

# Cults of Demeter Eleusinia and the Transmission of Religious Ideas

Hugh Bowden

*Cults of Demeter Eleusinia, and cults claimed to have been established from Eleusis, are found quite widely spread across central and southern Greece and Asia Minor. Earlier explanations of how they acquired this particular cult title have started from accounts of their supposed origins early in the archaic period. This paper suggests that titles of this kind did not necessarily date back to the cults' foundations. It argues that visiting religious experts familiar with mystery cults from across the Greek world (including, amongst others, Herodotos and Pausanias) might have influenced the way local officiants understood their own cults, and hence how they came to describe them.*

*Keywords: Greece; Religion; Mystery Cult; Eleusis; Demeter*

Network Theory is being increasingly applied in the study of both ancient and modern religion,<sup>1</sup> as it allows scholars to examine the way religious practices, vocabulary, and ideas can spread, how new forms of worship are able to grow, and indeed how and why established religions can decline. But theory cannot replace information: hypotheses can only be tested if there exists reliable evidence. While sociologists of religion in the contemporary world can use interviews and questionnaires in their investigations, ancient historians are reliant on whatever can be extracted from the historical record. In examining the connections between the various cults of Demeter Eleusinia in the Greek world, my concern is to ask as much about the nature of the evidence, as about how the cult might have spread.

In his account of the battle of Mykale in 479 BCE, Herodotos remarks that ‘the divine aspect of things is clear from many proofs’ (9.100.2), noting first that a rumour of the victory at Plataia reached the Greeks at Mykale, even though the battles happened on the same day; he also refers to a *thyrsos* found mysteriously lying on the

---

Correspondence to: Hugh Bowden, Department of History, King's College London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK. Email: hugh.bowden@kcl.ac.uk

beach, dropped by some divine messenger, as the reader is encouraged to believe. The historian then points out that both battles took place where there were sanctuaries (*temenea*) dedicated to Demeter Eleusinia (9.101.1). This comment takes the reader back to Herodotos's account of the battle of Plataia, where he notes that 'although the battle was right by the grove (*alsos*) of Demeter, there was no sign that any Persian had been killed in the *temenos* or entered into it; most of them fell near the temple in unconsecrated ground'. And here Herodotus makes one of his least equivocal comments about divine involvement in human affairs, adding, 'I think—if it is necessary to decide about divine matters—that the goddess herself denied them entry, since they had burnt her temple, the shrine at Eleusis' (9.65.2). As he understands it, a crime committed against Demeter in one of her sanctuaries is punished within sight of two other sanctuaries dedicated to her.<sup>2</sup> It would seem that some kind of network is present here.

Mykale and Plataia were not the only places with sanctuaries dedicated to the goddess.<sup>3</sup> Table 1 lists other cases known from our sources, either literary or epigraphic.<sup>4</sup> The list raises some questions: Can we trace the origins of these sanctuaries? Were they formally connected? Did they, in other words, form a wider Eleusinian network? As we will see, these questions are not as straightforward as they might seem. Before we address them, we need to look at the evidence a little more closely.

Herodotos tells us something of the origins of the cult at Mykale. It was founded by 'Philistos son of Pasikles when he went with Nileus son of Kodros to the founding of Miletos' (9.97), that is, as part of the Ionian migration. Interestingly, a parallel explanation is given for the presence of the cult at Ephesos by Strabo, who says that the priest of Demeter Eleusinia was drawn from the *genos* of the Basileis, who claimed descent from Androklos, son of Kodros, founder of the city (14.1.3). This is supported by inscription from the imperial period describing someone as *καὶ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς [καὶ ἱερεὺς Δῆμητρος διὰ] γένους* (IEph 2018.4–5). But there appears to be virtually no mention in the epigraphic record of the cult title 'Eleusinia' either in Ephesos or in Mykale or Miletos.<sup>5</sup> Instead, the cult titles that we find for Demeter at Miletos and Ephesos are usually *Karpophoros* and *Thesmophoros*; indeed at Ephesos inscriptions refer to *μυστήρια Δήμητρι Καρποφόρῳ καὶ Θεσμοφόρῳ*.

