

SLOBODAN DUŠANIĆ  
Faculty of Philosophy  
Belgrade

UDC 292.11:930.271.

### THE ATTIC *EYXAI* OF 362/1 BC (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 112*, lines 6-12), ARCADIA, AND THE ELEUSINIAN GODDESSES

*Abstract:* *IG II<sup>2</sup> 112* (line 8: καὶ τῆι Δήμητρι καὶ τῆι Κόρῃ) alludes to the theme of the Attic-Arcadian (Peloponnesian) kinship personified by Demeter and her daughter and coloured by the prestige of Eleusis. The *sungeneia* between Eleusis and the Arcadian centres of worship of the Two Goddesses appears to have become a propaganda instrument especially popular after 371 BC, owing to the diplomatic *rapprochement* between Athens and the Arcadian League.

Key-words: Arcadian League, Attic εὐχαί, Demeter, Eleusis, συγγένεια ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ.

I. The main body of the treaty of alliance of Athens, Arcadia, Achaea, Elis and Phlius, concluded at the end of 362/1 BC<sup>1</sup> and preserved in its Attic version (the decree moved by Periander), opens with the following provision: εὐξασθαι μὲν τὸν κήρυκα αὐτίκα μ<sup>7</sup>/άλα τῶι Διὶ τῶι Ὀλυμπίῳ καὶ τῆι Ἀθηνᾶι τῆι Πολιά/<sup>8</sup>δι καὶ τῆι Δήμητρι καὶ τῆι Κόρῃ καὶ τοῖς δώδεκα [θ]/<sup>9</sup>εοῖς καὶ ταῖς Σεμναῖς θεαῖς, ἐὰν συνενείγκῃ Ἀ[θῆν]/<sup>10</sup>ναίων τῶι δήμῳ τὰ δόξαντα περὶ τῆς συμμαχία[ς, θυ]/<sup>11</sup>[σί]αν καὶ πρόσσοδον ποιήσεσθ[α]ι τελουμένων [τοῦτῳ]/<sup>12</sup>[ν κα]θότι ἂν τῶι δήμῳ δοκῆ<sup>2</sup>. Above the inscription is the lower part of a relief whose figures throw some light on the content of the herald's proclamation; it

<sup>1</sup> S. Dušanić, *Ath. Mitt.* 94(1979) 128-135.

<sup>2</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup> 112* (found in Athens) (= *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 181; Tod, *GHI* 144; Bengtson, *St.-V.* II<sup>2</sup> 290), lines 6-12 (the restorations being certain, I shall cite in the sequel the Greek and the translation of lines 6-12 without brackets and the related editorial signs). "The herald shall vow right away to Olympian Zeus and Athena Polias and Demeter and Kore and the Twelve Gods and the August Goddesses (Erinyes), if benefit accrue to the Athenian People from their resolution concerning the alliance, that a sacrifice and procession shall be made, when these things are accomplished in accordance with the resolution of the People" (transl. Ph. Harding, from E. Badian and R. K. Sherk edd., *Translated Documents of Greece and Rome*, vol. 2: *From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus*, Cambridge 1985, 76 f. (No 56)).

represents “Zeus enthroned, with thunderbolt, approached by a female figure, probably Peloponnesus, while Athena stands behind”<sup>3</sup>.

Similar vows, accompanying the conclusion of international treaties<sup>4</sup>, have been attested in several epigraphic documents of the classical and later periods. Some parallels deserve to be quoted here. Each vow concerns only one city – whose copy of the treaty has been discovered and published<sup>5</sup> – so that we (still) do not possess two or more complementary clauses of vows, declared by all or at least more than one city from the number of those which had sworn to that particular treaty<sup>6</sup>. This state of affairs tends, of course, to reduce the possibilities of applying the comparative method to the analysis of the material that is at our disposal.

But the evidence available remains of value, nevertheless.

Another fragmentary stele recording an Athenian decree also and dating, approximately, from the same time as Periander’s proposal (i.e. from the ninth(?) prytany of Molon’s year (362/1 BC)) is especially instructive: ε[ὺ]ξ[ασθαι μὲν] τὸ[ν κήρυκα α]/<sup>7</sup> [ὺ]τίκα μάλα τοῖς δώδεκα θ[εοῖς καὶ ταῖς Σεμναῖς θεα]/<sup>8</sup>[ῖ]ς καὶ τῶι Ἑρακλεῖ, ἐὰν σ[υ]νε νέγκηι Ἀθηναίοις πέμψ]/<sup>9</sup>[α]σι τοὺς κληρούχους ἐς Ποτ[ε]ίδαιαν, καθὰ αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγ]/<sup>10</sup>[έλλουσ]ι οἱ ἤκοντε[ρ] δημοσίαι παρὰ τῶν ἐκκ Ποτειδα]/<sup>11</sup>[ίας, θυσίαν καὶ πρόσοδον ποιήσεσθαι, καθότι ἂν τῶι]/<sup>12</sup>[δήμωι δοκῆι]<sup>7</sup>.

A third Athenian document, recording the Attic-Chian alliance of 384 BC, will have included a comparable phrase, which is not extant any more<sup>8</sup>. Indeed, Theopompus’ fragment 104 Jac., whose

<sup>3</sup> Tod, *GHI* p. 134 (with bibl.); Dušanić (n. 1) 128 n. 47; below, notes 26 and 53. See also *infra*, n. 29, where similar reliefs are referred to (esp. Tod, *GHI* 159 (Parthenos safely identified)).

<sup>4</sup> Or publication of treaty-like documents; for *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 30 see note 7.

