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The giving and interchange of gifts, otherwise known as reciprocity or gift-giving, was a pervasive principle and practice in ancient Greek society, manifested in nearly all aspects of life. In particular, reciprocity was at the heart of patronage systems influencing religious gift-giving and civic works. This study focuses on one such system of patronage known as euergetism, in which wealthy individuals voluntarily donated funds for public facilities as munificent gifts to the city public. The traditional belief is that euergetism, emerging in the early Hellenistic period, was a sudden departure from previous patronage traditions, born out of economic necessity when Greek democracy failed. However, based on similarities in the functions and formulae of euergetism and preexisting patronage structures, it seems that euergetism was derived from earlier practices of civic and religious gift-giving, wherein its gifts functioned as a means of communication, legitimization, and mediation between benefactors and cities.

In addition to examining the practice of euergetism itself and its antecedents, this study focuses on the ways in which gift-exchange systems were manifested in the architecture, votives, and civic dedications within the sanctuary of Demeter at Eleusis. The surviving architectural and dedicatory remains at Eleusis, when understood within the context of euergetism and its correlatives, illustrate how relationships between benefactors and recipients were instigated, commemorated, reciprocated, justified, and
mediated through the objects of religious and civic gift-giving. Ultimately, euergetism, like other gifting systems, proves to be an integral social system in Hellenistic through Roman Imperial Greece.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“Κάριτος ἁμοιβή καὶ δόσις συνέχει τοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίους τῶν μὲν διδόντων, τῶν δὲ λαμβανόντων τῶν δ’ αὖ πάλιν ἀνταποδιδόντων.”

“The giving and interchange of favors holds together the lives of men.”

— Pseudo-Aristotle

The giving and interchange of gifts, otherwise known as reciprocity or gift-giving, was a pervasive principle and practice in ancient Greek society, manifested in nearly all aspects of life. Gift-exchange, in contrast to commercial exchange, was characterized by voluntary giving of benefit for benefit that was unenforceable by law and lacking precise equivalence in the objects or services exchanged. Often reciprocity and gift-exchange economies characterize pre-state societies lacking more elaborate monetary and law systems; commercial exchange, then, often replaces reciprocity as a state becomes more developed. This seems to be the case in Greece until the Hellenistic period: reciprocity was embedded in social, ethical, economic, and political systems in Archaic and Early Classical times; in the Classical period, which witnessed the development of elaborate monetary and law systems, reciprocity became less prominent in economic and political contexts, though it did remain central in social and religious contexts. With the end of democracy and beginning of the Hellenistic age, gift-exchange and reciprocity became

3 Ibid., 1 & 4.
4 Ibid., 6-7.
re-entrenched in political and economic dealings, a shift which was heavily supported by Hellenistic philosophers, such as Aristotle, comedians, such as Menander, and powerful elites in general. By examining reciprocity throughout the Greek historical period and into Roman Imperial Greece, it is clear that its practices and principles can be found “as an ethical value, as a factor in interpersonal relations, as an element of political cohesion, as economically significant, as a way of structuring human relations with a deity, as shaping the pattern of epic and historical narrative, and as a central theme of drama.”5 In particular, the principles of reciprocity were at the heart of the formation of the Greek polis in Homeric times, the longstanding practices of religious gift-giving that continued throughout the Greek historical period, and the practice of euergetism which become common in Hellenistic through Roman Imperial times.6

This study seeks to examine that system of reciprocity in Ancient Greece in which wealthy individuals, rather than the demos, donated funds for public facilities. This system of patronage, said to emerge in the Hellenistic period and continue into the Late Imperial era, is referred to as euergetism in scholarship, a term which first appeared in the writings of French historian Boulanger in 1923, who coined his term from the Greek euergetes, meaning benefactor.7 Despite the limited chronological parameters of euergetism in modern scholarship, this patronage system actually had its roots in preexisting systems of civic and religious patronage dating as early as the Archaic period

---

6 Ibid., 4-7 & 9-10.
(i.e., reciprocity); euergetism did not emerge suddenly in the Hellenistic period. Exploring the relationship between Hellenistic euergetism and prior reciprocal exchange systems will help to illuminate the role of euergetism within standard Greek practices of patronage, gift-giving, and reciprocity, while also adding to our understanding of euergetism as mode of communication and mediation between benefactors and cities.

In addition to examining the practice of euergetism itself and its antecedents, this study focuses on the ways in which such patronage structures were manifested in the architecture, votives, and civic dedications within the sanctuary of Demeter at Eleusis. Because Eleusis was one of the chief religious centers of Greece from Geometric to Late Imperial times, its archaeological record is ideal for the study of gift-giving and patronage systems over time. Furthermore, the sanctuary was the recipient of large scale public and private benefaction throughout its history, including private votive dedications, civic honorary dedications, publicly funded architectural programs – such as the Peisistratean, Kimonian, and Periklean Telesterion phases – and gifts of euergetism, such as the Lesser Propylaia of Appius Claudius Pulcher, or later on, the Outer Court attributed to Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius. For these reasons, the sanctuary at Eleusis serves as a case study for euergetism, providing a pedigree for patronage structures and gift-giving practices that were forerunners to euergetism itself. The surviving architectural and dedicatory remains at Eleusis, when understood within the context of euergetism and its correlatives, illustrate the ways in which patronage was instigated, commemorated, reciprocated, and mediated through the objects of both religious and civic gift-giving. Ultimately, euergetism, like other patronage systems,
proves to be an integral mode of communication and exchange for the mutual benefit of benefactors and cities of Hellenistic through Roman Imperial Greece.

This discussion of civic and religious gift-giving economies has two main components: first, a discussion of euergetism as it relates to gift-giving economies and the ways in which gift-giving functioned in religious, social, economic, and political contexts; the second section examines the votive and architectural dedications at the sanctuary of Eleusis as a diachronic case study for change in patronage structures. Chapter 2 begins by reviewing current scholarship on euergetism and then proceeds to establish the functions and implications of this gift-giving economy for both city and patron. In Chapter 3 euergetism is compared to religious gift-giving (i.e., votive dedications), the occasions soliciting religious donations, and the formulaic communication expressed by religious gifts, wherein reciprocity through gifts and public display is the common thread.

The study then shifts to Eleusis in Chapter 4, which provides an introduction to the trends in architectural and votive dedications as evidence of the change in gift-giving and patronage structures across time. The following chapters address the archaeological record at Eleusis chronologically, beginning with Chapter 5, concerning votive offerings at the sanctuary from the Geometric through Classical periods. From there, the discussion in Chapter 6 turns to Late Classical and Hellenistic trends in dedicatory objects at Eleusis, in particular, the proliferation of civic honorary dedications. These dedications were “thank-you cards” from cities in honor of their own euergetes who had donated funds for public works. Euergetism, generally speaking, appears in the
archaeological record in two forms: 1) the actual gift by *euergetes* to city, for example, a stoa, which for the sake of clarity will be referred to as the “endowment”, and 2) an honorific statue or monument erected by the city in gratitude for the *euergetes’* endowment, which will be referred to as the civic honorary dedication. None of the structures at Eleusis in the Hellenistic period or earlier could be considered endowments by *euergetes* because all previous building projects were publicly funded; thus, the Eleusinian civic honorary dedications – the tokens of gratitude for wealthy munificence – are the earliest evidence of the practice of euergetism in Attica.

It was not until the Late Roman Republican period, discussed in Chapter 7, that Eleusis was the direct recipient of *euergetai*’s endowments when the sanctuary received the Lesser Propylaia, a gift from Appius Claudius Pulcher. Prior to the Lesser Propylaia, Eleusis had been a venue for *other* cities to express gratitude toward *euergetai* for endowments by means of civic honorary dedications, but Eleusis had not received any endowments of its own. Chapter 8 examines the proliferation of Imperial euergetism at the sanctuary as well as the commemoration of Imperial endowments in Attica by placement of statues and monuments at Eleusis. Euergetism flourished in Imperial times at Eleusis, and the function of this gift-giving system as a means of communication, distribution, reciprocity, and mediation seems to be fully expressed, especially during the Antonine period when the sanctuary’s Outer Court received numerous structures, including the Greater Propylaia, a fountain house, a stoa, and a temple to Artemis Propylaia, which were then commemorated by the deme with dedicatory statues, triumphal arches, and other monuments. General conclusions on gift-giving economies
and their incarnations at Eleusis follow in Chapter 9. Lastly are the appendixes of votives and dedications found at Eleusis, which are arranged chronologically in four sections: Appendix A includes Geometric through Orientalizing dedications; Appendix B, Archaic through Late Classical; Appendix C, Hellenistic; and Appendix D, Roman Imperial.
The term euergetism was coined in 1923 by the historian A. Boulanger to describe a system of voluntary private patronage of structures or services for the city public. This ancient practice of euergetism is typically said to have arisen in the Hellenistic period with the devolution of democracy and continued until Late Imperial times; as democratic governments struggled economically, the income generated from taxes was not great enough to sponsor public works. As a result, many large scale public works began to be funded by wealthy benefactors donating large gifts to individual communities, gifts which included but were not limited to resources for religious buildings, civic structures, festivals or processions, sacrificial animals for religious occasions, or public entertainment. For the purposes of this study, architectural euergetism and the civic dedicatory rewards for such architectural gifts are the focus.

---


9 Arjan Zuiderhoek, *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor* (New York: Cambridge University, 2009), 10 believes the origins of euergetism date to the Hellenistic period. The author does not, however, believe that ancient Greek cities depended on private munificence (23 & Chapter 3); he describes euergetism as an ideological/political tool rather than an economic one. Gretchen Umholtz, “Royal Patronage of Greek Architecture as an Instrument for Foreign Policy in the Hellenistic Period,” (PhD diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1994), 22, on the other hand, believes the change in the Hellenistic period to be the direct result of economic change: “individual rulers in the Greek world had control of financial and human resources on a completely different scale from those of the earlier periods.” In terms of the origins of euergetism, Wandschneider, 5 reports that many scholars have noted patronage practices similar to euergetism in the early Archaic period (Domingo Gygax 2006) or Classical period (Veyne 1976). More commonly, however, euergetism is discussed as a Hellenistic phenomenon, beginning in the mid to late fourth century B.C.E. (Gauthier 1985 &1993; Migeotte 1992, 1995 & 1997; Marest-Caffey 2008).

10 Zuiderhoek, 6; Umholtz, “Royal Patronage of Greek Architecture,” 27 & 29.

11 Miriam Griffin, “De Beneficiis and Roman Society,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 93 (2003):92 states that the exchange of gifts and services became the subject of numerous philosophical treatises from the fourth century B.C.E. on. This could, to some extent, actually mark the beginnings of ‘scholarship’ on
Although euergetism, as it is typically defined in scholarship, refers to systems of patronage dating from Hellenistic to Late Imperial times which involve private funds going towards public uses, similar systems of exchange existed earlier. For example, in the time of Homer redistributions of wealth in the form of privately funded feasts for the community were common, and such liberality on the part of the aristocrats was considered noble. Euergetism, like the Homeric system, involved redistributions of wealth in the form of gifts, which could be considered noble or philanthropic, but moreover, the practice of euergetism often functioned as a tool for the wealthy to raise their position and status in society through ostentation while also establishing a mutually beneficial relationship with a city.

Not only can the redistributive and philanthropic aspects of euergetism be connected to earlier gift-giving exchange, but also the patronage of architecture for personal gain has antecedents prior to Hellenistic euergetism. Prior to the Hellenistic period, architectural patronage was most commonly carried out by cities due to the great cost involved. Architectural programs demonstrated a city’s religious piety and liberality toward mankind. There were, nonetheless, instances of private architectural patronage prior to the Hellenistic era, with known benefactors such as Themistokles, Kimon, Peisianax, Xenophon, and many others. According to Uhmoltz, these earlier instances of private patronage indicate “a widespread tradition of private patronage continuing down

---

13 Zuiderhoek, 6, 9, & 10.
into the Roman period."\(^{15}\) Donating funds was a highly political and public act which helped maintain relations between elites, rulers, and the city.\(^{16}\) Furthermore, redistributions of wealth in the form of gifts may have been vital in maintaining social harmony and political stability in a society with one of the most unequal distributions of wealth in history.\(^{17}\)

In the same way that Homeric gifting practices were precursors to euergetism, religious gift-giving seems to have prefigured the Hellenistic patronage system as well – at its core, euergetism is a gift-giving economy. Euergetism bears similarities to other ancient systems of exchange, namely religious gift-giving and patron-client relationships, in which honor and symbolism were valuable commodities.\(^{18}\) In all of these systems, exchanges of gifts and counter-gifts (whether services or goods) negotiated relationships within the asymmetrical, hierarchical relationship.\(^{19}\) These gifts masqueraded as disinterested gestures of benevolence toward a community or individual, though in reality, they “allowed pent-up political energies that otherwise might have been (and sometimes were) spent in fierce social conflicts between elite and non-elite groups to be

---

\(^{15}\) Umholtz, “Royal Patronage,” 18.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., 1, 18, 20; Zuiderhoek, 9.

\(^{17}\) Zuiderhoek, 4-5 & 115-6. For theory on how reciprocity and gift-exchange enforce social cohesion, see van Wees, 25, 29-30, & 45.

\(^{18}\) Zuiderhoek, 6, emphasizes the importance of understanding euergetism as a “gift-exchange between a rich citizen and his city/community or fellow citizens.” As a whole, his publication emphasizes the symbolic and ideological importance of the gifts in euergetism over the economic aspects. He claims that because these architectural gifts had little effect on the city’s economy or the poorer citizen’s living standards, it is really the ideological effect of such structures that motivated euergetes to donate their wealth.

\(^{19}\) Aloys Winterling, Politics and Society in Imperial Rome (Maldan, MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2009), 35 attributes this quality to patron-client relationships. Similarly, Koehraad Verboven, The Economy of Friends: Economic Aspects of Amicitia and Patronage in the Late Republic (Bruxelles: Latomus, 2002) says that patron-client relationships are based on gift-exchanges from both parties in order to achieve goals in a mutually beneficial relationship. These qualities are similar to those found in religious gift-giving and euergetism.
transferred into a process of subtle and skilled political negotiation over gifts and counter-gifts between benefactors, their fellow elite-members, and the demos.”

That euergetism and clientelism are both based on gift-giving economies is stressed by many authors. In a recent publication on the reciprocity in ancient Greek social systems, Hellenistic euergetism is discussed as a revival of earlier Homeric practices of reciprocity and translation of religious gift-giving systems, which had continued in practice throughout the historical period. Likewise, Zuiderhoek emphasizes euergetism as gift-exchange, and as a whole, he stresses the symbolic, intangible, and ideological importance of gifts rather than the economic aspects. Because these architectural gifts had little effect on the city’s economy or citizens’ living standards, Zuiderhoek submitted that it must have been the ideological effects of gifts that motivated euergetes to bequeath their wealth.

Euergetism may have proliferated in the Hellenistic period not only out of economic necessity but also out of social and political necessity: in the face of imperialism, the egalitarian ideals of democracy were no longer applicable; the socio-

20 Zuiderhoek, 10. Veyne, *le pain et le cirque* (Paris: Seuil, 1967), 230, 237, 319 as qtd. in Zuiderhoek, 113, believed such gifts to be truly disinterested. Verboven, 99, Griffin, 100, and Seaford, 2, on the other hand, suggest that gifts only pretended to be disinterested out of social obligation.

21 Verboven, 71 & 91; Zuiderhoek, 4-6; Guy M. Rogers, “Demosthenes of Oenoanda and Models of Euergetism,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 81 (1991):93; Griffin, 99-100 places clientelism “in line with modern theories of gift-exchange and reciprocity,” stating, “Gift-exchange lies in between these two extremes of the continuum. It is like economic exchange in that it normally involves individuals, not groups, and there is no obligation to give, only to return. It is unlike economic exchange in that the type of reciprocation is generalized: it is unspecified; indefinite as to time, quantity, and quality; and depends not so much on what gift the donor originally gave, but on what the original donor needs and when he needs it, and also on what the original recipient can afford to give and when. It is also unlike economic exchange in that at least a pretense of disinterested generosity is maintained and a bond of solidarity is created between the partners. Finally, it is unlike economic exchange in that there is no legal sanction to enforce return. Trust is needed between the partners because the only sanction is the social approval given to the recognition of past favors and the social disgrace conferred on failure to show sufficient gratitude.”

22 Van Wees, 45.
economic hierarchy began to be glorified by means of munificent endowments by elites. Through the gifts of euergetism, a new paradigm was established for celebrating collectivist ideals for a non-democratic polis.\textsuperscript{23} Thus, elite munificence may have been accepted by the citizen public because it provided political advantages, such as protection, and glorified the identity and topography of the city.\textsuperscript{24} At the same time that such endowments embellished the city, the endowments also functioned as propaganda to legitimize the increasing disparity of wealth and power.\textsuperscript{25}

In essence, the gifts of euergetism stabilized the new social order at a time when centralized power could not. Gift-exchange, unlike commercial exchange, established long term indebtedness of parties to each other, and when these reciprocal obligations created vast networks of prolonged relationships, social cohesion was the result.\textsuperscript{26} At the heart of gift-exchange was the relationship between the two parties themselves – the social relationship was the most valuable commodity exchanged and advertised by the gift. In commercial exchange, on the other hand, the relationship between the two parties was negligible; it was only the relationship between the goods – their monetary equivalence – that was of concern.\textsuperscript{27} Through a sort of social-triangulation, gifts became direct representations of one’s status by making publicly visible material connections with other individuals. The more central reciprocity was to a culture, the more potent

\textsuperscript{24} Van Wees, 45.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid.; Zuiderhoek, 71, 114-16.
\textsuperscript{26} Van Wees, 25-9.
\textsuperscript{27} Van Wees, 29.
such gifts could be in creating one’s status. During the Hellenistic period, then, with the continuation of longstanding religious and social reciprocity and the revival of political and economic reciprocity, the gifts of euergetism were central to legitimizing social hierarchies.

Without a doubt, the gifts of euergetism had diverse functions, but nonetheless, this Hellenistic gift-exchange economy had its roots in religious gift-giving, or, more generally, reciprocity, while also bearing similarities to clientelism. For example, euergetism, religious gifting, and patron-client relationships all involved placements of gifts in highly visible areas, with gifts serving as advertisements of patrons’ munificence. In religious gift-giving, the goodwill of the deity was thanked in the form of a votive offering; similarly, patron-client relationships often involved the setting up of a statue by the clients to their patron. Likewise in the practice of euergetism, civic honorary dedications were erected by the demos in response to munificence from a euergetes. Although all of these practices are gestures of thanksgiving, they are not empty disinterested gestures. In fact, the act of dedicating counter-gifts for munificence (whether the original munificence was from gods, patrons, or euergetai) wielded a significant amount of power to dedicators because it allowed the dedicator to publically acknowledge and advertise the relationship between the two parties. Votive offerings,

---

28 Van Wees, 30.
30 Zuiderhoek, 6; Seaford, 2 comments on the disinterestedness of gifts, saying, “Because requital is expected but not enforced, an act of generosity, even if seen as perhaps designed to elicit requital, may nevertheless retain an appearance (or even the reality) of gratifying disinterestedness, for there is always the possibility that it will not be requited.”
client statues, and civic honorary portraits could be moved, defaced, or destroyed at the
will of their dedicators if the relationship between the two parties needed to be dissolved
or manipulated.31

Gift-giving, whether in religious (votive), private (patron-client), or civic
euergetism) contexts, was a reciprocal exchange economy that, like trade, involved a
quid pro quo-mentality but with the expectation that these transactions would not be
immediately reciprocal.32 Greek gift-giving, whatever the context, necessitated long term
returns and prolonged the relationship between the two parties – both the original gift by
euergetes, deity, or patron and the return honors by city, religious devotee, or client were
means to negotiate the relationship between groups.33 Both the gifts themselves and the
placement of the gifts in highly visible locations seem to be essential components of the
enforcing reciprocity between the two parties in the practices of euergetism, religious
gift-giving, and even some aspects of patron-client relationships (which, because of the
scope of the paper, will not be addressed as fully as the former two patronage systems).
Thus, the dedications, architectural benefactions, and their placements are valuable
remnants of the mediations between individuals and cities, and are helpful in
reconstructing the ways in which gift-giving functioned in ancient Greece.

31 Tanner, “Portraits, Power, and Patronage in the Late Republic,” 32 discusses civic honorary portraits for
clientelism and euergetism. He states that such dedications could be defaced or destroyed in retribution.
32 Winterling, 35 & 36; Griffin, 100.
33 Umholtz, “Royal Patronage of Greek Architecture as an Instrument for Foreign Policy in the Hellenistic
Period,” 1 asserts that elite patronage was a way of maintaining relations between parties. Architecture
and other endowments could function as public relations, in a way (16). Similarly, Tanner, “Portraits,
Power, and Patronage in the Late Republic,” 36 states that gifts of honor, such as civic honorary
dedications, are able to assist in negotiations between two parties for mutual benefit. He also
acknowledges the symbolic significance of the placement of each civic honorary dedication – the
publicity was important in generating and sustaining the relationships (25, 32, and 46).
When considering that architectural endowments, civic honorary dedications, and gift exchanges in general were all forms of expressive communication between groups and individuals, it is clear that certain types of gifts were more advantageous to the donor based on the gifts’ manipulability. For example, architectural endowments were often considered less beneficial for *euergetai* because of the permanence and inflexibility. Once a building was constructed, the benefactor had little control over it, whereas with other forms of euergetism, such as funds for annual festivals, the gift was not permanent and could be revoked or suspended by *euergetai* if needed. Architectural endowments were most beneficial for benefactors when “the status of both ruler and city were high and they both expected their prosperity and good relationship to continue.”

Pendant to these disadvantages, the fruits of euergetism – both architectural endowments and civic honorary dedications – afforded numerous advantages for *euergetai* and *polies*. Although architectural donations were permanent and fixed, they were irrevocable evidence of the patron’s munificence toward the city. These endowments, because of their size and function, enjoyed a large audience; for that reason, architectural patronage was more honorific to the *euergetes* than other types of euergetism. Architectural endowments offered several benefits to their communities as well. The edifices could enhance the beauty and prestige of the city, free up city revenue for other purposes, occasionally generate revenue for the city (i.e., rents for rooms in stoas), and temporarily stimulate the economy by providing construction jobs. In

---

contrast to the permanent, fixed architectural benefactions, civic honorary dedications were more easily manipulated, making them ideal types of gifts for negotiating between cities and their benefactors. Nearly all euergetai were given statues from the city with long honorific inscriptions, which would be erected in highly visible public locations. These statues to the benefactors were a universal ‘thank you’, as well as an acknowledgement/acceptance of the endowment from the benefactor. The honors were not disinterested expressions of gratitude; they offered the citizen body the opportunity to make collective decisions regarding the patronage of the city by honoring each patron with varying sizes, qualities, and locations of civic honorary dedications. At the same time that these dedications mobilized collective decisions, the statuary and its honorary inscriptions glorified the euergetai to whom it was dedicated.