There is evidence for 'Eleusinian elements' in the cult of Demeter in these *poleis*, including a dedication at Ephesos to the combination of Plouton, Kore, and Demeter *Karpophoros*, which might strike one as Eleusinian. Another Asian *polis* with a cult of Demeter *Karpophoros kai Thesmophoros*, Pergamon, is reported to have had cult personnel, including a Hierophant, a Dadouchos, and *ho epi bomon*—all figures paralleled at Eleusis. Herodotos and Strabo had their reasons for their identifications, therefore. But the relationship between these cults and that at Eleusis itself is not necessarily straightforward.

There are two more observations that can be made about the Ionian cults of Demeter Eleusinia. The first is that one might reasonably assume that Eleusinian cults would be associated with the Eleusinian *gene*, that is, the priestly clans of the

**Table 1** Evidence for Cults of Demeter Eleusinia

	<i>Evidence for title Eleusinia</i>	<i>Cult including Mysteries</i>	<i>Start of cult</i>
Attika			
Eleusis		Yes	<i>Homeric Hymn to Demeter</i> etc.
Phlya		Yes	Paus. 1.31.4, 9.27.2, 9.30.12, cf. 4.1.5; Plut., <i>Them.</i> 1.3
Boiotia			
Hysiaia (Plataia)	Literary		Hdt. 9.57.1–2, 62.2, 65.2, 69.1; Plut. <i>Arist.</i> 11.3–8; Paus. 9.4.3
Arkadia			
Basilis	Literary		Paus. 8.29.5, Athen. 13.609e–f
Lykosoura			Paus. 8.37.1–10
Mantineia			IG v <sup>2</sup> , 265–6
Megalopolis		Yes	Paus. 8.31.7–9; IG v.2 517 (Late C2/Early C3 CE)
Onkeion		Yes	Paus. 8.25.4–7
Pheneos	Literary	Yes	Paus. 8.15.1–4
Thelpousa	Literary		Paus. 8.25.2–3
Trapezos			Paus. 8.29.1
Argolid			
Epidaurus			IG iv <sup>2</sup> .1 83 (40-2 CE); IG iv <sup>2</sup> .1 126 (post 117 CE)
Keleai (near Phlious)		Yes	Paus. 2.14.1–4
Lerna		Yes	Paus. 2.36.7, 37.3
Messene			
Andania		Yes	Paus. 4.1.5–9, 4.26.6–8, 4.33.4–6; IG v.1 1390 = LSCG 65 = Syll <sup>3</sup> 736 (92/1 BCE); Syll <sup>3</sup> 735 (93/2 BCE)
Lakonia			

(continued)

**Table 1** – *Continued*

	<i>Evidence for title Eleusinia</i>	<i>Cult including Mysteries</i>		<i>Start of cult</i>
Therai	Literary, Epigraphic		Paus. 3.20.5–7, IG v.1 607 (C2–3 CE)	By mid C2 CE
Aegean Islands				
Delos			ID 2475	
Ionia				
Ephesos	Literary	Yes	Strab. 14.1.3 (633); GIBM 481 (83/4 CE); I Eph 1270 (imperial);	By 25 CE
Erythrai	Epigraphic		LSAM 26 (189–150 BCE)	By 150 BCE
Miletos (Mykale)	Literary		Hdt. 9.97	By 479 BCE
Teos	Epigraphic		GIBM 1032 (= SEG 4, 598)	
Mysia				
Pergamon		Yes	Syll <sup>3</sup> 694	By 129 BCE
Karia				
Panamara			IStr 147 (dedication)	
Stratonikeia			IStr 1124 (dedication)	
Pisidia				
Termessos			TAM III 870	
Egypt				
Alexandria	Literary	Yes	Tac. Hist. 4.83, Schol. Callim. In Cer. 1	By ca. 300 BCE

Eumolpidae and the Kerykes. Thus, for example, according to Tacitus, a certain Timotheos (a Eumolpid) was brought to Alexandria by Ptolemy Soter, apparently to establish the cult of Demeter Eleusinia there (*Hist.* 4.83).<sup>6</sup> But in Ephesos and Miletos the cult of Demeter is associated with the sons of Kodros, not with the Eumolpidae; indeed the *genos* in charge of the rites at Ephesos is explicitly descended from the kings of Athens, and not from an Eleusinian ancestor.