<sup>5</sup> Usually it is the city whose territory has unearthed the monument in question. *St. – V.* III 551 (*infra*, note 19) forms an exception in that respect.

<sup>6</sup> The exception of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 34 (cf. *FGrHist* 115 F 104) is only partial, to say nothing of the hypothetical nature of our interpretation of these difficult pieces of evidence (*infra*, text and notes 8 ff., 34-36).

<sup>7</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 114 (“Athens sends cleruchs to Potidaea”) 114 (found in Athens) (= *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 180; Tod, *GHI* 146; see also Harding’s transl., No 58), lines 6 ff. Politically (two cities were involved: Athens and Potidaea) and, perhaps, in the legal form (cf. lines 4-6; the bulk of the stele having perished, it is hard to be positive on that point), the decree was tantamount to the document of an interstate alliance. The inscription of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 30 (below, note 12), which also dealt with a cleruchy (the Lemnian one), presented a similar but not an identical case: it must have shown less resemblance to an international treaty.

<sup>8</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 34 (found in Athens) (= Tod, *GHI* II 118; Bengtson, *St.-V.* II<sup>2</sup> 384; Dušanić, *ZPE* 133(2000) 21-30; see also Harding’s transl., No 31), lines after the secretary’s name (generally speaking, lines which immediately follow the prescripts of international treaties present the normal place for references to the εὐχαί). That

subject has been misdated<sup>9</sup>, shows that the εὐχαὶ phrase should be restored in the inscription. It also provides welcome information on the circumstances of the religious ceremony engaging the Athenians allied to Chios. Namely, Theopompus writes in the fragment : εὐχοντο γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι κοινῆι ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιαῶν ἑαυτοῖς τε καὶ Χίοις, ἐπειδὴ ἔπεμπον οἱ Χῖοι συμμάχους εἰς Ἀθήνας ὅτε χρεῖα πολέμου προσῆν, καθάπερ Θεόπομπος ἐν τῷ *IB* Φιλιππικῶν φησιν οὕτως ὅτι δὲ πολλοὶ τοῦ ταῦτα πράττειν ἀπειχον, ὥστε τὰς εὐχὰς κοινὰς καὶ περὶ ἐκεῖνων καὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐποιοῦντο, καὶ σπένδοντες ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις ταῖς δημοτελέσιν ὁμοίως ἔχοντο τοῖς θεοῖς Χίοις διδόναι τὰγαθὰ καὶ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς. . .<sup>10</sup>; for more than one reason, it is difficult to doubt that the historical realities narrated in his text reflect the Attic-Chian relations of 384 BC precisely<sup>11</sup>.

Chronologically speaking, there is nothing improbable in the hypothesis that a ceremony concerning the Attic *euchai* of the kind analyzed here has been alluded to in *FGrHist* 115 F 104 and left indirect traces in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 34. For, the public *euchai* of the same type occurred even before 384; their (so far) first epigraphical attestation in Athens is on a stone from 387/6 or 386/5<sup>12</sup>. L. J. Bliquez writes about it: “the text is badly damaged but the restoration in the section of interest seems sound, especially as the recovery of a new fragment confirms the existence of the word *συνενείκηι* in the text”. He

this part of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 34 cited the Athenians’ vows may be inferred from the immediate sequel, line 6, Ταῦτα μὲν ἤχθαι- -), as well as from Theopompus’ fragment adduced below (Dušanić, *loc. cit.*), not to mention other indications. – At the top of the stele there are uninformative remains of a relief (R. Binneboessel, *Studien zu den attischen Urkundenreliefs des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts*, Kaldenkirchen 1932, 51 No 31; H. K. Süsserott, *Griechische Plastik des 4. Jahrhunderts vor Christus*, Frankfurt a. M. 1938, 46 f. + T. 3, 1).

<sup>9</sup> It has been usually, and without conclusive arguments, assigned to the epoch of the *arche* (F. Jacoby, R. Meiggs et al.). The fragment’s context (Bk. XII of the *Philippika*), however, speaks for the early fourth century; the cult ties analogous to those alluded to in Aristophanes (*Aves* 880, cf. the next note) existed throughout the best part of the classical period. In the extant epigraphical sources, the Attic *euchai* of the same type occur as early as 387/6 or 386/5 (below, text and notes 12-13).

<sup>10</sup> *FGrHist* 115 F 104 (= *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 880).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Dušanić, *JHS* 119(1999) 9-13 and *ZPE* 133(2000) 25ff. As stressed in these two articles, the radical democrats of Athens (and Chios) – unlike their “moderate” compatriots – naturally insisted upon the intimacy of the Attic-Chian relations, which (c. 384 BC) meant i.a. shared vows and such “historical” propaganda that presented the Attic-Chian *συγγένεια* as a very close relationship, going back to the democrat Theseus.

<sup>12</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 30 (the decree dealing with affairs of (the cleruchs of) Lemnos) 30 (found in Athens) (= *SEG* XXV 83; L. J. Bliquez, *ZPE* 35, 1979, 237-239, with transl.; bibl. in *SEG* XL 195 bis), lines 2-3. Above, notes 4-5.

prints lines 2-3 of the revised text presented by R. S. Stroud in *Hesperia* 40(1971) 163 as follows: [--- εὐξασθαι μὲν τὸν κήρυκα αὐτίκα μάλα ....<sup>ca.9</sup>...] καὶ τοῦ[ς] δώδεκα θεοῖς, ἐ[ὰν ....<sup>ca.8</sup>...] συνενεῖκη [---]<sup>3</sup> [---] θυσίαν καὶ πρόσσπονδον ποιήσεσθαι καθότι ἂν τῶι [δ]ήμ[ω]ι δοκῆι.]<sup>13</sup>.

