Eumolpos and the Wars of Athens

Robert M. Simms

ANCIENT TRADITION recalled two great early wars between Athens and her neighbor Eleusis. Of these, the later was associated with Theseus, who captured Eleusis from the Megarians under Diokles and Skiron: although attested only by Megarian sources (Plut. *Thes.* 10), this conquest is perhaps related to the *synoikismos* of Attica which was regarded as Theseus' signal achievement.[1] The earlier war, on the other hand, is much more fully attested than that of Theseus: it is placed in the time of Erechtheus,[2] and is represented as the heroic defense of Athens against an invading force from Eleusis under the command of Eumolpos. This war too is sometimes said to have resulted in the annexation of Eleusis by Athens. Scholars generally agree[3] that these legends reflect one or more historical wars, but have disagreed about their number, sequence, and nature.[4] The present study will approach these questions by a different route, *viz.* the complex and self-contradictory legend of Eumolpos.

We begin by cataloguing the versions (I, II, etc.) and variants (A, B, etc.) of this legend, combining and enlarging upon the work of Kern[5] and Jacoby.[6] Our approach will entail an attempt to attribute each version and suggest its age.

[1] Thuc. 2.15.1, Philoch. *FGrHist* 328F107, Andron 10F14. For a good discussion of scholarship on the *synoikismos* see R. A. Padgug, *GRBS* 13 (1972) 135–50, and see now S. Diamant, "Theseus and the Unification of Attica," *Hesperia* Suppl. 19 (1982) 38–47.

[2] Thuc. 2.15.1; Eur. *Ion* 277–82, *Phoen.* 854 and schol., *Erech.*; Xen. *Mem.* 3.5.10; Demaratos *FGrHist* 42F4; Pl. *Menex.* 239B; Isoc. 4.68, 12.193; Dem. 60.8; Plut. *Mor.* 310D; Lycurg. *Leoc.* 98; Hyg. *Fab.* 46; Aristid. I 191 Dindorf; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.15.4–5; Paus. 1.27.4, 1.38.2–3; Phot. *Lex. s.v.* παρθένοι; Preller/Robert II 140ff; Engelmann in Roscher *Lex. s.vv.* "Erechtheus," "Eumolpos," "Hyakinthides." On Euripides' *Erechtheus* (in C. Austin, *Nova fragmenta Euripidea* [Berlin 1968] 22–40) see U. von Wilamowitz, *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin 1875) 173–74; T. B. L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London 1967) 127–30; C. Austin, *RechPap* 4 (1967) 11–62; W. M. Calder, *GRBS* 10 (1969) 147–56; J. C. Kamerbeek, *Mnemosyne* IV.23 (1970) 113–26; H. van Looy in *Hommages . . . Delcourt* (Coll. Latomus 114 [1970]) 115–22; M. Treu, *Chiron* 1 (1971) 115–31; C. Clairmont, *GRBS* 12 (1971) 485–95.

[3] See *e.g.* C. Picard, *RHist* 166 (1931) 1ff.

[4] The war related by Solon at Hdt. 1.30 may safely be left out of account (see Padgug [*supra* n.1] 139–40).

[5] *RE* 6 (1907) 1117–20 *s.v.* "Eumolpos." *Cf.* Engelmann in Roscher *Lex. s.v.*

[6] *Das Marmor Parium* (Berlin 1904) 73–74.

I. Eumolpos is one of the native Eleusinian *basileis* to whom Demeter reveals her Mysteries: *Hymn.Hom.Cer.* 149–55, 473–75 (*ca* 675–600 B.C.).[7] Parent(s) unnamed: if literally autochthonous (see A below), Eumolpos was essentially parentless.[8] Soon acquires Poseidon as father: vase of Hieron, *ca* 500 B.C.;[9] temple of Poseidon *Pater* at Eleusis.[10]

A. Eumolpos is an autochthonous Eleusinian shepherd: Kern, *Orph. Frag.* 52.

B. Eumolpos is a ruler (title lost) at Eleusis, founder of the Mysteries,[11] and σοφὸν ἀγητῆρα (in war? If so, against Athens)[12] of his people: poetic fragment, *P.Oxy.* XXXII 2622 + *PSI* XIV 1391, probably of Pindar,[13] and perhaps based upon a sixth-century epic original.[14]

Discussion. This version, our earliest account of Eumolpos, depicts him as native/autochthonous, a noble of Eleusis, and a recipient of Demeter's secrets. Its variants are trivial: A differs only in a 'rusticating conceit' by which, after the model of Eubouleus as swineherd, Eumolpos becomes a shepherd and Triptolemos a cowherd. B, again, does not contradict, but merely develops, the notions of political power and access to the *orgia* of Demeter which are already associated with Eumolpos in the *Hymn*. Nor do the polemic implica-