My second observation is to note that the Ionian epigraphic evidence is not completely silent about the title Eleusinia. Accounts for sacrificial victims from Erythrai from the mid-second century BCE do include sacrifices to Demeter Eleusinia there, and a decree from Teos mentions τῶν θεῶν τ[ῶν] Ἐλευσινίων, though without providing a clear context (SEG 4, 598). But at what date these cults were introduced, and what form they took, we cannot say.

Table 1 indicates another part of the Greek world in which the cult of Demeter Eleusinia seems to have been well established, and that is the Peloponnese, and above all Arkadia.<sup>7</sup> For information about these cults we must rely heavily on Pausanias, and unfortunately where we do have other evidence it does not necessarily fit well with Pausanias's statements. This is most evident in the case of the mysteries at Andania, to which I will return later. Even in cases where there is no contradictory evidence, the example of Ephesos and Mykale should make us cautious.

Pausanias identifies four sanctuaries in the Peloponnese as belonging to Demeter Eleusinia, and a further five instances in which he claims, or implies, that the cult practices were either introduced from, or modelled upon, the mysteries at Eleusis. In most cases, he tells the reader a little about the sanctuary, or about the cult. For the cults that he identifies as having the epithet 'Eleusinia', we learn that in Lakonia there is a procession of the cult statue of Kore from Helos to the sanctuary at Therai (3.20.7); that at Pheneos in Arkadia during the so-called *telete meizon*, secret texts are brought out and read to initiates (8.15.2); and that at Thelpousa there are large statues of Demeter, Kore, and Dionysos (8.25.3). From Athenaios comes the additional fact that the sanctuary at Basilis was the location for an annual beauty contest (13.609e–f). For none of these features do we know of parallels at Eleusis itself. Nor is it clear that mysteries were celebrated at any of these sanctuaries other than Pheneos. Conversely, in the case of Thelpousa, Pausanias implies that mysteries were associated with the nearby sanctuary of Demeter Lousia and Demeter Erinys (8.25.7).

In two cases, Pausanias states that Peloponnesian cults were founded directly from Eleusis. The cult at Keleai, near Phlious, was supposedly founded by Dysaules, brother of Keleus, the king of Eleusis who, according to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, reigned when Demeter appeared there (2.14.2). The cult observed at Pheneos in Arkadia, where the greater mysteries included the reading out of secret texts, was founded by Naus, grandson of Eumolpos, the eponym of the *genos* of the Eumolpidae (8.15.1). It is worth noting briefly that, whereas Ionian cults are associated with kings of Athens, these Peloponnesian foundations are associated with rulers of Eleusis. We cannot know whether these ancient 'pedigrees' belong to a long-established tradition, or are of recent antiquarianism.

There is no evidence in any of these cases—whether in the Peloponnese or in Asia Minor—of a formal connection with the sanctuary of Demeter at Eleusis. We have no records of *theoriai*, or of dedications from communities that observed cults related to Demeter Eleusinia. This notwithstanding, there were at times good reasons to claim such a connection. In the fifth century BCE the Athenians instituted, or re-instituted, the festival of the First Fruits, encouraging all the Greek cities to send offerings of wheat and barley to the sanctuary at Eleusis, and promising good harvests to those who did so, thereby remaining on good terms with the Athenians (IG i<sup>3</sup> 78).<sup>8</sup> Those cities already connected to Athens and Eleusis by a common cult would have been more likely to join in the venture. In the second century CE the creation under Hadrian of the Panhellenion had significant effects on Eleusis. The fabric of the sanctuary underwent major refurbishment, and it has been suggested that the Panhellenes made dedications at Eleusis in imitation of the First Fruits dedications of the fifth century.<sup>9</sup> The significance of Eleusis in the world of the Panhellenion can also be seen in dedications made by Panhellenes in their home towns. We have a dedication by Eurykles in Aizanoi in northern Phrygia from 157 CE to various deities, including Antoninus Pius, the divine Hadrian Panhellenius, the Eleusinian goddesses, Athena Polias, Poseidon, and Amphitrite (SEG 42:1191). Nonetheless, there appears to be no correlation between members of the Panhellenion and the *poleis* with cults of Demeter Eleusinia. Admittedly, the evidence for all of these matters is very limited, but it seems that there is no connection between the Panhellenion and the cult of Demeter outside Attika.

