

In presenting this dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I agree that the Library of the University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to copy from, or to publish, this dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written when such copying or publication is solely for scholarly purposes and does not involve potential financial gain. In the absence of the professor, the dean of the Graduate School may grant permission. It is understood that any copying from, or publication of, this dissertation which involves potential financial gain will not be allowed without written permission.

Jennifer Lynne Palinkas

**Eleusinian Gateways: Entrances to the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis
and the City Eleusinion in Athens**

By

Jennifer Lynne Palinkas
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Art History

Bonna D. Wescoat
Adviser

Eric Varner
Committee Member

Sandy Blakely
Committee Member

Accepted:

Lisa A. Tedesco, PhD.
Dean of the Graduate School

Date

**Eleusinian Gateways: Entrances to the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis
and the City Eleusinion in Athens**

By

Jennifer Lynne Palinkas
B.A., Hood College, 1996
M.A., State University of New York at Buffalo, 1998

Adviser: Bonna D. Wescoat

An Abstract of
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Art History

2008

Abstract

The sanctuaries of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion at Athens were joined by the sacred way and by the processions performed along this route during the festival of the Mysteries, when the sacred objects, cult personnel, and pilgrims moved between the two sacred spaces. The gateways to the sanctuaries, which directed prospective initiates in and out of the sanctuaries and on and off the sacred way, were volatile places both marking the connection between the sacred centers and signaling transitions, as pilgrims moved from one ritual context into another. Their form and decoration shaped the experience of prospective initiates and other participants. These entrances did not work in isolation, but were intimately connected with wall circuits, as well as other monuments and topographical features that shaped the actions of entrance. Between the 8th and 7th century B.C. and the 2nd century A.D., the design of the entrances and the pattern of the processional routes took several different forms, with each affecting the experience of the prospective initiate in particular ways. Re-evaluation of the archaeological and architectural evidence results in certain revised reconstructions for the entrances and processional routes through nine chronological phases, tracks the changes and continuities in the experience of the prospective initiates over time, and explores the interconnection of the sanctuaries through the experience of their entrances.

**Eleusinian Gateways: Entrances to the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis
and the City Eleusinion in Athens**

By

Jennifer Lynne Palinkas
B.A., Hood College, 1996
M.A., State University of New York at Buffalo

Adviser: Bonna D. Wescoat

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Art History

2008

Acknowledgments

Completion of this dissertation has been possible through the support of many individuals. I am grateful to them all.

First mention must be given to my adviser Bonna D. Wescoat for her patience and dedication, as well as her constant generosity of time and expertise. Eric Varner and Sandy Blakely, the other members of my committee, who gave generously of their enthusiasm and provided insightful questions and comments. I am also grateful to the remainder of the faculty and staff of the Department of Art History at Emory University for their support.

I would like to thank the American School of Classical Studies at Athens for the enabling my research through the Gorham Philips Stevens Fellowship. I am grateful for the support of many individuals at the American School, including Merle Langdon, Jim Sickinger, and John Oakley, all of whom encouraged and invited me to talk about my research through conversations or talks on site at Eleusis. I have also benefited greatly from conversations in Athens (and through e-mail) with Kevin Clinton, Margaret Miles, Molly Richardson, Judith Binder, Nancy Bookidis, Charles Williams, John Camp, Michael Hoff, Michael Cosmopoulos, Nigel Kennell, and Steve Tracy. I would also like to thank Guy Sanders, Ioulia Tzonou-Herbst, and James Herbst of the American School's excavations in Corinth, as well as Jan Sanders, for their friendship and unfailing support. Andrea Day provided expertise in the creation of phase plans for the sanctuary at Eleusis.

Many friends have also participated in engaging discussions and provided encouragement, some of whom I mention here in particular, including include Erin Black, Sheramy Bundrick, Laura Gawlinski, Brenda Longfellow, Gillian Elliott, Sarah

Lepinski, David and Katie Pettegrew, Bill Caraher, Marianne Wardle, Kimberley Pixley, Sarah James, Bronwen Wickkiser, Gwyn Johns, Nalini Jones, Angela Ziskowski, and Betsey Robinson. Finally, I thank my family, including our old and new members, for their unwavering love and support.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter 2: Pre-Archaic Phase (late 8 th and 7 th century B.C.) | 24 |
| Chapter 3: First Archaic Phase (600-550 B.C.) | 49 |
| Chapter 4: Second Archaic Phase (550-508/7 B.C.) | 65 |
| Chapter 5: Late Archaic and Early Classical Phase (508/7-460 B.C.) | 83 |
| Chapter 6: Classical Phase (460-404/3 B.C.) | 108 |
| Chapter 7: Late Classical Phase (4 th Century B.C.) | 129 |
| Chapter 8: The Hellenistic Period | 150 |
| Chapter 9: The Late Republican Period (c. 50 B.C.) | 160 |
| Chapter 10: The 2 nd Century A.D. | 215 |
| Chapter 11: Conclusion | 275 |
| Bibliography | 279 |