[7] N. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford 1974) 5–11. A *terminus post quem* for the *Hymn* is probably set by the date of composition of the Homeric poems, and especially of Hesiod's works, with which the poet of the *Hymn* seems to be familiar (Richardson 33–41). If these predecessors are to be dated in the late eighth or early seventh century (G. S. Kirk, *The Songs of Homer* [Cambridge 1962] 282ff; D. H. F. Gray, *Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship* [Oxford 1968] 29ff; for Hesiod, M. L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* [Oxford 1966] 40ff, *Works and Days* [Oxford 1978] 30–31), then a professional bard like the composer of the *Hymn* can have been familiar with them very shortly thereafter. *Ca* 675 is also the date from which obviously 'Homeric' themes begin to appear in Greek art (K. F. Johansen, *The Iliad in Early Greek Art* [Copenhagen 1967] 34ff). Stylistic considerations, on the other hand, militate in favor of a seventh- rather than sixth-century *terminus ante quem* for the *Hymn* (Richardson 11).

[8] It is in fact the variety of his parents later (Poseidon, Apollo, Mousaios, Keryx; Deiope, Chione, Astykome) which declares the absence of an early parental tradition.

[9] *CVA Brit. Mus.* 4 pl. 28.2; Nilsson *GGR* I³ Taf. 43.1.

[10] Paus. 1.38.6, *cf.* G. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton 1961) 167–69; Aristid. 22.4.

[11] *Cf.* also Istros *FGrHist* 334F22, Plut. *Mor.* 607B, Lucian *Demon.* 34.

[12] Pausanias (1.38.3) may preserve the sequel to the war of this version in his statement that the Eleusinians were thereafter subject to Athens, but that Eumolpos *and the daughters of Keleos* (*cf. Hymn* 105ff) continued to celebrate the Mysteries at Eleusis (see also at n.57 *infra*).

[13] E. Lobel *ad loc.*: see also U. von Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 314 n.1; H. Lloyd-Jones, *Maia* 19 (1967) 206–29.

[14] See E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*³ (Leipzig 1926) 5 and n.2; Lloyd-Jones (*supra* n.13) 226–28.

tions of B represent a contradiction of anything in the main version: the *Hymn*, as is often noted, deals with a peaceful segment of the tradition, and the absence of polemic references is therefore hardly surprising.[15] The *Hymn*, moreover, is also notorious for its avoidance of all things Athenian, and whatever the reason for this trait,[16] silence about a war with Athens is consistent with it. It is, in short, unnecessary to conclude from its absence from the *Hymn* that war with Athens was absent from the lowest strata of Eleusinian legend.

In all probablity, this version and its variants represent early stages of Eleusinian local tradition. The *Hymn*, in particular, has long been recognized as an early Eleusinian document,[17] and variant B, as noted above, is best understood as only a fuller account in which the stature of Eumolpos, but not his essential attributes, has been augmented: this augmentation marks B as of later date than the *Hymn*, and must reflect the growing prestige and authority of Eumolpos' priestly *genos*, the Eumolpidai, at Eleusis in the years after the *Hymn*'s composition. In later times we find the Eumolpos of this version defended by the Eumopidai against competing Eumolpoi: ἐγένοντο δὲ τρεῖς [Εὔμολποι]. ὁ μὲν ἐκ Θρᾴκης ἐπιστρατεύσας, ὃν οὐ προσποιοῦνται οἱ Εὐμολπίδαι. ὁ δὲ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ἀστυκόμης. ὁ δὲ Μουσαίου καὶ Δηϊόπης.[18]

II. Eumolpos is a native Thracian, who settles in Eleusis with other Thracians and there founds the Mysteries: Plut. *Mor.* 607B, ὃς ἐκ Θρᾴκης μεταστὰς ἐμύησε καὶ μυεῖ τοὺς Ἕλληνας; schol. Soph. *OC* 1053, κατοικῆσαι <δε> τὴν Ἐλευσῖνα ἱστοροῦσι {δε} πρῶτον μὲν τοὺς αὐτόχθονας, εἶτα Θρᾷκας τοὺς μετὰ Εὐμόλπου ... τινές δέ φασι καὶ τὸν [= τοῦτον τὸν] Εὔμολπον εὑρεῖν τὴν μύησιν, and τί δήποτε οἱ Εὐμολπίδαι τῶν τελετῶν ἐξάρχουσι, ξένοι ὄντες; Lucian *Demon.* 34; Paus. 1.38.3; probably the version of schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 854, τότε δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ εἰρήνῃ τὰ Μυστήρια Δήμητρος ἐτέλεσεν (thus the Mysteries predated the war); perhaps the version of the *Marmor Parium* (*FGrHist* 239A15), but with Mousaios as father of Eumolpos. His parents are Poseidon and Chione,[19] making him paradoxically the

[15] The πόλεμος καὶ φύλοπις of 265–66 are unlikely to refer to real warfare: see F. Creutzer in *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Volker*[3] IV (Leipzig 1842) 314ff; Richardson (*supra* n.7) 245–47.