In spite of the lack of evidence of ongoing contact, a number of attempts have been made to explain why the apparently explicitly Attic cult title ‘Eleusinia’ should appear in the Peloponnese at all. It has been suggested that the cult, and presumably therefore also the mysteries, were introduced from Athens by the Dorians when they moved into the Peloponnese. Alternatively, it has been suggested that the cult title was not related to Eleusis in Attika, but is a version of ‘Eleithyia’, and that the connection with Demeter is a later development.<sup>10</sup> Such generalizing explanations depart from the assumption that both cult and title go back to before the historical period, an assumption that is supported by a number of stories mentioned by Pausanias, but which is open to question.

An alternative view, put forward by Jost for Arkadia in particular, points to an existing indigenous cult of Demeter and her daughter (cf. Paus. 8.37.9)—not in this case Kore—onto which an Eleusinian form of cult was later grafted.<sup>11</sup> The lack of any precise evidence for when cults were actually established makes this claim difficult to substantiate, and consequently any discussion of origins must remain purely hypothetical. In any case it is difficult to separate discussion of cults of Demeter Eleusinia from discussion of cults of Demeter, which are said to derive from Eleusis, and even from cults of divinities who may be associated with Eleusis, for example cults of *Megalai Theai*.<sup>12</sup>

Of course, one factor that should not be ignored is the long-term spread of interest in matters Eleusinian, as initiates from outside Attika returned to their native communities,

and as Athenian initiates settled abroad. Initiates were of course forbidden to discuss the secret elements of the Mysteries, but the fact that they had been initiated was not a secret. Awareness of the significance of Eleusis itself would also have been increased through the work of *spondophoroi* (heralds) dispatched through the Greek world to invite people to the mysteries.<sup>13</sup> Although the effect of these things cannot be easily measured, it is likely that the name of Eleusis, and the cult associated with it, was widely known and generally respected in the Greek world. But the case needs further exploration before one can infer that local cults were themselves related to Eleusis.

Recent work on ‘ritual dynamics’, in particular by Angelos Chaniotis, has brought new attention to the way in which ritual practice, and the interpretation of it, evolved over time.<sup>14</sup> This may often have been the result of political changes—and the period covered in this paper witnessed more than one fundamental transformation of the political landscape of the Greek world—but there could be other forces at work. As Chaniotis notes:

A factor of enormous importance for the evolution of rituals—no matter whether we are dealing with revival or transmission, amalgamation or syncopation, aesthetic or ideological transformation—is the part played by individuals, their idiosyncrasy, personal piety, social position, education, or even political agenda.<sup>15</sup>

Given this, I wish now to consider the role of one particular category of individuals, who might be described as ‘religious experts’, and the effect they might have had on mystery cults. ‘Religious experts’ come in a variety of types. While we are familiar with prominent men like the Athenian Lampon, who are called upon by the *polis* to consider religious matters,<sup>16</sup> other such figures are less visible among the historical records, but are nevertheless referred to; for example, Epimenides of Crete (Pl., *Leg.* 642d, D.L. 1.110), or Methapos, whom we will meet shortly. Homer and Hesiod too are treated by later generations as sources of religious knowledge (e.g., Ar. *Ran.* 1032–35). But we should not underestimate the influence of some of the writers whose work has survived, in particular Herodotos and Pausanias. It is certainly the case that, by the early second century CE, Herodotos had become an authoritative source of information about Delphi for the officials at the sanctuary, if Plutarch’s categorizing him as an oracle collector has any meaning (*Mor.* 403e). Herodotos is presented in his history as more than ready to talk to religious officials, in Egypt (2.143), in Dodona (2.52.1), and at Delphi. He was, it would appear, an initiate at Samothrake (2.51) and probably at Eleusis, and in his work he is quite ready to make comparisons between different cult practices (e.g., 2.81).<sup>17</sup> Pausanias too was ready to talk to religious officials. He specifically mentions the *dadouchos* (torch-bearer) of the mysteries at Phlya, as being someone he has discussed things with (9.27.2). He was himself an initiate at Eleusis (1.38.7) and at Andania (4.33.5), and at Lykosoura (8.37.9), and quite probably at Megalopolis and Keleai. There have been recent studies of Pausanias, particularly in his role as observer and learner;<sup>18</sup> and he may also be considered as an actor and teacher.