Though much later and originating from cities other than Athens, two further examples are worthy of note as they provide valuable additional evidence concerning the criteria of the deities' choice. They refer to the factor of the contracting cities' kinship, συγγένεια; the first-cited inscription does that explicitly, the second implicitly but within an eloquent mythographical context. On the strength of their analogy, it may be taken that the considerations of *sungeneia* influenced the formulation of *euchai* in Athens, too, i.e. in the four earlier cases quoted here whose historical and/or epigraphic characteristics would have been otherwise less revealing as to the *sungeneia* links. The use of the *sungeneia* arguments (it is needless to develop this well-known point) distinguished more than one aspect of the ancients' international diplomacy<sup>14</sup>; it is only natural to assume that the practice of "political" vows which interests us here was not entirely different.

The treaty between Termessus Maior and Adada (of II cent. BC) prescribes: [εὐξασθαι μὲν τῶι Διὶ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς τοῖς συγγεν[είοις πᾶ]<sup>8</sup>[σι καὶ πάσαις ἐὰν συνενέγκη] αὐτοῖς ἢ <φι>λία{ι} καὶ ἡ συμμαχία ...<sup>15</sup>. The Zeus cited in line 7 (according to a plausible restoration) will have been a local divinity, Zeus Solymeus<sup>16</sup>. The term συγγέν[ειοι] θεοὶ – meaning here the Dioscuri, Helen, Amyclas and the other θεοὶ Πισιδικοί of, in the final analysis, Lacedaemonian origin<sup>17</sup> – points out the theme of the συγγένεια ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (vel sim.) uniting

<sup>13</sup> Bliquez (n. 12) 239. For the theonym lost in the lacuna of line 2 med. see *infra*. R. S. Stroud's (*Hesperia* 40(1971) 169) proposal [τῶι Ἡρακλεῖ] puts, anomalously, Heracles before the Twelve Gods and introduces a divinity which had no significant rôle in the politico-sacral context of the Athenian relations with their cleruchs on Lemnos (contrast below, text and notes 28 and 30).

<sup>14</sup> S. Lücke, *Syngeneia. Epigraphisch-historische Studien zu einem Phänomen der antiken griechischen Diplomatie*. Diss. München 1999 (Frankf. Alth. Beitr. 5, 2000; *non vidi*). The book of O. Curty (*Les parentés légendaires entre les cités grecques*. Genève 1995) does not pay enough attention to that side of the *sungeneia* lore.

<sup>15</sup> TAM III fasc. 1, No 2 (found at Termessus), lines 7-9 (as restored and explained by Ad. Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* II, 1912, 9 f. 18 f.). R. Heberdey (in the TAM) read the passage in a slightly different way (the difference does not affect the essence of our argument): [θῦσαι τῶι Διὶ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς τοῖς συγγεν[είοις] /<sup>8</sup> [θυσίαν, ὅπως ἂν συνενέγκη] αὐτοῖς ἢ <φι>λία{ι} καὶ ἡ συμμαχία ...

<sup>16</sup> Wilhelm (the preceding note) 19.

<sup>17</sup> Wilhelm (n. 15) 9 f. : Sparta was held to have been the metropolis of many cities in Pisidia and southern Anatolia in general.

many Greek cities; it is alluded to, frequently enough, in the epigraphical and literary sources<sup>18</sup>.

Naturally, the κτίσις stories must have played a prominent rôle in the choice of deities and lesser figures who personified the interstate *sungeneia* and as such had to be invoked in the “political” vows. Thence, for instance, the treaty between Rhodes and Hierapytna concluded in 201/200(?) BC widens the circle of the vows’ addressees to the Rhodians’ “archagetes and heroes” : εὐξασθαι μὲν τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ /<sup>2</sup> τοὺς ἱεροθύτας τῶι Ἀλίωι καὶ τᾶι Ῥόδοι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς /<sup>3</sup> πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις καὶ τοῖς ἀρχαγέταις καὶ τοῖς ἥρωσι, ὅσοι ἔχοντι /<sup>4</sup> τὰν πόλιν καὶ τὰν χώραν τὰν Ῥοδίων, συνενεγκεῖν Ῥοδίους καὶ /<sup>5</sup> Ἱεραπυτνίους τὰ δόξαντα περὶ τὰς συμμαχίας<sup>19</sup>. Helios and Rhodus were, of course, *numina Rhodiorum clarissima*<sup>20</sup>. But the “archagetes and heroes” are not quite an identical case, despite the addition ὅσοι ἔχοντι τὰν πόλιν καὶ τὰν χώραν τὰν Ῥοδίων; it would be wrong to qualify them as purely Rhodian symbols, though modern scholarship seems inclined to do that.

On the one hand (to risk a somewhat circular argument), the *euchai* clauses of the Pisidian inscription and – more discreet – the other documents examined here betray, so to say, the overall presence of the theme of interstate kinship. On the other hand, Rhodes and Hierapytna were really believed to have been linked through an early *sungeneia*; to be exact, there were mythographers who ascribed the foundation of Hierapytna to the Rhodian notabilities from the legendary past (Cyrbas; obviously, Camirus as well<sup>21</sup>). We are led to assume that both the initiators of the Rhodian *euchai* and most of the ancient readers of *St.-V.* III 551 were well aware that the mention of the Rhodian “archagetes and heroes”, in the context of the islanders’ alliance with the Hierapytnians, indicated – implicitly but clearly enough – the tradition of the Rhodian-Hierapytnian *sungeneia*. Like so many traditions implicating the kinships of Greek cities, it meant rather more than a learned fiction; introduced into the public cult (of which introduction the *euchai* quoted above are reliable witnesses), it must have been capable of arousing political emotions among the allied peoples.

