG I³* 386.146, *Anecd.Bekk.* 334.11). Other sources on the question (*Anecd.Bekk.* 326.24, Steph. Byz. s.v. “Αγρα καὶ “Αγραί) support by their indifference the equivalence of the two names, an equivalence accepted by most modern scholars: J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias’ Description of Greece II* (London 1913) 203; Wachsmuth (supra n.6) 887; P. Chantraine, *ClMed* 17 (1956) 1; Wycherley (supra n.1) 96; Travlos 112, etc. Singulars coexisted also with such plurals as Ἀθήναι, Μυκῆναι, Θήβαι, Συράκουσαι, etc. (Ἀθήνη Hom. *Od.* 7.80; Μυκῆνη *Il.* 4.52 etc.; Θήβη *Il.* 4.406; Συράκουσα Diod. 13.75.3).

as ἐν Ἄγρας.¹¹ If we knew of a divinity Agra, this construction would pose no problem, for it would then fall within that large category of ἐν + “personal” genitive with the approximate denotation of French *chez*, e.g. ἐμ Πανδίουος (IG II² 1138.8) “in Pandion’s (sc. sanctuary).” In each case, the name and context suggest the domain to be understood. Two interpretations of this construction have been offered: the first assumes actual ellipsis of a dative such as ἱερῶ, οἴκῳ, or δήμῳ, with the genitive a simple possessive. The minority holding this interpretation tend to include ἐν Ἄγρας as only another example, and thus—at least implicitly—to “personify” Agra.¹² The second and more influential interpretation, on the other hand, takes ἐν + genitive as an archaic genitive of *place* to which ἐν was appended.¹³ Applied to ἐν Ἄγρας, this interpretation allows Agra to be understood as a place, and responds neatly to the following facts: (1) no goddess Agra is specifically attested at Agrai, (2) Agra is specifically identified by the vast majority of our sources as a place, and (3) the expression ἐν Ἄγρας is always used to locate the cult or festival of another divinity.

In order, however, to examine this position more completely, let us focus more closely on the type. The Greek genitive’s independent locative function is fairly extensive:¹⁴ particularly noteworthy is the genitive form of many local adverbs, as ὄπου, οὐδαμοῦ, etc. It is not, however, primary—not, for example, winning a distinct place in the conspectus of the genitive given by M. Delaunois.¹⁵ The dative is of course the primary locative

¹¹Mysteries: *Anecd.Bekk.* 326.24, cf. Eust. *Il.* 2.852, Kleidemos F 1. Meter: IG I³ 369.91. Zeus Meilichios: *BCH* 87 (1963) 603–634, A.38–44.

¹²Examples in Schwyzer-Debrunner² II 120; LSJ *s.v.* ἐν; H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1966) para. 1302.

¹³LSJ *s.v.* Ἄγρα. K. Meisterhans and E. Schwyzer, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*³ (Berlin 1900) 214–215.

¹⁴Kuhner-Gerth³ II.1 384–387; Meisterhans/Schwzyzer (*supra* n.13) 214–215.

¹⁵*AntClass* 50 (1981) 188–191.

case, as it incorporates the Indo-European locative.¹⁶ The genitive, on the other hand, subsumes the I-E ablative, which itself is separative, privative, filiative, etc., in nature, not locative.¹⁷

Turning now to the “locative genitive with ἐν,” we enter territory still less primary and far less well-attested than is the simple locative genitive: for the occurrences of ἐν + genitive seem almost invariably to violate the fundamental requirement that a locative should present a *locus*, a place in which someone or something can be. There exist only two instances of ἐν with a *place* or *thing*: the adverb ἐμποδῶν, which is probably by analogic extension from ἐκποδῶν (Schwyzer-Debrunner² II 120, LSJ *s.v.* ἐμποδῶν), and a rare type (only four certain examples) in which the genitive is associated with another dominant genitive to which it seems to have been assimilated, rather than standing as a true “genitive with ἐν”: IG I³ 156.14–15 ἐάν τις ἀποκτένει ἐν τῶν πόλεων ἢ ὧν Ἀθηναῖοι κρατῶσι (*cf.* 27.13–15); 228.10–11 ἐν τῶμ πόλε[ων ὅσων Ἀ]θηναῖοι κρατ[ῶσιν]; 179.6–9 ἐάν τις [...¹¹...] ἀπ[ο]κτείνῃ βιαίῳ [θ]αυ[άτωι ἢ δῆσηι ἢ ἄγη]ι ἐν τῶν πόλεων π[ο]ῶν Ἀθηναῖοι κρατῶσιν (*cf.* 162.9–11)—all instances of τοῖς πόλεσι assimilated to ὧν or ὅσων; and IG II² 1534.93 ὀπισθε τῆς θύ[ρας] ἐν ἀριστερᾶς, with ἀριστερᾶ assimilated to τῆς θύρας.¹⁸ Clearly, these examples are *not* unqualified instances of ἐν with the genitive: they appear to employ another mechanism, and what is more, they are unique. All other examples of ἐν + genitive, so far as I have been able to