As has already been noted, between the time of Herodotos and that of Pausanias, the Greek world had undergone major transformations. The independent *poleis* of Herodotos's time had been made subordinate first to the Macedonian kings and their various Hellenistic successors, and then to Rome. Given the close connection between the religious and the political affairs of cities, this must have had an impact on how the citizens of the *poleis* understood their own cults and festivals.<sup>19</sup> Nonetheless, the *polis* remained the basic organizational unit of the Greek world throughout this period,<sup>20</sup> and, as we will see, while festivals whose interpretation was a matter of public concern might have to be reinterpreted in the light of new political circumstances, festivals in which significant elements were not allowed to be publicly discussed might be less affected by these changes. So in this respect the world of Pausanias was not necessarily completely different from the world of Herodotos.<sup>21</sup> And for the purpose of this study, the two aforementioned historian-writers are taken to be representative of a larger phenomenon, and belonging to a class of educated travellers who can be identified from Solon (Hdt. 1.29) onwards.

Herodotos and Pausanias then were well-travelled, literate men interested in discussing matters of cult. From the perspective of most small communities in the Greek world they would be exceptional individuals, who would have a perspective quite probably far superior to that of the cult personnel in places like, say, Phlious. We can get a picture of Pausanias's method perhaps from what he has to say about two mystery cults, those at Keleai, and at Andania. Although he avers that he holds the mysteries at Andania as second in importance only to Eleusis, it would seem that he obtained most of his information about it while in Attika. He mentions a conversation with a torch-bearer of the Lykomidai, an official at the mysteries at Phlya (9.27.2), and a statue base in a sanctuary there, dedicated by Methapos, who claimed to have made some changes to the cult at Andania (4.1.8). It would seem to be on the basis of this evidence, supported by a toponym from the poetry of Rhianos of Crete (4.1.6),<sup>22</sup> that Pausanias reconstructs the early history of the mysteries at Andania. According to this account, the mysteries were introduced to Messenia at its creation by Kaukon, grandson of Phlyos, the eponymous founder of Phlya, who brought the rites from Eleusis. They were then modified by Lykos son of Pandion, and further improved by Methapos (4.1.5–9).<sup>23</sup>

But Pausanias tells another story about the (re)foundation of the mysteries, in which Epaminondas and Epiteles, at the time of the fourth-century founding of Messene, were led by a dream to discover a jar containing an inscribed piece of tin foil, which had been buried by Aristomenes at the end of the Messenian revolt (4.20.4): the foil related the secrets of the Andanian mysteries (4.26.6–8). This latter story is more likely to have been told in Messenia. Here Pausanias not only provides two distinct stories about the mysteries, but he also makes links between them. We might ask whether the Messenians who told him the second story heard the first one from him, in return, and if so, what they made of it.

Pausanias's comments about Keleai suggest that some kind of debate might have followed. He notes that the rite at Keleai is a *mimesis* of the *teletai* at Eleusis, and adds



that the Phliasians agree (*homologousi*—perhaps ‘concede’ catches the tone better) that they imitate *ta en Eleusini drōmena* (2.14.1). He then reports the Phliasian claim that the mysteries at Keleai were founded by Dysaules, brother of Keleus, king of Eleusis, who fled there after defeat by the Athenians under Xouthos (2.14.2), and goes on to point out that there was no actual battle in the war with Xouthos, and to suggest that Dysaules could not have been a significant Eleusinian, since he is not named in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (2.14.2–4). What his Phliasian interlocutors thought about their own traditions after this barrage of erudition is not revealed, but the stories they told after this exchange with Pausanias may have differed from those they had been telling before.

We should note that there is an issue of authority here. We might suppose that people directly involved with the cults gave precedence to local traditions, because they were passed down from generation to generation. However, so far there is no good evidence to believe that this is how things actually worked. In a society where a reference in the catalogue of ships could be taken as a historical charter (see Plut. *Sol.* 10.1), the foreigner who knew his Homer could probably win out over the native who did not.

Such a supposition leads to some odd results. Herodotos, who was initiated at Samothrake, considered that the *Theoi Megaloi* of the island were the Kabeiroi (2.51.1–2), despite the fact that the name is never used in any document on Samothrake. Even more bizarrely, Pausanias, who was initiated at Andania, considered that it was a cult of Demeter and Kore, the *Theai Megalai*, when the one inscription we have from the site refers to the mysteries of the *Theoi Megaloi* (Syll<sup>3</sup> 736). There have been numerous attempts to explain this startling confusion,<sup>24</sup> but it seems to me that here there is a clash between the authority of Pausanias’s literary sources on the one hand, and practice on the ground on the other. The strength of the former seems to have been enough to distract Pausanias’s attention from the gender of the word endings.