<sup>18</sup> E.g. *Delphinion* 37 a, lines 2 and 5 (συγγένεια ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ: Apollo Delphinios, Miletus and Cnossus c. 230 BC); cf. Plato, *Tim.* 21 E ff. (the φιλία of Athens and Sais due to Athena/Sais c. 355 BC). Dušanić, *RhM* 139(1996) 286 f. (esp. note 55).

<sup>19</sup> Schmitt, *St.-V.* III 551 (original provenance: Hierapytna ?) (= *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 581; *Inscr. Cret.* III 3, no. 3; Bliquez (n. 12) 239, with transl.), lines 2-5. Though engraved in Crete, the inscription offers the Rhodian version of the treaty (including the *euchai* clause) only.

<sup>20</sup> M. Guarducci (*Inscr. Cret.* III 3, p. 37) *ad loc.*

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 19 and 20.

II. The main aspects of the vow ceremonies and their epigraphic records have been explained by a number of modern students of Periander's stele and related documents<sup>22</sup>. The lists of deities invoked<sup>23</sup> are another case, however. It is to be especially regretted that the list of *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 114 – its letter traces suffice to reveal that it consisted of three parts, citing the Twelve Gods, the August Goddesses, and Heracles respectively – has not been compared to the list of Periander's decree, though it is variously close to it. An analysis of their similarities and apparent differences – significantly, Heracles (not a very popular divinity in Attica) figures in No 114 but not in No 112, whose list is twice as long<sup>24</sup> – shows that both catalogues contain the names of (a) deities whose general importance (the Twelve Gods) or specific competences (the Erinyes' task was to punish perjury damaging the treaty) made them the expected addressees<sup>25</sup>, and (b) deities who were the patrons of the contracting parties' cities or regions (Olympian Zeus (the Peloponnese<sup>26</sup>), Athena Polias (Athens<sup>27</sup>), Heracles (Pallene<sup>28</sup>). An analogous state of affairs is encountered when we turn to the sculptural decoration

<sup>22</sup> See e.g. Wilhelm (n. 15); J. Vanseveren, *Rev. philol.* 63(1937) 342 f.; Bliquez (n. 12) 237-240; J. and L. Robert, *Bull. ép.* 1980, 197.

<sup>23</sup> I.e. expressly named (a list may refer to "all the gods and goddesses" but point out some of them by citing their names (below, note 30, on *St. – V.* III 551)).

<sup>24</sup> Other differences are less important as the Twelve Gods of No 114 may have been taken to include the Zeus, Athena, and Demeter of No 112 (which cites the Twelve Gods, too).

<sup>25</sup> The Twelve Gods: see e.g. Weinreich, "Zwölfgötter", *Roschers Myth. Lex.* VI (1924-1937) 772 ff. They figure in *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 30, too. – The Erinyes' task: Ernst Wüst, *RE Supplb.* VIII(1956) 112 f. (referring to e.g. *Hes. Op.* 803 and *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 112, 114).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. lines 38 f. ([τὰ μέγιστα τέλη Πελο]ποννησιῶν) and the relief above the inscription (text and note 3 above), featuring Zeus together with the personification of the Peloponnese (?). The famous treaty of alliance of Athens, Argos, Mantinea and Elis (420 BC) was published in four places: Athens (on the Acropolis), Argos (in Apollo's temple), Mantinea (in a temple of Zeus, but not an Olympian Zeus; cf. *Paus.* VIII 9. 2 (G. Fougères, *Mantineé et l'Arcadie orientale*, Paris 1898, 189 f.)), and Olympia. This last copy may be considered both Elean and collective, for it was set up "jointly" by three (Argos, Mantinea, Elis) or all four powers (*Thuc.* V 47, 11). And, naturally, Olympia and the Peloponnese were intimately connected in the parahistorical lore through the figure of Pelops, the founder of the Games and the eponym of the Peninsula.

<sup>27</sup> Shown in the relief, too.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. e.g. O. Gruppe, "Herakles", *RE Supplb.* III(1918) 954 f. The origin of the myth relating Heracles' victory over Alkyoneus in Pallene/Phlegra, probably Corinthian (thus Gruppe), well corresponds with our description of the Heracles of *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 114 as a patron of the Potidaeans, Corinthian colonists. With regard to such "evidence" as *FGrHist* 328 (Philochorus) F 18 (with comm.), we could perhaps qualify the occurrence of Heracles' name in No 114 as a case of (c), but that interpretation would not have been plausible; Heracles was not properly counted among the paternal divinities of Attica.

of the Attic stelae where international treaties and similar texts have been inscribed<sup>29</sup>. Even the order of theonyms – though it does not appear to have been strictly fixed, the *euchai* studied here tend to give precedence to (b)<sup>30</sup> – well accords with this typology. Furthermore, (b) recurs quite distinctly, and with prominence, in the Hellenistic decrees just quoted. They have it represented by Helios, Rhodus, local “archagetes and heroes” (Rhodes), and [Zeus Soly-meus] (Termessus); the θεοὶ συνγέν[ειοι] (Termessus), if having something in common with (b), tend nevertheless to postulate the existence of a third category, (c), which partly included the Rhodian “archagetes and heroes” also<sup>31</sup> and had as a general purpose to stress the historico-sacral unity of the contracting sides.