[16] See F. Walton, *HThR* 45 (1952) 114.

[17] L. R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* III (Oxford 1907) 154; J. H. Oliver, *Hesperia* 4 (1935) 26; Walton (*supra* n.16).

[18] Phot. *s.v.* Εὐμολπίδαι; *cf.* also Istros F22.

[19] Schol. *Phoen.* 854. This implies that the birth story as recounted in Apollod. 3.15.4 holds good for this version as well as for version III (*infra*).

great-grandson of Erechtheus![20] Later, his son Immarados (Ismaros: Apollod. 3.15.4) leads a united Eleusinian-Thracian force against Athens and is defeated and slain by Erechtheus.[21] After the battle a treaty is concluded whereby Athens gains political hegemony over Eleusis but leaves the Mysteries under Eleusinian control. Eumolpos remains at Eleusis as hierophant, together with the daughters of Keleos as priestesses (Paus. 1.38.3).

A. Eumolpos himself leads the attacking force, faces Erechtheus (ὁ νεώτερος: schol. *Phoen.* 854, *cf.* Paus.1.38.2), and dies. Immarados also participates, and is slain by Erechtheus (schol. *Phoen.*; implied in contradiction by Paus.).

B. Eumolpos is only the first foreigner to be initiated (schol. *Phoen.*).

Discussion. I have chosen, for reasons which will shortly become clear, to accept Pausanias' insistence that his is the *etymos logos*, and have called this version II. Pausanias sets out the version in a strongly Athenian context (1.27.4), and recommends it to Ἀθηναίων ὅσοι τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἴσασιν, *i.e.*, those familiar with Athenian local tradition. There is in fact one visible record of this tradition with which it fully concurs, *viz.*, the location of the relevant tombs. Eumolpos' tomb is in Eleusinian territory (Paus. 1.38.2); thus, in accordance with the conventions of heroic burial, he cannot have fought and died before the citadel of Athens, but must have remained at Eleusis. Immarados, on the other hand, is buried on the Acropolis north slope, in the city Eleusinion: thus it is he who died at the hands of his opponent, and the context of the battle, moreover, was religious as well as political, that is, it involved the Mysteries. To Pausanias, his version must have seemed confirmed by the monuments he saw—thus his vehemence in promoting it—and this congruence of artifacts and legend is a powerful indication that the version does in fact represent Athenian local tradition.

In version II the conflict between Athens and Eleusis comes to the fore, but with astonishing changes from version I: the inclusion of Thracians and the transformation of Eumolpos from Eleusinian native to Thracian immigrant with Athenian antecedents. Apart from their origins, nevertheless, the Eumolpoi of this version and version IB are effectively identical: both found the Mysteries, rule at Eleu-

[20] The genealogy through Chione is Eumolpos←Poseidon ~ Chione←Boreas ~ Oreithyia←Erechtheus (Apollod. 3.15.4, schol. *Phoen.* 854). Ancient mythographers felt the chronological difficulty of this genealogy: to solve it, the Euripides scholion invented a νεώτερος Ἐρεχθεύς to fight Eumolpos, and Philochoros F11 made Eumolpos a contemporary of Oreithyia.

[21] Paus. 1.5.2, 1.27.4, 1.38.3, 2.14.2; tomb of Immarados on Acropolis north slope in city Eleusinion, Clem. Al. *Protr.* 3.45.1; *cf.* schol. *Phoen.* 854, schol. *Il.* 18.483.

sis,[22] and preside over warfare against Athens. The whole Thracian aspect of version II, in fact, arguably enters via Immarados, whose name is non-Greek,[23] and is only with difficulty grafted into the legend.[24] The core, or unattested original *II, of version II, therefore, may be nothing more than the Athenian form of version IB, and should be considered contemporaneous with it.[25] Version II itself will have originated at some later time (see *infra*). About IIA the most that can be said is that it is no earlier than II: Pausanias characterizes it as a modern confusion, but nothing prevents it from having arisen virtually simultaneously with II.