List of Figures

- Figure 1. Plan of Eleusis, including the sanctuary, sacred way, city, and harbor. Ziro 1991, fig. 2.
- Figure 2. Plan of Acropolis and area to the north, including the City Eleusinion. *Agora XXXI*, fig. 2.
- Figure 3. Route of the Sacred Way between Athens and Eleusis. Camp 2001, fig. 124.
- Figure 4. The Ninnion Plaque. Papaggeli 2002, p. 257.
- Figure 5. Plan of the City Eleusinion in the 6th century B.C. After *Agora XXXI*, fig. 4.
- Figure 6. Plan of the City Eleusinion during the 5th century B.C. *Agora XXXI*, fig. 8.
- Figure 7. Plan of the City Eleusinion, with elevations added. *Agora XIV*, fig. 37.
- Figure 8. Plan of sanctuary at Eleusis, with conventional labels for walls, towers, and gateways. After Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, plan 1.
- Figure 9. Travlos' Geometric phase of the sanctuary at Eleusis, with labels added. After Travlos 1983, fig. 2.
- Figure 10. Plan of the Pre-Archaic Phase at the sanctuary at Eleusis. Drawn by J. Palinkas and A. Day.
- Figure 11. Detail of Telesterion area, with label for E3 added. After Mylonas 1961, fig. 6.
- Figure 12. Photograph of wall E5 and wall Z12, from north. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, pl. 1a.
- Figure 13. Photograph of wall E2 and E1, from southwest. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, pl. 2b.
- Figure 14. Sanctuary of Athena at Haliartos. Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, fig. 69.
- Figure 15. Plan of the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta. Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, fig. 275.
- Figure 16. Plan of sanctuary of Apollo at Eretria. Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, fig. 105.
- Figure 17. Plan of Barbouna Hill Apollo sanctuary. Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, fig. 238.
- Figure 18. Plan of sanctuary at Eleusis, with elevations indicated. After Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, plan 1. Elevations from Noack 1927, pl. 13, 14, and 15; Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, plans A, B.
- Figure 19. Section of Telesterion terrace. Noack 1927, pl. 1B.
- Figure 20. Detail of Telesterion area, with pyres highlighted. After Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, fig. 7.
- Figure 21. Photograph of wall E3.
- Figure 22. Reconstruction drawing of Megaron B and its extension. Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, fig. 171.
- Figure 23. Sanctuary of Athena Polias at Gonnoi. Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, fig. 56.
- Figure 24. Plan of Kalapodi. Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, fig. 61.
- Figure 25. Photograph of E6 and the inner gateway H24. Mylonas and Travlos 1981a, fig. 73.
- Figure 26. Plan of the sanctuary of Apollo at Eretria. Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, fig. 101.
- Figure 27. Detail of the sanctuary of Apollo at Eretria. Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, fig. 113.
- Figure 28. Photograph of the area northeast of Well W. Mylonas 1961, fig. 17.
- Figure 29. Plan of the area near E6, including Well W and the road. Mylonas and Travlos 1955, pl. 1.
- Figure 30. First Archaic Phase at the sanctuary at Eleusis. Drawn by J. Palinkas and A. Day.