The practice of euergetism and its products afforded both advantages and disadvantages to cities and patrons alike. Euergetism did not emerge out of pure economic necessity following devolution of democracy; in fact, the architectural endowments of euergetai embellished cityscapes but, overall, did relatively little to improve living conditions or local economies. Thus, euergetism was not invented in response to economic crisis. Nor was euergetism an entirely new invention of the Hellenistic period in general, for as stated earlier, euergetism has its roots in gift-giving practices existing as early as the Archaic period. Euergetism did, however, promote the

---

36 Zuiderhoek, 6 & 9.
37 Ibid.; see also Zuiderhoek, 11 where the author emphasizes, “Making a public donation did not automatically turn you into an euergetes; only public acceptance of your gift and the granting of the appropriate honours could do that.”; Tanner, “Portraits, Power, and Patronage in the Late Republic,” 25-6.
39 Ibid., 30 discusses the importance of civic honorary portraiture in mobilizing collective decisions; see also Zuiderhoek, 6.
40 Zuiderhoek, Chapter 2, esp. 23.
new social hierarchies predominating Hellenistic through Late Imperial Greek cities. Although architectural endowments and civic honorary dedications associated with euergetism provided tangible effects for cities and benefactors, the system was primarily an ideological/political tool rather than an economic exchange system. The ideological functions of euergetism parallel those of preexisting systems of gift-exchange and patronage. Most importantly, the gifts of euergetism, like those of its antecedents, mobilized expressive communication in art and architecture, and while these gifts embellished their surroundings, they also mediated relationships, paid thanks, engendered reciprocity, and glorified individuals and communities.
CHAPTER 3: RELIGIOUS GIFT-GIVING AND RECIPROCITY IN ANCIENT GREECE

Up to this point, this study has outlined the practice of euergetism as a method for redistribution of wealth, impetus for public works, form of self-promotion, and means of social cohesion. Now the focus shifts to religious gift-giving, a related form of reciprocal exchange that served as a predecessor to and model for the types of communication and display facilitated by the dedicatory and architectural gifts born out of euergetism.

In ancient Greece, the entire practice of giving gifts to the gods, or *kharis*, was “founded – not merely by implication, but through numerous explicit statements – on the belief of hope that reciprocity of this kind is a reality.”\(^{41}\) Religious gift-giving involved a wide range of practices, including but not limited to animal sacrifices, financial donations, architectural patronage, and votive offerings. Votive offerings are the primary focus of this chapter. For the purposes of this paper, votives are taken to include figurines, ceramics, bronze metal works (tripods and statues), marble statuary, and reliefs; in other words, votives are a category of objects rarely reconstituted for other purposes, such as the livelihood of the sanctuary, as was often the case with precious

metals and tithes.\textsuperscript{42} While animal sacrifices functioned to feed the gods, votive offerings were intended to please the gods and engender favor on behalf of the donor.\textsuperscript{43}

Votive offerings comprise a unique strand of gift-giving. On the one hand, votives stood in for the traditional transient animal sacrifices, while on the other hand such objects evoked a sense of permanence in line with that of architecture.\textsuperscript{44} Through their permanence and high visibility, votive offerings served not only as alms to the gods, but also as advertisements for the dedicator. The wealth and good fortune, gratitude for divine benevolence, relationship with the deity, and piety of the patron could all be expressed in this single dedicatory act. Like the endowments and civic honorary dedications of euergetism, then, this religious practice employed gifts to delicately establish, mediate, and reciprocate relationships.

Neyrey and Saller, in discussing benefactor-client relationships in the Late Republic and patronage in the early Empire, respectively, assert several crucial characteristics of this exchange process, many of which seem equally applicable to religious gift-giving and euergetism.\textsuperscript{45} First, the relationship between the two parties is

\textsuperscript{42} Carla M. Antonaccio, “Dedications and the Character of Cult.” In Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian: Proceedings of the Sixth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, edited by Robin Hägg and Brita Alroth (Sävedalen, Sweden: Svenska institutet i Athen, 1997), 102 specifies that true gifts to the gods, such as votives, do not continue to circulate; they are permanently given to that deity or sanctuary.
unequal, thereby providing vertical social mobility for the client, community, or devotee. Euergetism and votive offerings both follow this same model: gift-exchanges were thought to affect upward social mobility.⁴⁶ Clear reciprocal exchanges through gifts are another defining characteristic of clientelism; there is a “simultaneous exchange of resources, usually instrumental, economic, and political on the part of the benefactor, while the client responds especially with solidarity and loyalty to the … patron.”⁴⁷ The same could be said of religious gift-giving, in which the gift provided alms to the deity, while at the same time it solicited future benevolence from the deity and advertised the successful relationship between the two parties.⁴⁸ Euergetism too involves simultaneous exchanges of resources; while the endowment beautifies the polis, it also demonstrates the wealth and status of the patron and solidifies that status within the social hierarchy.⁴⁹

Another tenet of clientelism, according to Neyrey, is that its gifts express the loyalty and obligations between the two parties – a characteristic that could undoubtedly apply to religious gift-giving and euergetism as well. At the same time that loyalty was expressed by the gifts and counter-gifts of the patrons and clients, there was also clear favoritism in the relationship.⁵⁰ This too could be said of euergetism wherein cities competed for favoritism among Hellenistic dynasts or other wealthy foreign

---

⁴⁷ Neyrey, 267-8 as qtd. by Osiek, 144.
⁴⁸ Bremer, 130.
⁴⁹ Zuiderhoek, 115-16.
⁵⁰ Neyrey, 267-8 as qtd. by Osiek, 144.
benefactors. Likewise, it could be suggested that religious devotees sought favoritism from the gods by means of elaborate votive offerings. Another defining characteristic of patron-client relationships was that honor was the principal commodity exchanged or exhibited through gift-giving. This quality, which certainly permeated euergetism and religious dedications as well, set apart gift-giving from trade because the gifts often contained more intangible, symbolic capital that could enhance the status of both the dedicator and recipient of the gift.

In order to express loyalty, solicit favoritism, exchange honor, and establish reciprocal relationships between devotee and deity, votive offerings, like other systems of gift-giving, were most effective when they were sizeable, elaborate, self-aggrandizing, and highly visible – ostentatious, in a word. Ostentation, therefore, was both religiously and socially effectual. By modern definitions, ostentation is comparable to affectation, but in the context of ancient Greek religious gift-giving, ostentation was not only self-serving. Ostentation was a standardized formula – even a requirement – for votives when the patron’s means allowed. When, for example, devotees sought the assistance of a deity, they first made their pleas to the gods with promises of material returns in the event of their prayer being answered. It was only after the devotees’ prayers were answered

51 Erskine, 71 says that competition among Greek cities for favoritism among Hellenistic euergetai was prevalent.
52 Neyrey, 267-8 as qtd. by Osiek, 144.
53 For the function of honor in reciprocal-exchange systems, see van Wees, 29-30.
54 As Spivey, 82, says “…ostentation was an essential facet of personal piety.” These votives (particularly statues) ‘carried strong social, not to mention economic, indicators: a ‘love of honour’ was thereby made evident in places where both gods and mortals would notice it.” On preferences for expensive votives, see Versnel, 68.
that they erected votives and invoked sacrifices.\textsuperscript{55} In other words, votives recompensed the deeds of the gods; they were rewards for actions \textit{already} performed rather than preemptory bribes.\textsuperscript{56} Often, though not always, the good fortune already experienced by the donor was the subject of representation in the votive object.\textsuperscript{57} To the donor, this ostentatious subject matter may have been associated with the act of appropriate thanksgiving just as much as with competitive display and self-aggrandizement. In addition to this ostentatious subject matter, the predilection for ostentation also permeated the style, materials, and placement of the votive object. When devotees upheld their end of the bargain by bestowing gifts on the gods, they certainly would not have wanted to skimp on the quality or quantity of their donations. Successful aid from the gods \textit{necessitated} generous thanksgiving offerings, and this moment of thanksgiving was considered the ideal time for further communication with the gods, such as requests for future assistance.\textsuperscript{58} Expensive materials, quality workmanship, and prime placement at

\textsuperscript{55} Bremer, 130. See also Versnel, 70, in which it is suggested that analyses of dedicatory inscriptions prove that votives were meant to “redeem a vow previously made in prayer.” Votives can also be tokens of gratitude, but with strings attached. Versnel, 72 reports, “Even if a prayer was answered and a votive offering was presented in redemption of the vow contained in that prayer, the matter was still not generally regarded as settled. Needless to say the believer also hoped for the help and protection of his deity in the future, and he was not ashamed to ask for it at the very moment when the god was thought to be particularly well disposed towards him through his delight at having received the votive offering.” W. H. D. Rouse, \textit{Greek Votive Offerings} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902), 97 echoes this same sentiment when discussing votives for military success, “It did happen once or twice that a leader, confident in his cause and his own right arm, paid [a] vow before the battle was fought; but on most of these occasions the deity seems to have mistaken his faith for presumption, and allowed him to be defeated…As a rule, this kind of faith did not appeal to the Greek; he waited to let the god fulfill his part of the bargain first. In some cases, however, the deity does not seem to have been displeased by an act of bravado.”

\textsuperscript{56} Versnel, 72 & 80. Bergman, 37; Bremer, 130.

\textsuperscript{57} Versnel, 72 & 74.

\textsuperscript{58} Spivey, 82 writes that the protocol for dedicating votives was to record a previous prayer made or request granted, while at the same time perpetuating other prayers.
highly visible locations within a sanctuary all contributed to the effectiveness of the votive object.

Furthermore, gifts to the gods were often semi-contractual in manner, especially in the language and format of their inscriptions – a fact which emphasizes the centrality of *reciprocity* in religious gift-giving.\(^59\) As contracts between devotee and deity, gifts to the gods were media of expressive communication between the two parties that provided expressions of gratitude, requests for services, aggrandizements of oneself, and negotiations between parties. These pseudo-contracts, however, were unenforceable, and they were based on the premise that the extending of gifts would generate goodwill, and therefore a return from the other party.\(^60\) Euergetism, as a form of reciprocal exchange, functioned on this same principle: freewill gestures of generosity were made in hopes of instigating or continuing reciprocal relationships.

Gift-exchange, therefore, is at the heart of both religious dedications and euergetism. This system enabled various segments of society to negotiate status and partnerships within a standardized, although flexible, set of processes and parameters. The gift, in religious and civic contexts, constituted the primary line of communication between devotee and deity, devotee and visitors, demos and *euergetes*, and demos and populace. The extravagance, inscription, and placement of the gift were all vital factors impacting the message conveyed and the reception of that message. Highly visible areas, such as sanctuaries, were ideal sites for dedicatory display. Eleusis, for example, was a profitable location for dedicatory display because of the cult’s international audience.

\(^{59}\) Spivey, 84.
\(^{60}\) Seaford, 2-3 states that one of the main features of reciprocity is that requital was unenforceable, thereby making the system reliant on generosity and voluntary returns.
drawn to the Mysteries each year. This was amplified in Imperial times, when the Romans hailed the Eleusinian Mysteries as the foundation of Greek and Roman civilization.\textsuperscript{61} It is to these gift-giving practices, as they appeared in the votives, civic honorary dedications, and architectural endowments at Eleusis, that the discussion now turns.

CHAPTER 4: INTRODUCTION TO EUERGETISM AT ELEUSIS

The remainder of this study focuses on the dedications and architectural endowments from the sanctuary of Demeter at Eleusis as a case study for diachronic change in patronage structures and gift-giving practices. Eleusis provides ample evidence for gift-exchange over a millennium of constant inhabitation and cult use. Eleusis, like the many other interstate sanctuaries, was an “agreed upon venue in which to mediate relationships within the community, and between communities, through the worship of the gods,” making it an ideal site for studying gift-giving economies as forms of mediation between multiple parties and as forces driving social cohesion. Ultimately, the dedications at Eleusis should be understood as standardized forms of expressive communication between *euergetai*, deities, communities, and votive patrons.

The earliest remnants of gift-giving at Eleusis are small scale votive offerings to the gods, consisting of small terracotta figurines with bird-like features and pottery excavated in the Sub-Geometric pyres (Appendix A, Geometric through Archaic finds at Eleusis). Archaic votive remains from the sanctuary include pottery, terracotta and bronze figurines of females, architectural sculpture, one large scale votive relief, two athletic dedications, four basins, three dedicatory pillars, two bases for statues now destroyed, and one monument (Appendix B, Archaic and Classical Dedications). Far more votive objects from the Classical period have survived, including numerous reliefs.

---

62 Antonaccio, 110.
63 Spivey, 82.
freestanding sculptures, statuettes of Demeter and Kore, figurines of initiates, ceramics, and votive pinakes, such as the famous Ninnion Tablet (see also Appendix B). It is in the Late Classical period that dedications in honor of civil servants first appear at Eleusis, and in the Hellenistic period and later, with the coming of euergetism, that civic honorary dedications for euergetai proliferated at the sanctuary (Appendix C, Hellenistic and Late Republican Dedications; Appendix D, Roman Imperial Dedications).

The earliest architectural benefaction at Eleusis that can be definitely called euergetism itself is the Lesser Propylaia of Appius Claudius Pulcher from the Late Republican period, which is discussed in Chapter 7. Subsequently, Eleusis experienced a renaissance when the site received numerous euergetism endowments themselves in Roman Imperial times. At that same time the sanctuary became a forum for advertising political alliances and civic munificence in a manner strikingly similar to the patron-client honorary dedications of the Late Republican period.

An examination of the surviving votive offerings, dedicatory remains, and architectural endowments at Eleusis elucidates not only the ways in which patronage systems changed over time, but also how such systems were instigated, commemorated, reciprocated, and mediated through the objects of both religious and civic gift-giving.
CHAPTER 5: RELIGIOUS GIFT-GIVING AT ELEUSIS

Votive objects could be dedicated for numerous reasons and occasions, and often the particular circumstance prescribed the appropriate subject matter or class of object. By looking at the circumstances of dedications and their constituent votive offerings, we see that some occasions are more prevalent at Eleusis. Based on the surviving dedicatory bases, inscriptions, and objects, the most common offerings at Eleusis involved commemorations of initiation into the Mysteries, tributes to the agricultural goddesses, and, increasingly in the fourth century, honorific statuary for individuals who provided exemplary service to the community. The dedicatory objects from the fourth century B.C.E. on at Eleusis attest to a shift in gifting practices: objects functioning as thanksgiving offerings to deities were supplemented with civic dedications to local community benefactors. It appears that the language of religious gift-giving was translated into the counter-gifts erected in the name of euergetai.

In order to dissect this transformation from religious to secular gift-exchange systems, we must first examine the types and occasions inspiring religious gift-giving and their incarnations at Eleusis. Throughout the sanctuary’s history, a relatively small number of gods are represented in the votive dedications and architectural adornments at

---

65 Jeremy J. Tanner, “Art as Expressive Symbolism: Civic Portraits in Classical Athens,” Cambridge Art Journal 2, no. 2 (1992):176. This trend has been noted throughout the Greek world. Tanner discusses the appearance of portraiture in the fourth century as a result of the waning of democracy. He suggests that these honorary portraits were a form of expressive communication, and that these were not just reflecting the “decline of the democratic spirit” (Dontas 1977, 86) and a corruption of customs for the benefit of wealthy strong men. This shift from religious to civic offerings at sanctuaries has traditionally been explained as a loss of religious piety, a corruption of the religion. It seems that there may be other factors at play here outside of (or even contrary to) disillusionment with the gods, which will be discussed in the following section.
Eleusis, including but not limited to Demeter, Kore, Plouton, Hades, Hectate, Triptolemos, Iachkos, Eubouleus, and, occasionally the legendary founder of the mysteries, Eumolpos. In some cases, the type of object or the subject matter depicted can be indicative of the occasion of dedication. The most recognizable of these are votives commemorating the Mysteries, votives celebrating athletic and choragic events (Eleusis had both a stadium and theater), and dedications memorializing career honors. Victory in battle and games were common occasions for thanksgivings to the gods, not just at Eleusis but throughout the Greek world; typical dedications included war spoils, instruments of their victory (whether athletic or military), sculptural representations of spoils, and athletic prizes such as trophies, tripods, amphorae, and crowns. Initially, athletic dedications showing the victor or instruments of his athletic prowess were small in scale, but this class of objects rapidly developed from small figurines into life-size sculptures. Buildings, statues of deities, and representations of the deity blessing the event were common dedications for battles and many other occasions. Money from spoils could also be donated, though it was less desirable as it provided no permanent memorial of the victory. Commemoration of musical and scenic victories was often similar to that of athletics, with dedications often consisting of objects of the victor’s trade, instruments of success, or prizes, such as theatrical masks, portions of the scene, and tripods, respectively. Disease and calamity were frequent circumstances that

---

66 Spivey, 85 & 88; Rouse, Chapter III: War, esp. 95 & 97-8. Rouse, 145-6 discusses how tripods become the most common and standard dedication. For more on dedications for games, consult Rouse, Chapter IV: Games and Contests, especially pages 151, 161-3.

67 Spivey, 88.

68 Rouse, Chapter III: War, esp.118.

69 Rouse, Chapter IV: Games and Contests, esp. 162.
necessitated dedications to the gods, and such occasions provided one of the few exceptions in which a votive may have been dedicated before the dedicatory’s prayers had been answered.⁷⁰ Statues of healing deities, models of impaired body parts, and reliefs of the sick receiving healing deities’ blessings were prolific.⁷¹

In addition to personal or collective victories, significant events in a patron’s life may elicit votive dedications, including civic or religious appointments as well as rites of passage, such as puberty, marriage, inheritance, and childbirth.⁷² The proliferation of votive acknowledgments of civic appointments was a rather late development comparatively. The Peisistratids may have been the first to commemorate their ranks with two altars in the late 6th century,⁷³ but it was not until the fourth century that this practice proliferated. At this point, civic honorary dedications, as well as annual dedications, seem to have become a requirement for officials to acknowledge their religious or civic appointments.⁷⁴ Dedications for successful careers seem to have become more inclusive over time, so that all types of professions, from priests to craftsmen, were found commemorating their good fortunes with votives.⁷⁵

Other occasions for votives were not based on the dedicatory’s personal life but were instead dictated by the religious calendar and agricultural cycles.⁷⁶ These

⁷⁰ For occasions for dedications, see Spivey, 89 and Rouse, Chapter V: Disease and Calamity. On the timetable of dedications for illnesses, see Rouse, 191.
⁷¹ Rouse, Chapter V: Disease and Calamity.
⁷³ Rouse, 259.
⁷⁴ Ibid., 251-263. The largest number of these dedications comes from priestly classes.
⁷⁵ Spivey, 92.
⁷⁶ Spivey, 84; Rouse, Chapter II.
circumstances are most illustrative of the dedications at Eleusis, which consisted of considerable numbers of annual first-fruit dedications as well as abundant votive commemorations of initiation into the Mysteries. First-fruits, or *aparche*, were dedicated to agricultural deities in thanksgiving for successful harvests and in hopes of future fecundity; such tithes could take a number of forms: the actual fruits of, proceeds from, or artistic representation of the harvest could be donated to the deity.\(^{77}\)

Because of the myth of Persephone, Demeter, and Triptolemos and their subsequent gifts of grain and agricultural cultivation, Eleusis was particularly appropriate for first fruits offerings; for some time, in fact, the giving of first-fruits to Eleusis was enforced by Athenian decree starting in the second half of the fifth century.\(^{78}\) *Aparche* can be more challenging to reconstruct because of the perishable nature of the dedications themselves as well as the repurposing of proceeds from selling these harvests. At Eleusis, three *siroi*, storerooms, were constructed beyond the Kimonian fortification walls in the later 5\(^{th}\) century, which bear witness to increased *aparche* dedications.\(^{79}\) The proceeds from these types of donations, however, were stored in Athens to be overseen by the *epistatai*; these surplus funds could be employed for both Eleusinian and Athenian endeavors.\(^{80}\) The *epistatai* continued to manage the goddesses’ finances well into the

\(^{77}\) Spivey, 84; Rouse, Chapter I, esp. 41, 92, & 94.


\(^{80}\) Cavanaugh, xiii & xiv; Kevin Clinton, “Eleusinian Treasures in the Late Fifth and Early Fourth Centuries.” In *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on his Eightieth Birthday*, edited by Alan L. Boegehold, et al. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1984), 55, 57-8, & 60 discusses the routine transfer of capital
fourth century. During the Hellenistic period, first fruit dedications seem to have waned, and it is not until Hadrian that the practice is reinstituted, as evidenced by inscriptions commemorating these types of offerings during the second century C.E. (Appendix D, C.1 & 2).

Both the Greater and Lesser Mysteries were festivals soliciting liberal offerings at the sanctuary. Because of the initiation process, the Greater Mysteries functioned not only as an annual event of the religious calendar, but also as a rite of passage. In many cases, neither votive iconography nor dedicatory inscriptions reveal the circumstances of donation at Eleusis, so that sometimes it is unclear whether a votive was intended for the Greater or Lesser Mysteries, the Thesmophoria, the Eleusinia, or other occasions. Yet, there are certain classes of objects that can be most likely attributed to the Greater Mysteries alone, namely representations of initiates, Hades, the duo Theos (Hades) and Thea (Kore), Iakchos, and Eubouleus. In the first half of the fourth century depictions of initiates, or mystai, became prevalent (Appendix B, # 12, 14, 17, 18, 23, & 26; Appendix

---


(58) During the Hellenistic period, according to Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 152-55, the Mysteries had largely lost their prominence and first fruits dedications were mostly abandoned.

Without the income of visitors and their gifts, building activity at the sanctuary was rather static.
In the Archaic and Classical periods, initiates did not appear alone on reliefs, although individual initiates were commemorated by way of figurines and small-scale statues, such as Statuette of a Boy Initiate (§ 14). Mystai are most often represented as a group or even a sizeable crowd, each participant barefooted and holding a torch, as is exemplified on a statue base ornamented with reliefs on all four sides, The Procession of the Mystai (§ 12). Another recurring motif exclusive to the Greater Mysteries is the theoxenia, a dining party of mortals and gods. Here, Theos and Thea are typically depicted reclining on couches, while a small group of initiates, in diminished scale, stand to the side (§ 17 & 18).

Occasionally the initiates accompanied a larger party of dining deities in theoxenia scenes, as witnessed in the Votive Relief of Lysimachides (Appendix C, § 5), in which mother-and-daughter duo Demeter and Kore appear with the coupled Theos and Thea. Here, Kore appears twice but in different incarnations. As it appears in Eleusinian iconography, this contrast between Kore as consort of Plouton and Kore as Thea seems to support the proposition that the Greater Mysteries evolved out of the agricultural festival, the Thesmophoria, and is an instance in which votives can be telling of changes in the character of the Eleusinian cults. For both festivals, the Rape of

---

82 Mylonas, Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries, 199.
84 Clinton, Myth and Cult, 61, although unspecified when this shift in Eleusinian cults occurred, the Mysteries “seem to be relatively new, created out of many of the constituent elements of the Thesmophoria and other such festivals...Another important departure consists in a new and different focus. While the Mysteries kept the fundamentally agrarian concerns of the Thesmophoria, at least on a
Persephone was the central myth. Originally, however, the myth was adapted from the Thesmophoria for the Greater Mysteries so that Kore’s voyage into the underworld was protracted: the maiden did not stop upon descending into the earth and meeting Plouton (the minimum figurative ‘depth’ of the underworld that would allow her regeneration and the agricultural symbolism) and instead continued to the deepest depths of the underworld where she and Hades ruled as king (Theos) and queen (Thea) of the underworld. Initiates could appeal to Thea upon the occasion of their entry to the underworld; thus, the story of Kore’s agricultural regeneration was given an additional layer of symbolism to create this adapted myth, which then was associated with the final destiny of the soul.  