If admitted as an actual phenomenon of ancient political religion, (c) is to be taken to have reflected the influence of widespread notions about the συγγένεια ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ and similar relations, briefly dealt with in the preceding section of the present paper. This possibility should be insisted upon. To put Periander’s decree aside for the moment, there are reasons to believe that certain members of a body that might be termed θεοὶ καὶ ἀρχαγέται καὶ ἥρωες συγγένειοι were the addressees of the Athenian vows as early as 387/6 (386/5) and 384. (It hardly needs to be said that the Greek expression labelling the body has been coined here from the corresponding lines of the Pisidian and the Cretan inscriptions, quoted above in Section I. According to an interpretation which seems almost inevitable, the θεοὶ συνγέν[ειοι] refer to the pantheons of both contracting cities<sup>32</sup>, not one city solely.)

<sup>29</sup> For (b) – which is much more frequent – see e.g. Meiggs – Lewis, *GHI* 94; Tod, *GHI* 108, 127, 159 (+ Meiggs – Lewis, *GHI* 89). For (a) see e.g. Tod, *GHI* 147.

<sup>30</sup> In 387/6 (or 386/5), the Twelve Gods occupied the latter place in the list (the list obviously consisted of two theonyms, the first of which has perished), while the former seems to have been held by Athena, the patroness of both the Athenians and their Lemnian cleruchs (see below). In the document of the Attic-Peloponnesian alliance of 362/1, whose *vota* addressed five deities, the Twelve Gods are listed as far as the fourth place, and the Erinyes the fifth. The other decree of 362/1 is somewhat of an exception in citing the Twelve Gods and the Erinyes at the beginning of its short list, before Heracles, but this order was probably a consequence of the status of Heracles, whose divine rank was inferior to that of the Olympians. An analogous explanation seems to hold for the names’ order in the list of *TAM* III 3, no. 2 (i.e. for the comparatively low places of the Dioscuri, Helen, etc.). Note also that *St. – V.* III 551, lines 2-3, invokes “all the gods and goddesses” but cites by name Helios and Rhodus only; these theonyms figure before the θεοῖς πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις while the “archagetes and heroes” are cited at the very end of the list.

<sup>31</sup> *Supra*, text and notes 19 – 21.

<sup>32</sup> Strictly speaking, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 30 did not regulate relations between two cities but between a city and a cleruchy, the latter constituting a political unit of inferior status. But the difference was not crucial in the matter which interests us here. Cf. note 7 above.

Our claim that the Attic vows envisaged i.a. members of the category of the θεοὶ καὶ ἀρχαγέται καὶ ἥρωες συγγένειοι is less easy to corroborate for *IG II<sup>2</sup> 30*, where the first-cited theonym of line 2 has not been preserved. The name's length in the dative has been estimated at *c.* 10 letters (the inscription being non-*stoichedon*), which makes a restoration of Athena's name (spelled [τῆι Ἀθηνᾶα]ι (10 letters all together)) rather attractive, in view of the indications jointly provided by the space available and the sacral features of the context; actually, no other deity whose rank would make it eligible for the first place in the list, before that given to the Twelve Gods, has the name of a convenient length. Once accepted, the restoration [τῆι Ἀθηνᾶα]ι – note the absence of the attribute Πολιάδι (which figures in Periander's decree) ! – would imply that the *euchai* addressed Athena as the common patroness of the city and its cleruchy<sup>33</sup>. The ancient reader of the inscription will have been induced to associate it with the fact that the famous statue of the Lemnian Athena stood not far from the stele of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 30*, on the Athenian Acropolis itself.

In the light of literary testimonies, however, we are somewhat better informed on the vow of 384. As Theopompus tells us, it was made in the name of Athens and Chios at the same time. To the modern scholar who wishes to restore (however incompletely) the *euchai* clause of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 34*, this suggests a specific choice of gods. The restoration must cite gods (= (c)) most or all of whom were particularly close to both states. Otherwise, i.e. if the list had been constituted (restored as such) from theonyms belonging to deities (= (b, Athenian) and/or (a)) outside of the circle of the Attic-Chian συγγένειοι, the joint *vota* of 384 would have been hardly acceptable for one or both allied sides. If these observations on *FGrHist* 115 F 104 and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 34* prove justified, the list of that year should be assumed to have included a selection from the circle of deities etc., like Ionian Apollo, Poseidon, Neleus, Theseus, and Oinopion; as is well known, their worship and mythology (to focus our attention on the myths concerning foundations, genealogical connections et sim.) were widely shared by the Athenians and the inhabitants of Chios<sup>34</sup>. Judging from certain allusions in Plato<sup>35</sup> and Isocrates<sup>36</sup>, Ionian Apollo and Theseus enjoyed political topicality *c.* 384 BC thanks to the Attic-Chian relations of the moment; these allusions tend to sustain the foregoing comments on the list of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 34* and, less directly, that of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 30*.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. notes 13 and 28 above.

<sup>34</sup> Dušanić (n. 11: 1999, 2000).

<sup>35</sup> *Euthyd.* 302 B-D. *JHS* 119(1999) 9 ff.

<sup>36</sup> *Helen* (X) 18, 21-39. *JHS* 119(1999) 3, 12 f.