¹⁶For the I-E evidence, see J. Kurylowicz, *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European* (Heidelberg 1964) 190–191; L. R. Palmer, *The Greek Language* (London 1980) 269.

¹⁷Kühner-Gerth³ II.1 292; Kurylowicz (*supra* n.16) 185–186; Delaunois (*supra* n.15) 188–191.

¹⁸IG I³ 96.5 has τὸν ἄγρον ... τὸν ἐγ Κλαμαδο[ν], but with a large lacuna following, this can as well be restored ἐγ Κλαμαδο[ίς]. In 1454.58–59 ἐν τῶν χω[ρίων] - - -, although a relative construction appears to be ruled out by the available space, the reading itself is very uncertain, and ἐν τῶν χω[ρίων] appears equally likely.

discover, show *personal* nouns or pronouns: e.g. ἐν Ἴτιδου, Plut. *Cat.Mai.* 23.2, etc.; ἐν ἀφνειοῦ πατρὸς, Hom. *Il.* 6.47; ἐν ἀνδρὸς εὐσεβεστάτου, Eur. *IA* 926; ἐν κιθαριστοῦ, Pl. *Tht.* 206A; ἐμ Μολπῶν, *LSAM* 50.43; ἐν Χολαργέων, *IG II²* 1248.8–9. Thus, if we accept the “local genitive with ἐν” hypothesis, we must conclude that the putative original form of the idiom has all but disappeared, while only a large group of incompatible examples has survived.

It is also necessary to consider the possibility that ellipsis is a correct explanation of ἐν Ἴγρας, but that the ellipsis in question is of a word such as χωρίον—Agra/ae is, after all, called a χωρίον in several sources (*cf.* n.2)—and that Ἴγρας in ἐν Ἴγρας (τῷ χωρίῳ) is thus to be understood as an appositive genitive, *i.e.*, “in the place Agra.” Not only, however, is this type unmentioned in studies of grammar, but an extensive search of literature and inscriptions reveals not a single instance of it.

Let us return, therefore, to the minority hypothesis of a *personal* (divine) Agra, which was never seriously discussed or justified by its promoters—among whom is W. Judeich, who makes the bald statement that Agra is a goddess and *equivalent* to Artemis Agrotera.¹⁹ While of course possible, there is no ancient indication whatsoever to support this. But what, if anything, can be adduced in favor of the simpler idea that Agra is, indeed, an early goddess? First, a divine Agra does have some slight ancient support: a late lexicographical tradition,²⁰ which may derive from Alexandrian scholars through the Atticist Pausanias of Hadrianic times (A 20 Erbse), explains ἐν Ἴγρας as equivalent to ἐν Ἴσκληπιῶ. All the witnesses to this tradition include it incongruously together with the standard interpretation that Agra was a *place* and equivalent to Agrai; yet

¹⁹ *Topographie von Athen*² (Munich 1931) 367.