Apparently the pairs were not interchangeable: the agrarian Kore and Plouton had distinct functions apart from the magistrates of the souls in the underworld, Persephone and Hades, or Thea and Theos. These distinctions are not attested in the epigraphical record, but the characters seem to have been carefully differentiated by their attributes and the settings in which they are depicted.  

Plouton’s attributes consist of the cornucopia, scepter, and wheat stalks, and he is often accompanied by both Demeter and Kore. An amphora by the Oinokles Painter (not from Eleusis) depicts Plouton with a cornucopia and scepter chasing Kore (Fig. 2; see also the Red-Figure Tablet from Eleusis, Appendix B, # 5). Typical attributes of Hades, on the other hand, include a rhyton or other dining ware, as well as an absence of any agricultural implements; most often, however, Hades is identified by his pose and setting, 

85 Clinton, Myth and Cult, 61.
86 Ibid., 61-2 & 105.
reclining on a couch bare-chested next to Persephone (see Appendix B, # 17 & 18, and Appendix C, # 5).  

The Lakrateides Relief, like theoxenia scenes, distinguishes between the agrarian Kore and Plouton and the magistrates of the souls in the underworld, Persephone and Hades. This monumental relief was dedicated by Lakrateides, an Eleusinian priest, on behalf of his family members, who are depicted as votaries. This relief depicts nearly the entire Eleusinian pantheon with inscriptions identifying each individual. Included (from left to right) are a boy and woman (their inscriptions are not preserved), a seated Demeter next to a standing pair identified as Kore and Plouton. To their right is Triptolemos, seated, and on his right is the standing pair, Thea and Theos. To their right, a long haired, torch bearing youth wearing a short chiton stands (possibly to be identified as Iakchos or Eubouleus; his inscription is not preserved). In shallow relief in the background, Lakrateides, the dedicator, is included among the Eleusinian deities. Here, it is clear through the double representation of Kore/Persephone that she has two aspects, and that her two partners, Plouton and Hades are not interchangeable.

Like dedications featuring Theos and Thea, votives representing Iakchos or Eubouleus are exclusive to the Greater Mysteries as well. Iakchos, because he had only one duty as sacred herald of the procession from Athens to Eleusis along the Sacred Way,

---

87 Clinton, Myth and Cult, 105.
88 Mylonas, Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries, 197.
89 R. Heberdey, “Das Weiherelief des Lakrateides aus Eleusis.” In Festschrift Benndorf (Vienna, 1899), 111-16 as cited by Clinton, Myth and Cult, 51 as the only publication to date to deal with this relief in detail.
90 Clinton, Myth and Cult, 60, states that Eubouleus (as opposed to Zeus Eubouleus/Bouleus) was worshipped solely in the context of the Mysteries at Eleusis. See also page 66 for comments on Iakchos at Eleusis, and the Dionysiac quality thought to have colored the procession along the Sacred Way from Athens to Eleusis.
can be associated only with the Mysteries and not with any other celebrations at Eleusis. One of the earliest representations of Iakchos to survive at Eleusis is the *Ninnion Tablet* (Appendix B, # 26), in which Iakchos is depicted wearing a *himation* over a tunic and carrying double torches as he leads the initiates to Demeter, who is seated on the Mirthless Rock." Apparently as the initiates processed along the Sacred Way, “iakchos” was their ritual cry. This performance seems to have ultimately become personified as a deity, thus Iakchos is represented as the sacred escort of the initiates on their journey to the Mysteries at Eleusis. He, like the initiates, wears a myrtle crown.

Eubouleus, Persephone’s escort back from Hades, shares many attributes in common with Iakchos, making differentiating between the two in votive representations difficult. Both Eubouleus and Iakchos are leaders of sacred journeys, represented as young adults with long hair, and they both don knee-length or shorter garments and boots while bearing torches. Iakchos wears a *himation* over a short tunic with a myrtle wreath in his hair, while Eubouleus is clothed in a long sleeved tunic alone. Of these two sacred escorts, the company with which they are represented is most indicative of their identity: Eubouleus is represented with Theos and Thea, while Iakchos is in the company of mortal initiates, who also wear *himatia* and myrtle wreaths. Two busts thought to be Eubouleus or, alternatively, Iakchos (Appendix C, # 2 & 3) were found in the Sacred Precinct of the Mirthless Rock and near the Telesterion, respectively. In these cases,

---

92 Ibid., 66. Iakchos was also an epithet for Dionysos, but the Iakchos who led the initiates at Eleusis is distinct from Dionysos.
93 Ibid., 56, 64, 66-7, 71-3.
94 Ibid., 67-8 describes the typical garb of initiates, and 71 asserts the importance of the escort’s company in identifying him.
identification of the deity cannot be certain due to the absence of attributes, inscriptions, or accompaniment, although most commentaries have tended to prefer Eubouleus, based on similar busts found throughout Attica.95

Another figure featuring prominently in Eleusinian myth and iconography is Triptolemos. Demeter, upon the return of Kore from Plouton’s chthonic lair, instructed Triptolemos in the procedures agricultural cultivation, and he traveled the world spreading this knowledge. Triptolemos was celebrated as part of the Thesmophoria at Eleusis, though his role in the Mysteries is uncertain. Most often, Triptolemos was shown as a bearded man or young adult, holding stalks of grain in one hand and a scepter or staff in the other while seated on his winged chariot with serpents entwined about the wheels, as can be seen in several votives from Eleusis in the Classical periods (Appendix B, # 10, 11, 24, & 25).96 Prior to 480 B.C.E. Triptolemos seems to have had a strictly agrarian function in both the literary and pictorial records, and thus it may have been possible that Triptolemos did not play any role in the Mysteries. Dedications featuring his image before 480 B.C.E. may, therefore, have been set up on the occasion of the Thesmophoria.97 After 480 B.C.E., however, Triptolemos is not only associated with the spreading of agricultural knowledge, but also with extending the invitation to the Mysteries to the rest of the world.98

---

95 Gerda Schwarz, “Zum Sogenannten Eubouleus,” Getty Museum Journal 2 (1975):71-84; Clinton, Myth and Cult, 57-8, 70, & 135 suggests an alternative interpretation: A bust that is usually interpreted as Eubouleus (Eubouleus, Catalog, Sculpture, No. 4) was found in the precinct of the Agelastos Petra, but the association with the Agelastos Petra would allow Iakchos to be an alternative interpretation.” (70)

96 Clinton, Myth and Cult, 41-2 & 45-6 describes the most common attributes of Triptolemos, both in Attica and elsewhere.

97 Ibid., 58.

98 Clinton, “The Eleusinian Sanctuary during the Peloponnesian War,” 52.
Eleusis, then, presents an unusual situation: the majority of votive dedications were not in thanksgiving for personal requests granted by deities; rather, first fruits, rites of passage, and the religious calendar seem to be the primary occasions on which votives were deposited at the sanctuary. The aforementioned votives, with their representations of Persephone, Hades, Theos, Thea, Iakchos, Eubouleus, and/or initiates, are associated with the Mysteries at Eleusis alone, and thus are gifts to the gods in commemoration of this famed rite of passage. Representations of Demeter and Kore were more multifunctional as votive objects; as the two main goddesses of the sanctuary and all of its subsidiary events, depictions of Demeter and Kore were able to serve as mementos of the Mysteries as all-purpose dedications for any occasion at Eleusis.

Even though most votives at Eleusis in the Geometric through Hellenistic period commemorate agricultural fecundity, rites of passage, and the religious calendar, there are several exceptions. The Votive Relief of Eukrates (Appendix B, # 16) paid tribute to Demeter for restoring the vision of Eukrates, the patron. The representation of oversized and simplified representations of body parts in conjunction with a deity recalls votive plaques to healing deities. Demeter herself was not a healing deity, but the revelation of the Great Mysteries was said to have culminated in a great vision for the initiates.99 The Votive Relief of Eukrates, then, may have been dedicated in honor of religious – and not literal – healing. While the format of Eukrates’ plaque places it in contrast to the more common occasions for votive dedications at Eleusis (the Mysteries), an alternative interpretation could be that this plaque does, in fact, commemorate the brilliant revelation experienced by initiates during the Mysteries.

99 Kerenyi, 97-8; Clinton, Eleusis, the Inscriptions in Stone, 108.
Thanksgiving offerings to the gods on the occasions of athletic and choragic victories have also been found at Eleusis, which should not be surprising given the stadium and theater at the site. The earliest surviving athletic commemorations to be published are the *Terracotta Geometric Chariots* (Appendix A, # 2). In the Archaic period, a race post (or possibly the racetrack itself) was dedicated by Alkiphron (Appendix B, A.1), and a discus (Appendix B, A.2), presumably the instrument of the victor’s success, was dedicated in thanksgiving at the sanctuary. A pillar erected by Kydeides Kydistratou Peiraieus commemorated his victory in the Greater Eleusinia sometime in the first half of the fourth century B.C.E. (Appendix B, F.1), and a plaque in honor of a victory in the synoris at Eleusis (Appendix B, F.2) from the first half of the fifth century. A statue of a young athlete from the Roman period (Appendix D, # 6) may have been in recognition of an athletic victory at Eleusis as well. Three inscriptions attesting to choragic commemorations at Eleusis are found in the Classical (Appendix B, I.1 & I.2) and Hellenistic periods (Appendix C, C.1). Commemorations of military victories are also attested in the votive remains of the sanctuary, such as the *Dedication by a Hipparch* (Appendix B, # 7), one inscription from the Classical period (Appendix B, J.1), and six inscriptions from the Hellenistic (Appendix C, D.1-6).

Six honorific decrees have been found at Eleusis dating from the mid-fourth century to end of the Late Classical (Appendix B, I.1-6). According to Mylonas, these likely would have been erected in front of the Bouleuterion, located along the temenos.

---

wall in the south edge of the sacred court, next to the sanctuary’s south gate. The practice of dedicating honorific decrees seems to be related to earlier practices of erecting votives to the gods in thanksgiving for career successes. Although these decrees can be interpreted as offerings to the gods, they also had civic functions. These Late Classical dedicatory types become even more common in the Hellenistic period.

The resulting conclusion is that prior to the mid-fourth century, the majority of surviving votive objects and their bases seem to have been dedicated largely on the occasion of the Mysteries or in thanksgiving for agricultural fecundity. After the fourth century, and even more so in the third century when euergetism was thriving, the number of dedicatory bases (in most cases, bases for statues) were set up on the occasion of civic or career honors of notable individuals. The inclusion of honors to humans with those to deities at sanctuaries and other religious sites has been attributed by some to the downfall of democracy in the fourth century, the rise of the powerful individuals, and disillusionment with religion as a result of social turmoil. However, an examination of the continuity and change in religious and civic gifts from democratic versus imperial times seems to suggest that civic honorary dedications are not necessarily evidence of a disenchanted society, nor did such gifting practices depart drastically from religious gifting. Instead, civic honorary dedications translated the preexisting formulae of religious gift-exchange and revived Archaic principles of reciprocity in efforts to legitimize and stabilize Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic social hierarchies.

101 Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 153-4 states that a Bouleuterion existed at Eleusis in the aforementioned location in the fourth century. During the third century B.C.E the fourth-century structure was replaced. Mylonas, 154 states that this was the specified location for honorific decrees. Another Bouleuterion was constructed in the same location in Roman times.
CHAPTER 6: HELLENISTIC TRANSLATIONS: RELIGIOUS GIFTS TO CIVIC HONORS

Relatively little building activity took place at Eleusis during the Hellenistic period when the Athenian economy could no longer support building campaigns throughout Attica. The small fort atop the west hill, the Bouleuterion, and the porch on the front of the Telesterion by the architect Philon under the instruction of Demetrios of Phaleron, were constructed, but none of these projects can be decisively considered euergetism because so little evidence survives regarding their patronage. In terms of religious gift-giving, the same practices were maintained: gifts were given to the gods in thanks for answered prayers, gifts often represented initiates or members of the Eleusinian pantheon, and the occasions for their dedications often influenced the motifs of the objects themselves. During the Hellenistic period, the most significant change in dedications at Eleusis seems to be the proliferation of civic honorary dedications—twenty-seven date to this period, while only six were attested in the Classical and Late Classical periods (for Classical & Late Classical, see Appendix B, I.1-6; for Hellenistic,

---

102 Jennifer Lynne Palinkas, “Eleusinian Gateways: Entrances to the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion in Athens” (PhD diss., Emory University, 2008), 148-51 & 155.
103 For more on the Porch of Philon, consult Lacey D. Caskey, “Notes on Inscriptions from Eleusis Dealing with the Building of the Porch of Philon.” American Journal of Archaeology 9, no. 2 (1905):147-156. See also Mylonas, Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries, Chapter VI, 130-54 for more on construction at Eleusis from the fourth century and Hellenistic Era at Eleusis. Consult also Kourouniotes, 66 for fourth century building at the sanctuary. Palinkas, 156 discusses the Hellenistic bouleuterion constructed in the late fourth century B.C.E.
104 Parker, 112 argues that gifts to the gods functioned on the principle of engendering favor and providing thanksgiving to the gods throughout Archaic, Early Classical, Classical, and Late Classical society. When discussing the changes in the Hellenistic period, he says, “Nor is it in fact the case that kharis lost all importance as a social principle in post-classical Greece, though its sphere of application doubtless changed enormously. It was in the Hellenistic period that kharites were re-interpreted, both speculatively and in cult, as symbols of gratitude.” Thus, in the same way that religious votives were symbols of gratitude, civic honorary dedications paid respects to public benefactors.
Thus, the majority of this section focuses on civic honorary dedications, and the ways in which they borrow and depart from Archaic through Late Classical gifting traditions at Eleusis.

Civic honorary dedications typically consisted of portraits, crowns, and honorific decrees. The rise in this type of dedications at sanctuaries such as Eleusis has been attributed to the rise in euergetism endowments in the Greek cities beginning in the Hellenistic period. Because these civic honorary dedications praised human achievements instead of divine intervention and were placed in religious locations, they have been cited as manifestations of a decline in religious piety in Hellenistic Greece.

---

105 Zuiderhoek, 4 & 6 discusses the abundance of civic honorary dedications in the Hellenistic period.
107 According to Keesling, 396 “Though the Athenian demos emerges as a patron of votive statues in the Late Archaic period, the majority of inscribed, monumental sanctuary dedications of the Archaic and Classical periods attest to the patronage of private individuals.” In the Hellenistic period, on the other hand, civic honorary portraits dedicated by the deme appear in large numbers. For more, see the sentiments of Metzler and Donats, as retold by Tanner in “Art as Expressive Symbolism,” 176 (note 109).
108 D. Metzler, Porträt und Gesellschaft; über die Entstehung des griechischen Porträts in der Klassik, (Munster: privately published, 1971), 69 & 151, as paraphrased in Tanner, “Art as Expressive Symbolism” 176, says “…the practice whereby the Athenian demos gave honorific portraits to its leading citizens, most notably generals, in the fourth century B.C. marks a decline in Athenian civic values with their strongly collective emphasis, disturbed by the rise of overmighty individuals.” Similarly, G. Donats, “Bemerkungen über einige Attische Statuengebilde der Klassischen Zeit.” In Festschrift fur Frank Brommer (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1977), 79-92 as quoted by Tanner, “Art as Expressive Symbolism,” 176 said “in the fourth century, internal weakness of the polis and a decline of the democratic spirit led to dependence on strong individuals, who consequently received honours such as portraits. “ Customs were corrupted, in the political realm mob-rule and individualism reigned.” Likewise, Gretchen Umholtz, “Architraval Arrogance? Dedicatory Inscriptions in Greek Architecture of the Classical Period.” Hesperia 71, no. 3 (2002):261 challenges the typical interpretations of this patronage practice in her essay on the proliferation of dedicatory inscriptions in the second half of the fourth century B.C.E. She says, “inscribing personal names on the architraves of Greek buildings is not the product of foreign influence or royal arrogance, nor an appropriation by individuals of rights previously exercised only by the state, but rather a natural and predictable manifestation of widespread Greek votive and epigraphical habits of long standing.” (Italics mine, 261) She goes on to say that the proliferation of architraval inscriptions is usually wrongly interpreted as a big change, a decline in morals, and symptomatic of the rise of the individual over the polis (261-2). Ultimately, she suggests that these dedicatory practices are continuations of long standing Greek trends (263), and that “nothing in the wording or formulas of these dedications distinguishes them from inscriptions on dedications in other media” or in other times.( 272)
Ancestors to civic honorary dedications, however, existed in sacred locations as early as the 6th century with the Peisistratids, who dedicated two altars in celebration of their rule of Athens. In democratic Athens civic portraits were awarded to notable individuals in the Agora and on the Acropolis. As discussed in the previous section, alms to the gods for success of all kinds – including career successes – in permanent, visible, material form was common in sanctuaries. Thus, civic honorary dedications and religious commemoration of career success have their origins prior to the Hellenistic period and the institutionalization of euergetism. Based on these antecedents, the practice of civic honorary dedications seems to have been a translation of a preexisting practice in religious gift-giving that was particularly well suited to honoring munificence of euergetai in the same way that divine benevolence had been honored in religious votives.

---

109 Rouse, 259.
110 According to Metzler, 69 & 151 as cited in Tanner, “Art as Expressive Symbolism”, 176, the fourth century saw a rise in portraits of military officials, which Metzger connects to the weakening of democracy and reliance on powerful military men.
111 Rouse, 259-63.
112 Charlotte Wikander, “The Practicalities of Ruler Cult.” In *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian: Proceedings of the Sixth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult*, edited by Robin Hägg and Brita Alroth (Svedalen, Sweden: Svenska institutet i Athen, 2005), 113-120 seems to echo this same sentiment. She states that when considering the epigraphical evidence on religious honorifics given to Hellenistic rulers, these honors “seem to have fitted effortlessly into already established patterns for Greek poleis. Thus, no really new formulas for the expression of gratitude on the part of the individual cities seem to have been created, although the relationship between Greek cities and monarchical Graeco-Macedonian rulers were completely new.” (113) Furthermore, Wikander’s article focuses on disproving the long-held notion that the ruler-cult was strange and new to Greek society, a phenomenon that was not true religion in the Hellenistic. Her article focuses on the normative aspects of the Hellenistic ruler cult from Alexander’s death to 280 B.C.E. (114). Ultimately, she finds that the ruler cult fit naturally into polis religion: “altars, cult statues, pomai, sacrifices and agones” remained typical practices in the Hellenistic, and “Whereas the granting of divine honours to a living ruler may seem problematic to modern research, there can be no doubt that no need was felt to design anything new pertaining to such a cult. The traditional pattern was followed in every respect.” (118)
In the Archaic period, Greek society was characterized by reciprocity/gift-exchange rather than commercial exchange.\textsuperscript{113} As the laws and monetary systems of the state became developed in the classical periods, gift-exchange was replaced by market exchange in the political and economic realms, although gift-exchange remained deeply embedded in social and religious practices.\textsuperscript{114} In classical Athens, politicians engaging in gift-exchange was cause for punishment because it was thought to conflict with democratic egalitarian ideals.\textsuperscript{115} With the dissolution of democratic government in the Hellenistic period, social, political, and, to some extent, economic systems returned to pre-democratic traditions: reciprocity – manifested now as euergetism – became the driving force providing for civic needs, glorifying the city, establishing alliances, mediating relationships, and legitimizing new social hierarchies.\textsuperscript{116}

According to Jeremy Tanner, civic honorary dedications were derived from preexisting forms of expressive communication, and they do not represent the corruption of democratic values or religious piety.\textsuperscript{117} In fact, civic honorary dedications, and euergetism in general, allowed the city to maintain a semblance of democracy by making collective decisions about rewarding outside benefactors. Thus, a democratic assembly remained intact beneath an Imperial overlord. \textit{Euergetai} benefitted from this system as well: the civic honorary dedications raised their status and advertised their munificence, while at the same time, collective recognition of their generosity, as decided by the

\textsuperscript{113} Seaford, 6-7.
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., 6 & 10-11.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid., 7-8.
\textsuperscript{116} Van wees, 45.
\textsuperscript{117} Tanner, “Art as Expressive Symbolism,” 179.
demos, solidified benefactors’ superior social standing. Tanner describes this type of collective decision making as a system of “reward symbolism,” saying:

“Far from being an indication of the decline of the polis and civic values, as traditional art historians have argued, the development of this system of expressive symbolism in the fourth century B.C.E. represents a fuller institutionalization of the normative culture of the democratic polis. These expressive symbols enabled the communication of shared affective meanings between the Athenian demos and its leading men within the framework of a set of norms which was integrated with the common values which constituted the Athenians as a collectivity. This served to enhance the level of solidarity between the demos and its leaders, the levels of commitment to collective values, and the capacity of the Athenian polis to realize collective goals, since members of the elite were thereby better motivated to participate in the political activity and military undertakings of the city.”

If civic honorary dedications were not token gestures of a dependent citizen body, but reward symbolism derived from preexisting gifting systems that allowed the demos to realize collective goals, why were these memorials set up in sanctuaries, such as Eleusis? It seems that the location of this new strain of dedications, like the civic honorary dedications themselves, was derived from anterior traditions, namely, votive offerings to the gods in thanksgiving for career successes. Sacred spaces had been the accepted milieu for commemorating victories of all kinds as well as providing thanksgiving for intervention from the gods, and these sites had the added benefit of being inviolable and highly visible. Therefore, civic dedications are not necessarily replacements to religious practices, manipulations of sacred space, or political ploys fronting as votives; instead,

---

118 Tanner, “Art as Expressive Symbolism,” 179.
civic rewards might be thought of as socially affective continuations of commemorating personal career success and rewarding munificence.\textsuperscript{119}

Rather than empty gestures, civic honorary dedications were transmissions between city and \textit{euergetes} that contained more than expressions of gratitude for previous actions, for these dedications could also solicit future assistance from the benefactor based on the appearance, location, and upkeep of the statue. If, for example, a \textit{euergetes} displeased his fellow citizens, his statue could be removed or even destroyed, which would have been an embarrassment (not to mention counteractive) for elite benefactors who sought, first and foremost, increased status and social harmony through their endowments.\textsuperscript{120} Furthermore, the placement, material, size, and style were all aspects of civic honorary dedications that were decided upon collectively, approved for certain locations; the dedications, then, were essentially public advertisements of the level of honors the city thought fit for the deeds of each particular \textit{euergetes}.\textsuperscript{121} By controlling the appearance and visibility of honorary dedications, the city was able to wield a significant amount of power to secure future patronage from \textit{euergetai}. At a time when the egos of many Greek cities depended on elite munificence, these statues, by mobilizing public opinion, were a way for the citizen body to establish reciprocal, rather than parasitic, relationships with elites.