Is it possible to attribute a role to men like Herodotos and Pausanias in the creation of links between cults? In truth, all ritual activity is made up of basic elements, most of which are shared between cults over a wide area. There is likely to have been a standard form of animal sacrifice, for instance, with its accompanying purifications, libations and so on, shared by most divine cults across the Greek world and beyond, whereas other ritual acts might be associated with particular divinities. The daily interactions between individuals and communities could therefore have spread something approaching a shared understanding of these acts, and as such ritual can be seen as a sort of language conveying information about gods and mortals, and about the relationships between them.

With mystery cults this inter-communication is necessarily much more limited. While the public aspects of such cults are likely to be understood well enough, the secret parts—those known only to initiates—will inevitably be more obscure to participants. As it was rare for individuals to be initiated into a large number of cults, there will have been comparably little opportunity to draw parallels between practices.

For most participants of course this need not have mattered, but for some it might. What was actually secret seems to have varied from cult to cult, but often it appears to have played a minor role in the general practice of worship. The mysteries of Demeter seem generally to be related to the story of the abduction of Persephone, which must in part reflect the wide circulation of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, but which also might relate to the importance of the seasonal cycle to cults of Demeter. But in itself that single story can generate a range of secrets. At Lykosoura and Onkeion in Arkadia, for example, the name of Despoina, the daughter of Demeter and Poseidon, conceived while Demeter was searching for Kore, was a secret known only to initiates; whereas at Pheneos and probably at Andania some ‘secret’ texts were apparently read out loud to the worshippers present.

Consequently, just how much the actual ritual of the mysteries varied from cult to cult is difficult to know—after all, we only have the vaguest idea of what happened at Eleusis itself. Nor do we know how exactly ritual actions were copied and therefore transmitted within cults. The assumption that this was a crucial element of ancient religion should therefore perhaps be questioned. If there was a certain fluidity in the transmission of ritual, then the contribution of learned outsiders could be quite significant. If Pausanias were to tell you that your mysteries were obviously modelled on those of Eleusis, but that they differed in one small respect, would you keep doing the different thing to assert your distinctiveness, or would you modify your practice to be closer to the more prestigious cult? The latter possibility might well be more likely—a case perhaps of the theologians taking over the Pantheon.

As to how far such influence actually travelled, the question is of course unanswerable, given that there must have been other factors affecting the interpretation of cult activity. It does, however, give us an idea of how the process might have operated. If we return to our starting point, we have Herodotos’s reference to a sanctuary dedicated to Demeter Eleusinia at Mykale, a title otherwise unattested by epigraphic evidence; and a similar case with Strabo’s discussion of Ephesos. We might explain this away as the difference between the official title on the one hand, and a more colloquial one on the other, but this may not be the whole truth. Although the usual title of the cult of Demeter in Miletos and elsewhere is ‘Karpophoros’, we do have one reference in an inscription to Demeter Karpotokos (IEph 1305), which presumably refers to the same cult. But the confusion goes a little further: when Apollo at Didyma was asked about the erection of an altar to Kore next to the altar of Demeter *Karpophoros*, he replied that it would indeed be acceptable to erect the altar ‘next to the altar of Demeter *Karpotrophos*’ (IDid 504. 11–2.24)—a reply that suggests that the deity himself was a little confused about his aunt’s title.

The appellations Karpotrophos, Karpotokos, and Karpophoros are closely related in meaning, and Demeter Karpophoros is sometimes also called ‘Thesmophoros’. Perhaps it is better not to think of them as titles at all, but simply as descriptions that help to distinguish between different sanctuaries and cults. But descriptions can also be used to point up similarities, and writers like Pausanias may have used them to designate such connections. From this evidence, to distinguish between links made

by scholarly tourists, and those which result from the movement of ideas across networks, may not always be possible.