²⁰ *Anecd.Bekk.* 326.24, Eust. *Il.* 2.852, *Lex.Seg.* (9.24) Ἴγραι.

it clearly asserts *per se* the view that Agra singular was a personal, not local, name. Plato himself, in the *Phaedrus*, refers to τὸ τῆς Ἄγρας or Ἀγραίας:²¹ this expression, too, appears to entail ellipsis of something like ἱερὸν.²²

If, then, there is no compelling philological reason not to take ἐν Ἄγρας at face value, and some ancient support for doing so, we may now look to the consequences. If a goddess Agra existed, it would follow that the name of the district was derived from that of the goddess: Agrai from Agra; and this corresponds exactly to the naming of Ἀθηναίαι from Ἀθηνᾶ (Eust. *Il.* 5.7 [II 6 Erbse]), Μυκῆναι from the heroine Μυκίηνη (Paus. 2.16.3–4, Hom. *Od.* 2.120; Nilsson, *GGR* I² 349), etc.

Another nominal correspondence with Athena exists: in her cult at Agrai, Artemis Ἀγρότερα had the alternate epithet Ἀγραία (schol. Pl. *Phaedr.* 229c, *Anecd. Bekk.* 326.24, Eust. *Il.* 2.852). This epithet for Artemis is unknown elsewhere than at Agrai, although the cult of Artemis Agrotera was widespread,²³ and may of course derive from the place name itself: ancient derivations began from either the place name or the meaning of the adjective ἀγραῖος.

A more interesting possibility, however, is that Agraia is instead an alternate name of the goddess Agra: Ἀθηνᾶ is likewise also named Ἀθηναία. The cult of Artemis, then, may

²¹ 229c. A scholiast's lemma has τὸ ἐν Ἄγρας in contradiction to the MSS.' τὸ τῆς Ἄγρας, and Burnet incorporated τὸ ἐν Ἄγρας in his Oxford edition (1902). Although clearly the *lectio difficilior*, its status is nevertheless doubtful. It is to the variant reading τὸ τῆς Ἀγραίας (for Ἄγρας), not the given lemma, upon which the scholiast seems in fact to be commenting: Ἀγραίας Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν ἵδρυσαν Ἀθηναῖοι κτλ. Accordingly, τὸ ἐν Ἄγρας may well be spurious. That τὸ τῆς Ἀγραίας is the correct reading is further suggested by Eustathios' comment (*Il.* 2.852) ἢ καὶ Ἀγραία παρὰ Πλάτωνι κατὰ Πausανίαν (*cf. Anecd. Bekk.* 326.24).

²² This reference has been interpreted as local (*cf. infra*). W. J. Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* 8 (1955) 267–268, compares Thuc. 3.93 πρὸς τὸ Κήναιον τῆς Εὐβοίας: but in Thucydides there is no ellipsis, and τὸ with a substantive is hardly equivalent to τό alone.

²³ K. Wernike, *RE* 2 (1895) 1378.

have supplanted that of Agra/Agraia, and, by a familiar process (e.g., Poseidon Erechtheus and Apollo Hyakinthos),²⁴ the dominant divinity had assumed as an epithet the name of the lesser. On the model of our exemplars, Artemis' cult should have been coupled physically with that of Agra: although the phrase ἐν Ἄγρας has not been found in connection with her cult, we can now point to evidence almost as explicit (*Anecd. Bekk.* 326.24, *Lex.Seg.* Ἄγραι): καὶ Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ Ἀγραία ἀὐτοθὶ (i.e. ἐν Ἄγρας) τὸ ἱερόν. This passage is commonly emended to καὶ Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Ἀγραίας (Paus. Attic. A 20 Erbse). If, however, Agraia = Agra, the passage is intelligible as it stands, stating both the separate identity of Agraia and her close proximity (καὶ ... καὶ) to Artemis.

Further, if Agraia = Agra, we have an explanation for the "confusion" between the two names in the *Phaedrus* MSS. quoted above. Ancient scholiasts and lexicographers (see n.21) adopted the reading Agraia, by which they understood Artemis: the MSS. themselves, however, may reflect an earlier reality in which the two figures were separate and distinct.