\textsuperscript{119} Umholtz, “Architraval Arrogance,” strongly supports the notion that the system of patronage, how it appeared, and how it was commemorated was a continuation of pre-existing systems of communication in her research on architectural dedications by private patrons in the second half of the fourth century and into the Hellenistic and not with civic honorary dedications directly.
\textsuperscript{120} Tanner, “Art as Expressive Symbolism,” 179.
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid. discusses how the placement was determined by law, and that the placement would communicate additional levels of meaning to the honoree and citizen body. Later, on page 180, Tanner specifies that the form and style were “civically regulated and certainly read and judged in terms of civic moral cultural rather than in terms of specifically aesthetic values.”
In terms of architectural patronage at Eleusis, several smaller structures are dated to the fourth-century and Hellenistic period, but the source of their patronage is unknown, and therefore, whether these were gifts from *euergetai* is possible but improvable. Such structures include the “Ploutonion” (now reported by Clinton to be the Sacred Precinct of the Mirthless Stone instead), the Bouleuterion, the stepped platform along the sacred way, and the small fort. These structures are not attributed to any specific donors, and without further information on their funding it is impossible to determine whether they were given as gifts to the sanctuary or whether they were locally funded. The donor of the Porch of Philon, on the other hand, is known: Demetrios of Phaleron instigated construction on the porch during his reign, sometime between 317 and 307 B.C.E. The architect overseeing the construction – which lasted nearly fifty years – was Philon; the actual design of the portico, however, had been conceived more than a century earlier by Iktinos for the Periklean building phase of the Telesterion. Construction had begun in the mid-fourth century B.C.E., and it was not until Philon’s tenure that the project was finally completed. Because the Porch of Philon was the continuation of an older construction project, and because it was not donated as a gift by an outside benefactor, the portico cannot be considered an endowment of euergetism.

---

122 Consult Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* for more information on Late Classical and Hellenistic building at Eleusis: for the Porch of Philon, 133-5; for the Ploutonion, 146-9; for the stepped platform, see 143-6; for the small fort, 152-3; for the bouleuterion, 153-4. On the identification of the “Ploutonion” as the Sacred Precinct of the Mirthless Stone, see Clinton 1993, Chapter 1: The Sacred Landscape. According to Mylonas, 146-7, an earlier structure existed in the Sacred Precinct of the Mirthless Stone during the Archaic period, but it seems to have been rebuilt or replaced in the fourth century, and enclosed in a peribolos.


124 Davis, 2 & 19; Caskey, 148; Kourouniotes, 23; Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 133 dates the beginning of construction of the Philonian Porch to a motion by Lykourgos soon after 360 B.C.E.
The dedications at Eleusis in the Hellenistic period are indicators of the expanding functions of gifts in the Greek world as it was transforming politically, socially, and economically. Religious dedications, as gifts to and contracts with the gods, continued to be erected at the sanctuary in the Hellenistic period as they had been in previous eras. Another class of gifts, however, was introduced into the sacred landscape of the sanctuary at this time: the civic honorary dedication. As public rewards to city benefactors, this class of dedications seems to attest to the existence of euergetism near Eleusis at this time, or at the very least, civic honorary dedications denote a translation of religious gift-exchange traditions. While votives were erected in thanksgiving to the gods for career successes (a common dedicatory practice going back to the Archaic period), civic honorary dedications, although they were career honors as well, were public recognitions of individuals’ munificence towards cities.

The gift, in both religious and civic contexts, was a mode of expressive communication that enabled individuals and groups to realize collective goals and legitimize social hierarchies. Through the language of reward symbolism, the gift not only demonstrated appreciation but also negotiated future dealings between the patron and its recipient. Inherent to the gift-giving economies of euergetism and religious dedications alike is symbolic and prolonged exchange: no monetary amount could be fixed to the benefits gained by civic honorary dedications or architectural endowments; reciprocity could not be enforced by law; and transactions were often not immediately reciprocal. These similarities in functions and formulae suggest that Hellenistic gift-giving practices, namely civic honorary dedications, were not symptoms of political or

125 Seaford, 2-3.
religious decline; rather, Hellenistic gift-exchanges were a proactive appropriation of preexisting systems that functioned to stabilize economic inequality, social hierarchies, and democratic ideologies in an age of imperialism. The architectural endowments of euergetism, such as Appius Claudius Pulcher’s Lesser Propylaia at Eleusis, functioned toward these same ends.
CHAPTER 7: LATE ROMAN REPUBLICAN EUERGETISM AT ELEUSIS: THE LESSER PROPYLAIA OF APPIUS CLAUDIUS PULCHER

In sum, the discussion of votive objects has demonstrated that gift-giving was a system of exchange requiring reciprocity from both parties, but the return on the original gift could be on an extended timetable. Prior to the fourth century, career honors were occasionally attested at the sanctuary, but it was not until the Hellenistic period that civic honorary dedications proliferated. At this point, religious gift-giving seems to have begun to incorporate additional functions, in particular, the demonstration of thanksgiving to individuals for their munificence.\(^\text{126}\) The earlier practice of commemorating divinely-influenced career successes was translated into commemorating civic benefactors (often euergetai, by this period) by the deme through dedicatory objects placed in sanctuaries, such as Eleusis. To interpret this in terms of standard religious gift-giving practices, the cities seem to have been publicly thanking the gods for causing the civic benefactors to act in the city’s favor, so that civic honorary dedications were counter-gifts to the deities and euergetai at the same time.

Until the Late Republican period, the only evidence for euergetism at Eleusis was that of the indirect sort mentioned above, civic honorary dedications to euergetai, which shed light on the commemoration of euergetism starting in the fourth century. The many building projects of Archaic and Classical Eleusis, such as the Telesterion, gateways, fortifications, and storerooms of the sanctuary cannot be considered euergetism because they were neither funded by wealthy individuals nor dedicated as gifts to the city. For

\(^{126}\) Parker, 112.
example, the various phases of the Telesterion attributed to the Peisistratids, Kimon, and Perikles were Athenian building campaigns; they were not funded by outsiders nor were they gifts to the city of Eleusis. Indeed, the Archaic and Classical structures at Eleusis bear more similarities to religious votives than euergetism endowments because these buildings were considered to be gifts to the gods, and not gifts to the city. In the Late Roman Republican period, when the fad for self-promotion through architectural had reached extreme levels, the first true gift of euergetism – the architectural endowment of the Lesser Propylaia by Appius Claudius Pulcher – was bestowed upon Eleusis.\textsuperscript{127}

Between 54 and 51 B.C.E., construction on the Lesser Propylaia (Figures 8 and 9) was begun by Pulcher while he imperator; following his death, it was completed and dedicated by his nephews Claudius Pulcher and Marcius Rex.\textsuperscript{128} Not only was this the first true instance of euergetism toward Eleusis, but it is also the earliest known instance of Roman patronage of monumental architecture at Eleusis.\textsuperscript{129} Pulcher’s Propylaia was built atop the foundations of the Peisistratean North Gate.\textsuperscript{130} As visitors approached the Lesser Propylaia from outside the sanctuary, they passed through an ante-room towards one central doorway (although two additional doorways were added later) on the back wall of the ante-room. The room was fronted by two Corinthian columns, which supported a roof. This roofed area continued over to the back portico of the Propylaia,

\textsuperscript{127} Palinkas, 206.
\textsuperscript{129} Mylonas, \textit{Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 156 reports that the Lesser Propylaia was begun following Pulcher’s consulship of 54 B.C., but the gateway was completed by his two nephews several years after his death; Clinton, “Eleusis and the Romans: Late Republic to Marcus Aurelius,” 163-4 mentions the statue group of Ariobarzanes II and his family that is dated to 70 B.C. This statue group, although earlier than Pulcher’s Propylaia, is not an instance of Roman patronage, but rather an instance of Athenian recognition of important benefactors through the agency of the sanctuary at Eleusis.
\textsuperscript{130} Palinkas, 74-5.
where it was supported by two Caryatids carrying *kistès*, or cylindrical baskets, on their heads. Ionic and Doric elements were intermixed to create the entablature: the architrave contained three fasciae, which was characteristic of the Ionic, while the frieze exhibited the typical Doric triglyph-metope alternation (Figure 9). The metopes were ornamented with symbols of Demeter’s cult, such as poppy flowers, sheaves of wheat, and *kistès*, while the pediment seems to have been left completely undecorated.\(^{131}\)

The decoration of the entablature, Corinthian columns, format of the Latin dedication, and *kistephoroi* are characteristic of Roman tastes of the Late Republican and Early Imperial periods.\(^{132}\) At the same time, these popular architectural styles were employed as a way for Pulcher to compete with his contemporaries at a time when personal patronage of foreign cities had reached extreme levels. His choice to dedicate a Propylaia, rather than any other type of monument, may have been because of the prominence of such gates: the gate was the point of entry into Eleusis after a long procession from Athens, and the gate itself could transform the entire ritual space as well as the experience of the initiate.\(^{133}\) Thus, gateways were among the most potent types of monuments for *euergetai* to bequeath, and Eleusis was one of the most prominent cultural sites in Greece.

While the Lesser Propylaia testified to Pulcher’s wealth and status as an architectural endowment from *euergetes* to foreign city, the gateway also demonstrated his religious piety. Apparently during the time of Pulcher’s consulship in 54 B.C.E., the

---

132 Palinkas, 194.
133 Ibid., 1-2 & 206.
area around the Tiber flooded, significantly impacting the city’s grain reserves that were stored along the river.\textsuperscript{134} Recently Palinkas and Clinton have suggested that Pulcher may have vowed to Demeter a magnificent gift if she were to stop the floods along the Tiber. Eleusis, then, would have been the ideal place to fulfill his promise with a monumental gift to the goddess.\textsuperscript{135} However, this chain of events is purely hypothetical.

Regardless of the motivations behind Pulcher’s patronage, his contribution to Eleusis could be seen as both a gift to the goddess because of its dedicatory inscription, as well as an instance of Roman euergetism. And in the spirit of euergetism, Pulcher’s Lesser Propylaia was competitive in form and size as well as symbolic in its inscriptions and placement, thereby demonstrating simultaneously Roman munificence and authority.

\textsuperscript{134} Cassius Dio 39.61, 63.
\textsuperscript{135} Palinkas, 206; Kerenyi, 74-5; Clinton, “Eleusis and the Romans: Late Republic to Marcus Aurelius,” 164; Clinton, “The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors, Second Century B.C. to A.D. 267,” 1506.
CHAPTER 8: ROMAN IMPERIAL EUERGETISM AT ELEUSIS: THE OUTER COURT AND ITS STRUCTURES

“nam mihi cum multa eximia divinaque videntur Athenae tuae peperisse atque in vitam hominum attulisse, tum nihil melius illis mysteriis, quibus ex agresti immanique vita exculti ad humanitatem et mitigati sumus, initiaque ut appellantur, ita re vera principia vitae cognovimus; neque solum cum laetitia vivendi rationem acceperimus, sed etiam cum spe meliore moriendi.”

-- Cicero (De Legibus II.36)

In the Roman Imperial period, the practices of euergetism and clientelism seem to have been merged beginning with Augustus as way to legitimize Imperial authority and presence. Augustus, having defeated his enemies, translated clientelism – a firmly rooted moral system in the Roman world – into a somewhat hybridized strain of euergetism, declaring himself the patronus, the euergetes, of the Empire. As Saller reports, “the princeps’ role continued to be defined in terms of a patronal ideology.”\(^{136}\) Beneficia, thus, became an important aspect of elite perception of successful emperorship.\(^{137}\) The patronal aspects of clientelism, in combination with the munificence of euergetism, seem to be responsible for the proliferation of Roman Imperial euergetism found at Eleusis in the first and second centuries C.E.

Following Appius Claudius Pulcher’s Lesser Propylaia, many imperial projects at Eleusis can be identified as euergetism in the Roman Imperial period, including the construction of several structures in the sanctuary’s Outer Court, a bath to the south of the sanctuary, an aqueduct, and a colonnaded peristyle south of the sanctuary (Figures 1 and

\(^{136}\) Saller, 41.

\(^{137}\) Ibid.
Not only was imperial patronage received at the sanctuary, but architectural endowments, whether to Eleusis or other cities, were rewarded here as well – a practice which certainly kept in line with Hellenistic and Late Republican civic honorary dedicatory practices at Eleusis. For example, a monument to Augustus and Livia as well as two triumphal arches to Hadrian were erected by the Athenians in gratitude for previously received Imperial munificence. Not all civic honors were associated with the Imperial family, however; honors were given to T. Pinarius, P. Painius Statius, and M. Porcius Cato, to name only a few of the Roman benefactors attested at Eleusis. In sum, two triumphal arches, two monuments, twenty statue bases, and two altars paid tribute to emperors and the imperial family at Eleusis (Appendix D, dedications known from inscriptions). Statues of the emperors Tiberius (Appendix D, # 7) and Nero (Appendix D, # 10) are the only to survive, but many other dedications to emperors have been identified through inscriptions on extant statue bases. Still, this probably represents only a fraction of the dedications that would have originally filled the sanctuary’s Outer Court and the Sacred Court of the Telesterion.

Prior to the flourishing of Imperial patronage at Eleusis, the Mysteries of Demeter had largely lost their international prominence; aparche dedications had stopped, and it would not be until Roman intervention that the Eleusinian cult would be fully revived.

---

138 Kourouniotes, 22-3. For Roman waterworks at Eleusis, consult Kourouniotes, 68 and Philios, 73.
139 Clinton, “Eleusis and the Romans: Late Republic to Marcus Aurelius,” 174 & 176 agrees that the honoring of benefactors at Eleusis in the Imperial Period was a continuation of a longstanding tradition at the site.
140 See Clinton, “The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors, Second Century B.C. to A.D. 267,” 1504, 1514, & 1515, respectively, for the honors given to the aforementioned Roman benefactors.
141 Mylonas, Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries, 152-55; Palinkas, 160-1; Clinton, “Eleusis and the Romans: Late Republic to Marcus Aurelius,” 163; Clinton, “The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors, Second Century B.C. to A.D. 267,” 1520-21; and Clinton “Hadrian’s Contributions to
The very few public works of note were carried out in the years following the death of Alexander the Great, which was a troublesome era for Athens as well as Eleusis. At Eleusis, only three new structures corresponding to this period – between the death of Alexander and the beginning of Roman Republican Greece (146 B.C.E.) – have been identified: a fort atop the acropolis, a Bouleuterion south of the Telesterion, and the Porch of Philon. By the end of the second century B.C.E, however, Eleusis was slowly beginning to regain popularity in the numbers of initiates, and the sanctuary subsequently witnessed changes to its architecture, such as the Lesser Propylaia of Appius Claudius Pulcher discussed above. As the popularity of the site increased rapidly from the early Imperial period on, with thousands of pilgrims visiting the site each year, Eleusis became an ideal site for Imperial euergetism as well as civic honorary dedications. Thus, Pulcher’s addition to the sanctuary was later followed by Imperial building campaigns, and, as a whole, construction proliferated at the sanctuary in the Roman Imperial era thanks to the munificence of, most notably, emperors Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius. The Telesterion, for example, was restored back to the splendor of its fifth-century, Iktinian design. Numerous subsidiary buildings around the sanctuary’s periphery and outer courts were added to the sanctuary.

---

142 Palinkas, 160.
143 Ibid., 161.
144 Clinton, “The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors, Second Century B.C. to A.D. 267,” 1500 dates the rapid expansion of the Mysteries beginning in the time of Cicero.
145 Kourouniotes, 37.
146 Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 155; Clinton, “Eleusis and the Romans: Late Republic to Marcus Aurelius,” 163 mentions the regained popularity of the cult beginning as early as the end of the second century B.C.E.
Many emperors were initiated into the Mysteries, several emperors were commemorated by dedications at the sanctuary, and a few emperors were actual *euergetai* of the site. Shortly after the Battle of Actium, Augustus was initiated into the Mysteries in 31 B.C.E. It is unknown whether he instigated any construction projects at Eleusis, but a Roman Imperial presence was created at the sanctuary when the citizens of Athens dedicated a monument in honor of Augustus and Livia at Eleusis sometime between 31 and 27 B.C.E. Other statues at Eleusis in honor of the Julio-Claudian family included statues of Tiberius, Livia as Demeter, and Nero, all of which could be classified as civic honorary portraiture, because it was in the reign of Augustus that the emperor became known as the supreme benefactor. An entablature block dedicating a shrine of Agrippina and a colonnaded structure (Figure 10) outside of the sanctuary’s south gate have been interpreted as evidence of an emperor cult at Eleusis. If this is the location of the Imperial cult, its position among the other structures and entrances to the sanctuary may have been symbolic: as Roman pilgrims made their journey by sea to Eleusis, the house of the Roman Imperial cult would be their first vision of the sanctuary, yet at the same time, the Roman Imperial cult remained circumspect because its location did not impede upon the Sacred Precinct of Demeter.

---

149 Lomas and Cornell, 6-7.
150 Clinton, “Eleusis and the Romans,” 163-8 & 170-74. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 183, on the other hand, speculates that this colonnaded structure may have been a gymnasium.
In addition to initiates of the Julio-Claudian family, persons such as Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius, Commodus, Lucius Verus, and Septimius Severus were known to have attended the Mysteries, and in some cases, were patrons of sanctuary building projects as well. Many other prominent Romans travelled to Eleusis to attend the Mysteries, including Sulla, Cicero, his friends Atticus and T. Pinarius, Hadrian’s two companions, Antinous and Sabina, and later, L. Sergius Salvidienus Scipio Orfitus and Agrius Saturninus. Cicero hailed the Mysteries in *De Legibus* (2.36) for bringing a world of barbarians into civilization by means of the gifts of Demeter and Persephone—agricultural cultivation; this sentiment was echoed by the Romans in general, whose philhellenism led to the adoption of Greek architectural styles, philosophy, religion, and in this case, the particular subset of Greek religion practiced at Eleusis. While the Mysteries were practiced and hailed by many Romans in the Imperial period, it seems that embellishment of the sanctuary was largely motivated by the symbolic significance of the site. In other words, Eleusis was a symbol of civilization to the Romans just as much as it was a site of

---


154 Kourouniotes, 32. A. J. Spawforth and Susan Walker, “The World of the Panhellenion. I. Athens and Eleusis,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 75 (1985):78 & 100 discuss Roman philhellenism and admiration for the many cultural achievements of the Greeks, which also included the renowned Mysteries at Eleusis. Spaeth, *The Roman Goddess Ceres*, 17 reports on Cicero’s statements about the Mysteries: “Cicero (Verr. 2.5.187; cf. Varr. Rust. 3.15.5), Ceres is a goddess of beginnings, for it is she who provided the laws that enabled humankind to establish civilization, especially the law that provided for the division of the fields and led to the adoption of agriculture and hence to civilized life. The goddess is connected with the transition from a lawless state to an ordered one, from a society based on hunting and gathering to one based on agriculture, from barbarism to civilization. Again according to Cicero (Leg. 2.35-36), this transition does not have merely a historical and societal significance, but also a personal mimetic meaning. By becoming initiated into the mysteries of the goddess, the individual is tamed and cultivated.”
active cult. Ultimately, Eleusis, like Athens, became a museum of the golden age of Athens through the architectural embellishments of the imperial family.\textsuperscript{155}

The most extensive renovations were carried out during the times of Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius, appearing almost exclusively in the Outer Court of the sanctuary (Figures 10 and 12).\textsuperscript{156} In 131/2 A.D. Hadrian instituted the Panhellenion and established Athens as its headquarters; subsequently, both Athens and Eleusis underwent substantial renovations continuing into the reigns of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius.\textsuperscript{157} The Outer Court as well as all road surfaces between the two termini of the Sacred Way – from the Sacred Gate in Athens to the porch of the Telesterion at Eleusis – were repaved under Hadrian’s benefaction.\textsuperscript{158} A Pi-shaped Fountain House (Figures 10, 12, and 13) was added on the east side of the Outer Court, probably begun before the rest of the court construction because its water pipes run under the paving stones of the court.\textsuperscript{159} The Fountain House consisted of a large rectangular tank set within a marble, stoa type structure fronted by six columns.\textsuperscript{160} From the western face of the tank, water poured from eight spouts into a trough on the building’s marble floor.\textsuperscript{161} Little else is known about this structure because of its scanty remains, although it does seem to resemble some features of the Library of Hadrian.\textsuperscript{162}

Also during this period, a Temple to Artemis Propylaia (Figures 13 and 14) was built in the Outer Court, to the north of the Greater Propylaia. Rather small in size, the

\textsuperscript{155} Clinton, “Eleusis and the Romans,” 161-81.
\textsuperscript{156} Palinkas, 222.
\textsuperscript{157} Spawforth and Walker, 102.
\textsuperscript{158} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{159} Ibid.; Clinton, “Hadrian’s Contributions to the Renaissance at Eleusis” 63.
\textsuperscript{160} Mylonas, \textit{Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 166; Palinkas, 225.
\textsuperscript{161} Mylonas, \textit{Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 166; Kourouniotes, 38.
\textsuperscript{162} Mylonas, \textit{Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 166; Palinkas, 225.
temple was of the Doric order, amphi-prostyle in-antis with monolithic columns on both front and rear porches.\textsuperscript{163} The structure, made of pentelic marble, was placed upon a five step base and resembled the Temple of Athena Nike on the Acropolis, but with the use of the Doric, rather than Ionic order.\textsuperscript{164} The temple was covered with a wooden roof supporting terracotta roof tiles.\textsuperscript{165}

The Greater Propylaia at Eleusis was arguably the grandest imperial project at Eleusis (Figures 15, 16, and 17). In design, the gateway memorialized Roman benefaction at the sanctuary, reinforced the symbolic importance of Eleusis, and glorified Hellenic cultural achievements. During the time of either Hadrian or Antoninus Pius, construction of the Greater Propylaia began, but it was not until the time of Marcus Aurelius that the gateway was completed.\textsuperscript{166} The Greater Propylaia was a facsimile of the Mnakeskleon Propylaia on the akropolis: the gateway was made of pentelic marble, raised on a platform so that both inner and outer porches shared the same elevation, and designed so that its dimensions matched exactly those of the Mnakeskleon Propylaia.\textsuperscript{167} The exterior façade contained six Doric columns, while the interior included two rows of three Ionic columns.\textsuperscript{168} The larger portico faced the Outer Court, and the interior portico, which was reached through five doorways, was smaller than the outer portico.\textsuperscript{169}

The decoration of the Greater Propylaia’s pediment (Figure 17), however, was not a copy of the Mnakeskleon: it contained a bust of an emperor with a giant carved on his

\textsuperscript{163} Kourouniotes, 40; Mylonas, \textit{Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 168.
\textsuperscript{164} Palinkas, 226.
\textsuperscript{165} Mylonas, \textit{Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 167-8; Spawforth and Walker, 102.
\textsuperscript{166} Mylonas, \textit{Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 162; Clinton, “Eleusis and the Romans,” 175; Clinton, “Hadrian’s Contribution to the Renaissance at Eleusis” 64 & 67.
\textsuperscript{167} Mylonas, \textit{Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 162-5.
\textsuperscript{168} Philius, 55; Kourouniotes, 42.
\textsuperscript{169} Kourouniotes, 42.
shoulder-strap and Medusa engraved on his chest, symbolizing Roman protection over the sanctuary at Eleusis.\textsuperscript{170} Although there is much debate, the bust is most convincingly identified as Marcus Aurelius.\textsuperscript{171} The pediment’s sculpture, then, may also be understood as illustrative Aurelius’s defeat of the barbarian Marcomani in 172/3 A.D.\textsuperscript{172} Thus, the propaganda contained within the pediment suggested imperial protection, while at the same time the entire Greater Propylaia, in its Mnesiclean plan, implied a return to the golden age of Athens, albeit under Roman authority.\textsuperscript{173}

Reconstruction of the Telesterion by the Antonines conveys a similar message. In 170 A.D. the Telesterion at Eleusis was sacked by the Kostovoks and was subsequently restored by Marcus Aurelius.\textsuperscript{174} The western wall of the sanctuary was expanded another 2.15 meters into the Sacred Court, which likely required additional quarrying of the hill.\textsuperscript{175} Despite the extensive conflagration, restoration of the initiation hall was done in strict adherence to its preexisting Iktinian plan, again, it seems, to pay respects to the Greek golden age.\textsuperscript{176}