III. Of the theonyms in the list of Periander's decree, Demeter and Kore are best attributed to our third category, (c). These goddesses, in the ancients' opinion, could be described as patronesses of sorts of both Athens<sup>37</sup> and the Peloponnesians, Arcadia principally<sup>38</sup>. For an adequate understanding of lines 6 – 12 of Periander's decree, the importance of the Arcadian cults of Demeter-Kore (also called the Great Goddesses in Megalepolis and at Trapezus (Bathos)) seems all the more relevant as "Arcadia" – which means, in the brachylogy of the decree and with regard to the Athenian southern policy of late 362/1 reflected in its text, the part of the country centred on Mantinea<sup>39</sup> – was the most powerful of Athens' Peloponnesian allies at the time; the order of the contractants' names in lines 2 f., 15, 19 f. and 27 f. illustrates that political fact clearly enough<sup>40</sup>.

The Attic-Arcadian (Peloponnesian) *sungeneia* personified by Demeter and her daughter and coloured by the prestige of Eleusis must have evolved as a learned motif from stories that began circulating early on. Their nucleus may have gone back as far as the religiosity of the Bronze Age<sup>41</sup>. Aspects of the entire cult complex obviously formed phenomena of long duration; the imitation of Eleusis will continue in Arcadia till the late Hellenistic times, and beyond<sup>42</sup>. But it will have also displayed certain varying features which depended on the demands of the historical context. The *sungeneia* between Eleusis and the Arcadian centres of worship of the Two Goddesses appears to have become a propaganda theme especially popular after 371 BC, owing to the diplomatic *rapprochement* between Athens and the Arcadian League. As such, that *sungeneia* is likely to have had distinct connections, political as well as cultural, with the realities that caused the conclusion of Periander's treaty; the Athenian influence in Arcadia – the Mantinean part of it, primarily<sup>43</sup> – tended to characterise the whole federal period of

<sup>37</sup> See e.g. Isocr. IV 28-33.

<sup>38</sup> See e.g. Hdt. II 171 and VI 137, 1 (with *FGrHist* 328 F 99-101 comm., p. 408; note the reference to the [Peloponnesian] Pelasgians' mastery of agriculture in Hecataeus-Herodotus, and the stories connecting Pelops to Demeter); Apollod. ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. *Arkas*. R. Stiglitz, *Die grossen Göttinnen Arkadiens. Der Kultname Megallai Theai und seine Grundlagen*, Wien 1967; M. Jost, *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie*, Paris 1985, 353-355 et passim.

<sup>39</sup> Dušanić, *The Arcadian League of the Fourth Century* (in Serbian with an English Summary), Belgrade 1970, 307-11.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. also lines 31 f. in my restoration ((n. 1) 134).

<sup>41</sup> Stiglitz (n. 38) 152 f. et pass.

<sup>42</sup> Stiglitz (n. 38) 22 f. 44 ff. 138 f. 146 ff. et pass. (sporadically too sceptical); Jost (n. 38) 30 f., 69 f., 298 f., 311 f., 318 ff., 337 ff., 353-355.

<sup>43</sup> Dušanić, *REG* 92(1979) 325 ff. 330 ff.; (n. 39) 286-290, 300, 309 f., 313 f. For the *sungeneia* sphere, cf. the legend which ascribes the Attic origin (Cepheus) to the Arcadian Caphyatans (Paus. VIII 23, 3, et al.); it involved Mantinea (the neighbour of Caphyae: Dušanić (n. 39) 184 n. 90 on Strab. XIII 1, 53), founded by

fourth-century Arcadian history<sup>44</sup>. This of course does not mean that the *sungeneia* was always considered a relationship wherein the Attic (Eleusinian) side was the more important historically; there must have existed certain versions of the story, among the Arcadians especially, which attributed the birth of the Eleusinian sanctuary to one of its Peloponnesian counterparts<sup>45</sup>.

Although our evidence is meagre and precise chronological indications are non-existent, practically speaking<sup>46</sup>, what we possess suggests that, indeed, the *sungeneia* in question was especially relevant during the post-Leuctran decade. Three sets of facts of diverse nature may be emphasized. First, Pausanias mentions Arcas' close connection with Eleusis: "(Arcas) introduced the cultivation of crops, which he learned from Triptolemus, and taught men to make bread..."<sup>47</sup>. This formed part of a tradition which, presenting the eponym of the tribe as its cultural hero<sup>48</sup>, was likely to reflect the time of the birth of the League, when Arcas' popularity visibly increased and his "historical" merits multiplied<sup>49</sup>. It is permitted to Cepheus' daughter Antinoe (Paus. VIII 8, 4 f.; 9, 5). For some other manifestations of the Athenian cultural impact upon federal Arcadia see Dušanić (n. 1) 128 with n. 46; Tod, *GHI* II 132 (p. 102: the use of the Attic dialect).

<sup>44</sup> Which lasted from 371 to 323/2 BC and consisted of three main sub-periods: the Pan-Arcadian League (371- 362), divided Arcadia (362-338/7 BC (the Mantinea-centred Koinon continued to exist in the north of the country)), and the reunited League (338/7 – 323/2 BC).

<sup>45</sup> Above, n. 38. Cf. e.g. Paus. VIII 15, 1-4, esp. 3 ("even before Naüs arrived").

<sup>46</sup> J. Toepfer, "Apehidas", *RE* I(1894) 2714: "(Arcadian) Verknüpfungen mit Eleusis, deren Zeit wir gern kennen würden..."; Jost (n. 38) 354: "L' époque où les traditions" (concerning Arcas' connections with Triptolemus, Crocon, etc.) "ont été élaborées ne se laisse pas déterminer"; cf. Dušanić (n. 39) 184 nn. 89-90. Stiglitz (n. 42) does not envisage the possibility that the formation of the Arcadian Confederacy promoted the sacred *sungeneia* of Eleusis and the Arcadian centres of Demeter's cult. This omission seems especially regrettable in the cases of Megalepolis and Pheneus.