- Figure 31. Plan of curving wall beneath forecourt near the temple of Artemis. Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, fig. 183.
- Figure 32. Plan of the City Eleusinion in the 6th century B.C. *Agora XXXI*, fig. 4.
- Figure 33. Photograph of the First Archaic Phase wall from the City Eleusinion.
- Figure 34. Plan of the eastern entrance to the sanctuary of Hera at Samos. Kienast 2002, fig. 5.
- Figure 35. Actual state plan of area around City Eleusinion. Miles *Agora XXXI*, plan 3.
- Figure 36. Plan of the Classical entrance to the Acropolis. Vanderpool 1974, fig. 1
- Figure 37. Southern peribolos wall at Z6. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, fig. 4b.
- Figure 38. The First Archaic Phase wall at Z6. Noack 1927, fig. 7.
- Figure 39. Photograph of wall Z6. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, plate 3a.
- Figure 40a. Plan of Pre-Archaic and First Archaic Walls, as well as Stepped Podium Area. Mylonas 1961, fig. 23.
- Figure 40b. The altar at Z13, within the niche of the later Second Archaic Phase wall. Kourouniotes 1935, fig. 19.
- Figure 40c. The stepped podium, with the statue base added during the Early Classical Phase visible to its right. Kourouniotes 1938, fig. 39.
- Figure 41. The acropolis at Selinous, c. 560-30. Mertens 2003, fig. 349.
- Figure 42. Plan of the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth. *Corinth XXVIII.3*, plan 5.
- Figure 43. The sanctuary of Apollo at Delos, including the first propylon and the Oikos of the Naxians. Gruben 1997, fig. 22.
- Figure 44. Proposed early 5th century B.C. propylon of the Athenian Acropolis. Shear 1999, fig. 4.
- Figure 45. Plan of the sanctuary of the Great Gods, Samothrace. McCredie 1974, fig. 1.
- Figure 46. The sanctuary of Aphaia at Aegina, c. 570 B.C. Walter 1993, fig. 56.
- Figure 47. Plan of the acropolis at Selinous, c. 580-60 B.C. Mertens 2003, fig. 342.
- Figure 48. Plan of the sanctuary at Eleusis during the Second Archaic Phase. Drawn by J. Palinkas and A. Day.
- Figure 49. Sanctuary of Athena at Haliartos. Austin 1931/32, fig. 1.
- Figure 50. Sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia at the end of the 6th century B.C. Gebhard and Hemans 1992, fig. 18.
- Figure 51. Plan of Dodona. Katsikoudi 2005, plate 1.
- Figure 52. Plan of the temple precinct at the sanctuary of Poseidon at Kalaureia. Welter 1941, plate 31.
- Figure 53. Plan of Propylon II at the sanctuary of Apollo at Delos. Gruben 1997, fig. 22.
- Figure 54. Photograph of the northern end of the Lesser Propylaia foundations. Hörmann 1932, fig. 17.
- Figure 55. Foundations beneath the Lesser Propylaia, from north. Noack 1927, plate 5.
- Figure 56. Plan of the so-called Plutonion with Archaic blocks inside later temple. Noack 1927, plate 6.
- Figure 57. Noack's plan of the sacred way within the sanctuary. Noack 1927, plate 8.
- Figure 58. Actual-state plan of City Eleusinion. *Agora XXXI*, plate 2.
- Figure 59. Temple of Triptolemos reconstruction. *Agora XXXI*, fig. 7.
- Figure 60. Plan of the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion. Goette 2000, fig. 21.
- Figure 61. Plan of the sanctuary of Aphaia at Aegina, c. 500 B.C. Walter 1993, fig. 60

- Figure 62. Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis during the Late Archaic and Early Classical Phase. Drawn by J. Palinkas and A. Day.
- Figure 63. The Early Classical Phase wall. Ziro 1991, fig. 22.
- Figure 64. Noack's plans and reconstructions of the gateway at Th5. Reproduced by Ziro 1991, fig. 23.
- Figure 65. Plan of the Delion on Paros. Schuller 1991, plate 2.
- Figure 66. View from the porch of the gateway at Th5 toward the statue base in the area of the Stepped Podium. Ziro 1991, plate 23.
- Figure 67. Reconstruction of the Kallichoron Well, including the Early Classical Phase wall. Ziro 1991, fig. 18.
- Figure 68. Photograph of Th3 and the brick wall between H21 and H24. Kourouniotes 1935a, fig. 23.
- Figure 69. Photograph of the brick wall between H21 and H24. Kourouniotes 1935a, fig. 22.
- Figure 70. Photograph of the exterior face of the pseudo-isodomic wall between H25 and H29, with altar Z13 and niche. Kourouniotes 1935a, fig. 19.
- Figure 71. Photograph of the First Archaic Phase wall and the Early Classical Phase pseudo-isodomic construction between H25 and H29.
- Figure 72. Photograph of the Early Classical statue base next to the stepped podium. Kourouniotes 1935a, fig. 39.
- Figure 73. Plan of *siros*, or storehouse. Mylonas 1961, fig. 36.
- Figure 74. Photograph of stepped podium and the Classical Phase storehouse. Ziro 1991, pl. 6b.
- Figure 75. Plan of the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis in the Classical Phase. Drawn by J. Palinkas and A. Day.
- Figure 76. Photograph of Classical Phase wall and tower I14. Mylonas 1961, fig. 39.
- Figure 77. Blocks at Mithraion assigned to Classical porch by Ziro. Ziro 1991, fig. 28.
- Figure 78. Anta capital assigned by Ziro to Classical porch. Ziro 1991, fig. 32.
- Figure 79. Plan of the sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron. Coulton 1976, fig. 57.
- Figure 80. Plan of the Herakleion on Thasos. Bergquist 1973, fig. 7.
- Figure 81. Plan of the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion. Goette 2000, fig. 21.
- Figure 82. Plan of the sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros at Selinous. White 1967, fig. 2.
- Figure 83. Plan of the propylon of the sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros at Selinous. Miles 1998, fig. 7.
- Figure 84. Plan of the Acropolis. Hurwit 1999, fig. 3.
- Figure 85. Plan of several phases of the Telesterion. Papaggeli 2002, p. 132.
- Figure 86. Plan of City Eleusinion in the 2nd century B.C. *Agora XXXI*, fig. 9.
- Figure 87. Plan of the sanctuary at Eleusis during the 4th Century B.C. Drawn by J. Palinkas and A. Day.
- Figure 88. Photograph of the exterior face of the 4th century B.C. wall behind the Kallichoron Well. Ziro 1991, pl. 32a.
- Figure 89. Photograph of the interior face of the 4th century B.C. wall behind the Kallichoron Wall. Ziro 1991, pl. 32b.
- Figure 90. Reconstruction drawing of the northern entrance to the sanctuary at Eleusis. Ziro 1991, fig. 41.
- Figure 91. Section drawing of the L-shaped steps. Noack 1927, fig. 95.