Two triumphal arches in the Outer Court were dedicated by the Panhellenes to the two goddesses and the emperor (Figures 18 and 19).\textsuperscript{177} Facing each other across the court, the eastern arch was placed next to the Fountainhouse, and it led to the recreation

\textsuperscript{170} Spawforth and Walker, 102-3.
\textsuperscript{171} Clinton, “Hadrian’s Contribution to the Renaissance at Eleusis,” 64.
\textsuperscript{172} Mylonas, \textit{Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 163; Walker and Spawforth, 102-3.
\textsuperscript{173} For more on the image of Marcus Aurelius as emblematic of Imperial protection, consult Spawforth and Walker, 102-3.
\textsuperscript{174} Clinton, “The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors,” 1530.
\textsuperscript{175} Mylonas, \textit{Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 160-1; Spawforth and Walker, 102.
\textsuperscript{176} Palinkas, 222.
\textsuperscript{177} Clinton, “Hadrian’s Contribution to the Renaissance at Eleusis,” 58.
centers; the western arch was placed next to the stoa, and it led to the town of Eleusis.\(^{178}\) Very little of these two arches remain *in situ*, but the designs seem to have imitated Hadrian’s arch near the Olympieion in Athens.\(^{179}\) Near the eastern arch, five statue bases were found dedicated to Marcus Aurelius as Theos Antoninus, Faustina as Thea Faustina, and his three daughters, Faustina, and Vibia Aurelia Sabina, and Lucilla. Also near the eastern arch a dedicatory base to Theos Adrianos Panhellenios was discovered.\(^{180}\) Based on the number of dedicatory bases found and the state of their carvings, several of the statues must have originally been placed on the upper stories of the arches with bases set back to back.\(^{181}\) The arches were originally dedicated to Hadrian by members of the Panhellenion, with members of the imperial family honored with statues and honorific inscriptions in the niches. Before the arches could be completed, however, Hadrian died. The arches were then rededicated to Antoninus Pius, and several of the statues and inscriptions were replaced.\(^{182}\) Based on the similarities to the arch of Hadrian, these arches may have designated the territory of the Panhellenes at Eleusis.\(^{183}\)

With the exception of the Kallichoron Well, all of the structures in the Outer Court referred to Athenian buildings or monuments either in architectural details or complete plan. The Greater Propylaia mimicked the Mnesiklean Propylaia; the Fountain imitated the Library of Hadrian in its architectural details; and the two triumphal arches

\(^{178}\) Kourouniotes, 38; Clinton, “The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors,” 1519.
\(^{179}\) Ibid.; Palinkas, 228.
\(^{180}\) Palinkas, 228-9.
\(^{181}\) Palinkas, 228; Clinton, “The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors,” 1519; Clinton “Hadrian’s Contributions to the Renaissance at Eleusis” 59-61.
\(^{182}\) Clinton, “The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors,” 1520; Clinton “Hadrian’s Contributions to the Renaissance at Eleusis” 61-2.
\(^{183}\) Palinkas, 235; Clinton, “Eleusis and the Romans,” 174-5; Clinton, “The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors,” 1520.
were replicas of Hadrian’s arch near the Olympieion. As initiates completed their procession from the Sacred Gate at Athens, the Outer Court through which they inevitably passed would have brought to mind both the Athenian golden age and Roman Imperial patronage of, and therefore presence in, Athens and Eleusis. The co-opting of celebrated Athenian forms and insertion of distinctly Roman styles demonstrated even more than foreign patronage and presence – it confirmed a sense of Roman control of Greek culture, history, and past accomplishments. Eleusis, by means of its architectural endowments, was visually and specifically equated to the Athenian Acropolis, which was a comparison of great potency. This association is indicative of Roman attitudes toward the Mysteries of Demeter at Eleusis: it was the Mysteries, like the great philosophical school of Athens, that were the origins of Greek and Roman culture and excellence. The place that Eleusis held in Roman intellectual and cultural history seems to have been what inspired the proliferation of imperial endowments and civic honors at the sanctuary in the second century C.E.

With the rise of Christianity and ultimately its endorsement by the Roman Empire in the fourth century, Roman emperors could no longer contribute funds to the pagan sanctuary; in fact, Marcus Aurelius was the last known emperor to contribute to Eleusis. Statesmen and wealthy initiates, the sanctuaries secondary patrons, were also dwindling in numbers, so that when the sanctuary was sacked by the Goths, led by Alaric

---

184 Palinkas, 224-5 & 235.
185 Ibid., 235 & 266.
186 Kerényi, 11, mentions Valentinian’s abolition of the festivals at Eleusis in 364 A.D.; Mylonas, Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries, 186.
in 395/6 A.D., it was never rebuilt, and the Mysteries were never able to recover.\(^{187}\) Eleusis was left in ruins and its Mysteries left homeless.

In the millennium of cultic practice at Eleusis, the architecture of the sanctuary and its surroundings evolved in both the number and magnitude of the structures therein. The buildings at Eleusis were remodeled time after time in response to the ever-growing crowds of initiates into Mysteries, until the Hellenistic period, at which point the numbers of initiates had declined. Ultimately, however, Eleusis experienced a renaissance in the second century C.E. under the patronage of Roman emperors, who glorified the site with architectural endowments not only because of its cultic practices, but also because of the symbolic significance of the Mysteries. As Mylonas stated, “The cult of Demeter could become the instrument for the unification of the Greeks under the Hegemony of Athens, whose prominence in activities of lasting value and cultural renown would be enhanced by the undertakings at Eleusis.”\(^{188}\) Likewise in the Roman Imperial period, Eleusis was the site at which political alliances, personal relationships, familial status, and religious piety were negotiated, ultimately engendering social cohesion. Eleusis, as a forum for these mediations, became an ideal site for Roman propaganda and gifts. Thus, the continuous expansion and renovation of the buildings at Eleusis should not be attributed only to the astonishing popularity of the religion, especially in the Roman Imperial era, because such structures, as architectural endowments of Roman euergetai, were gifts of euergetism, rather than civic projects in response to public need.

\(^{187}\) Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 186; Kerényi, 16.
\(^{188}\) Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 127.
When Eleusis lost its independence to Athens, the site became, in essence, a platform for Athenian propaganda and glorification for the remainder of its existence. A curious trend is that the “Athenianization” of Eleusis, which can be traced as early as the Archaic period, continued well into the Roman period with patrons such as Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius, and Antoninus Pius. These Roman patrons, realizing the tremendous cultural significance of Eleusis, modeled their architectural endowments on the gems of Athens’s golden age. In short, the Roman euergetai revived the sanctuary of Eleusis to its former glory, reignited the Eleusinian Mysteries, and improved relationships between Athens and Rome, all the while asserting Roman control over Greek religion, history, and culture through the process of re-Athenianizing Eleusis.

189 Kourouniotes, 14-22; 190 Clinton, “Eleusis and the Romans,” esp. 174-5.
CHAPTER 9: CONCLUSIONS ON GIFT-GIVING AT ELEUSIS

Euergetism, the system of patronage and gift-giving associated with the Hellenistic, Roman Republican, and Imperial periods, can be difficult to pinpoint within the archaeological record because it often depends on the survival of evidence regarding the funding of such benevolent projects. Furthermore, to qualify as “euergetism,” the object or structure donated has to have been considered a gift to another party. The counter-gifts in response to the endowments of euergetism at Eleusis include civic honorary dedications, triumphal arches, and monuments, such as those dedicated to notable civic benefactors, Hadrian, and Augustus and Livia, respectively. Nonetheless, the archaeological remains at the sanctuary of Demeter at Eleusis provide a useful case study for the pervasiveness of Greek reciprocity in social, religious, and political institutions over time.

Ultimately, religious gift-giving, clientelism, and euergetism prove to be similar institutions as they each rest on the principles and practices of reciprocity. Euergetism, emerging from the decline of democracy in Greece, was not only a system monopolized by Hellenistic elites to glorify themselves, for it also prompted the careful reinterpretation of political and economic exchange systems by the polis in efforts to maintain a semblance of democratic ideology through collective affirmations of euergetai’s endowments. Because euergetism is strongly tied to preexisting reciprocal-exchange systems, it did, in fact, generate reciprocal rather than parasitic interactions between benefactor and demos. Such gifts from euergetai are therefore neither bribes, nor are
they pure self-aggrandizement, a reflection of a corruption-filled era, or godsend to economic crises. The gifts and dedications associated with euergetism are, in essence, a form of communication and mediation through the exchange of both material gifts and intangible goods in efforts to stabilize and legitimize the social hierarchies, political alliances, and economic realities of Hellenistic through Late Imperial Greece. Despite the varied practices in gift-exchange over time, Eleusis, as a widely celebrated and highly visible site, served as an ideal forum for these varied modes and media of expressive “gifting” communication.
FIGURES

1. Plan of Eleusis by J. Travlos, 68.
2. First Archaic Phase at the sanctuary at Eleusis, 69.
3. Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis during the Late Archaic and Early Classical Phase, 70.
5. Plan of the sanctuary at Eleusis during the 4th Century B.C., 72.
6. Ground plan of the Telesterion at Eleusis in various periods, 73.
7. Plan of the sanctuary at Eleusis during the late Republican period, 74.
8. Hörmann’s proposed second phase for the Lesser Propylaia at Eleusis, including fountains, 75.
9. Triglyphs and metopes from the Lesser Propylaia at Eleusis decorated with Eleusinian objects, including wheat sheaves, deeply carved rosettes, round pyxides, and skull of a sacrificed steer, 76.
10. Plan of the sanctuary at Eleusis during the 2nd century A.D. and the later Roman period, 77.
11. Colonnaded Structure or Sebasteion, south of the court of the Telesterion at Eleusis, 78.
12. Model of Outer Court at Eleusis with (from left to right along fortification wall) fountaineau, arch of Hadrian, Kallichoron Well, Greater Propylaia, and a second arch of Hadrian; in foreground stoa and temple of Artemis Propylaia, 79.
13. Elevation of Temple of Artemis Propylaia in the Outer Court at Eleusis, 80.
14. Temple of Artemis Propylaia and corner of the Greater Propylaia in the Outer Court at Eleusis, 81.

15. Reconstruction of Greater Propylaia in the Outer Court at Eleusis, 82.


17. Pediment with *imago clipeata* of Marcus Aurelius from the Greater Propylaia at Eleusis, 84.

18. Reconstruction of triumphal arch of Hadrian in Outer Court at Eleusis, 85.

19. Pediment of triumphal arch of Hadrian in Outer Court at Eleusis, 86.
Figure 1: Plan of Eleusis by J. Travlos, 1966.

Figure 2: First Archaic Phase at the sanctuary at Eleusis.

Figure 3: Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis during the Late Archaic and Early Classical Phase.

Figure 4: Plan of the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis in the Classical Phase.

Figure 5: Plan of the sanctuary at Eleusis during the 4th Century B.C.

Figure 6: Ground plan of the Telesterion in various periods.

Figure 7: Plan of the sanctuary at Eleusis during the late Republican period.

Figure 8: Hörmann’s proposed second phase for the Lesser Propylaia, including fountains.

Figure 9: Triglyphs and metopes from the Lesser Propylaia decorated with Eleusinian objects, including wheat sheaves, deeply carved rosettes, round pyxides, skull of a sacrificed steer.

Figure 10: Plan of the sanctuary at Eleusis during the 2nd century A.D. and the later Roman period.

Figure 11: Colonnaded Structure or Sebasteion south of the court of the Telesterion.
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APPENDIX A: GEOMETRIC THROUGH ORIENTALIZING VOTIVE OBJECTS

1. Figurines from the Sub-Geometric Pyre
   a. Image: Mylonas 1932, Fig. 10
   c. Subject: These terracotta figures depict the human form with bird-like features, such as wings and beaks. The figurines found at Eleusis are thought to represent a female deity, but whether it is Demeter, Kore, or an alternative goddess is not certain.\(^{191}\)
   d. Date: 9\(^{th}\) & 8\(^{th}\) centuries B.C.E.\(^{192}\)
   e. Find Spot: Found by Mylonas in the Sub-Geometric Pyre.\(^{193}\)

\(^{191}\) Kourouniotes, 119-20.
\(^{192}\) Kourouniotes, 119-21 describes these as belonging to Primitive and Geometric times. Mylonas also describes such figures as primitive.
\(^{193}\) Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 279.
2. **Terracotta Geometric Chariots**
   a. Image: Kourouniotes 1936, Fig 66, page 120.
   c. Subject: Terracotta miniatures such as these were common in the Proto-Geometric and Geometric times at Eleusis. The typical representation includes a rider standing on the back legs of his multiple horses, so that the hindquarters of the horses become conflated with the rider’s absent chariot.
   d. Date: 9\textsuperscript{th} & 8\textsuperscript{th} centuries B.C.E.\textsuperscript{194}
   e. Find Spot: Found in the area of the Telesterion.\textsuperscript{195}

\textsuperscript{194} Kourouniotes, 119-21.
\textsuperscript{195} Ibid., 119.
3. **Proto-Corinthian Alabastra**
   c. Subject: Animals are the most typical subjects of Proto-Corinthian pottery, and these examples include boards, cocks, swans, lions, and dolphins.
   d. Date: ca. 725-600 B.C.E.
   e. Find Spot: Found near the sanctuary’s Geometric enclosure wall abutting the court in front of the Telesterion. Because nearly all of the Proto-Corinthian, Corinthian, and Orientalizing vases of the sanctuary were found in front of the Telesterion, these objects seem to have been either dedicated as offerings or were used in the process of other sacrifices. Thus, the “votive” status of these objects is not certain.\(^\text{196}\)

---

\(^{196}\) Kourouniotes, 109.
4. *Proto-Corinthian Amphora*
   
a. Image: Kourouniotes 1936, Figure 56, page 110.
   
   
c. Subject: Animals are the most typical subjects of Proto-Corinthian pottery, although humans occasionally appear, as can be seen on the neck of this amphora.
   
d. Date: ca. 725-600 B.C.E.
   
e. Find Spot: Found near the sanctuary’s Geometric enclosure wall abutting the court in front of the Telesterion. Because nearly all of the Proto-Corinthian, Corinthian, and Orientalizing vases of the sanctuary were found in front of the Telesterion, these objects seem to have been either dedicated as offerings or were used in the process of other sacrifices. Thus, the “votive” status of these objects is not certain.\(^197\)

---

\(^{197}\) Kourouniotes, 109.
APPENDIX B: ARCHAIC TO CLASSICAL VOTIVE OBJECTS

Reliefs and Architectural Sculpture

1. The Fleeing Maiden
   c. Subject: Traditionally interpreted as Kore or one of her royal maidens fleeing from Hades in the rape story. More recently Edwards and Clinton have identified the running maiden as Hekate. Based on stylistic similarities, the Fleeing Maiden may be from the same structure as Statue of Nike (Appendix B, # 2)
   d. Date: ca. 485-80 B.C.E.  

---

199 Edwards, 313.
e. Find Spot: found in the vicinity of the South Gate, either within or near the temenos of the “Sacred House.” Known to have originally adorned a pediment (possibly that of the Peisistratean “Sacred House,” according to Mylonas) based on its unfinished backside, pose, and plinth upon which she stands.

2. Statue of Nike
   a. Image: Edwards 1986, Fig. 7
   b. Bibliography: Edwards 1986, 309

---

200 Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 192 states that the sculpture was found inside the enclosure wall of the Sacred House, but Edwards, p. 311 identifies the find spot as “outside the enclosure wall of the sanctuary, near the South Gate.” Clinton reports on the contradicting reports on where the maiden was found, “The statue was found outside the peribolos of the sanctuary in the vicinity of the South Gate. Later, after the precinct of the “Sacred House” was discovered in this area, the excavators stated that the statue was found “near” the polygonal peribolos of this precinct, and recently Travlos declared that it was found “on the south side of the wall” of the precinct.” Regardless, it is clear that the sculpture belonged to a pediment and that it was pre-Persian in date.

c. Subject: This Late Archaic statue of Nike seems to have stood as akroteria atop the pediment group of the aforementioned *Fleeing Maiden* (Appendix B, # 1).²⁰²

d. Date: ca. 490/80 B.C.E.²⁰³

3. *Archaic Head*
   a. Image: Edwards 1986, Fig. 6
   c. Subject: Edwards has argued that this head is that of Demeter from the same sculptural program as the *Fleeing Maiden* and *Statue of Nike.*
   d. Date: ca 485-80 B.C.E.²⁰⁴
   e. Find Spot: uncertain. The National Museum’s records read, “bought by Philios in 1884.” This may indicate that Philios bought the object from someone who claimed to have found the head at the sanctuary.²⁰⁵ This fact lends even more uncertainty to the argument that the *Archaic Head* and *Fleeing Maiden* belong to the same group; in fact, the argument relies entirely on stylistic analysis of the two sculptures’ similarities.

²⁰² Edwards, 309
²⁰³ Ibid., 311-13.
²⁰⁴ Ibid., 309.
²⁰⁵ Ibid.
4. *Stele of Demeter and Hekate/Kore (?)*

a. Image: Mylonas, 1961, Fig. 67.


c. Subject: A seated Demeter with loosened hair, *polos* (high crown), scepter in left hand, and ear of corn in right hand is approached by either Kore\(^\text{206}\) or Hekate\(^\text{207}\) bearing two torches.

d. Date: 500 B.C.E., according to Kourouniotes; 480/75 B.C.E. according to Mylonas and Kanta. This is the sanctuary’s earliest surviving marble sculpture of Demeter.\(^\text{208}\)

e. Find Spot: Found by Philios in 1894 in auxiliary area B.\(^\text{209}\)

---

\(^{206}\) Kourouniotes, 85.

\(^{207}\) Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 192.

5. Demeter with Kore on her Lap
   a. Image: Mylonas 1961, Fig. 73
   b. Bibliography: Kourouniotes 1936, 97-8; Mylonas 1961, 201.
   c. Subject: This sculpture, 0.26m. high, represents Demeter with Kore seated on
      her lap. This motif recurs in Eleusinian sculpture – several of such are kept in
      the Eleusis Museum’s storeroom and are thought to be miniature copies of the
      West pediment of the Parthenon.
   d. Date: 5th century B.C.E. 210

210 Kourouniotes, 98.
6. Statue of Demeter
   a. Image: Mylonas 1961, Fig. 75
   c. Artist: attributed to Agorakritos.\textsuperscript{211}
   d. Subject: This over life-size statue of Demeter presents the goddess dressed in a sleeveless chiton and a peplos with her left hand lifting her chiton while her right arm hangs beside her body.\textsuperscript{212}
   e. Date: 450-420 B.C.E. if it is the work of Agorakritos; otherwise more generally ca. late 5\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.E.

\textsuperscript{211} Mylonas, \textit{Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 195; Kanta, 62-3.
\textsuperscript{212} Mylonas, \textit{Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 194; Kourouniotes, 83.
7. Dedication by a Hipparch
   c. Dedicator: possibly Epizelos, the cavalry officer leading the combat in 421 B.C.E.
   d. Subject: The relief shows two levels of horsemen and foot soldiers in battle, supposedly Athenians and Lacedaemonians.²¹³ A relief on an Athenian casualty list of 429 and 426 may have inspired the landscape setting and arrangement of figures in Epizelos’ dedication.²¹⁴
   e. Date: ca. 425-415 B.C.E.²¹⁵
   f. Find Spot: Found on the property of “Ioannis Rigo” reused in a Byzantine wall.²¹⁶

²¹³ Kourouniotes, 91-2.
²¹⁴ Carol L. Lawton, “Attic votive reliefs and the Peloponnesian War.” In Art in Athens During the Peloponnesian War, edited by Olga Palagia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 70.
²¹⁵ Clinton, Eleusis, Inscriptions on Stone, 53 suggests 425-415 B.C.E. as a tentative date. Kourouniotes, 92 dated the relief to the end of the fifth century as well. Lawton, 69 dates the relief to 420 by the hipparch Pythodoros Epizelou, the year after he signed a peace treaty.
8. **Dedication by Platthis**
   a. Image: Kanta 1979, Fig 9 pages 44-5.
   c. Dedicator: Inscription tells us that Platthis Dionysiou Ky[---], possibly a woman, dedicated the marble relief.\(^{217}\)
   d. Subject: This relief depicts Kore, standing and carrying two torches, facing a (not preserved) seated Demeter, of which only the left hand is visible. Demeter’s left hand would have likely held a scepter.\(^{218}\)
   e. Date: ca. 420 B.C.E.\(^{219}\)

---


\(^{217}\) Ibid., 56; Lawton, 72.

\(^{218}\) Ibid., 56; Kanta, 44-5.

\(^{219}\) Ibid.
9. Great Eleusinian Relief
   a. Image: Clinton 1992, Fig. 1, page 158.
   b. Artist: The shallow relief and archaizing tendencies have been attributed to a late 5th century sculptor from Thespiai.\(^{220}\)

\(^{220}\) Evelyn B. Harrison, “Eumolpos Arrives in Eleusis,” *Hesperia* 69, no. 3 (2000): 286 describes the purposes of archaistic styles as derived from a need to “render a sacred image with appropriate solemnity.” See Harrison, 287 for attribution of workshop.
c. Subject: Clinton has interpreted this relief as Demeter (left), holding her scepter in her left hand has just retracted her right hand, after giving to Ploutos stalks of grain. The stalks of wheat would have been either painted or made of bronze, being held in place by the pressure of Ploutos’ closed hand. Kore (right), holds her characteristic torch in her left hand, while her right hand places what would have been a bronze wreath on the young boy’s head. Harrison, on the other hand, has identifies the young boy as Eumolpos, the son of Poseidon and legendary founder of the Eleusinian Mysteries. Traditionally, Eumolpos is rendered as an adult with his defining attribute, the scepter. The features of Eumolpos in the Great Eleusinian Relief are thought to be attested in Statuettes from a Small Pediment at Eleusis, (Appendix B, # 1, 2, & 3), in which Eumolpos is shown as a young boy, seated on the lap of Kore. Harrison reconstructs the relief as follows: Demeter holds a ribbon doubled over (originally painted), Eumolpos reaches for one of the dangling ribbon ends as he presents himself to the great goddess, as if for military service (this motif is found in several contemporary Attic vase paintings of the young Theseus’s arrival in Athens). His semi-nudity, sandals, and wet hair are thought to refer to his emergence out of his childhood home, the sea, and into the upper world where he would spend his adulthood, and ultimately establish the Mysteries.

d. Date: last decade of the 5th century B.C.E.

e. Find spot: Found by Philios outside the sanctuary, reused in the pavement of the Chapel of St. Zacharias. Mylonas suggests that this relief, as well as plaques such as the Ninnion Tablet may have been hung on the Telesterion or Anaktoron walls.

f. Occasion: Harrison has speculated that the Great Eleusinian Relief was dedicated on the occasion of the temporary re-establishment of the Mysteries’ procession from Athens to Eleusis along the Sacred Way in 407 B.C.E. Prior to this event, Spartan possession of Eleusis and the surrounding area during the Peloponnesian War had forced initiates to travel from Athens to the sanctuary by sea; a procession by land was thought to dangerous. This significantly reduced attendance, dedications, and the overall splendor of the Mysteries, and thus, the re-establishment of the procession is thought to have been celebrated in this relief, possibly dedicated by the hierophant himself.