III. Eumolpos is a native Thracian, who lives for a time at Eleusis—returning afterward to Thrace as king—and ultimately leads a large Thracian force to support Eleusis' invasion of Athens, but is defeated and slain by Erechtheus. His son Immarados is also killed (schol. *Il.* 18.483), or dies before the battle (Apollod. 3.15.4). His parents are Poseidon and Chione.[26] He has nothing to do with the Eleusinian Mysteries, which do not yet exist: these are founded by a later generation homonym (Eur. *Erech.* fr.65.100f):

A. in the second subsequent generation, by Eumolpos son of Deiope (Istros F22) and Mousaios (?) (Jacoby [*supra* n.6]); *cf.* the second generation Eumolpos of Andron F13.

B. in the fifth subsequent generation, by Eumolpos son of Mousaios and Deiope.[27]

[22] The positing, in version II, of Immarados as leader of the Eleusinian-Thracian force implies that his 'father' Eumolpos was ruler at Eleusis.

[23] See E. Maass, *Hermes* 23 (1888) 617.

[24] See the contortions of Apollod. 3.15.4.

[25] This is not to claim that there was no still earlier form of II at Athens, corresponding in some respects to the plain Eleusinian version I.

[26] Eur. *Erech.*, esp. frr.39, 50.46–50, 57, 60, 63, 65 Austin; *cf.* Lycurg. *Leoc.* 98; Demaratos F4; Apollod. 3.15.4; Hygin. 46; schol. *Il.* 18.490; Isoc. 4.68, 12.193; Lucian *Anach.* 34; Strab. 8.7.1.

[27] Andron F13; Akestodoros *FHG* II 464; *cf. Etym.Magn.* 393.28. The earliest attestation for Mousaios as father of an Eumolpos is a Meidias vase of *ca* 400 B.C.: G. M. A. Richter, *AJA* 43 (1939) 1ff; *cf.* Suda *s.v.* Μουσαῖος [DK 2A1], (?) Pl. *Resp.* 363C [DK 2A5a], Paus. 10.5.6 [DK 2B11]. Except for the *Marmor Parium* (A15 [DK 2A8]), all ancient references to Mousaios as father of Eumolpos may be assigned to the variants of version III: that is, the Eumolpos whom he fathers is invariably the Mystery-founding later-generation descendant of the Thracian Eumolpos. Mousaios' Thracian dress on the Meidias vase, therefore, must be due to his position in the Thracian's line of descent, or, at any rate, to some other cause (see, *e.g.*, n.37 *infra*) than a direct relationship with the original Thracian Eumolpos—whose father, in any case, is Poseidon. The fact that he fathers, without exception, the Mystery-founder/first hierophant suggests strongly that a shared musical interest formed the basis for his association with Eumolpos. Jacoby (*supra* n.6) would separate the second-generation Eumolpoi of Andron and Istros (IIIA), because Andron's is expressly called a descendant of the

Discussion. Euripides' *Erechtheus* (*ca* 422 B.C.) is the earliest attestation of this version. Here, as in version II, Eumolpos is Thracian, not Eleusinian: uniquely to this version, however, he has little to do with Eleusis, and nothing at all to do with the Mysteries—indeed, the *telete* is still unknown. Version III is also distinguished from I and II in its concentration upon the Thracian, rather than the Eleusinian, component of the forces opposed to Erechtheus: our sources in fact scarcely mention Eleusinians.[28] Third, this version is silent about the aftermath, for Eleusis, of the Athenian victory: the enemy is simply driven out of Athenian territory.[29] While this would be a plausible outcome for the unsuccessful invasion of a distant enemy, we might well expect a sequel in the case of an aggressor so near Athens as Eleusis.[30] From its earliest source, I conclude that version III is of Athenian provenance. Its peculiarites, noted above, suggest a history of development: as version II seemed essentially Eleusinian in content, with a Thracian veneer, so version III seems primarily Thracian, with only tangential Eleusinian involvement. Two stages of development can be inferred,[31] the first (*III) a legend of a purely Thracian invasion led by Immarados, which was beaten off with no further consequences, and the second (III) incorporating Eumolpos and the Eleusinians, but with Eumolpos usurping the rôle of Thracian commander from Immarados—who is retained as a son or brother.[32]

This version has often been treated as a relatively late 'answer' to the difficulties posed by, *e.g.*, version II,[33] and many scholars make

---

Thracian and is not said to have founded the Mysteries, while Istros' is called ὁ Δηϊώπης τῆς Τριπτολέμου and the Mystery-founder. These differences, which I believe are only apparent (see *infra*), do not seem to justify a separation of the two Eumolpoi: that they occupy the same generation argues, in my view, for their essential identity (the ἔνιοι of Istros seem to have held Triptolemos a contemporary of the Thracian Eumolpos, reasoning nominally from the *Homeric Hymn*, although, as will be seen, this Eumolpos and that of the *Hymn* really have nothing in common but their name).