<sup>47</sup> VIII 4, 1 (transl. W. H. S. Jones, LCL).

<sup>48</sup> Fougères (n. 26) 204.

<sup>49</sup> Dušanić (n. 39) 285 with n. 22 (on Paus. VIII 9, 4; 36, 8); 293 with n. 26 (on Paus. X 9, 5, and the monument's material remains). There were attempts to place the transference of Arcas' bones (from Mt. Maenalum) to Mantinea (Paus. VIII 9, 4; 36, 8) in the period as early as c. 425 – 418 (see Th. Heine Nielsen, "Arkadia. City-Ethnics and Tribalism", in: M. H. Hansen, *Introduction to an Inventory of Polis. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre*, vol. 3, *Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser* 74 (The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Copenhagen 1996) 157 n. 50). But that early date would run against the fact that the transference was ordered from Delphi, which, unlike Mantinea, held an anti-Athenian as well as pro-Spartan position during the Peloponnesian War (H. W. Parke, *Greek Oracles*, London 1967, 108 ff.). The date of c. 371/0 BC, traditionally preferred by modern scholars for Arcas' re-burial, well accords with all the indications that Mantinea was the centre of activities leading to the Arcadian unification in 371. On the other hand, it accords also with the political orientation of Delphi after Sparta's catastrophe at Leuctra (cf.

ascribe a genealogical detail to the same epoch as well as a politico-literary *genre*. According to Apollodorus (III 9, 1), Triptolemus' son Crocon had a daughter Metaneira (Meganeira), who married into the house of the Arcadian mythical kings<sup>50</sup>. Second, in Athens, the themes of corn and “the Mother of the Earth” inevitably connected the Eleusinian cult with the concept of autochthony, which displayed rather marked political facets<sup>51</sup>. In Arcadia, things must have been similar<sup>52</sup>. As the slogan of autochthony became very popular there during the early federal period and involved something that might be termed Peloponnesian patriotism<sup>53</sup>, we are entitled to assume that the case was the same with the Arcadian federalists' attitude to the Eleusinian religion, the sacral complement of, and source of moral justification for, their insistence upon the advantages of the “earth-born”. This is all the more so as the image of a traditional and self-confident Peloponnesian had a prominent part in both the *historia sacra* of the Two Goddesses and the anti-Theban, anti-radical programmes of the Mantinea-centred Arcadians after 371 BC<sup>54</sup>. Third, the Thersilion of Megalepolis – the Council Hall of the Arcadian League, built during the 360's approximately – imitates in a marked way the architecture of the Eleusinian Telesterion. The imitation will have been inspired, or followed at least, by the acceptance of the Eleusinian Goddesses into the pantheon of the Arcadian capital<sup>55</sup>. It need not have implied symbolical messages but it is tempting to postulate them. In other words, we may ascribe the architects of Thersilion an ambition to suggest, through the visual effect produced

---

J. Buckler, *The Theban Hegemony, 371 – 362 BC*, Harvard Un. Press 1980, 136; for Paus. X 9,5, see the beginning of the present note).

<sup>50</sup> Toepfer (n. 46) 2713 f. (“Man ersieht hieraus die nahen Beziehungen zum Mysterienkultus von Eleusis”); Jost (n. 38) 352 and 354 f.; cf. Ch. Callmer, *Studien zur Geschichte Arkadiens*, Lund 1943, 68 (Apeidantes at Tegea). Toepfer and some other modern scholars are inclined to credit Azan, the third son of Arcas and Erato, with certain Eleusinian associations as well.

<sup>51</sup> See e.g. Plat. *Menex.* 237 D – 238 B.

<sup>52</sup> Demosthenes' reference to the Athenian and Arcadian autochthony (XIX 261) and his swearing “By Demeter” in the immediately following line (XIX 262) show that the autochthony, the worship of Demeter and the Attic-Arcadian legendary kinship formed a nexus of closely associated themes. Cf. Cic. *De Rep.* III 15, 25.

<sup>53</sup> Xen. *Hell.* VII 1, 23 (Lycomedes' speech of 369/8). Cf. the inscription of the famous monument erected by the Arcadians to Delphic Apollo c. 369 BC (Dušanić (n. 39) 293 n. 26).

<sup>54</sup> *Historia sacra*: see e.g. the stories recorded in the sources which are referred to in notes 38 and 45 above. The political aspects of the notion of the Peloponnesian in the post-Leuctran Arcadia: Xen. *Hell.* VII 4, 35; 5, 1 (cf. 1, 23 (the foregoing note)). Even the figure of the Peloponnesus decorating the relief on Periander's stele may have been politically meaningful in the sense postulated here (above, notes 3 and 26).

<sup>55</sup> Paus. VIII 31. Cf. F. Hiller von Gaertringen, “Megala polis”, *RE* XV(1931) 134; Dušanić (n. 39) 183 f. 288 with n. 45.

by their work, that the political function of the Hall and the political aspects of the Eleusinian cult (notably its connection with the concepts of legislation and justice<sup>56</sup>) had something in common.