---

221 Clinton, Myth and Cult, 39-55.
222 Harrison, “Eumolpos Arrives in Eleusis,” 275.
223 Ibid., 285.
224 Ibid., 287.
225 Mylonas, Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries, 192.
226 Ibid., 189.
10. *Fragmentary Votive Relief of Demeter, Triptolemos, and Kore*

a. Image: Kanta 1979, Fig 5, page 36.

b. Bibliography: Kanta 1979, 36.

c. Subject: Triptolemos (left) stands behind a veiled Demeter, while Demeter likely faces Kore (not preserved), of whom only her characteristic torches survived.

d. Date: Late 5th to early 4th century B.C.E.  

228

e. Find Spot: Found in 1895 by Kourouniotes within the Boulouterion. Remnants of paint were considerably well-preserved, leading Kourouniotes to believe that the relief was buried rather shortly after it was erected.  

229

---

228 Kanta, 36.
229 Ibid.
11. Votive Relief of the Mission of Triptolemos

a. Image: Mylonas 1961, Fig. 74

b. Bibliography: Kourouniotes 1936, 76-8; Mylonas 1961; Clinton 1992,

c. Subject: This relief recalls the myth in which Demeter educated Triptolemos in the principles of agriculture, the foundation of civilization. Triptolemos then traveled the world teaching humankind these principles. In the relief, Demeter approaches Triptolemos, seated on his winged dragon chariot with entwined serpents in which he spread his instructions for cultivation. Both Demeter and Triptolemos would have held spears in their left, upraised arms. Originally the bronze wheels of the chariot were affixed to the relief by way of holes on either side of the seat. Behind Triptolemos is Kore holding two torches, and behind Demeter are four pairs of initiates in diminished scale. The figures are set within two projecting antae and a roof, of which we see the eaves and lowed edges of the tiles. The Mission of Triptolemos was common subject of votive reliefs in Attica post-Persian Wars, including several of such at the Eleusis museum. These depictions often include the representation of the dedicator’s family.231

d. Date: Early 4th century B.C.E.232

---


231 Kourouniotes, 75-6; Clinton, Myth and Cult, 58; For popularity of Mission scenes and iconography of Triptolemos, consult Raubitschek, “The Missino of Triptolemos.”

232 Kourouniotes, 75-6; Clinton, Myth and Cult, 58.
12. The Procession of the Mystai

a. Image: Kerenyi 1967, Fig 26 page 79; or Clinton 2005, plates 202-3
c. Dedicator: probably the family of Nu(mmius) Nigreinos, Sacred Herald.
d. Subject: This fragment of a pedestal base for Nu(mmius) Nigreinos, Sacred Herald, represents the mystai (initiates) into the Greater Mysteries with torches. It is thought to have been erected by his family after his death.²³³ The pedestal may have originally held a bronze statue.²³⁴
e. Date: first half of 4th century B.C.E.²³⁵

²³⁴ Clinton, Eleusis, Inscriptions on Stone, 374.
²³⁵ Clinton 1974, 78-9.
13. Relief of Demeter and Kore
   a. Image: Mylonas 1961, Fig. 63
   c. Subject: Relief of Demeter seated on her *kiste* with Kore standing at her side. This arrangement of Demeter being approached by her daughter is one of the most common in Eleusinian imagery of all media.\(^{236}\)
   d. Date: 4\(^{th}\) century B.C.E.\(^{237}\)

\(^{236}\) Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 190.
\(^{237}\) Ibid.
14. Statuette of a Boy-Initiate

a. Image: Mylonas 1961, Fig. 80
b. Bibliography: Kourouniotes 1936, 97-8; Mylonas 1961, 203.
c. Subject: A young initiate into the Greater Mysteries wears a *himation* and holds in his left hand a wand. Remnants of his sacrificial pig are visible on his right side. Two other fragmentary statuettes of young male initiates were found at the sanctuary. Representations of boy-initiates to the Eleusinian cult were not uncommon throughout the Greek and Roman world from the fourth century on.
d. Date: 4th century B.C.E.

---

238 Kourouniotes 1936, 97 & Mylonas 1961, 203.
239 Mylonas 1961, 203.
240 Mylonas 1961, 203.
15. **Stele of Kore as Hydranos**

   a. Image: Mylonas 1961, Fig. 70


   c. Subject: The relief depicts Kore (or possibly a priestess) pouring water from a bronze *phiale* (not preserved) onto a young initiate.\(^{241}\)

   d. Date: late 5th century B.C.E. or early-mid 4th century B.C.E.\(^{242}\) Kanta suggests a more narrow date of ca. 440 B.C.E.\(^{243}\)

---

\(^{241}\) Kourouniotes, 85; Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 194; Kerenyi, 60-1.

\(^{242}\) Kourouniotes, 85 attributes the statue to “not long after the time of Phidias.” Mylonas, 194 postulates a date in the first half of the fourth century B.C.E.,

\(^{243}\) Kanta, 42-3.
16. Votive Relief of Eukrates
a. Image: Clinton 1992, Fig 78 page 209.
c. Dedicator: Eukrates
d. Subject: The inscription on the stes, “To Demeter by Eukrates.” The lower area contains a simplified representation of a nose, eyebrows, and eyes while the in the upper register Demeter is depicted with red rays emanating from behind her head. The representation of oversized and simplified representations of body parts in conjunction with a deity recalls votive plaques to healing deities. Demeter herself was not a healing deity, but the revelation of the Great Mysteries was said to have culminated in a great vision (figuratively) for the initiates. The Votive Relief of Eukrates, then, may have been dedicated in honor of religious – and not literal – healing.

e. Date: While Kerenyi dates the relief to the 5th century B.C.E., Clinton dates the relief to the 4th c. B.C.E. 245
f. Find Spot: The votive was found next to the building I 12/30, the central round tower of the sanctuary’s wall. 246

244 Kerenyi, 97-8; Clinton, Eleusis, Inscriptions on Stone, 108.
245 Ibid.
17. *Banquet of Initiates, Theos, and Thea*
   a. Image: **No Image Available.** Eleusis Museum Inv. No. 5172
   c. Subject: This relief depicts a familiar subject: the dining initiates and underworld deities. Theos is represented reclining, while an attendant with a theatrical mask waits at his side.
   d. Date: ca. 370 B.C.E.

18. *Banquet with Initiates, Theos, and Thea*
   a. Image: Kanta 1979, Fig 21 page 66.
   c. Subject: This relief of a *theoxenia* portrays five initiates (left) approaching the god and goddess of the underworld, Thea (center) and Theos (right). Thea stands at the foot of the dining couch while holding a box, and Theos reclines with a *rhyton* and *phiale.*
   d. Date: ca. 350 B.C.E.

---

247 Kanta, 66.
248 Ibid.
Figurines

19. Terracotta Figurines
   a. Image: Mylonas 1932, Fig. 15
   c. Subject: Terracotta figurines such as these were among the most common votive offerings (alongside vases) discovered in the Archaic pyre. The figurines, whether seated or standing, were white washed and then painted in dark reds and blues. Seated figures often rest their hands on their knees while standing figures holding offerings below their breasts with their right arms and their left hands grasp their veils.249
   d. Date: 7th & 6th centuries B.C.E. (?) based on finds, which included Corinthian, Orientalizing, and Black-Figured ceramics but notably no Red-Figured pottery. Other similar figures, with the addition of suspension holes, have been found dating to the 5th century.250
   e. Find Spot: found by Mylonas in the Archaic pyre discovered between the retaining wall and column DI.251

250 Kourouniotes, 119-21.
20. Bronze Female Figurine
   a. Image: Kaltsas and Shapiro 2008, Fig. 69 page 157.
   b. Bibliography: Kaltsas and Shapiro 2008, 156.
   c. Artist: Laconian workshop
   d. Subject: This figurine seems to represent Kore, as she wears a wreath on her head and holds a poppy (not preserved) in her right hand.\textsuperscript{252}
   e. Date: ca. 560-550 B.C.E.\textsuperscript{253}

\textsuperscript{252} Kaltsas and Shapiro, 156.
\textsuperscript{253} Ibid.
Ceramics

21. *Black-Figure Stand*
   a. Image: Mylonas 1932, Fig. 13
   c. Subject: The base of the stand depicts a chariot race. The uppermost register (of what remains of the stand) may portray a procession of deities being led by Hermes.  
   d. Date: second half of 7th century and first half of 6th century B.C.E. based on finds, which included Corinthian, Orientalizing, and Black-Figure ceramics but notably no Red-Figure pottery.
   e. Find Spot: found by Mylonas in the Archaic pyre discovered between the retaining wall and column DI.

255 Ibid., 281-2.
256 Ibid., 281.
22. *Black-Figure Votive Pinax*
   a. Image: Kaltsas and Shapiro 2008, Fig. 64 page 147
   c. Artist: The Painter of Eleusis
   d. Subject: This votive plaque represents a woman (right), raising her hand in a
gesture of instruction to another female figure (left). Both figures, if they are to
be interpreted as the two Eleusinian goddesses, lack their typical defining
attributes – Demeter with her scepter and Kore with her torches. Nonetheless, the
*polos* crowns suggest that the two women are deities, most likely Demeter and
Kore.
   e. Date: ca. 550 B.C.E.\textsuperscript{257}

\textsuperscript{257} Kaltsas and Shapiro, 147.
23. **Black-Figure Eskhris**

a. Image: Kaltsas and Shapiro 2008, Fig. 63 Page 146.


c. Artist: Attic workshop\(^{258}\)

d. Subject: This escharis illustrates a procession of initiates led by Kore toward the enthroned Demeter. Kore and several of the initiates carry myrtle branches. Both goddesses wear *polos* crowns. Kore extends her left hand to offer what appears to be a pomegranate to Demeter, who in turn, extends in her right hand to give Kore a myrtle wreath\(^ {259}\).

e. Date: 530-20 B.C.E.\(^ {260}\)

---

\(^{258}\) Kaltsas and Shapiro, 146.

\(^{259}\) Ibid.

\(^{260}\) Ibid.
24. Large Red-Figure Skyphos
   a. Image: Kaltsas and Shapiro 2008, Fig 62 Page 145
   c. Dedicator: According to the inscription, Anthippe was the dedicator.  
   d. Artist: Attic workshop
   e. Subject: Despite its fragmentary condition, two scenes are identifiable on this skyphos. The first scene is that of the Rape of Persephone, while the second scene is the Mission of Triptolemos.
   f. Date: 440-430 B.C.E.

---

261 Kaltsas and Shapiro, 145.
262 Ibid.
263 Ibid.
25. Red-Figure Tablet/Votive Pinax
   a. Image: Kerenyi 1967, page 129 Fig 38.
   c. Subject: This fragmentary pinax probably represented Ploutos (not preserved) with a horn of plenty, only the tip of which remains near Kore’s cheek. Kore faces a seated Demeter holding her characteristic scepter. Behind Demeter is a male figure (not preserved), most likely to be identified as Triptolemos based on the fragmentary wheel with entwined serpent to the right of his legs.\textsuperscript{264}
   d. Date: end of 5\textsuperscript{th} century or 4\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{265}
   e. Find Spot: Found south of the Telesterion with The Ninnion Tablet.

\textsuperscript{264} Clinton, \textit{Myth and Cult}, 109 & 134.
\textsuperscript{265} Ibid. provides both dates. Henri Metzger, \textit{Recherches sur l’imagerie athénienne} (Paris: E. De Boccard, 1965), 36 attributes the \textit{pinax} to the end of the fifth century.
26. The Ninnion Tablet

a. Image: Kaltsas and Shapiro 2008, page 151, Fig. 66.
c. Deducator: Ninnion

d. Subject: The interpretation of the Ninnion Tablet is a matter of much debate – a
topic worthy of discussion in itself. Kevin Clinton’s discussion of the tablet
seems best supported by iconographic traditions; he reports the tablet to depict
three scenes of the initiation ritual. The lower register contains (left to right) two
initiates led by Iakchos, who wears a himation over a tunic and carries double
torches, as he and his followers approach Demeter, seated facing the Mirthless
Rock holding a phiale and her characteristic scepter. The empty seat next to
Demeter is thought to suggest the absence of Kore and thus, the moment depicted
is the first day of the Mysteries at Eleusis, when initiates first reach the sanctuary.
In the upper register are depicted three initiates processing away from a structure
(indicated by the Ionic column) and towards Kore, holding two torches
representing her escape (albeit temporary) from the underworld. Kore joins her
mother, who is shown seated with scepter. The female initiate nearest Kore
carries on her head a plemochoe while the younger male initiate carries a jug for a
libation. The scene therefore represents the last day of the Mysteries, after Kore’s
homecoming. The woman carrying the plemochoe, who is represented in both
registers, is believed to be Ninnion herself, the tablet’s dedicator.

e. Date: Mylonas dates the tablet to the first half of the fourth century. More
recently Clinton, Kaltsas, and Shapiro have suggested a date of 370 B.C.E.

f. Find Spot: Found in nine pieces to the south of the Telesterion with the Red-
Figure Tablet/Votive Pinax (Appendix B, # 25). Tablet would have been hung
by means of nails or pegs through the four holes on the corners.

---

266 Clinton, Myth and Cult, 73-4.
267 Mylonas, Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries, 213.
268 Clinton, Myth and Cult, 136.
269 Kaltsas and Shapiro, 150; Kerenyi, 129 states that the Red-Figure Tablet and Ninnion Tablet were found
together.
27. Votive Skyphos Fragment
   a. Image: Clinton 1992, Fig 63 page 200
   c. Artist: attributed to the Marsyas Painter
   d. Deducator: Demetria
   e. Subject: The preserved fragment represents Demeter with her loose hair and scepter.
   f. Date: mid-4th century B.C.E.

Eleusinian Dedications known from Inscriptions

* The following breakdowns of dedicatory inscriptions found at the sanctuary ARE derived from Kevin Clinton’s three volume collection on the inscriptions of Eleusis (2005). Only inscriptions relating to votive objects have been included here, broken down by type of dedication and, when possible, occasion of dedication. For more information on each inscription, consult Clinton (his catalog numbers are provided for each, followed by IG numbers).

Archaic Period

A. Athletic Dedications (2):
   1. 3, race post (IG I3 991), ca. mid-6th c. B.C.E.
   2. 6, discus (IG I3 990), 520-500 B.C.E.
B. Basins (4)
   1. 4 (IG I$^3$ 992), ca. 525-480 B.C.E.
   2. 5 (IG I$^3$ 992), ca. 525-480 B.C.E.
   3. 15 (IG I$^3$ 998), ca. 500-480 B.C.E.
   4. 16 (IG I$^3$ 1001), ca. 480 B.C.E.

C. Pillars (3)
   1. 11 (IG I$^3$ 996), ca. 500 B.C.E.
   2. 12 (IG I$^3$ 993), ca. 500 B.C.E.
   3. 14 (IG I$^3$ 995), ca. 500-480 B.C.E.

D. Statue Bases (2):
   1. 10 (IG I$^3$ 1006), ca. 500 B.C.E.
   2. 17 ((IG I$^3$ 997), ca. 480 B.C.E.
      i. According to Travlos’ reconstruction, this base may have been one of
         the largest of Classical dedications at Eleusis. It was found on
         the porch of the Telesterion, but it may have once been located in the
         courtyard or inside the Telesterion; alternatively, the base may have
         been repurposed on the porch of the Telesterion during Marcus
         Aurelius’ reconstruction of the façade.\textsuperscript{270}

E. Other Dedications (1):
   1. 2 (IG I$^3$ 990), five architectural blocks, ca. mid-6\textsuperscript{th} c. B.C.E.
      i. Based on its size, the monument is now thought to have been the
         crowning course, for the wall of a building or the peribolos.\textsuperscript{271}

Classical

F. Athletic Dedications (2):
   1. 54 (IG II$^2$ 3124), pillar for victor of Eleusinia, 400-350 B.C.E.
   2. 64 (IG II$^2$ 3126), plaque for victor of Synoris, 500-450 B.C.E.

G. Bases (non-statuary) (9):
   1. 49 (IG I$^3$ 1048), ca. 415-410 B.C.E.
   2. 51 (IG I$^3$ 1004), ca. 410 B.C.E.
   3. 55 (IG II$^2$ 4549), early 4\textsuperscript{th} c. B.C.E.
   4. 56 (IG II$^2$ 4554), early 4\textsuperscript{th} c. B.C.E.
   5. 62 (now lost), ca. 357 B.C.E.
   6. 77 (IG II$^2$ 1702), ca. 350-340 B.C.E.
   7. 82 (IG II$^2$ 2408), ca. 335 B.C.E.
   8. 84 (IG II$^2$ 1189), ca. 333/2 B.C.E.

\textsuperscript{270} Clinton, \textit{Eleusis, Inscriptions on Stone}, Commentary 38.
\textsuperscript{271} Ibid., Commentary 29-30.
9. 86 (SEG XLI 107), 332/1 B.C.E.

H. Basins (1):
   1. 20 (IG I3 1003), ca. mid-5th c. B.C.E.

I. Civic Honorary Dedications (6):
   1. 70 (IG II2 1186), Decrees of the Eleusinians in honor of Damasias and Phryniskos of Thebes, ca. mid-4th c. B.C.E. (Decree by Eleusinians, erected elsewhere – not the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore)
   2. 72 (IG II2 1188), Decree of the Eleusinians in Honor of the Hierophant Hierokleides Teisamenou Paianieus, ca. mid. 4th c. B.C.E. (Decree by Eleusinians, erected elsewhere – not the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore)
   3. 80 (IG II2 1193), Decree of Eleusinians in Honor of Smikythion of Kephale, Peripolarch, ca. 340-335 B.C.E.
   4. 81 (IG II2 2973), Dedication by Soldiers in Honor of the General Dein[krates Kleombrotou Acharneus] and the Peripolarchoi, 338/7 B.C.E.
   5. 84 (IG II2 1189), Dedication by Ephebes of Hippothontis and Decree of the Eleusinians in their Honor, 333/2 B.C.E.
   6. 85 (not accessioned), Two Decrees of the Eleusinians, one in Honor of Philokomos Phalanthidou Eleusinios and Moirokles Euthydemou Eleusinios (the other concerning leasing the quarries of Heracles), 332/1 B.C.E. (Not from the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore)

J. Choragic Dedications (2):
   1. 53 (IG I3 970), ca. late-5th c. B.C.E.
   2. 66 (IG II2 3100), mid-4th c. B.C.E.

K. Statue Bases (5):
   1. 57 (IG II2 4552), ca. 375 B.C.E.
   2. 58 (IG II2 4608 + 4934), ca. 375 B.C.E.
   3. 59 (now lost), ca. 360 B.C.E.
   4. 65 (Skias’ No. 815) ca. mid-4th c. B.C.E.
   5. 79 (IG II2 2845), ca. 340 B.C.E.
      i. Found on the south hillside and thought to have supported a statue of Dionysos.

L. Stelai (2):
   1. 61 (IG II2 2839 + 2844), ca. 357/6 B.C.E.
   2. 76 (Skias’ no. 62), post mid-4th c. B.C.E.

M. Pillars (2):
   1. 18 (IG I3 1000), ca. 475 B.C.E.
   2. 26 (IG I3 1002), ca. 450-415 B.C.E.
APPENDIX C: LATE CLASSICAL, HELLENISTIC, AND LATE REPUBLICAN VOTIVE OBJECTS

1. **Demeter on the “Mirthless Stone” approached by Votaries**
   c. Subject: In the garb of an old woman, Demeter is seated on the Mirthless Rock being approached by three men, a woman, and a girl balancing on her head a basket engaged in an act of worship. Representations of initiates in the company of the Eleusinian deities became a common convention from the early fourth century on.  
   d. Date: ca. 330/320 B.C.E.

---

274 Kanta, 58.
2. **Bust of Eubouleus (or Iakchos?)**
   a. Image: Schwarz 1975, Page 74
   c. Artist: attributed to Leochares, Euphranor, and even Praxiteles. Most likely a copy because several similar busts have been found throughout Attica.²⁷⁵
   d. Subject: The hairstyle and appearance of young adulthood aligns this bust with traditional representations of Eubouleus, though it is also possible that Iakchos is the subject, especially given its findspot, the Sacred Precinct of the Mirthless Rock, which was associated with Iakchos in particular.²⁷⁶
   e. Date: 330 B.C.E.²⁷⁷
   f. Find Spot: Found by Philios in the “Ploutonion,” the area now referred to as the Sacred Precinct of the Mirthless Stone.²⁷⁸

---

²⁷⁵ Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 199. See also Schwartz.
²⁷⁷ Ibid.
3. **Head of Eubouleus** (or Iakchos?)
   
a. Image: Schwarz 1975, Page 75
   
   
c. Subject: Thought to be Eubouleus, based on similarity to contemporary busts from Attica.\(^{279}\)
   
d. Date: Hellensitic.
   
e. Find Spot: Found near the Telesterion.\(^{280}\)

---

\(^{279}\) Clinton, *Myth and Cult*, 56 states Eubouleus’ typical features, as identified through the Lakrateides Relief (Appendix C, # 4) as such: “resembles a young man, not a boy like Ploutos; his long locks of hair flow down onto his chest on either side; he carries a single torch; and he wears a long-sleeved tunic that ends just above his knees.” The hair, in particular, is Eubouleus’ hallmark when looking at busts such as this. In Clinton’s appendix on Eubouleus, he identifies five other heads thought to be Eubouleus from Attica, which bear similarities to the two Eleusis heads (135-6). The identifications of these other busts were made by Schwarz, “Eubouleus” and *LIMC*, Eubouleus.

4. **Lakrateides Relief**
   a. Image: Clinton 1992, Fig. 5.
   b. Bibliography: Kourouniotes 1936, 80-3; Mylonas 1961, 197-200; Clinton 1992 51-3 & 56.
   c. Dedicator: Dedicated by Lakrateides, an Eleusinian priest, on behalf of his family members, depicted as votaries.  
   d. Subject: The **Lakrateides Relief** is the Rosetta Stone of Eleusis, because it shows almost the entire pantheon of Eleusinian deities with inscriptions identifying each individual. From left to right, the figures are represented as follows: “a boy at the lower left (whose inscription is not preserved); behind him, a woman standing (perhaps Eleusis); Demeter seated; Kore standing; Plouton standing; Triptolemos seated; Thea standing; Theos seated; Lakrateides, in low relief, standing in the background; and at the far right a youth with long hair, a torch, and a short chiton (his inscription is missing).”
   e. Date: 100 B.C.E.