[28] Were it not for a comment [. . . ἐν Ἐρε]χθεῖ Εὐριπί[δου] (*P.Oxy.* VI 853.x.2) on Thuc. 2.15.1 Ἐλευσίνιοι μετ' Εὐμόλπου, we should have no idea from the surviving fragments of *Erechtheus* that Eleusinians were involved at all: for Thracians, on the other hand, see frr.54.46–49, 57 ("barbarians"), 60.4–5, 65.13 ("barbarians"); Lycurg. *Leoc.* 98.

[29] *Cf.* Lycurg. *Leoc.* 98, τοὺς ἐπιστρατευομένους ἐκ τῆς χώρας ἐξέβαλε [ὁ Ἐρεχθεύς], quoting from *Erechtheus*.

[30] Pausanias (2.14.2) does assert that a treaty was concluded before the war was fought out, but he writes in the context of another version (II): see also n.57 *infra*.

[31] These stages were first seen by J. Toepffer, *Attische Genealogie* (Berlin 1889) 43; *cf.* Eitrem, *RE* 9 (1914) 1107 *s.v.* "Immarados"; Jacoby *ad FGrHist* 328F13 (p.284); Richardson (*supra* n.7) 198.

[32] Schol. *Il.* 18.483; Paus. 1.5.2, 1.38.3; Apollod. 3.15.4; schol. *Phoen.* 854 (brother).

[33] Kern (*supra* n.5) 1120; L. Pearson, *The Local Historians of Attica* (Philadelphia 1942) 154.

Euripides himself its originator.[34] On the contrary, so extreme an alteration—comparable, let us say, to making Electra the daughter of Aigisthos—would hardly have been possible for any dramatist, and Euripides' main interests, in any case, lay elsewhere.[35] As a solution of difficulties, moreover, the version is an abject failure.[36] I think it almost certain that even version III's final form predates Euripides: nor is there any compelling reason, in my view, to assign it to the fifth, rather than some earlier, century. Its original form *III is likely to be extremely ancient (see *infra*).

I have now characterized our two Athenian versions (II, III) of Eumolpos as hybrids, each containing a Thracian and an Eleusinian element. Version II added a Thracian aspect, I think, to an original (*II) which dealt strictly with Eleusis, while version III added Eumolpos and Eleusinians to an original (*III) dealing solely with Thracians. In both cases, Eumolpos himself has undergone a major change of character. Other scholars, both ancient and modern, have noted the transformation of Eumolpos in these versions, and have suggested 'innocent' processes by which it could have been effected:[37] these explanations, however, all lack a driving mechanism, a factor which could have propelled, not merely permitted, the manifestly violent and 'unnatural' transformations and conflations observed in the myths. This motive force, I think, can only have been deliberate intent, and its source is readily identifiable, from the versions' provenance, as Athenian.

Why, then, and when, would the Athenians have found it profitable[38] to manipulate their legend of Eumolpos so as finally to produce

[34] Toepffer (*supra* n.31) 43, Richardson (*supra* n.7) 198.

[35] Jacoby *ad FGrHist* 328 nos. 20ff (p.277 n.9) believes that Euripides' 'alterations' in fact reflect Athenian local tradition. *Cf.* also E. Ermatinger, *Die attische Autochthonensage* (Berlin 1897) 85ff.

[36] Even the famous query of schol. *OC* 1053, τί δήποτε οἱ Εὐμολπίδαι τῶν τελετῶν ἐξάρχουσι, ξένοι ὄντες, which this version purportedly answers by separating the Thracian invader from the Mystery-founder, is hardly satisfied when the Mystery-founder still remains in the Thracian's line of descent.

[37] Strabo (10.3.17) wrote that, as all music was considered Thracian or Asiatic in origin, so great legendary musicians, *e.g.* Orpheus, Mousaios, Thamyris, and Eumolpos, tended to be taken for Thracians also. In modern times, Toepffer (*supra* n.31) 36ff has suggested that Eumolpos was attracted into the Thracian realm of Orpheus *et al.* through a common association with music and mysteries, and was thus available for Euripidean innovation.