As noted above, the cults of Meter and Zeus Meilichios²⁵ were also designated as ἐν Ἄγρας. It would be entirely reasonable for an old *hieron* of Agra to have been quite spacious, as each year it will have accommodated throngs of initiates into the Mysteries: it is probable that the initiates into the Lesser Mysteries camped out in tents (Phot. *Bibl.* p.369a = Himer. *Or.* 10.20), thus requiring even more enclosed space. The sanctuary must easily, therefore, have afforded space for other cults. More significantly, neither a temple nor *hieron* is attested for Demeter herself at Agrai, though the entire district is called her

²⁴*IG* I³ 873, II² 3538.8–9, 4071.26–27, etc.; Polyb. 8.28.3; Nilsson, *GGR* I² 316, 388–389

²⁵For a good discussion of the probability that this god played a role in the Lesser Mysteries, see M. Jameson, *BCH* 89 (1965) 159–162.

sanctuary.²⁶ Thus, rather than being in the earliest stratum of divinities at Agrai, Demeter and Kore were probably relative late comers, with their cult accommodated in the old sanctuary of Agra. There is even evidence to suggest that this was generally an open sanctuary. Pherekrates in his comedy *Graes* writes: εὐθὺς γὰρ ὡς ἐβαδίζομεν ἐν Ἄγρας.²⁷

The Lesser Mysteries, alone, are also designated as πρὸς Ἄγραν.²⁸ This suggests that a procession took place in the rites; and there is other evidence, as well, for a procession “to the goddesses”—perhaps a *kernophoria*—in both the Greater and the Lesser Mysteries, e.g., the “Ninnion tablet” from Eleusis, which may depict such processions.²⁹ πρὸς Ἄγραν, however, although it may later have been interpreted as local (Agra for Agrai), can originally have indicated a procession to the goddess Agra, *in her own festival*. This, in turn, suggests that the Lesser Mysteries were founded upon the old rites of Agra, which had, themselves, contained a procession. The sanctuary’s river-bank location suggests that purification had been an aspect of Agra’s cult—other cults in the vicinity were certainly or probably purificatory in nature³⁰—which was retained in the Lesser Mysteries (Polyaen. *Strat.* 5.17 καθαρόν): thus the banks of the Ilissos were termed “mystic” (Himer. *Or.* 10.20).

As for Agra’s divine role, a suggestion can be found in the cults of Artemis, Demeter, Meter, and Eileithyia which clustered within and about her sanctuary (the sources for Eileithyia [*supra*

²⁶ Hesych. s.v. Ἄγραι· χωρίον Ἀττικὸν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως ἱερὸν Δημήτρας; cf. *Anecd.Bekk.* 334.11; *Suda* s.v. Ἄγρα· Δήμητρος ἱερὸν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως πρὸς τῷ Ἰλισσῷ; Farnell, *Cults* III 169.

²⁷ Fr.40 (*PCG* VII 127), from *Anecd.Bekk.* 326.24, *Lex.Seg.* (9.24) Ἄγραι, Paus. Att. A 20.

²⁸ *IG* II² 661.9–10, 847.21–24, 1231.11–12; Plut. *Dem.* 26.3–4.

²⁹ A. Skias, *EphArch* 1901, 1–39; J. N. Svoronos, *JIAN* 4 (1901) 268–269; G. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton 1961) 213–221 and fig. 88.

³⁰ Zeus Meilichios: see Jameson (*supra* n.25) 161 and nn.6–7; Eileithyia: *hersephoroi* at Agrai, *IG* II² 5099.

n.4] place her simply ἐν Ἀγροαίς). All are significantly associated with the life of women, and especially generation. The Demeter cult, of course, was introduced into the program of the Eleusinian Mysteries: these themselves, however, may have originated as rites of women or girls.³¹ Artemis Agrotera, on the other hand, is nominally associated with hunting, but the epithet was by no means restrictive in practice: her *attested* functions at Athens were martial and political,³² and it is difficult to imagine that she would not also have been cultivated by women. We know that the nearby spring Kallirrhoe was used by girls at their marriage:³³ given the common practice of the Greek world (see Farnell II 448), one may suspect that the divinity before whom these purifications were conducted was the local Artemis.

It is possible, then, that Agra's role was akin to that of the other divinities, and that her principal rite had been a women's festival, perhaps of sufficient length to necessitate camping out (thus the large precinct), and involving also a procession and purification rituals. Such a festival would have generally resembled the historical Thesmophoria.³⁴ In time, cults of Artemis

³¹ N. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford 1974) 18–19; B. Lincoln, *Emerging from the Chrysalis* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1981) 71–90.