---

282 R. Heberdey, 111-16, as cited by Clinton, *Myth and Cult*, 51 as the only publication to date to deal with this relief in detail.
283 Kourouniotes, 80 suggests a date in the first century B.C.E. Mylonas suggests a date of ca. 100-90 B.C.E. based on the relief’s inscriptions. Clinton, *Myth and Cult*, 135 suggests a date of 100 B.C.E.
5. **Votive Relief of Lysimachides**
   c. Dedicator: Lysimachides
   d. Artist: Attic workshop
   e. Subject: This banqueting scene depicts (from left to right) a male winebearer fetching from an amphora a drink for his immortal diners. Further right, Demeter sitting on a *kiste* and holding a scepter is crowned with a diadem by Kore, who holds in her left hand a double torch. To the right is Kore again and her now-husband, Hades, shown holding a *rhyton* and goblet. The couple is portrayed as Theos and Thea (specified by the inscriptions: ΘΕΩΙ and ΘΕΑΙ), the reigning god and goddess of the underworld.284 The relief was probably originally attached atop a pillar.285
   f. Date: ca. 335-320 B.C.E.286
   g. Find Spot: Found in 1885 within the sacred precinct of the Mirthless Rock.287

---

284 Kerenyi, 151-2; Clinton, *Myth and Cult*, 51 & 109; Kaltsas and Shapiro, 152.
286 Ibid., 84.
287 Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 198 note 34.
6. **Pair of Archaistic Perirrhanteria** (Demeter and Kore?)
   c. Deducator: According to the two inscriptions on the bases of each statue, the Athenian demos dedicated these to the goddesses.  
   d. Subject: A pair of archaistic draped females may represent Demeter and Kore, each wearing a mantle with overfold hanging from only one shoulder over a thin chiton. The female originally held at their waists basins of water, which would have been used for purification rites. The basins have now been lost, but the rectangular cutting in the center of the statue reminds the viewer of the original function of these two statues. The two figures most likely adorned either the entrance to the sanctuary or to the Telesterion itself.
   e. Date: ca. 330-310 B.C.E.

---

290 Ibid., 214; Kanta, 81; Kourouniotes, 93.
7. **Archaistic Statue of Youthful Dionysos**

   a. Image: Kanta 1979, Fig 29


   c. Subject: Resembling in style the *Archaistic Perirrhateria*, this headless statue may represent Dionysos, although it has alternatively been identified as a mortal priest.\(^{292}\)

   d. Date: Late Classical to Early Hellenistic\(^{293}\)

---

\(^{292}\) Fullerton, 209 & Kourouniotes, 94 both identify the statue as Dionysos. Both E. B. Harrison, *The Athenian Agora, IX, Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture* (Princeton, 1961), 58 & H. Bulle, *Archaisierende griechische Rundplastik*, (Munich, 1918), 25-6, on the other hand, suggest that this is a representation of a mortal priest.

\(^{293}\) Fullerton, 209.
8. *Initiate with Young Pig*
   a. Image: Kanta 1979, Fig 23 page 68
   b. Bibliography: Kanta 1979, 68.
   c. Subject: Sculpture of initiate carrying his *bacchoi* (sacred torch for procession along the Sacred Way to the Mysteries) and his sacrificial piglet across his chest (not preserved).
   d. Date: 3rd century B.C.E.\(^{294}\)

\(^{294}\) Kanta, 68.
9. **Headless Statue of Kore**
   
   a. Image: Mylonas 1961, Fig 76
   
   
   c. Subject: This life size Kore-figure wearing a peplos over a thin *chiton*, is possibly a Roman copy of a Greek original. The hands are now broken off, but Kore most likely would have held two torches.
   
   d. Date: 2nd century B.C.E. ²⁹⁵

²⁹⁵ Kanta, 61.
Eleusinian Dedications known from Inscriptions

A. Aedicular Reliefs (3):
1. 109 (IG II² 4920), 4th c. B.C.E.
2. 112 (IG II² 4922), 4th c. B.C.E.
3. 125 (IG II² 4921), 4th/3rd c. B.C.E.

B. Bases (non-statuary) (24):
1. 103 (IG II² 4606), late 4th c. B.C.E.
2. 108 (IG II² 4925), late 4th c. B.C.E.
3. 110 (IG II² 3841), late 4th c. B.C.E.
4. 111 (Skias’ no. 223), late 4th c. B.C.E.
5. 114 (Skias’ no. 127), late 4th c. B.C.E.
6. 115 (Skias’ no. 346A), late 4th c. B.C.E.
7. 116 (Skias’ no. 332), late 4th c. B.C.E.
8. 117 (Skias’ no. 125), late 4th c. B.C.E.
9. 120 (Inv. No. E 398), 4th/3rd c. B.C.E.
10. 124 (Inv. No. E 18), 4th/3rd c. B.C.E.
11. 128 (Inv. No. E 7), 4th/3rd c. B.C.E.
12. 129 (Inv. No. E 1076), 4th/3rd c. B.C.E.
13. 130 (Inv. No. E 890), 4th/3rd c. B.C.E.
14. 131 (Inv. No. E 849), 4th/3rd c. B.C.E.
15. 133 (Inv. No. E 418), 4th/3rd c. B.C.E.
17. 213 (IG II² 3859), late 3rd c. B.C.E.
18. 215 (Inv. No. E 367), late 3rd c. B.C.E.
19. 218 (Inv. No. E 1078), late 3rd c. B.C.E.
20. 219 (Inv. No. E 449), late 3rd c. B.C.E.
21. 222 (Inv. No. E 283 & 633), ca. 175/135 B.C.E.
22. 235 (IG II² 3469), ca. 140 B.C.E.
23. 247 (Inv. No. E 24), 2nd c. B.C.E.
24. 255 (Inv. No. E 179A), 2nd/1st c. B.C.E.

C. Civic Honorary Dedications (27):
1. 95 (IG II² 1191), Decree of the Eleusinians and Athenian Soldiers in Honor of Xenokles, 321/0 B.C.E.
2. 99 (IG II² 1187), Decree of the Eleusinians in Honor of the General Derkylos Autokleous Hagnousios, ca. 319/8 B.C.E.
3. 100 (IG II² 1230), Decree of the Kerykes in Honor of the Euthydemos Paredros of the Basileus, late 4th c. B.C.E.
4. 101 (IG II² 1274 + 1194), Decree of the Eleusinians and Athenians in Honor of Euthydemos Moirakleous Eleusinios, late 4th c. B.C.E.
5. 102 (not accessioned), Dedication by a General in Honor of the emarch Euthydemos, ca. 300 B.C.E.
6. 181 (Inv. No. E 1049), Decree of the Athenians in Honor of Epimeletai of the Mysteries, 267/6 B.C.E. (Eleusinian or Acropolis copy)
7. 182 (IG II2 1272), Decree of Athenian Soldiers Stationed at Eleusis in Honor of Dionysios, Scribe, 267/6 B.C.E.
8. 184 (IG II2 1304b), Decree of Athenian Soldiers Stationed at Eleusis in Honor of Sosikrates Tamias (TVN STRATIVTIKVN), ca. 258 B.C.E.
9. 191 (IG II2 1288 + 1219), Decree of the Eleusinians and Athenians Residing in Eleusis in Honor of [a General?], ca. mid. 3\textsuperscript{rd} c. B.C.E.
10. 193 (IG II2 1280), Decree of the Eleusinians and the Athenian Soldiers Stationed at Eleusis in Honor of King Antigonus, ca. 245-243 B.C.E.
11. 194 A & B (IG II2 1285), Decree of Athenian Soldiers Stationed at Eleusis in Honor of the General, Demeterios (Phanostratou Phalereus), ca. 242 B.C.E.
12. 195 (IG II2 2971), Dedication of Athenian Soldiers in Honor of the General Demetrios Phanostratos Phalereus, ca. 240 B.C.E. – crowns
13. 196 (IG II2 1299), Decree of Athenian Soldiers and Foreign Mercenaries at Eleusis and Decree of the Eleusinians in Honor of the General Aristophanes, ca. 234 B.C.E.
14. 197 (IG II2 1305), Decree of Athenian Soldiers Stationed at Eleusis, Panakton, and Phyle and Athenians Residing at Eleusis in Honor of Thrasyklæ, ca. 229-203 B.C.E.
15. 201 (IG II2 1235), Decree of the Keryxes and Eumolpidai in Honor of Chairetios Prophetou Eleusiniou, Hierophant, ca. 225 B.C.E.
16. 207 (IG II2 1303), Decree of the Athenian Soldiers Stationed at Eleusis, Panakton, and Phyle in Honor of their General, Theophrastos, ca. 216 B.C.E., or shortly thereafter
17. 208 (IG II2 847), Decree of the Athenians in Honor of Epimeletai of the Mysteries, ca. 214/13 B.C.E.
18. 209 (IG II2 3857), Decree of Dedication in Honor of Niketes Niketou Pergasethen, ca. 215 B.C.E.
19. 210 (IG II2 1958), Dedication of Soldiers Stationed at Eleusis in Honor of their General Ekphantos Euphanou Thriasios, ca. 210 B.C.E.
20. 211 (IG II2 1304), Decree of Athenian Soldiers and Upaiyro in Honor of their General, Demainetos Hermokleous Athmoneus, ca. 209 B.C.E.
21. 225 (Inv. No. E 324), Dedication (?) in Honor of Nou[m]enios Halaiou, Epimelete of the Procession of at the Dionysia, ca. 170-160 B.C.E.
22. 226 (IG II2 3463), Dedication (base) in Honor of an Epimelete of the Mysteria, ca. 169-135 B.C.E.
23. 229 (IG II2 949), Decrees of the Athenians and Eleusinians in Honor of Pamphilos Archontos Eleusinios, Demarch, ca. 165/4 B.C.E.
24. 230 (IG II2 1321), Decree in Honor of [---]medes Demetriou Hamaxanteus, ca. mid. 2\textsuperscript{nd} c. B.C.E.
25. 236 (IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2944), Dedication in Honor of a Hierophant, ca. 140 B.C.E.
26. 271 (IG II2 1338), Decree of the Synod of Dionysiac Artists in Honor of their Epimelete Phelmon, ca. 76 B.C.E., or shortly thereafter
27. 274 (IG II² 3219), Dedication in Honor of a Tamias, ca. 62/1 B.C.E.

D. Choragic Dedications (1):
   1. 107 (IG II² 3107), 4th century B.C.E.

E. Military Dedications (4):
   1. 92 (IG II² 2969), ca. 325 B.C.E.
   2. 94 (IG II² 2847), ca. 235-320 B.C.E.
   3. 186 (IG II² 3460), ca. 255 B.C.E.
   4. 190 (Inv. No. E 669), mid-3rd B.C.E.

F. Plemochoe (1):
   1. 121 (SEG XLI 22), 4th/3rd c. B.C.E.

G. Statue Bases (61):
   1. 88 (IG II² 4615), ca. 330-320 B.C.E.
      i. Base for statue of Eubouleus, found in the precinct of the Mirthless Rock. A head of Eubouleus was also found in this precinct, but, according to Clinton, does not belong to this base under question.  
   2. 89 (Inv. No. E 1127), ca. 330-320 B.C.E.
   3. 97 (IG II² 2841), 321/0 B.C.E.
      i. These bases (97 & 98) were pendant bases supporting on one a statue of Demeter and on the other, a statue of Kore, which would have once occupied either side of the main entrance to the sanctuary, the area that is now the site of the Lesser Propylaia. The statues most likely share the same sculptor.
   4. 98 (IG II² 2840), 321/0 B.C.E.
      i. See above (97).
   5. 113 (now missing, squeeze = Skias’ No. 124), 4th c. B.C.E.
   7. 126 (IG II² 4664), 4th/3rd c. B.C.E.
   8. 127 (Inv. No. E 21), 4th/3rd c. B.C.E.
   9. 212 (IG II² 3858), late 3rd c. B.C.E.
  10. 216 (not accessioned), 3rd c. B.C.E.
  11. 223 (IG II² 3874), ca. 170 B.C.E.
  12. 231 (IG II² 4296), mid-2nd c. B.C.E.
     i. Signed by the sculptors Eucheir and Euboulides Kropidai, father and son.
  13. 232 (IG II² 4301), mid-2nd c. B.C.E.
     i. Signed by sculptor Euboulides Eucheir Kropidai (son).

---

296 Clinton, Eleusis, Inscriptions on Stone, Commentary, 102.
297 Ibid., 107.
298 Ibid., 275.
299 Ibid., 276.
14. 238 (IG II² 3478), hearth initiate, ca. 115-110 B.C.E.
15. 241 (IG II² 3487), late 2nd c. B.C.E.
16. 242 (IG II² 3512), hierophant, late 2nd c. B.C.E.
17. 243 (IG II² 4690), priestess of Demeter and Kore, late 2nd c. B.C.E.
18. 244 (IG II² 3475 + 3476), hearth initiate, late 2nd/early 1st c. B.C.E.
19. 245 (Inv. No. E 38), hearth initiate, 2nd c. B.C.E.
20. 246 (Inv. No. E 885), hierophant, 2nd c. B.C.E.
21. 248 (Inv. No. E 47), late 1st c. B.C.E.
22. 251 (IG II² 3492), hearth initiate, 2nd/1st c. B.C.E.
23. 252 (Inv. No. E 215), hearth initiate, 2nd/1st c. B.C.E.
24. 253 (Inv. No. E 660), hearth initiate, 2nd/1st c. B.C.E.
25. 254 (IG II² 3878), 2nd/1st c. B.C.E.
26. 256 (Inv. No. E 266), 2nd/1st c. B.C.E.
27. 257 (Inv. No. E 389), 2nd/1st c. B.C.E.
28. 258 (Inv. No. E 655), 2nd/1st c. B.C.E.
29. 259 (Inv. No. E 720), 2nd/1st c. B.C.E.
30. 260 (Inv. No. E 773), 2nd/1st c. B.C.E.
31. 261 (Inv. No. E 623), 2nd/1st c. B.C.E.
32. 262 (IG II² 3937), priestess of Demeter and Kore, 2nd c. B.C.E.-2nd c. C.E.
33. 263 (IG II² 3941), 2nd c. B.C.E.-2nd c. C.E.
34. 264 (Inv. No. E 517), possibly to hearth initiate, 2nd c. B.C.E.-2nd c. C.E.
35. 265 (Inv. No. E 789), 2nd c. B.C.E.-2nd c. C.E.
36. 266 (Inv. No. E 902), priestess of Demeter and Kore, 100/99 B.C.E.
37. 267 (IG II² 3220), early 1st c. B.C.E.
38. 268 (IG II² 3495), priestess of Demeter and Kore, early 1st c. B.C.E.
39. 269 (Inv. No. E 1126), hearth initiate, last quarter of 2nd c. B.C.E.
40. 270 (IG II² 3480), hearth initiate, ca. 85 B.C.E.
41. 272 (Inv. No. E 1094), ca. 75-65 B.C.E.
   i. Bases for family group statues of Ariobarzanes II of Cappadocia and his family, who were know to be prolific benefactors of Athens, which may have been the reason for their commemorative display at Eleusis on behalf of the deme. 300
42. 273 (IG II² 3491), hearth initiate, ca. 70 B.C.E.
43. 275 (IG II² 3490), exegete, ca. 60 B.C.E.
44. 276 (IG II² 4108), ca. 50 B.C.E.
   i. This base is for T. Pinarius, who was a friend of Cicero. 301
45. 277 (IG II² 3507), daduch, ca. mid-1st c. B.C.E.
   i. Both this base and the following were dedicated by a wife in honor of her deceased husband. 302
46. 278 (IG II² 3508), daduch, ca. mid-1st c. B.C.E.
   i. See previous.

300 Clinton, Eleusis, Inscriptions on Stone, 292-3.
301 Ibid., 294.
302 Ibid.
47. 279 (IG II² 4704), ca. mid-1st c. B.C.E.
48. 280 (IG II² 4037), ca. mid-1st c. B.C.E.
49. 281 (IG II² 4716), priestess of Demeter and Kore, ca. mid-1st c. B.C.E.
50. 282 (IG II² 3498), hearth initiate, ca. mid-1st c. B.C.E.
51. 283 (IG II² 3727), hearth initiate, ca. mid-1st c. B.C.E.
52. 284 (Inv. No. E 298), ca. mid-1st c. B.C.E.
53. 285 (Inv. No. E 768), daduch, psot mid-1st c. B.C.E.
54. 286 (IG II² 3913), ca. 50-25 B.C.E.
55. 287 (IG II² 4705), ca. 50-15 B.C.E.
56. 288 (IG II² 3514), hierophantis, ca. 50-15 B.C.E.
57. 289 (IG II² 4112), shortly after 41 B.C.E.
58. 291 (IG II² 3513), ca. 40 B.C.E.
   i. Large base over 4.0m. wide containing statues of Q. Caecilius Pomponianus Atticus, Phaidros Lysiadou Berenikides, and probably three other family members of Phaidros arranged hieratically.\(^{303}\)
59. 292 (IG II² 4231), ca. 40 B.C.E.
60. 294 (IG II² 4202), ca. 40-30 B.C.E.
61. 295 (IG II² 3500 = 3501), ca. 35-30 B.C.E.
   i. Base for statue of Kallikratides, Hoplite General.\(^{304}\)

H. Other Dedications (1):
   1. 293 (IG II² 4708), Bench in outer court, ca. 40 B.C.E.

---

\(^{304}\) Ibid., 301.
1. **Statue of Antinoos**
   
a. Image: Kanta 1979, Fig. 36 page 88
   
b. Bibliography: Kourouniotes 1936, 90; Mylonas 1961, 202; Kanta 1979, 89.
   
c. Dedicator: Hadrian \(^{305}\)
   
d. Subject: Here Antinoos is shown deified with attributes of either Dionysos or Asclepius with the Delphic Omphalos at his feet. \(^{306}\)
   
e. Date: 2\(^{nd}\) century A.D. Would have been dedicated after Antinoos’ death and likely before the death of Hadrian, thus dating it between A.D. 130 and 138. \(^{307}\)
   
f. Find Spot: Found in 1860 by Lenormant in the outer court of the Sanctuary. \(^{308}\)

---

\(^{305}\) Kourouniotes, 90; Kanta, 89.

\(^{306}\) Kanta, 89.

\(^{307}\) Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 202, note 43; Kanta, 89.

\(^{308}\) Ibid.
2. *Fragments of Archaistic Statue of a Maiden*
   a. Image: Mylonas 1961, Fig 77; Kanta 1979, Fig 31; Fullerton 1986, Plates 42 & 43 (all fragments)
   c. Subject: This Roman archaistic statue (possibly Kore) was one of a pair of perirrhanteria that would have originally held basins of water for purification for initiates.
   d. Date: Roman, possibly 1st century A.D. based on similarity in treatment to the Caryatids of the Lesser Propylaia.\(^{309}\)

\(^{309}\) Fullerton, 209-10; Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 202; Kanta, 81.
3. *Statuette of Dionysos*
   
a. Image: Kanta 1979, Fig 26
b. Bibliography: Kourouniotes 1936, 89-90; Kanta 1979, 73.
c. Subject: This Roman copy depicts Dionysos with his typical attributes: long hair crowned with an ivy wreath, grapes, and *kantharos*. His cloak is shown barely hanging from his left arm and hips, exposing his genitals.
d. Date: Roman.\textsuperscript{310}

\textsuperscript{310} Kourouniotes, 90; Kanta, 73.
4. *Statuette of Poseidon*
   
a. Image: Kanta 1979, Fig 33  
b. Bibliography: Kourouniotes 1936, 89-90; Kanta 1979, 83.  
c. Subject: This Roman copy of a Greek original represents Poseidon with his right leg lunging forward to rest on a dolphin. His cloak is shown draped over his right leg while his left hand wielded a trident (not preserved).\(^{311}\)  
d. Date: Roman. Another copy of the Greek original is on display in Pella, which dates to the late Hellenistic period.

\(^{311}\) Kanta, 83.
5. **Statuette of Nike**
   a. Image: Kanta 1979, Fig 20.
   c. Subject: Reminiscent of the Victory of Paeonius from Olympia, the Eleusinian *Statuette of Nike* is preserved only from the chest down. The drapery of her tunic is rendered clinging to her body as she flies.
   d. Date: Roman\(^{312}\)

---

\(^{312}\) Kanta, 65.
6. **Young Athlete**
   
a. Image: Kanta 1979, Fig. 32
b. Bibliography: Kanta 1979, 82.
c. Subject: What is preserved of this statue represents a young athlete with cloak over his left shoulder.
d. Date: Roman copy of 4th century original *Hermes of Andros*.\(^{313}\)

\(^{313}\) Kanta, 82.
7. Emperor Tiberius
   a. Image: Kanta 1979, Fig. 37
   c. Dedicator: Tiberius (42 B.C.E.- A.D. 37, ruled A.D. 14-37)
   d. Subject: Tiberius is depicted larger than life (2.10m.) in a hooded toga as Pontifex Maximus.\textsuperscript{314}
   e. Date: Early 1\textsuperscript{st} century A.D.

\textsuperscript{314} Kanta, 91; Mylonas, \textit{Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries}, 202.
8. *Headless Statues*


c. Subject: Two headless statues now sit in the courtyard of the Eleusis Museum. Both wear characteristically Roman attire, leading to the conclusion that their dedicators were probably Romans. Mylonas noticed that the heads of these statues would have been made of a separate piece of marble to be inserted into the neck. He postulated these headless statues constitute a customizable but mostly ready-made sort of dedication sold to Roman patrons travelling from afar for the Mysteries. The bodies were prefabricated and the customer could have the head custom made in time for his travels to the sanctuary.\(^\text{315}\)

d. Date: Roman Imperial

---

9. **Statue of Herakles**
   
   
   b. Bibliography: Kanta 1979, 92.
   
   c. Subject: Roman copy of Herakles holding a lion’s pelt over his left arm.
   
   d. Date: Roman
10. Statue of Nero

a. Image: Kanta 1979, Fig. 39.
b. Bibliography: Kanta 1979, 94.
c. Dedicator: Nero (A.D. 37-68, ruled A.D. 54-68)
d. Subject: The Emperor Nero is shown wearing a hooded toga.  
316e. Date: Mid-1st century A.D.

316 Kanta, 94.
11. *Statue of Dionysos*

a. Image: Kanta 1979, Fig. 40

b. Bibliography: Kanta 1979, 95.

c. Subject: This Eleusinian statue of Dionysos holds a *kantharos* in his right hand, while his left arm rests on a tree trunk ornamented with ivy vines and grapes. Dionysos probably held a thyrsus or scepter in his left hand (partially preserved).

d. Date: Roman Imperial\(^\text{317}\)

\(^{317}\) Kanta, 95.
12. Statuette of a Sacrificial Pig
   a. Image: Mylonas 1961, Fig. 66
   c. Subject: This sculpture constitutes a votive offering of a sacrificial pig, the required offering for the Greater Mysteries. Statues of traditional sacrificial animals such as this were not uncommon gifts to the gods; statues of animals were more permanent reminders of one’s devotion to the gods.
   d. Date: Roman.\textsuperscript{318}

\textsuperscript{318} Kanta, 53.
13. Statue of Iakchos
   a. Image: Clinton 1992, Fig. 64 page 200.
   c. Subject: The identity of this statue is uncertain, but Clinton has proposed that it is a Dionysiac Iakchos, rather short in stature (typically Iakchos was shown shorter than the two goddesses) with long hair, a himation, and probably objects in his hands (not preserved). According to Clinton, the attributes of Iakchos and Eubouleus are so similar, that the only feature differentiating the two when they appear together in sculpture is Iakchos’ himation, as we see in this Statue of Iakchos. The find spot – in the sacred precinct of the Mirthless Rock (previously referred to as the “Ploutonion”) – would have been conducive to representations of Iakchos because it was he who led the initiates to this spot where the first events of the Mysteries at Eleusis occurred.
   d. Date: 2nd century A.D.
   e. Find Spot: in the sacred precinct of the “Ploutonion.”