In the Athenian propaganda of the classical epoch, the Eleusinian values were cited in support of Athens' claim that Attica, to which Eleusis belonged, was the source of civilization — agrarian, peaceful, and Panhellenic<sup>57</sup>. This propaganda, essentially conservative and socio-historically dependent on Attic nobility, squared with the anti-radical orientation of Periander<sup>58</sup> as well as with the anti-Theban (and anti-Persian, in view of e.g. conservative Athens' attitude to the Messenian question<sup>59</sup>) purposes of the alliance of 362/1. Among other aims, the document proclaimed the allies' readiness to prevent an important extension of the territory of Megalepolis, an extension which was planned by the Arcadian *boiotiazontes* of the late 360's and which was soon realized in a more or less complete form<sup>60</sup>. Resulting in the radicalization of Peloponnesian relations, this expansion of the militant Megalopolitans even hindered the southern Arcadians' return to agricultural activities<sup>61</sup>. To put it in the somewhat exaggerated language of political religion, the neglect of agriculture in southern Arcadia was tantamount to an offence against the Great Goddesses.

Let us conclude with another, and complementary, cult detail concerning Periander's decree. The absence of Poseidon's name from lines 7-9 seems worthy of closer analysis — though it may lead to an *argumentum e silentio*. For, the omission of that god from the herald's proclamation is difficult to explain away in a simple manner. Generally speaking, the compilers of the list (if their reasoning may be speculated about on such a point) would have found Poseidon an expected choice: in Athens, he contended with Athena for the patronage of the city and was frequently held to have been Theseus' father; in the Peloponnese (Arcadia, including Mantinea, especially<sup>62</sup>), he was widely worshipped, and his cult there had many

<sup>56</sup> Cf. e.g. Plato, *Apol.* 41 A; Xenocrates fr. 98 Heinze.

<sup>57</sup> Isocr. IV 28 ff., et al. Cf. R. Meiggs – D. Lewis, *GHI* 73, with comm.

<sup>58</sup> On which, *infra*, n. 66.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. e.g. T. T. Ryder, *Koine Eirene. General Peace and Local Independence in Ancient Greece*, Oxford 1965. 88 ((of Periander's decree and the Attic-Thessalian Alliance of 361: Tod, *GHI* II 144 and 147) "These moves clearly were directed against the Thebans...") and 144 (the Peace of 362/1 and Artaxerxes' support to the Theban-Messenian bloc).

<sup>60</sup> Dušanić (n. 1) 133 f.; (n. 39) 307 f. 331; *infra*, note 66.

<sup>61</sup> Dušanić (n. 39) 305 f.

<sup>62</sup> Poseidon and the Peloponnese at large: Diod. XV 49, 4. Poseidon and Arcadia (Mantinea, Orchomenus, Pheneus, Tegea, Megalepolis, Thelpusa, etc.): Ernst Wüst, "Poseidon", *RE* XXII(1953) 519 f.

points of contact with Demeter's and his myths some points of contact with those concerning the Athenian Acropolis<sup>63</sup>. Striking as it is, his absence from the list is perhaps best interpreted as a reflection of political divisions, comparable to those of 384 BC<sup>64</sup>. The Greeks, particularly Athenians, of the classical period inevitably associated Poseidon with maritime activities, ultrademocratic attitudes and aggressive wars<sup>65</sup>. Well aware of that state of affairs, the promoters of the Attic-Peloponnesian alliance of 362/1, whose ideology and concrete options were "moderate" and quite different from those of the pro-Theban radicals<sup>66</sup>, will have deliberately avoided invoking a divinity who personified completely opposite political programmes<sup>67</sup>.

<sup>63</sup> Poseidon and Demeter in Arcadia: Wüst (n. 62) 520. The Poseidon of the Acropolis and the Poseidon of Mantinea: Paus.VIII 10, 4 ("the wave of sea-water" rises up in the god's sanctuaries in Mantinea, on the Athenian *arx* and at Mylasa).

<sup>64</sup> Above, text and notes 11, 34-36.

<sup>65</sup> To cite a random instance illustrating this, cf. Plato's (in the *Euthydemus*; the *Timaeus-Critias* also offers an implicit criticism of the Poseidonic mentality of the ultrademocratic Athens) and Isocrates' (in the *Helen*) indirect controversy over the political image of Poseidon, a controversy involving the notions of Thesean radicalism, the maritime war et sim. (*JHS* 119, 1999, 1-16, esp. notes 12, 13, 88 and 89).

<sup>66</sup> The treaty rallied the enemies of the aggressive and democratic Thebes; note that the term *πολιτεία* (used for the constitutions of Achaëa, Elis and Phlius in lines 31-32) is more or less of a euphemism for an "oligarchy". For the conservative orientation of the mover of the decree (*PA* 11800), which inspired i.a. his reform of the Athenian trierarchy in 357, see K. J. Beloch, *Die attische Politik seit Perikles*, Leipzig 1884, 162 f. (cf. P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaiion Politeia*, Oxford 1981, 680; C. Mossé, *La fin de la démocratie athénienne*, Paris 1962, 308 f.; J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600 – 300 B.C.*, Oxford 1971, 464; Dušanić (n. 1) 134 f. (esp. n. 82)). Its defensive nature shows that the alliance he proposed was intended to keep the Peloponnesse peaceful; the clause of lines 32-33, which (on my restoration and interpretation) provides that the attempts at the extension of Megalepolis' territory should be resisted, expresses analogous intentions as such attempts were bound to provoke wider hostilities – in the north of Arcadia especially. The ensuing events (Dušanić (n. 39) 308 f., of Pammenes' intervention in 361 and the war of 352) as well as Demosthenes' comments in the *pro Megalopolitis* throw clear enough light on the peaceful character of the provision of lines 32-33.

<sup>67</sup> It should be noted that after the Boeotian fleet's operations in the Aegean of 364 BC (Buckler (n. 49) 169-74, cf. 155 f.), Poseidon may have become an *alter ego* of Epameinondas himself. This is all the more so as Epameinondas' maritime expedition was part of a strategy which gave an important rôle to the Peloponnesse.