[38] That mythology was commonly used as a political tool is well known: W. S. Ferguson, *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 16–17; M. P. Nilsson, *AJP* 59 (1938) 392. A case in point is the Eleusinian attempt to appropriate Keryx, eponym of the Kerykes, by making him the son of Eumolpos. The Kerykes themselves derived him from Hermes and Aglauros, an early divinity of the Athenian Acropolis (Paus. 1.38.3). This is, incidentally, another indication that the Kerykes were in fact an exclusively Athenian institution (Ferguson 42; suspected by Padgug [*supra* n.1] 145–46).

versions II and III? To answer this, let us recapitulate the effects of the change. First, it made Eumolpos, the Mystery-founder, and his *genos*, the priesthood of Eleusis, foreigners to Eleusis. Second, it gave Eumolpos genealogical ties with Athens. Such effects suggest an Athenian attempt, several instances of which have been collected by Nilsson,[39] to draw a foreign hero out of his proper sphere and attach him to Athens for the purpose of acquiring a foreign possession associated with that hero. Here, the desired possession can only be the Mysteries, an Eleusinian institution in which the Athenians began to take interest during the seventh century—perhaps even as early as the *Hymn to Demeter*.[40] By the early sixth century this interest had evidently progressed so far that the Athenians were stopping at nothing in their campaign to, in Ferguson's words, "give ... Athenians a worthy share in the celebration and administration of the *telete*."[41] This was the time of Solon, whose manipulation of Salaminian heroes for political purposes is notorious;[42] and it is possible that the impetus for alteration of the legend of Eumolpos was his. Whether or not his goal, as Nilsson once thought,[43] was the complete transfer of the Mysteries to Athens, the famous annual procession of the Eleusinian *hiera* to and from Athens—which looks very much like the partial satisfaction of just such a goal—was apparently in place by *ca* 550 B.C.[44] The revised legend itself, of course, was even more successful: it became canonical, and was τὰ ἀρχαῖα for Pausanias some seven hundred years later (version II *supra*). We may therefore tentatively date the basic Athenian manipulations of the Eumolpos story to the early years of the sixth century B.C.,[45] although further developments may have continued for some time thereafter. These manipulations produced, either directly or indirectly, versions II and III.

Can anything now be said about the peculiar conflation of the two original legends (*II, *III) which produced our versions II and III? In part the conflations may have been random, haphazard and 'unrea-

[39] *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece* (Lund 1951) 29–31, 56–65.

[40] Walton (*supra* n.16) thinks that the *Hymn*'s silence about Athens signifies a protest against Athenian claims upon the Mysteries.

[41] Ferguson (*supra* n.38) 42.

[42] Nilsson (*supra* n.39) 27–29.

[43] *JdI* 31 (1916) 314.

[44] Under Peisistratos the Telesterion at Eleusis was greatly enlarged, and the main entrance to the sanctuary was changed to face Athens and the Sacred Way: Mylonas (*supra* n.10) 77ff, 103ff. Formal administrative oversight, under the archon basileus, may have been achieved much earlier (Padgug [*supra* n.1] 143–44).

[45] The date of the *Homeric Hymn* is a *terminus post*, as its Eumolpos is not yet the developed figure whose appropriation would be valuable for propaganda; while *ca* 550 may be taken as the *tempus ante*.

sonable': there is however one feature that warrants closer inspection. In the 'vulgate' tradition of Eumolpos, his confrontation with Athens takes place in the time of Erechtheus; yet, oddly enough, in no version or variant of the tradition, early or late, is any Eumolpos actually contemporary with this antagonist. Version I, of course, does not name contemporaries at Athens, but version II's Eumolpos battles Erechtheus only at the expense of a genealogy which places him in the third generation after his enemy. Among the multiple Eumolpoi of version III, the first, who fights Erechtheus, is down-dated three generations by his genealogy, while the others postdate Erechtheus by, respectively, two and five generations. These observations alone should raise a question about the relative chronology of Eumolpos: in all cases, he is imperfectly synchronized with Erechtheus, seeming rather to 'belong' either 2–3 or 5 generations later.

The fifth-generation Eumolpos, however, may be a later development. His genealogy first appears in Andron of Halikarnassos, a fourth-century[46] historian. It has often been noted[47] that this Eumolpos corresponds to Theseus in the Athenian king list as it stood in the fourth century:

Eumolpos I	Erechtheus
Keryx	Kekrops II
Eumolpos II	Pandion II
Antiphemos	(Metionidai)
Mousaios	Aigeus
Eumolpos III (Mystery-founder)	Theseus

This Athenian list, however, is the expansion of an earlier list, current until the end of the fifth century,[48] which contained only Aigeus between Erechtheus and Theseus. It is possible that the names Antiphemos/Mousaios/Eumolpos III represent a corresponding, and consequent, expansion of the Eumolpid list, and that Eumolpos II was the opposite number to Theseus in the earlier, shorter lists:

Eumolpos I	Erechtheus
Keryx	Aigeus
Eumolpos II (Mystery-founder)[49]	Theseus

[46] Pearson (*supra* n.33) 87.

[47] Jacoby (*supra* n.6) 74–75; Lloyd-Jones (*supra* n.13) 213.

[48] Its alteration, probably after 406, was the work of Hellanikos of Lesbos: see *FGrHist* 323aF27 and Jacoby *ad loc.*, Pearson (*supra* n.33) 4–17.

[49] In the expanded list of Andron, of course, Eumolpos II cannot found the Mysteries, for that task has passed to the added Eumolpos III (*cf.* the second-generation Mystery-founding Eumolpos of Istros F22). The expansion of the Eumolpid list must have followed closely upon Hellanikos' elaboration of the Athenian list, and it is this

Jacoby[50] believed that these 'extra' Eumolpoi were mere projections into the time of Theseus designed to account for the tradition that Eumolpos had initiated Herakles into the Mysteries. It has been pointed out, however, that no form of the Eumolpos legend actually achieves synchronism with Erechtheus, but that in every case Eumolpos remains, by birth, a contemporary of Theseus, and is only imperfectly and with difficulty engaged with Erechtheus. Thus it is the 'Erechthean' Eumolpos, not the 'Thesean', who is a projection.

Are there other traces of Eumolpos in the time of Theseus? Indeed there are. Diokles, an Eleusinian *basileus* in the *Hymn to Demeter* (153, 474, 477), is archon at Eleusis when the city is taken by Theseus (Plut. *Thes.* 10). Triptolemos, another associate of Eumolpos in the *Hymn* (153, 474, 477), also appears with Herakles and the Dioskouroi,[51] all contemporaries of Theseus.[52] Two minor figures of Eumolpos' war with Erechtheus, Skiros and Phorbas,[53] are found, likewise, in connection with Theseus.[54] Lastly, to repeat, there is the tradition that Eumolpos initiated Herakles into the Mysteries.[55]

In this context, it is proper to stress the Megarian tradition that Theseus attacked and captured Eleusis, especially as Diokles is common to both this tradition and the Eleusinian account of Eumolpos.[56] Authors such as Thucydides (2.15.1), moreover, assume that Eleusis participated in the *synoikismos* attributed to Theseus. Our 'Thesean' Eumolpos, then, is likely to have presided over warfare with Athens.[57] Furthermore, he is the founder of the Mysteries.[58] This is, in

---

expansion which may have brought Mousaios into the Eumolpid line: it may, in fact, be no coincidence that our earliest attestation of Mousaios as father of an Eumolpos is dated to *ca* 400 B.C. (see *supra* n.27), shortly after Hellanikos' work on the Athenian kings.

[50] *Supra* n.6, and *ad FGrHist* 10F13; *cf.* Lloyd-Jones (*supra* n.13) 213.

[51] Xen. *Hell,* 6.3.6; mid-sixth-century vase (Nilsson *GGR* I[3] 860).

[52] It is conceded that no extant source assigns the main event of the *Hymn*, the arrival of Demeter at Eleusis, to the time of Theseus, and that one source, the *Marmor Parium* (A12–15) synchronizes this event with Erechtheus (*cf.* also schol. Aristid. III 55 Dind., which follows the *Marmor*). Because, however, almost all ancient references to Demeter's activities at Eleusis treat them in solely an Eleusinian context, our evidence is quite limited. The *Marmor*'s testimony, on the other hand, simply follows in the train of version II, the 'vulgate' version of Eumolpos.

[53] Paus. 1.36.4; Hellanikos *FGrHist* 323aF3, schol. *Phoen.* 854.

[54] Skiros: Philoch. F111; Phorbas: see *ad FGrHist* 334F31 (nn.4–5).

[55] Apollod. 2.5.2; *P.Oxy.* 2622 + *PSI* 1391.

[56] On Megara see E. Meyer, *RE* 15 (1931) 152ff; K. Hanell, *Megarische Studien* (Lund 1934) 40ff; Jacoby *ad FGrHist* 484–87; R. P. Legon, *Megara* (Ithaca/London 1981). Though οἱ Μεγαρόθεν συγγραφεῖς often polemized against hostile Athenian tradition, one is hardly justified in dismissing their testimony on that account alone.

[57] In version II (Paus. 1.38.3, 2.14.2) the account of the war's conclusion appears to have been transferred with Eumolpos into the time of Erechtheus: we hear that the

short, none other than the Eumolpos of version IB and the original version *II.

Thus the martial aspect of these versions can be defined as an Eleusinian defense, under Eumolpos, against Athenian aggression under Theseus. This legend of conflict, however, is essentially independent of these protagonists, and will, in particular, have long antedated its association with the 'developed' Eumolpos—ruler and Mystery-founder—of version IB and *II *ca* the later seventh century. Before this time, it is uncertain what, if any, direct connection existed (in either Athenian or Eleusinian legend) between the earlier, less prominent Eumolpos and the war.[59] For Eleusis, version I has been assumed to include the war: for Athens, I shall refer to the early martial tradition, in its uncertain relationship with Eumolpos, as version *IIM.

It is also uncertain at what time Theseus was associated with this adventure against Eleusis.[60] Ultimately, however, the attack-legend was suppressed at Athens, and the imputation fostered that Theseus' *synoikismos* had proceeded without violence. This suppression was probably incidental to the Solonian manipulation of Eumolpos, but its own rationale is not far to seek: pure aggression was simply incompatible with the character of a national hero who, especially in the sixth century,[61] was deliberately modeled as "the Athenian youth educated in the palaestra," who "puts down highwaymen and robbers, enemies of a peaceful and civilized life."[62]

The historicity of Erechtheus, of course, is no more assured than that of Eumolpos or Theseus. I propose, therefore, only that Athens' earliest traditions included two wars, an earlier and unsuccessful invasion of the city by Thracians[63] which was associated with Erechtheus (*III), and a later, successful Athenian attack upon Eleusis

---

war was ended before being "fought through," that a treaty specified Eleusis' annexation by Athens, and that Eumolpos and the daughters of Keleos remained at Eleusis.

[58] In fact all Eumolpoi—excepting only the patent Immarados-surrogate of version III—participate in the foundation of the *telete*.

[59] See *supra* n.25.

[60] For the relatively late construction of most of Theseus' legend, see most recently Diamant (*supra* n.1) 38.

[61] See R. Conner, "Theseus in Classical Athens," *The Quest for Theseus* (London 1970) 143–47.

[62] Nilsson (*supra* n.39) 55.

[63] Legends of Thracian incursions into central Greece were not confined to Athens, but are known also from Boeotian Orchomenos (Diod. Ath. *FGrHist* 372F39), Phocis (Thuc. 2.29.3), and elsewhere. N. Hammond, *Migrations and Invasions in Greece and Adjacent Areas* (Park Ridge 1976) 136 and n.26, thinks they may refer to a time "before the Trojan War."

associated with Theseus and Eumolpos (*IIM–*II). This compound martial tradition is the progenitor of versions II and III, which have been shown, at least vestigially, to mirror it. Version *IIM (= the Eleusinian version I) must long predate its appearance in the *Homeric Hymn*, and a date in the Geometric period or earlier is also likely for version *III. The rise of *II, in turn, was contemporaneous with that of IB at Eleusis, and subsequent to the *Hymn*: the late seventh century may be suggested *exempli gratia*. The revisions which produced II and III, finally, were assigned *supra* to Solonian times, the early sixth century.

In light of these conclusions about the early martial tradition of Athens, one is tempted—however unwisely—to speculate about History.[64] As a basis for discussion, I shall only summarize the results of recent research. Finds on and near the Athenian Acropolis suggest that the city faced and withstood a siege near the end of the thirteenth century B.C.,[65] and Diamant[66] has shown that a Mycenaean date for the Athenian *synoikismos* is unlikely. In the Dark Ages there is evidence that Athens recovered more rapidly from its decline than did other areas, and some overall organization of the Athenian economy is observable as early as the Proto-geometric period.[67] In this and the Early Geometric period, *ca* 1050–875, large numbers of weapons appearing in Attic burials are thought by Kurtz and Boardman[68] to indicate a renewal of martial activity.[69] Thus the archaeological evidence is at least compatible with the notion of two early wars of the type, and in the order, analyzed here.[70]

THE EMMA WILLARD SCHOOL
April, 1983

[64] Speculation is perhaps most justified when, as here, the tradition concerns warfare.

[65] O. Broneer, *Hesperia* 2 (1933) 329ff, 4 (1935) 109ff. In these years a secret spring was brought into use beneath the Acropolis: Broneer, *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 168ff, 8 (1939) 317–433. The nymph of this spring, Aglauros, was in one later tradition (Philoch. F105) associated with the war of Erechtheus.

[66] In *Quest* (*supra* n.61) 41–45.

[67] Diamant (*supra* n.1) 45–47.

[68] D. Kurtz and J. Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs* (Ithaca 1971) 39–40.

[69] Many of Padgug's arguments (*supra* n.1) will support a date in the Dark Ages for the Athenian takeover of Eleusis.

[70] I should like to express my thanks to the anonymous referee of *GRBS* for many helpful suggestions concerning this paper.