319 Clinton, Myth and Cult, 71.
320 Ibid., 70.
321 Ibid., 70 & 137.
Eleusinian Dedications known from Inscriptions

A. Altar Dedications to Emperors (2):
   1. 446 (IG II² 3380), dedicated to Hadrian, ca. C.E. 132
   2. 482 (IG II² 3404), dedicated in honor of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, ca. C.E.161-169

B. Altar Dedications (9):
   1. 306 (IG II² 4709), 1st c. C.E.
   2. 328 (IG II² 4717), early 1st c. C.E.
   3. 387 (IG II² 4939), 1st c. C.E.
   4. 390 (IG II² 4996), altar dedicated to Artemis, 1st c. C.E.
   5. 400 (Inv. No. E 1072), bomiskos for Iakchos, 1st/2nd c. C.E.
   6. 401 (IG II² 4755), bomiskos for Kourotrophos, 1st/2nd c. C.E.
   7. 447 (IG II² 2961), post C.E. 131/2
   8. 668 (IG II² 5014), to Kourotrophos, Imperial
   9. 669 (IG II² 4878), Imperial

C. Aparche Dedications Commemorated by Inscription (2):
   1. 504 (IG II² 2957), ca. C.E. 177-189
   2. 523 (IG II² 3687), 2nd c. C.E.

D. Bases for Dedications to Emperors and the Imperial Family (20):
   1. 297 (Inv. No. E 887), statue base for Augustus Caesar as Zeus Boulaios, 27 B.C.E.
   2. 331 (IG II² 3263), statue base for Emperor Tiberius, ca. C.E. 14-37
   3. 422 (Inv. No. E 852), statue base for an emperor, 1st/2nd c. C.E.
   4. 424 (Inv. No. E 294), statue base for an emperor, 1st/3rd c. C.E.
   5. 453 (IG II² 3386), statue base for deified Hadrian PanHellenios, post C.E. 138
   6. 461 (IG II² 3399), statue base for Annia Faustina, wife of Marcus Aurelius, ca. C.E. 146-160
   7. 471 (IG II² 4085), statue base for an emperor, ca. C.E. 150-200
   8. 495 (IG II² 3407), statue base for Marcus Aurelius, ca. C.E. 172-175
   9. 496 (IG II² 3408), statue base for Marcus Aurelius, ca. C.E. 172-180
  10. 497 (Inv. No. E 825), statue base for Marcus Aurelius, ca. C.E. 172-180
   11. 505 (IG II² 3397), statue base for deified Marcus Aurelius, ca. C.E. 180-2
   12. 506 (IG II² 3402), statue base for Lucilla, daughter of Marcus Aurelius, ca. C.E. 180-182
   13. 507 (IG II² 3400), statue base for deified Faustina, wife of Marcus Aurelius, ca. C.E. 180-182
   14. 508 (Inv. No. E 1059), statue base for deified Faustina, wife of Marcus Aurelius, ca. C.E. 180-182
   15. 509 (IG II² 3401), statue base for Sabina, daughter of Marcus Aurelius, ca. C.E. 180-182
16. 510 (IG II² 3398), statue base for Faustina, daughter of Marcus Aurelius, ca. C.E. 180-182
17. 518 (IG II² 3413), dedication honoring Julia Domna and Septimus Severus, ca. C.E. 195-198
18. 519 (IG II² 3415), statue base for Julia Domna, ca. C.E. 195-198
19. 597 (IG II² 3236), statue base for an emperor, 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
20. 660 (IG II² 3422), statue base for Diocletian and Maximianus, ca. C.E. 286-305

E. Bases (non-statuary) (16):
   1. 320 (Inv. No. E 311), 1st – 3rd c. C.E.
   2. 394 (IG II² 3567), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
   3. 408 (Inv. No. E 251), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
   4. 457 (IG II² 2809), ca. C.E. 140-150
   5. 525 (IG II² 4082), late 2nd c. C.E.
   6. 527 (IG II² 3165 + 3166), dedicated for victory in the Eleusinia, 2nd c. C.E.
   7. 559 (IG II² 3967), 2nd c. C.E.
   8. 584 (Inv. No. E 780), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
   9. 589 (IG II² 4948), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
  10. 598 (Inv. No. E 353 + 135 + 467), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
  11. 600 (IG II² 5008), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
  12. 607 (Inv. No. E 131), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
  13. 666 (IG II² 4096), unknown date
  14. 670 (now missing), Imperial
  15. 671 (now missing), Imperial
  16. 673 (now missing, Skias’ No. 269A), unknown date

F. Civic Honorary Dedications (7):
   1. 300 (not accessioned), Decree in Honor of Themistokles Theophrastou
       Hagnousoi, Daduch, ca. 20/19 B.C.E.
   2. 487 A, B, & C (IG II² 3984), Statue Base in Honor of Titus Flavius
       Euthykomos Paianieus, C.E. 166/167
   3. 488 (IG II² 3985), Statue Base in Honor of Titus Flavius Menandros
       Paianieus, C.E. 166/167
   4. 516 (IG II² 3411), Statue Base in Honor of the Hierophant who Saved the
       Hera during the Invasion of the Costobocs, ca. C.E. 191/2
   5. 528 (IG II² 3987), Herm in Honor of Iounios Agathopodos Marathonios, 2nd c.
       C.E.
   6. 529 (IG II² 3967), 2nd c. C.E.
   7. 647 (IG II² 3419), dedicated to Emperor Maximinianus, ca. C.E. 235/236

G. Columns (1):
   1. 432 (Inv. No. E 936), 1st – 3rd c. C.E.
H. Dedications by Herodes Attikos (4):
   1. 438 (IG II² 3604B), statue base for dedication by Herodes, ca. C.E. 115
   2. 475 (Inv. No. E 774), statue base for daughter of Herodes, ca. C.E. 155
   3. 476 (IG II² 4072), statue base for wife of Herodes, ca. C.E. 160
   4. 498 (IG II² 4781), statue of Asklepius, ca. C.E. 175

I. Herms (2):
   1. 529 (IG II² 3967), 2nd c. C.E.
   2. 647 (IG II² 3419), dedicated to Emperor Maximinius, ca. C.E. 235/236

J. Monuments to Emperors and the Imperial Family (2):
   1. 296 (Inv. No. E 1142), large statue base for statues of Augustus and Livia, after 31-27 B.C.E.
   2. 335 (Inv. No. E 844), monument attributed to the cult of Julia Augusta, ca. C.E. 25

K. Monuments (non-Imperial) (3):
   1. 342 (IG II² 4721), by priestess of Demeter and Kore, ca. C.E. 25-65.
   2. 551 (now missing), hearth-initiate, 2nd c. C.E.
   3. 555 (Inv. No. E 1029B), 2nd c. C.E.
   4. 556 (Inv. No. 707 + 905 + 709), 2nd c. C.E.

L. Statue Bases to dadouchia and their families (7):
   1. 298 (IG II² 3509), ca. 25 B.C.E.
   2. 301 (IG II² 3510), to four members of the family, ca. 20 B.C.E.
   3. 302 (IG II² 3511), to son of daduch, late 1st c. B.C.E.
   4. 493 (IG II² 4084 + 4087), ca. C.E. 170
   5. 520 (IG II² 3693), to daughter of daduch and hearth initiate, late 2nd c. C.E.
   6. 622 (IG II² 3610), to grandson of daduch, ca. C.E. 200
   7. 632 (IG II² 4088), to daughter of daduch, ca. C.E. 210

M. Statue Bases to Exegeses (12):
   1. 313 (Inv. No. E 730), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
   2. 324 (IG II² 3523), early 1st c. C.E.
   3. 337 (IG II² 3525), ca. C.E. 25
   4. 359 (Inv. No. E 130), ca. C.E. 50-100
   5. 455 (Inv. No. E 580 + 300 + 769 + 769B), ca. C.E. 140-150
   6. 456 (Inv. No. E 1105), to a relative of exegete, ca. C.E. 140-150
   7. 531 (IG II² 3621), 2nd c. C.E.
   8. 544 (Inv. No. E 39), 2nd c. C.E.
   9. 545 (Inv. No. E 211), 2nd c. C.E.
10. 550 (Inv. No. E 554), 2nd c. C.E.
11. 590 (IG II² 4081), to a daughter of exegete, 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
12. 663 (Inv. No. E 477), 3rd c. C.E.
N. Statue Bases dedicated to Hierophants and Hierophantises (14):
1. 325 (IG II² 3527), early 1st c. C.E.
2. 371 (IG II² 3585), ca. C.E. 90-105
3. 380 (IG II² 3553), to granddaughter of hierophantis, 1st c. C.E.
4. 433 (IG II² 3546), early 2nd c. C.E.
5. 454 (IG II² 3575), post C.E. 138
6. 465 (IG II² 2341), ca. mid-2nd c. C.E.
7. 466 (IG II² 3628), ca. mid-2nd c. C.E.
8. 483 (IG II² 3592), ca. C.E. 162 or shortly thereafter
9. 501 (IG II² 3633), ca. C.E. 175-200
10. 502 (IG II² 3632), to daughter of hierophantis, ca. C.E. 176-192
11. 631 (IG II² 3641), ca. C.E. 210
12. 637 (IG II² 3811 + Inv. No. E 995 + Inv. No. E 33), ca. C.E. 215-220
13. 646 (IG II² 3661), ca. C.E. 235
14. 649 (IG II² 3662), ca. C.E. 240

O. Statue Bases dedicated by Priestesses of Demeter and Kore (6):
1. 343 (IG II² 2879), dedicated by Kleo Eukleous, ca. C.E. 25-65
2. 379 (IG II² 2954), 1st c. C.E.
3. 523 (IG II² 3687), 2nd c. C.E.
4. 549 (Inv. No. E 1027), 2nd c. C.E.
5. 594 (Inv. No. 105 + 540 + 509), priestess of Demeter, 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
6. 651 (IG II² 4824), priestess of Demeter, ca. mid-3rd c. C.E.

P. Statue Bases dedicated by Hearth-Initiates (50):
1. 299 (IG II² 3519), ca. C.E. 25
2. 307 (IG II² 3499), ca. late 1st c. C.E.
3. 317 (IG II² 3723), 1st c. B.C.E.-2nd c. C.E.
4. 318 (Inv. No. E 262 + 804), 1st c. B.C.E.-2nd c. C.E.
5. 319 (Inv. No. E 295), 1st c. B.C.E.-2nd c. C.E.
6. 323 (not accessioned), late 1st c. B.C.E.-early 1st c. C.E.
7. 329 (IG II² 3518), during the lifetime of Augustus
8. 351 (IG II² 3551), ca. mid-1st c. C.E.
9. 357 (Inv. No. E 883), ca. C.E. 50-60
10. 364 (IG II² 3604A), ca. C.E. 65
11. 365 (IG II² 3552), ca. C.E. 75
12. 370 (IG II² 3581), ca. C.E. 80-90
13. 373 (IG II² 3586, now missing), ca. C.E. 90-105
14. 374 (IG II² 3587), ca. C.E. 90-105
15. 384 (IG II² 4203), 1st c. C.E.
16. 391 (Inv. No. E 724), 1st c. C.E.
17. 393 (IG II² 3517), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
18. 395 (IG II² 3568), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
19. 396 (IG II² 3569), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
20. 399 (IG II² 4058), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
21. 414 (Inv. No. E 354), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
22. 416 (Inv. No. E 520), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
23. 429 (now missing), 1st – 3rd c. C.E.
24. 431 (Inv. No. E 818), 1st – 3rd c. C.E.
25. 441 (IG II² 3577, now missing), before C.E. 124/5
26. 442 (Inv. No. E 755 + 806), ca. C.E. 125–140
27. 458 (IG II² 3557), ca. C.E. 145
28. 459 (Inv. No E 206), ca. C.E. 145-50
29. 464 (IG II² 3619), ca. mid-2nd c. C.E.
30. 467 (IG II² 3611), ca. mid-2nd c. C.E.
31. 474 (IG II² 3708), ca. C.E. 155
32. 477 (IG II² 3608), ca. C.E. 160-165
33. 480 (Inv. No. E 1021), ca. C.E. 160-170
34. 481 (IG II² 3676), ca. C.E. 160-170
35. 511 (IG II² 4077), ca. C.E. 180-185
36. 521 (IG II² 3713 + 4089), late 2nd c. C.E.
37. 522 (IG II² 3647), late 2nd c. C.E.
38. 524 (IG II² 3648), late 2nd c. C.E.
39. 535 (IG II² 3657), 2nd c. C.E.
40. 568 (Inv. No. E 161), 2nd c. C.E.
41. 587 (IG II² 3656), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
42. 591 (now missing), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
43. 621 (IG II² 3688), late 2nd/early 3rd c. C.E.
44. 628 (IG II² 3686), early 3rd c. C.E.
45. 635 (IG II² 3637), after C.E. 212
46. 636 (IG II² 3638), ca. C.E. 220
47. 639 (IG II² 3710), ca. C.E. 225-250
48. 640 (IG II² 3646), ca. C.E. 225-250
49. 642 (IG II² 3706), ca. C.E. 225-250
50. 648 (IG II² 3679), ca. C.E. 240

Q. Statue Bases (individuals of unspecified status/rank) (171):
1. 303 (Inv. No. E 270), late 1st c. C.E.
2. 304 (IG II² 4306), late 1st c. C.E.
3. 305 (IG II² 3887 + 3888), late 1st c. C.E.
4. 308 (IG II² 3905), 1st c. C.E.
5. 309 (Inv. No. E 800), 1st c. C.E.
6. 312 (Inv. No. E 668), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
7. 314 (Inv. No. E 879), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
8. 316 (Inv. No. E 333), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
10. 322 (Inv. No. E 1090), 1st – 3rd c. C.E.
11. 326 (IG II² 3915), early 1st c. C.E.
12. 327 (IG II² 3920), early 1st c. C.E.
13. 330 (IG II² 3904), during the lifetime of Augustus
14. 332 (Inv. No. E 613), ca. C.E. 14-54
15. 333 (IG II² 3547), ca. C.E. 20
16. 338 (IG II² 3526), ca. C.E. 25
17. 339 (Inv. No. E 726), ca. C.E. 25-50
18. 340 (Inv. No. E 134), ca. C.E. 25-50
19. 345 (preserved only in IG IV² 82-84), ca. C.E. 38-48
20. 346 (IG II² 4046), ca. mid-1st c. C.E.
21. 347 (IG II² 3919 + 4165), ca. mid-1st c. C.E.
22. 348 (IG II² 3928), ca. mid-1st c. C.E.
23. 349 (IG II² 4042), ca. mid-1st c. C.E.
24. 350 (IG II² 4190), Cato, mid-1st c. C.E.
25. 352 (IG II² 3927), ca. mid-1st c. C.E.
26. 353 (IG II² 4043), ca. mid-1st c. C.E.
27. 355 (IG II² 3934), ca. C.E. 50-59
28. 356 (Inv. No. E 143), ca. C.E. 50-60
29. 358 (IG II² 4722), ca. C.E. 50-60
30. 361 (IG II² 3562), ca. C.E. 60
31. 362 (IG II² 3789), ca. C.E. 60
32. 366 (IG II² 3953), ca. C.E. 75-80
33. 367 (IG II² 3954), ca. C.E. 75-80
34. 368 (Inv. No. E 514), ca. C.E. 75-80
35. 372 (IG II² 3584), ca. C.E. 90-105
36. 375 (IG II² 3588), ca. C.E. 90-105
37. 376 (now missing, squeeze = Skias’ no. 298), ca. C.E. 90-105
38. 377 (IG II² 3558), late 1st c. C.E.
39. 378 (IG II² 3931), 1st c. C.E.
40. 381 (IG II² 3914), 1st c. C.E.
41. 382 (IG II² 3938), 1st c. C.E.
42. 383 (IG II² 4198), 1st c. C.E.
43. 385 (IG II² 4202), 1st c. C.E.
44. 386 (IG II² 4311), 1st c. C.E.
45. 388 (IG II² 4940), 1st c. C.E.
46. 389 (Inv. No. E 284), 1st c. C.E.
47. 397 (IG II² 3948 + 3949), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
48. 398 (IG II² 4055), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
49. 402 (IG II² 4205), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
50. 403 (IG II² 4942), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
51. 404 (IG II² 4749), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
52. 405 (IG II² 4768), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
53. 406 (IG II² 4767), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
54. 407 (Inv. No. E 247), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
55. 409 (Inv. No. E 261 + 263 + 291 + 419+ 459), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
56. 410 (Inv. No. E 265 + 558), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
57. 412 (Skias’ No. 499 + 500 [now missing]), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
58. 413 (Inv. No. E 352), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
59. 415 (Inv. No. E 370 + 380), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
60. 417 (Inv. No. E 582), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
61. 418 (Inv. No. E 728), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
62. 419 (Inv. No. E 729), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
63. 420 (Inv. No. E 810), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
64. 421 (Inv. No. E 828), 1st/2nd c. C.E.
65. 423 (Inv. No. E 53 + 369), 1st–3rd c. C.E.
66. 425 (Inv. No. E 335 + 425), 1st–3rd c. C.E.
67. 426 (Inv. No. E 471 + 474), 1st–3rd c. C.E.
68. 427 (Inv. No. E 985), 1st–3rd c. C.E.
69. 428 (now missing), 1st–3rd c. C.E.
70. 430 (Inv. No. E 727), 1st–3rd c. C.E.
71. 434 (IG II² 4754), ca. C.E. 105-145
72. 435 (IG II² 3559), ca. C.E. 105-145
73. 436 (IG II² 3560), ca. C.E. 105-145
74. 437 (IG II² 4753), ca. C.E. 105-145
75. 439 (IG II² 4195), after C.E. 117
76. 440 (IG II² 4093), after C.E. 117/118
77. 443 (IG II² 2884), ca. C.E. 125-150
78. 445 (Inv. No. E 476), ca. C.E. 130-140
79. 460 (IG II² 3598), before mid-2nd c. C.E.
80. 463 (IG II² 4071), mid-2nd c. C.E.
81. 468 (IG II² 3966), mid-2nd c. C.E.
82. 469 (Inv. No. E 760), mid-2nd c. C.E.
83. 470 (IG II² 4251), ca. C.E. 150-200
84. 472 (Inv. No. E 41), ca. C.E. 150-200
85. 473 (IG II² 4057 + 4213), ca. C.E. 150-160
86. 478 (IG II² 3614), ca. C.E. 160-170
87. 479 (IG II² 3615), ca. C.E. 160-170
88. 485 (IG II² 3677, now missing), ca. C.E. 165
89. 490 (IG II² 2959), ca. C.E. 170
90. 491 (IG II² 3627), ca. C.E. 170
91. 492 (IG II² 3616), ca. C.E. 170
92. 512 (IG II² 3645), ca. C.E. 180-185
93. 534 (IG II² 3993), 2nd c. C.E.
94. 536 (Inv. No. 565 + 817 + 884), 2nd c. C.E.
95. 537 (IG II² 4715), 2nd c. C.E.
96. 538 (Inv. No. E 900), 2nd c. C.E.
97. 539 (Inv. No. 499 + 743), 2nd c. C.E.
98. 540 (Inv. No. E 788), 2nd c. C.E.
99. 541 (Inv. No. E 360), 2nd c. C.E.
100. 542 (Inv. No. E 372), 2nd c. C.E.
101. 543 (Inv. No. E 378), 2nd c. C.E.
102. 546 (IG II2 2888), 2nd c. C.E.
103. 547 (Inv. No. E 239), 2nd c. C.E.
104. 548 (Inv. No. E 600), 2nd c. C.E.
105. 558 (Inv. No. E 391), 2nd c. C.E.
106. 560 (Inv. No. E 896), 2nd c. C.E.
107. 561 (Inv. No. E 491), 2nd c. C.E.
108. 562 (Inv. No. E 839), 2nd c. C.E.
109. 563 (Inv. No. E 504), 2nd c. C.E.
110. 564 (Inv. No. E 749), 2nd c. C.E.
111. 565 (Inv. No. E 830), 2nd c. C.E.
112. 566 (Inv. No. E 863), 2nd c. C.E.
113. 567 (Inv. No. E 801), 2nd c. C.E.
114. 569 (Inv. No. E 821), 2nd c. C.E.
115. 570 (Inv. No. E 733), 2nd c. C.E.
116. 571 (Inv. No. E 843), 2nd c. C.E.
117. 572 (Inv. No. E 162), 2nd c. C.E.
118. 573 (Inv. No. E 164), 2nd c. C.E.
119. 574 (Inv. No. E 379), 2nd c. C.E.
120. 575 (Inv. No. E 285), 2nd c. C.E.
121. 576 (Inv. No. E 286), 2nd c. C.E.
122. 577 (Inv. No. E 293), 2nd c. C.E.
123. 578 (Inv. No. E 857), 2nd c. C.E.
124. 579 (Inv. No. E 319), 2nd c. C.E.
125. 580 (now missing), 2nd c. C.E.
126. 581 (Inv. No. E 321), 2nd c. C.E.
127. 582 (Inv. No. E 451), 2nd c. C.E.
128. 583 (Inv. No. E 1112), 2nd c. C.E.
129. 585 (not accessioned into Eleusis collection; Inv. No. 17488 at Stanford University Museum of Art), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
130. 592 (Inv. No. E 770), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
131. 593 (Inv. No. E 19 + 529), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
132. 595 (Inv. No. E 610), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
133. 596 (Inv. No. E 722), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
134. 599 (Inv. No. E 384), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
135. 602 (Inv. No. E 34), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
136. 603 (Inv. No. E 32), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
137. 604 (Inv. No. E 50), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
138. 605 (Inv. No. E 78), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
139. 606 (Inv. No. E 80), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
140. 608 (Inv. No. E 302), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
141. 609 (Inv. No. E 390), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
142. 610 (Inv. No. E 473), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
143. 611 (Inv. No. E 746), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
144. 612 (Inv. No. E 1037), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
145. 613 (Inv. No. E 488), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
146. 614 (Inv. No. E 612), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
147. 615 (Inv. No. E 715), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
148. 616 (Inv. No. E 767), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.
149. 617 (Inv. No. E 837), 2nd/3rd c. C.E.

150. 623 (IG II² 3659, now missing), ca. C.E. 200
151. 624 (IG II² 3658), ca. C.E. 200
152. 625 (IG II² 4219), ca. C.E. 200
153. 626 (IG II² 3666), early 3rd c. C.E.
154. 627 (Inv. No. E 397), early 3rd c. C.E.
155. 629 (IG II² 4067), ca. C.E. 200-210
156. 630 (IG II² 4216), C.E. 203-205
157. 633 (IG II² 4075 + 4083), ca. C.E. 210-225
158. 634 (IG II² 3817), before C.E. 212
159. 641 (IG II² 4051), ca. C.E. 225-250
160. 644 (IG II² 4346), ca. C.E. 230
161. 645 (IG II² 3707), shortly after 231/2
162. 652 (Skias’ No. 138 + 139 + 178 [now missing]), ca. mid-3rd c. C.E.
163. 653 (IG II² 3802), ca. mid-3rd c. C.E.
164. 656 (IG II² 3671), ca. C.E. 270
165. 657 (Inv. No. E 412), ca. C.E. 270
166. 658 (IG II² 3714), ca. C.E. 270
167. 659 (IG II² 3709), late 3rd c. C.E.
168. 661 (IG II² 4218), 3rd c. C.E.
169. 662 (Inv. No. E 1014A), 3rd c. C.E.
170. 664 (Inv. No. E 758), 3rd c. C.E.
171. 665 (IG II² 4009), 3rd c. C.E.
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