³² Paus. 1.19.6; schol. Pl. *Phaedr.* 229c; Nilsson, *GGR* I² 484.

³³ Thuc. 2.15.5, etc. Though there is no ancient evidence for the exact location of Kallirrhoe, the majority of sources place it south of the Acropolis and thus near the Ilissos: see E. J. Owens, *JHS* 102 (1982) 222–225. Travlos (204 and fig. 154) notes that a large spring was until very recently evident on the west (right) bank of the river opposite the church of St Photini (*cf.* Wycherley [*supra* n.1] 95): if this marks the location of the ancient Kallirrhoe, it is no more than about 100 m. distant from foundations on the east (left) bank which have been associated with the "Ilissos temple" (*supra* n.8) and assigned either to Meter (Judeich [*supra* n.19] 370–371; W. B. Dinsmoor, *Architecture of Ancient Greece*² [London/New York 1950] 185; Travlos, *Πολεοδομική Ἐξέλιξις τῶν Ἀθηνῶν* [Athens 1960] 92 and pl. III; Wycherley 97) or Artemis Agrotera (W. Dorpfeld, *AM* 22 [1897] 227–228; C. Robert, "KYNHTINΔΑ," in H. Glück, ed., *Studien zur Kunst des Ostens* [Vienna 1923] 61–65; Travlos 112 and fig. 154).

³⁴ L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1932) 50–60; H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (Ithaca 1977) 82–88

and Demeter joined that of Agra, and Artemis gradually absorbed the cult and name of Agra.

Ultimately, the local rites of Demeter were recast *in situ* as a purely Athenian adjunct to the Mysteries at Eleusis: the “Lesser” Mysteries. This final alteration may be dated to the first half of the sixth century B.C., a time when Athens seems to have greatly expanded its participation in the Eleusinian Mysteries themselves: under Peisistratos the Telesterion at Eleusis was enlarged, and the main entrance to the sanctuary was turned toward Athens and the Sacred Way.³⁵ The Eleusinion at Athens was probably also founded in the sixth century.³⁶ These constructions were clearly designed to facilitate inauguration of the great procession to and from Athens which in classical times opened the program of the Greater Mysteries. The foundation legend of the Mysteries at Agrai, moreover, concerns the initiation of Herakles on his way to the underworld to fetch Kerberos.³⁷ John Boardman³⁸ has suggested that Herakles’ position in this legend reflects his prominence in Athenian political life when the legend was created (*i.e.*, in the time of Peisistratos), and that the expansion of Athens’ role in the Mysteries is visible in the altered iconography of Herakles’ *katabasis* in Attic vase painting beginning around 530.³⁹

Artemis’ fate in the sixth-century reorganization of Agrai is uncertain. We have no direct evidence of her cult until after 490, when she presumably began to receive the munificent annual sacrifice vowed by the Athenians for her aid in the battle of

³⁵ Mylonas (*supra* n.29) 103–105.

³⁶ H. Thompson, *Hesperia* 29 (1960) 338.

³⁷ For Herakles in this foundation myth, see schol. Ar. *Plut.* 845, 1013; [Pl.] *Ax.* 371E; Mylonas (*supra* n.29) 240; Richardson (*supra* n.31) 211–212. For his more general involvement (purification) in these rites, see the Lovatelli Urn and Torre Nova Sarcophagus (Mylonas 205–208 and figs. 83–84), *P.Oxy.* XXXII 2622, *PSI* XIV 1391, *Eur. HF* 613, *Xen. Hell.* 6.3.6, *Plut. Thes.* 30.5.

³⁸ *JHS* 95 (1975) 5–10.

³⁹ See also *Apollod.* 2.5.12, *Diod.* 4.14.3, *Plut. Thes.* 30.5, schol. Ar. *Plut.* 1013.

Marathon (*Ath.Pol.* 58.1–2; *Plut. Mor.* 349^F–350^A, 862^{A–B}). It is quite possible that, whatever the state of her public cult before the reorganization, Artemis failed to profit from it as did Demeter and Kore, and thus endured relative obscurity for several decades until the Athenians' vow restored her prominence in 490.

February, 2003

Department of Classics
State University of New York at Albany
Albany, NY 12222
rsimms@emma.troy.ny.us