- Figure 92. Plan of the Telesterion. Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, plan A.
- Figure 93. Section drawing of the combined interior faces of K16 and K17. Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, plan Gamma.
- Figure 94. Photograph of the outer face of the 4th century B.C. peribolos wall.
- Figure 95. Plan of the gateway next to tower K6. Noack 1927, fig. 80.
- Figure 96. Elevation of the gateway next to tower K6. Noack 1927, fig. 81.
- Figure 97. Photograph of the gateway next to tower K6. Kourouniotes 1932, fig. 2.
- Figure 98. Entrance area of sanctuary of Zeus at Labraunda. Hellström 1996, fig. 1.
- Figure 99. Plan of the South Propylon at Labraunda. Jeppesen 1955, pl. 17.
- Figure 100. Plan of the sanctuary of Asklepios at Troizon. Welter 1941, pl. 12.
- Figure 101. Actual state plan at the southwestern corner of the City Eleusinion. *Agora* XXXI, fig. 10.
- Figure 102. Plan of the sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia. Detail of Gebhard and Hemans 1998, fig. 18.
- Figure 103. Plan of the sanctuary at Eleusis during the Hellenistic period. Drawn by J. Palinkas and A. Day.
- Figure 104. Section of the gateway next to tower K6. Noack 1927, fig. 82.
- Figure 105. Photograph of the eastern face of the wall at K12. Wrede 1933, fig. 87.
- Figure 106. Plan of so-called Bouleterion. Gneisz 1990, fig. 57.
- Figure 107. Plan of the Kallichoron Well, after Hellenistic modifications. Ziro 1999, fig. 42.
- Figure 108. Plan of the sanctuary at Eleusis during the late Republican period. Drawn by J. Palinkas and A. Day.
- Figure 109. Photograph of Lesser Propylaia pilaster capital, including mason's mark to the right of the dowel cutting.
- Figure 110. Capitals from the Lesser Propylaia. Hörmann 1932, pl. 14.
- Figure 111. Kistephoros in the Fitzwilliam Museum. Vassilika 1998, no. 46.
- Figure 112. Actual state plan of the Lesser Propylaia. Hörmann 1932, pl. 4.
- Figure 113. Reconstruction drawing of the Lesser Propylaia, from the north. Hörmann 1932, pl. 35.
- Figure 114. Actual state plan of the Lesser Propylaia, with areas labeled. After Hörmann 1932, pl. 4.
- Figure 115. Photograph of Lesser Propylaia foundations. Hörmann 1932, fig. 17.
- Figure 116. Lesser Propylaia, photograph of eastern stylobate of the north porch column and pilaster.
- Figure 117. Lesser Propylaia, western stylobate for the north porch column and pilaster.
- Figure 118. Profile of the Ionic bases from the north porch of the Lesser Propylaia. Hörmann 1932, fig. 20.
- Figure 119. Lesser Propylaia, column fragments from the north porch. Hörmann 1932, pl. 11.
- Figure 120. Lesser Propylaia, photograph of a north porch capital.
- Figure 121. Lesser Propylaia, reconstruction of northwestern Corinthian capital and epistyle. Hörmann 1932, fig. 9.
- Figure 122. Lesser Propylaia, photograph of pilaster capital from the north porch.
- Figure 123. Lesser Propylaia, entablature blocks from the north porch. Hörmann 1932, pl. 6.

- Figure 124. Lesser Propylaia, photograph of north porch entablature blocks.
- Figure 125. Lesser Propylaia, wall entablature blocks. