

The Eleusinia in the Sixth to Fourth Centuries B.C.

Robert M. Simms

THE ELEUSINIA, a very ancient agonistic festival associated with the harvest, was celebrated at Eleusis in honor of Demeter and Kore.¹ Like other harvest festivals, it was observed annually,² but varied from year to year in elaboration. A 'plain' celebration without contests occurred in the fourth year of the Olympiad.³ The remaining observances were agonistic and were segregated into separate biennial (trieteric) and quadrennial (penteteric) sequences,⁴ the biennial in the first and third Olympiad-years, and the quadrennial (*Ἐλευσίνια τὰ μεγάλα*), with greater magnificence and an aug-

¹ See schol. Pind. *Ol.* 9.150, 166; *IG XII.5* 444.30; Arist. fr. 637 (Rose). I am indebted to Professor J. D. Mikalson for his advice and encouragement at every stage of this study. Thanks are also due Fr. Robert F. Healey, who provided me with a copy of his dissertation. Modern accounts of this festival and its Eleusinian background are the following: Robert F. Healey, "Eleusinian Sacrifices in the Athenian Law Code," unpubl. diss. (Harvard 1962), hereafter HEALEY (unspecified references will be to the author's summary in *HSCP* 66 [1962] 256-59); August Mommsen, *Feste der Stadt Athen* (Leipzig 1898) 179-204, hereafter MOMMSEN; George E. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton 1961), hereafter MYLONAS; A. R. van der Loeff, *De ludis Eleusiniis* (Leyden 1903), hereafter VAN DER LOEFF; also Ludwig Deubner, *Attische Feste*² (Hildesheim 1959) 91-92; J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*³, pt. V, I (New York 1935) 70-88; P. Stengel in *RE* 5 (1905) 2330-32.

² Scholars have always claimed that celebrations of the Eleusinia were attested in only two or three years of each Olympiad (Mommsen 184-86, van der Loeff 113-36, Healey [diss., *supra* n.1] 31-37). The evidence, however, positively shows that the festival was observed in all four Olympiad-years: (first year) *IG II*² 1496.126, 130; (second year) *IG II*² 1304.13-14, 19-20, 22-26; (third year) *IG II*² 2336.200, 202-03 + G. Daux, *REG* 47 (1934) 164-79 + S. Dow, *HSCP* 51 (1940) 121, 122; (fourth year) *IG II*² 1028.1-16 + van der Loeff 133 + Dow 119.

³ See *IG II*² 1672.252-62. This is an account of grain allocations from the sacred Rharian Field over a four-year period to "priests and priestesses" (lines 255-57), allocations which were evidently intended for sacral use in the Eleusinia since they are distinguished from, but ultimately (lines 261-62) combined with, other allocations which were to be used as prizes in the games. It will be observed that the sacral dispensations occurred in all four years but that those for prizes were restricted to the trieteric and penteteric observances (see n.4 *infra*) which occupied the first three years. This clearly shows that the fourth-year celebration comprised sacrifices but not games.

⁴ *IG II*² 1672.255-62; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 54.7.

mented programme of games, in the second.⁵ The festival was almost certainly celebrated in Metageitnion.⁶ It is thus wholly distinct from the Great Mysteries at Eleusis, a fact which was first recognized by A. Mommsen (179–82).⁷ In this century van der Loeff, Healey and others have significantly advanced Mommsen's work and have produced a description of the Eleusinia which is clear and, for the most part, consistent with the evidence. It will now be necessary to seek a general interpretation of this important⁸ festival, and, in

⁵ IG II^a 1304.13–14, 18–19, 22–26; so Deubner (*supra* n.1) 91, Healey 257. The errors of earlier scholars in dating these sequences resulted generally from either (1) confusion of the Eleusinian Mysteries with the Eleusinia (e.g., U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen* I [Berlin 1893] 230 n.89) or (2) misdating of the relevant inscriptions (e.g., van der Loeff 101–36; W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age* [Cambridge (Mass.) 1931] 212). For an up-to-date account of Athenian archon-years see B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year* [Berkeley 1961] 231–38; and for a discussion of early attempts to date the festival see Dinsmoor 210–12.

⁶ See IG II^a 1496.126–32, which makes the Eleusinia follow the Panathenaia (end of Hekatombaion) and precede the Sacrifice for the Democracy (12 Boedromion, i.e., the commemoration of the *χαριστήρια ἐλευθερίας* offered by the victorious democrats after their defeat of the Thirty in 404/3 [Plut. *De glor. Ath.* 7; IG II^a 4992: cf. Stengel (*supra* n.1) 2331–32, van der Loeff 74–79]). Within this interval, Boedromion 1–12 have been effectively disqualified as dates for the Eleusinia by J. D. Mikalson (*The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* [Princeton 1975]), who demonstrates (186–90) that the *Ekklesia* at Athens was not ordinarily convened during state festivals and finds that in Boedromion the dates 9–11 were meeting days of the *Ekklesia* and 1–8 were occupied by other state rites and private transactions (47–53): in effect, no days remain in Boedromion for the festival. Moreover, a date in Metageitnion is favored by the records of two deme sacrifices in that month which probably reflect observances of the Eleusinia: IG II^a 1358.39, 43–44, a biennial sacrifice perhaps related to the Eleusinian *trieteris*; BCH 87 (1963) 607, col. B.1–5. The latter sacrifice was performed in Athens on 12 Metageitnion, which was, however, a meeting day of the *Ekklesia* (Mikalson 38) and so cannot have been a state festival day. The days 5–8 and 13–20, on the other hand, are completely free of attested events (Mikalson 36–37, 39–42), and the second interval seems particularly apt for the Eleusinia in view of the deme sacrifice on the 12th.

⁷ Cf. P. F. Foucart, *Les grands mystères d'Eleusis* (*Extr. MémAcInscr* 37, Paris 1900) 144–47. Many scholars (Carl Robert, GGA [1899] 536–38; L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* III [Oxford 1907] 164–65; E. Pfuhl, *De Atheniensium pompis sacris* [Berlin 1900] 43ff; Wilamowitz [*supra* n.5] *ibid.*; even Mylonas 243) have been misled by some late and non-Attic sources which applied the term *Ἐλευσίνια* promiscuously to the Mysteries (e.g., Gal. *De usu part.* 7.14; Luc. 19.22; Aristid. 13.182; schol. Ar. Plut. 1014). In Attic inscriptions, however, van der Loeff (3–13) conclusively demonstrated that *Ἐλευσίνια* refers exclusively to the games (e.g., ArchEph [1914] 167–68, no.232.35–38, τὸς δὲ | σπονδοφόρους τοὺς ἐπαγγέλλ[α]σθ[εν]τας τὰ τε Ἐλευσίνια καὶ τὰ Πα|ναθηναῖα καὶ Μυστήρια; IG II^a 1304.24–28).

⁸ Monuments recording victories in the Eleusinia have been recovered from Cos (SIG^a 1066.4, 17–18), Rhodes (IG XII.1 78.4), Miletus (*Milet* I.ix [Berlin 1928] no.369 col. B.8–9) and elsewhere. The festival was one of those at which crowns for service to the *polis* were proclaimed (IG II^a 900.9–10; II^a 958.29–31; *al.*), and so must have enjoyed a large attendance. Most striking of all, it was granted the distinction of a Panhellenic truce (ArchEph [1914] 167–68, no.232.35–38, *supra* n.7).

particular, to determine the place it occupied in the larger context of Eleusinian religion.

One great impediment, however, to a reasonable interpretation of the Eleusinia is its supposed division into 'pre-sacrifices' (*προτέλεια*) and 'festival' (*έορτή*). The only evidence for such a division is the restoration by H. von Prott⁹ of IG I² 5.

AthMitt 24 (1899) 253 (= IG I² 5)

Early fifth century B.C.

- 1 [Ἐδοχσε]ν [: τῆι βολῆι] : καὶ [τ]ῶι δέμοι : ἡό[τ]ε
 Παραιβάτε[ς ἐγραμμάτενε]
 [προτέ]λεια : θ[ύε]ν : τὸς ἱεροποιὸς : Ἐλευ-
 σινίον : καὶ [: - - - - - : ἐ]ν
 [τῶι Ἐλ]ευσιν[ί]οι : Γ]ῆι : Ἡερμῆι Ἐναγονίοι :
 Χάριον : αἶγα [: Ἡιπποθόοντι : κρι ?]ὸν
 [Ποσειδ]ὸνι : [κριὸ]ν : Ἀρτέμιδι : αἶγα : Τελεσι-
 δρόμοι : Τρι[πτολέμοι : οἶν ?]
 5 [Πλούτο]νι : Δ[ολί ?]χοι : θεοῶν : τρίττοαν :
 βόαρχον : ἐν τῆι : έορ[τῆι]

Prott's restoration of line 2 has dominated all subsequent analysis: it has produced fruitless debates regarding the division of the sacrifices between *προτέλεια* (line 2) and festival (line 5),¹⁰ and the text so restored virtually requires that most, if not all, of the offerings belonged to the *προτέλεια*.¹¹ Moreover, it has encumbered the analysis of all new evidence with the necessary decision of whether pre-sacrifice or festival proper is represented. Thus Healey, after demonstrating that the fragment of the Athenian State Calendar published in *Hesperia* 4 (1935) 19–29 must refer to the Eleusinia (256–57), concludes that all of the sacrifices represented are those of the *προτέλεια*, not of the festival (258–59). To the questionable association of *προτέλεια* with this festival, then, is added a most improbable conclusion, *i.e.*, that a great deal of evidence survives for the minor pre-sacrifices but almost none for the festival itself.¹²

⁹ *AthMitt* 24 (1899) 241–66.

¹⁰ Deubner (*supra* n.1) 91–92; F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris 1969) 8. An exception to the trend is K. Clinton, *AJP* 92 (1971) 498.

¹¹ See Deubner (*supra* n.1) 91–92, Clinton (*supra* n.10) *ibid.*

¹² This is quite apart from the fact that the State Calendar sacrifices can hardly be described as 'minor' to the degree that would be expected of preliminary offerings (see J. D. Mikalson, "Prothyma," *AJP* 93 [1972] 577–83).

[*προτέ*]λεια, however, cannot be the correct restoration in line 2 of IG I² 5. For the *ει* in *τέλειος*, from which *προτέλεια* must be derived, is a false diphthong which is not found in Attic inscriptions before the second century B.C.,¹³ whereas IG I² 5 dates from the early fifth century. The alternatives [*προτό*]λεια and [*ἀκρό*]λεια, which Prott summarily rejected,¹⁴ are on the other hand not only morphologically suitable—both have the genuine diphthong *ει*—but are appropriate also in the context of these games. They are defined as follows: *πρωτόλεια* (Phot. *Lex.* [II 118 Naber]): τὰ ἀπάργματα τῆς λείας ἃ τοῖς θεοῖς ἀνεντίθεσαν ἢ αἱ τῶν καρπῶν ἀπαρχαί, οἶον πρωτολήϊα. ἀκρόλ(ε)ιον (*Suda* [1007 Adler]): ἀπαρχή· ὡσπερ πρωτόλ(ε)ιον.¹⁵ While *προτέλεια* have never been explained or justified as a component of the Eleusinia, *ἀκρόλεια* and *πρωτόλεια* are immediately intelligible in terms of the very nature of the Eleusinia as a harvest festival (schol. Pind. *Ol.* 9.150), at which an ἀπαρχή or offering of first-fruits would be prominent. The enumerated sacrifices of IG I² 5 are, of course, animal, not the vegetable offerings which we would expect at a presentation of first-fruits; but this may actually account for the use of the obscure term *πρωτόλεια*/*ἀκρόλεια*: ἀπαρχαί were the original offerings of grain (cf. ἀπάρχεσθαι, IG I² 76.4), and *πρωτόλεια*/*ἀκρόλεια* may have been a technical term for the animal sacrifices purchased with the income from those offerings.

Either of these restorations presents still more interesting possibilities if one considers that IG I² 5 is an *Athenian* decree (decrees of the deme Eleusis were invariably so designated). Thus, with *πρωτόλεια*/*ἀκρόλεια* understood, we find certain ἀπαρχή-related sacrifices imposed by *Athens* upon the Eleusinia (ἐν τῷ : ἐορ[τῷ], line 5), a circumstance which discourages their attribution to the purely local ἀπαρχή of a typical harvest festival. Indeed, there is reason to believe that they should be referred instead to the great Athenian-directed Panhellenic ἀπαρχή (see IG I² 76; I² 311, etc.)¹⁶ and that this ἀπαρχή, which has been

¹³ Meisterhans-Schwyzler 43 n.275. Prott conceded this difficulty (247 n.1) but evidently did not consider it serious.

¹⁴ Prott was followed by L. Ziehen in *Leges Graecorum sacrae* II (Leipzig 1906) 7 n.11.

¹⁵ ἀκρόλιον, πρωτόλιον cod. A (*sic* Adler): -λειον SM. It is impossible epigraphically to choose between these terms. [*προτό*]λεια, with nine letters, is perhaps the better in terms of available space (see Prott 253).

¹⁶ The great ἀπαρχή is first attested in IG I² 76 (ca 422 B.C.), which evidently describes an expansion of the practice sufficient to require three new *σιροί* at Eleusis for storage of the grain offerings (lines 10–12): an earlier date of origin is indicated by line 4, ἀπάρχεσθαι . . . κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. From all Athenian farmers the several demarchs were enjoined to collect

associated by scholars with a variety of state festivals,¹⁷ was actually a central element of the Eleusinia. The late orator Aristides provides specific testimony (19.257) in support of this view: ἀγῶνά τε γυμνικὸν γενέσθαι πρῶτον Ἐλευσίνι τῆς Ἀττικῆς, καὶ τὸ ἄθλον εἶναι τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ φανθέντος . . . ἀπάγειν δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀπαρχὰς τῶν καρπῶν ἐκ ἅσπερ ἄθλησεν ὡς μητροπόλει σφῶν τε αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν καρπῶν τῶν Ἀθηναίων τῇ πόλει.¹⁸ We need not, however, rely upon Aristides

1/600 of the barley harvest and 1/1200 of the wheat, which they were, in turn, to send to the *ἱεροποιοὶ Ἐλευσινόθεν* (see n.27 *infra*) at Eleusis (lines 4–10). Levies were to be conducted according to the same formula in the allied cities (lines 14–18), and the rest of the Greek world was also to be invited to participate (lines 24–26, 30–34).

¹⁷ See F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques, Supplément* (Paris 1962) 35. Although at one point Mommsen (183–84) implicates the great ἀπαρχή with the Eleusinia—correctly, I believe (see n.24 *infra*)—as a determinant of its date, he does not develop the idea further and later explicitly associates the ἀπαρχή with the Proerosia (193) and also with the Haloa (359ff). The first of these proposals is based upon schol. Ar. Eq. 729, which explains the ἀπαρχή as a Panhellenic thank-offering for a *προηρόσιον θυεΐαν* once performed by the Athenians on behalf of all the Greeks in time of famine. This scholion does not, however, identify the historical festival of the Proerosia, or any other festival, as that to which the ἀπαρχαί were sent, and shows evidence of some confusion as well in apparently conflating accounts of (1) a festival of Helios and the Hours in Pyanopsion and Thargelion and (2) the famine (*cf.* the more consistent schol. Ar. Plut. 1054). The second proposal, based upon a likewise-muddled statement in Eust. Il. p.772.25, is vitiated by the fact that sacrifices of the Haloa were bloodless (Ps.-Dem. 59.116), while those of the ἀπαρχή included animal victims.

Farnell (n.7 *supra*) 42–43, on the other hand, joins the ἀπαρχή to the Great Mysteries, under the assumption that the Mysteries were essentially a harvest festival and, in fact, “the only festival of Demeter occurring at a convenient time and attracting a vast number of visitors.” But the Eleusinia is *attested* as a harvest festival, was even more convenient to the harvest than the Mysteries, and also attracted throngs of visitors.

A more serious proposal, however, is that of F. M. Cornford (“The Ἀπαρχαί and the Eleusinian Mysteries,” *Essays and Studies Presented to William Ridgeway* [Cambridge 1913] 153–66), followed by M. P. Nilsson (*Opuscula Selecta* II [Lund 1952] 576ff), which, in the context of the myth of Demeter and Persephone related in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, identifies the ἀπαρχή-grain with Persephone (Kore), the grain-maiden. According to this view, Persephone’s descent to Hades each year fell in late spring and was equivalent to the storage of the ἀπαρχή at Eleusis in underground *σιροί* (IG I² 76.10–12). The parched summer season was thus the barren time of the myth when Kore was absent (*Hymn* 399ff). The removal of this grain at the time of the fall sowing, then, represented Kore’s return and as such was celebrated at the Great Mysteries. This is an attractive theory but suffers from serious weaknesses: see N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford 1974) 284–85. Even on *a priori* grounds it seems more plausible to associate the anxiety and doubt represented by Demeter’s bereavement with the ominous period between sowing and sprouting—in accordance with ancient belief—than with the summer months when the grain is secure in its storehouses and one has not yet been required to face the ultimate question of its viability.

¹⁸ Aristides’ source for this information is probably the *Peplos* of Aristotle, on the basis of the temporal reference *πρῶτον* which reflects Arist. fr.637 (Rose) *πρῶτα μὲν τὰ Ἐλευσίνα,*

alone, for the festival and ἀπαρχή themselves supply evidence which strongly suggests their coincidence.

First, a peculiarity in the nature of the Eleusinia can be observed in the sources: it is variously reported as a thanksgiving, either for the current harvest (schol. Pind. *Ol.* 9.150), or for the 'invention' (εὕρησις) of grain culture itself (schol. Aristides 13.189.5). This second explanation is of great significance, for it obviously refers to the elaborate Eleusinian myth of Demeter and Triptolemos (see Soph. *Triptolemos*: Pearson, *Fragments* II 239–53, nos.596–617; Callim. *Cer.* 19–21; Ov. *Met.* 5.645). And, in fact, the historical festival of the Eleusinia was linked at many points with the Triptolemos myth:¹⁹ the prizes in the games, for example, were grain from the Rharian Field (schol. Pind. *Ol.* 9.150; *IG* II² 1672.252–61), which was the first land sown by the hero in his legendary world-encompassing journey (see Paus. 1.38.6). But the myth of Demeter and Triptolemos is the obvious *aitia* for the great ἀπαρχή as well (see Aristides 19.257, *supra*).²⁰ Hence the ἀπαρχή and the Eleusinia shared a common mythological foundation.

Secondly, there is evidence to suggest that the preparations for the Eleusinia were identical with the programme of the ἀπαρχή: in both cases, the process began with grain receipts and culminated in animal sacrifices derived from those receipts (there would also, of course, have been direct offerings of grain to the goddesses: *IG* I² 76.40–42). For the ἀπαρχή *IG* I² 76 is explicit: the animal sacrifices enumerated are to be obtained ἀπὸ . . . τῶ πελανῶ (line 36), and [ἀ]πὸ τῶν κριθῶν καὶ τῶν πυρῶν (line 38), i.e., from the proceeds of sale of the ἀπαρχή-grain.²¹ For the Eleusinia an identical process can be deduced from *IG* II² 1672 (see n.3 *supra*), which describes annual allocations of grain from the Rharian Field for sacral use in the festival (lines 255–57) and as prizes for the ἀγῶνες (lines 258–61). It will be noted that the sacral allocations

διὰ τὸν καρπὸν τῆς Δήμητρος. That Aristides was aware of this Aristotelian account is proved by his statement (13.189.5), τούτων [τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀγῶνων] πρεσβύτατος ὁ τῶν Παναθηναίων, εἰ δὲ βούλει, ὁ τῶν Ἐλευσινίων, and schol.

¹⁹ This myth does not belong with the Great Mysteries, as has often been assumed. Isocrates (*Paneg.* 28) sharply distinguishes the two great gifts of Demeter to Athens, τοὺς τε καρπούς . . . καὶ τὴν τελετὴν: thus far is the First Sower set apart from the sacred rite of the Mysteries. Moreover, it is generally accepted (cf. Nilsson [*supra* n.17] 536ff) that the mythology underlying the Mysteries is precisely that of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, which does not admit the story of Triptolemos.

²⁰ For discussion of an unlikely *aitia* for the ἀπαρχή see n.17 *supra*.

²¹ Cf. *IG* I² 311; Ziehen (*supra* n.14) 24–25.

are too large (61 *medimnoi* annually) to have been sacrificed directly, and must, therefore, have been sold to provide animal victims for sacrifice, just as were the grain-receipts of the *ἀπαρχή*.²² This common sequence of events suggests that the grain allocated for sacral uses from the Rharian Field was, in effect, a portion, though by far the most sacred, of the Panhellenic grain offering.

As regards the animal sacrifices themselves, there is a striking correspondence between *IG I² 5.5* and *I² 76.37* in their specification of a *τρίττο(ι)α βόαρχος* for the goddesses Demeter and Kore. This rarely-attested offering occurs elsewhere in no other recognizable Attic context than that of the Eleusinia or the great *ἀπαρχή* (cf. *IG I² 845*). That *IG I² 5* and *I² 76* otherwise contain few correlations has been amply noted by Ziehen.²³ In fact, it is most improbable that these, or any two inscriptions referring to the same festival, should exhibit marked similarity, for their purpose is ordinarily to describe *revisions* of existing rites, rather than the rites themselves. The similarities which do occur, consequently, are all the more striking as tokens of common reference.

It is very probable, then, that the Eleusinia had for its *ἀπαρχή* a prodigiously expanded institution which involved the whole of Greece. This result is corroborated by *IG I² 5* if *πρωτόλεια/ἀκρόλεια* be substituted for *προτέλεια* in line 2. The new restoration, therefore, combines with orthography the virtues of simplicity and consistency. And *IG I² 5*, thus restored, provides the key to a full understanding of the Eleusinia; for it not only clearly indicates the central position occupied by the Panhellenic *ἀπαρχή* in the festival but also identifies the *ἀπαρχή* as the focus of Athenian interest in this nominally Eleusinian institution.

In light of this identification, it will be recalled that the Eleusinia exhibits two distinct natures: that of simple harvest festival and that of thanksgiving for the 'invention' of agriculture. As has been remarked, the second nature is almost certainly related to the myth of Demeter and Triptolemos, a myth about which the celebration of the Eleusinia was artificially organized in historical times. Yet this myth cannot have played a rôle in the early history of the festival, which was regularly dated from the time of Pandion (*ca* 1450 B.C.: *IG XII.5*

²² The ultimate recipients of this grain, whether purchasers or victors in the games, surely used it to bless their own sowing (cf. Cornford [*supra* n.17] 164).

²³ *Op.cit.* (*supra* n.14) 9.

444.30; schol. Aristides 13.189.4): the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, of the seventh century B.C., knows Triptolemos only as an Eleusinian noble; hence, as Nilsson (n.17 *supra*: p.549) observes, even by this time his aspect as the First Sower had not yet been added. Thus the festival's 'duality' is probably to be interpreted as evidence of two separate periods in its development: the first, when it was an unadorned local harvest festival, and the second, in which an elaborate superstructure centered upon the myth of Demeter and Triptolemos had been imposed upon it, and, also in accordance with that myth, its local ἀπαρχή had been expanded to international dimensions.²⁴

So radical a reorganization is unlikely to have arisen at Eleusis, given local religious conservatism, but seems rather more typical of Athenian manipulation in the period from ca 600 B.C. when the city was beginning to assert her own preëminence in the Greek world. Moreover, 600 B.C. probably marks the final incorporation of Eleusis into Athens (see Solon's story of Tellos in Hdt. 1.30.2–5, Mylonas 63–64), and this incorporation would have provided not only the opportunity but also a powerful incentive for the Athenians to promote the Triptolemos myth. The absorption of Eleusis had rendered Eleusinian mythology their own: Triptolemos was now an Athenian as well as an Eleusinian, and the site of Demeter's greatest boon to mankind, the Rharian Field, was now Athenian territory. Thus Athens' claim to cultural superiority in the Greek world could be given concrete expression through the expanded festival of the Eleusinia and its international ἀπαρχή.

This date of ca 600 B.C. as a *terminus post quem* for the reorganization of the Eleusinia is in accord with other evidence. As observed above, the Triptolemos myth itself, upon which the changes were based, had not yet arisen by the time of the *Hymn to Demeter* in the seventh century but begins to be represented on archaic vases from ca 650.²⁵ Archaeological evidence, regrettably, is practically nonexistent. The edifices at Eleusis which were specifically associated with the Eleusinia (a stadium, IG II² 1682.6; a temple, altar and threshing-floor of Triptolemos, Paus. 1.38.6; *κίποι*, IG I² 76.10) have never been located

²⁴ The date of the festival in Metageitnion, which is itself suspiciously late for a harvest celebration, may also have been the result of a revision to provide sufficient time for receipt and tabulation of the grain offerings from abroad (Mommsen 183–84).

²⁵ See B. Grossman, "The Eleusinian Gods and Heroes in Greek Art," unpubl. diss. (Washington Univ., St. Louis 1959).

with any certainty (see Mylonas 96–97, 125–27, 185). Moreover, the sacred precinct at Eleusis, of which certain altars were used in the Eleusinia ($\theta[\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon]\nu \dots [\acute{\epsilon}]\nu [\tau\acute{\omicron}\iota \acute{\epsilon}\lambda]\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu[\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota : \Gamma]\acute{\epsilon}\iota$, IG I² 5.2–3 [*supra*]; *potius* $[\acute{\epsilon}]\nu [\tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota \acute{\epsilon}\lambda]\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu[\iota \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\lambda]\acute{\epsilon}\iota$, O. Rubensohn, *JdI* 70 [1955] 9 n.42), was so thoroughly devoted to the Great Mysteries as to leave no trace of its use in the lesser-renowned *ἀγῶνες*. The presentation, however, of Sophocles' *Triptolemos* in 468 (frs.596–617 P.; IG II² 2325 I.i.5; Plin. *HN* 18.65) is at least a likely *terminus ante quem* for the reorganization.

More precise dating between these limits (*ca* 600–468) is necessarily conjectural: two periods, however, stand out as particularly likely to have produced such alterations. The first is the time of Peisistratos (560–527), on general grounds of his zealous promotion of all things Athenian and his building program at Eleusis (see Mylonas 77–105). Certain of the 'Peisistratean' remains at Eleusis have also been proposed by K. Kourouniotes and J. Travlos (*Deltion* 15 [1933–35] 75ff) as *κυροί* of the great *ἀπαρχή*. Finally, there is a nominal analogy between the elaborate quadrennial observance of the Eleusinia (*Ἐ. τὰ μεγάλα*, IG II² 1304.25; *πεντετηρὶς τῶν Ἐ.*, IG II² 1672.262) and of the Panathenaia (*Π. τὰ μεγάλα*, IG I² 45.12; *πεντετηρὶς τῶν Π.*, Lycurg. 102), the latter of which is known to have been established by Peisistratos (schol. Aristides 13.189.4).

The other attractive possibility for reconstruction of the Eleusinia is the period 480–468, a time of waxing Athenian pride and extensive rebuilding of both Eleusis and Athens. Kimon was Athens' administrator of the Eleusinian building program in this period, and was also among the judges who awarded first prize at the Great Dionysia of 468 to Sophocles for his tetralogy which included *Triptolemos* (Plut. *Cim.* 8.8–9). This perhaps suggests a current state policy of promoting the *Triptolemos* myth which might well have motivated its incorporation into a major state festival. Moreover, W. M. Calder has persuasively argued (*Philologus* 118 [1974] 203–05) that *Oinomaos* (Pearson, *Fragments* II 121–31, nos.471–77) accompanied *Triptolemos* in Sophocles' tetralogy. Since *Oinomaos* dealt with mythological events antecedent to the Olympia, a festival which in the period 472–468 had become newsworthy for its administrative upheavals, revised program and building plans (Hdt. 4.148; Paus. 5.9.3, 10.2; Pind. *Ol.* 6.1ff; A. Andrews, *Phoenix* 6 [1952] 1–5), its combination with *Triptolemos*, which treated the mythological foundations of the Eleusinia, would

perhaps suggest a topical basis for the tetralogy as a whole, and thus imply a recent alteration of the latter festival as well. Beyond these conjectures, however, the evidence does not permit us to go, and a definite choice between the two times proposed for the reconstruction of the Eleusinia is clearly impossible.

Another Athenian alteration of the structure of the Eleusinia which was probably contemporaneous with this great reorganization can be inferred from the anomalous distribution of the festival observances within the Olympiad as attested by later sources. Such a distribution was very probably the result of addition to a simpler arrangement. The analogy of the Panathenaic *penteteris*, which was imposed upon an original sequence consisting of identical annual observances, is instructive in this context. Presumably the Eleusinia originally consisted of simple annual rites with biennial games only, and the quadrennial *ἀγών* was imposed later by Athens upon one of the 'plain' observances.

The fact that Athenian, not Eleusinian, officials (the *ἱεροποιοὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν*, Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 54.7) administered the Eleusinia supports the theory that the Eleusinian *penteteris* was an Athenian creation. It is also noteworthy that these officials were not peculiar to the Eleusinia but managed other Athenian quadrennial festivals as well.

Hieropoioi also directed the non-penteteric observances of the Eleusinia: IG II² 1496.130,138–39 records that proceeds from the sacrifices of the Eleusinia were received "from *hieropoioi*" in the first year of the Olympiad (*i.e.*, that of the *trieteris*) as well as in the second. The record for the other years is lost. It has been generally assumed that these *hieropoioi* for the non-penteteric celebrations were also the *ἱεροποιοὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν* of Aristotle's description. But van der Loeff (123) points out that Aristotle probably would not have restricted his discussion to the *penteterides* alone had the *ἱεροποιοὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν* enjoyed a broader responsibility.

Van der Loeff argues, accordingly, that the *hieropoioi* of the non-penteteric celebrations were of some other *collegium* than those described above; but he does not attempt to suggest an alternative. If, however, the international *ἀπαρχή* was the chief component of the Eleusinia, then the *hieropoioi* in question (as of *ca* 400 B.C.)²⁶ were the

²⁶ In the fourth century B.C. these *ἱεροποιοὶ* were replaced by Athenian *ἱεροποιοὶ ἐγ βουλῆς* as directors of the non-penteteric observances (IG II² 1672.280–98; II² 410.23; cf. Foucart [*supra* n.7] 84, van der Loeff 77 n.3).

Eleusinian *ἱεροποιοὶ Ἐλευσινόθεν*²⁷ whose duties in connection with the *ἀπαρχή* are recorded in IG I² 76.8–44 and also (as *ἱεροποιοὶ Ἐλευσῖνι*) in IG I² 311.

It is natural to see these Eleusinian *hieropoioi* as the original administrators of the Eleusinia in the era preceding the Athenian annexation of Eleusis and subsequent domination of the local cults. In this process, the *penteteris* imposed by Athens would naturally have received Athenian administration. The observances of the remaining years, on the other hand, were allowed to continue under the original Eleusinian officials.

It thus appears that the Eleusinia was a typical harvest festival which at some time in the period 600–468 (probably in either 560–527 or 480–468) was modified and expanded in expression of Athens' claim to cultural supremacy in the Greek world through the mission of Triptolemos.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
May, 1975

²⁷ The term *Ἐλευσινιάδε*, which is frequently appended to the title of these *ἱεροποιοὶ* on the basis of IG I² 76.9–10, 17–18 (see J. Oehler in RE 8 [1913] 1585), is far better taken as an adverb with *παραδιδόναι* in lines 9 and 17, respectively (cf. *Ἀθέναζε*, line 16; *ἐπιτάται Ἐλευσινόθεν*, IG I² 311.15–16).