## Notes

- [1] Ancient: e.g., Collar, this volume; Rutherford, this volume. Modern: e.g., Hirst, ‘Social Networks’.
- [2] For this as a feature of Herodotos’s approach, see Bowden, ‘Herakles, Herodotos’.
- [3] Farnell, *Cults*, 3.198–213; Sfameni Gaspasso, *Misteri e culti*.
- [4] The absence of two areas of the Greek world from Table 1 deserves explanation. At least two Cretan *poleis*, Biannos and Olos, as well as the island of Thera, named their months *Eleusunios* or *Eleusiniios*. This makes it highly likely that these communities celebrated a festival called the Eleusinia or Eleusunia. It is, however, not known whether they had sanctuaries dedicated to Demeter Eleusinia. On this, see Parker, ‘Demeter’. Magna Graecia is an area particularly associated with the cult of Demeter and Kore. However, there is no evidence at all for the cult title ‘Eleusinia’, or indeed for any sanctuary-based initiatory cult of the goddesses (Hinz, *Der Kult von Demeter*), and no other evidence linking the sanctuaries specifically with Eleusis. In Attica there was an Eleusinion at Phaleron, as well as one in the city and the sanctuary at Eleusis. It is clear that these were all part of the same cult complex, as they were administered together (IG i<sup>3</sup>, 32). Inscriptions from Marathon, Paiania and Phrearrhioi refer to an Eleusinion, but there is no other evidence for local sites of that name, and all the inscriptions could be referring to the city Eleusinion. Although nothing is certain, there seems no good reason for supposing the existence of local cults in addition to that at Eleusis. On Attica in general see Parker, *Polytheism*, 327–68, esp. 332–33.
- [5] The fact that an inscription from Milesian colonies in the Black Sea includes the name ‘Eleusiniios’ has been taken as evidence for a cult of Eleusinian gods from an early date in Miletos itself (Graf, *Nordionische Kulte*, 274 n. 18; *LGPN* IV s.v. Ἐλευσίνιος). However, it is not safe to assume that, even if Eleusiniios were a direct descendent of one of the original colonists, his ancestor was a Milesian citizen: Milesian ‘colonies’ would have had a Milesian *oikist*, and no doubt the blessing of Apollo at Didyma, but the settlers themselves may have come from further afield—thus enabling Miletos to be metropolis of so many settlements in a relatively short time.
- [6] ‘Timotheum Atheniensem e gente Eumolpidarum, quem ut antistitem caerimoniarum Eleusine exciverat.’ Cf. Schol. Callim. *In Cer.* 1.
- [7] Cf. Jost, *Sanctuaires et cultes*; ‘Mystery Cults’.
- [8] Discussion in Bowden, *Classical Athens*, 125–29; Cavanaugh, *Eleusis and Athens*, 29–95.
- [9] Spawforth and Walker, ‘World of Panhellenion’, 100.
- [10] Discussed in Graf, *Nordionische Kulte*, 274–77. See also Parker, ‘Demeter’, 101–2.
- [11] Jost, ‘Mystery Cults’.
- [12] Jost, ‘Grandes Déeses’; ‘Nouveau regard’.
- [13] Mylonas, *Eleusis*, 244.
- [14] Chaniotis, ‘Ritual Dynamics: Boiotian Festival’; ‘Ritual Dynamics in the Eastern Mediterranean’; ‘Statusänderung’.
- [15] Chaniotis, ‘Ritual Dynamics in the Eastern Mediterranean’, 162.
- [16] Bowden, ‘Oracles for Sale’.
- [17] On religion in Herodotus in general: Harrison, *Divinity and History*; Mikalson, *Herodotus and Religion*.
- [18] Rutherford, ‘Tourism’; Elsner, ‘Pausanias’.
- [19] Chaniotis, ‘Ritual Dynamics: Boiotian Festival’, 39–40.

- [20] As witnessed for example by Jones, *Greek City*.
- [21] Pausanias himself reinforces this perception through his imitation of Herodotos. See e.g., Hutton, *Describing Greece*, 190–213.
- [22] For Pausanias's reliance on Rhianos see 4.6.1–3. On his method in Book 4 see Musti and Torelli, *Pausania*.
- [23] Cf. Ogden, *Aristomenes*, 89–103.
- [24] Guarducci, 'I culti'; Robertson, 'Melanthus, Codrus'; Zunino, *Hiera Messeniaka*; Graf, 'Lesser Mysteries'.

## References

- Bowden, Hugh. 'Oracles for Sale'. In *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, edited by Peter Derow and Robert Parker. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- . *Classical Athens and the Delphic Oracle: Divination and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . 'Herakles, Herodotos and the Persian Wars'. In *Herakles and Hercules: Exploring a Graeco-Roman Divinity*, edited by Louis Rawlings and Hugh Bowden. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2005.
- Cavanaugh, Maureen B. *Eleusis and Athens: Documents in Finance, Religion and Politics in the Fifth Century B.C.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Chaniotis, Angelos. 'Ritual Dynamics: the Boiotian Festival of the Daidala'. In *KYKEON. Studies in Honour of H.S. Versnel. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 142*, edited by H. F. J. Horstmanshoff, H. W. Singor, F. T. van Straten, and J. H. M. Strubbe. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . 'Ritual Dynamics in the Eastern Mediterranean: Case Studies in Ancient Greece and Asia Minor'. In *Rethinking the Mediterranean*, edited by William V. Harris. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . 'Griechische Rituale der Statusänderung und ihre Dynamik'. In *Investitur- und Krönungsrituale. Herrschaftseinsetzungen im kulturellen Vergleich*, edited by Marion Steinicke and Stefan Weinfurter. Köln: Böhlau, 2005.
- Elsner, John (Jas). 'Pausanias: A Greek Pilgrim in the Roman World'. *Past and Present* 135 (1992): 3–29.
- Farnell, Lewis R. *The Cults of the Greek States*. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896–1909.
- Graf, Fritz. *Nordionische Kulte: religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulturen von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia*. Rome: Schweizerisches Institut in Rom, 1985.
- . 'Lesser Mysteries – Not Less Mysterious'. In *Greek Mysteries: The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults*, edited by Michael B. Cosmopoulos. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Guarducci, M. 'I culti di Andania'. *Studia materiali di Storia delle religioni* 10 (1934): 174–204.
- Harrison, Thomas. *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Hinz, Valentina. *Der Kult von Demeter und Kore auf Sizilien und in der Magna Graecia*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1998.
- Hirst, Rob. 'Social Networks and Personal Beliefs: An Example from Modern Britain'. In *Predicting Religion: Secular and Alternative Futures*, edited by Grace Davie, Paul Heelas, and Linda Woodhead. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- Hutton, William. *Describing Greece: Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Jones, Arnold H. M. *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

- Jost, Madeleine. 'Les Grandes Déeses d'Arcadie'. *Revue des Études anciennes* 77 (1970): 138–51.
- . *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1985.
- . 'Nouveau regard sur les Grandes Déeses de Mégalopolis: influences, emprunts, syncrétismes religieux'. *Kernos* 7 (1994): 119–29.
- . 'Mystery Cults in Arcadia'. In *Greek Mysteries: The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults*, edited by Michael B. Cosmopoulos. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Mikalson, Jon D. *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- Musti, Domenico, and Mario Torelli, eds. *Pausania, Guida della Grecia, IV, La Messenia*. Milan: Mondadori, 1991.
- Mylonas, George E. *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Ogden, Daniel. *Aristomenes of Messene: Legends of Sparta's Nemesis*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2004.
- Parker, Robert. 'Demeter, Dionysus and the Spartan Pantheon'. In *Early Greek Cult Practice*, edited by Robin Hägg, Nanno Marinatos, and G. C. Nordquist. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Vörlag, 1988.
- . *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Robertson, Noel. 'Melanthus, Codrus, Neleus, Caucon: Ritual Myth as Athenian History'. *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 29 (1988): 201–61.
- Rutherford, Ian. 'Tourism and the Sacred: Pausanias and the Traditions of Greek Pilgrimage'. In *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*, edited by Susan E. Alcock, John F. Cherry, and Jas Elsner. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Sfameni Gasparro, Giulia. *Misteri e culti mistici di Demetra*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1986.
- Spawforth, A. J., and Walker, Susan. 'The World of the Panhellenion I: Athens and Eleusis'. *Journal of Roman Studies* 75 (1985): 78–104.
- Zunino, Maddalena L. *Hiera Messeniaka. La storia religiosa della Messenia dall'età micenea all'età ellenistica*. Udine: Forum, 1997.

Copyright of *Mediterranean Historical Review* is the property of Routledge and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.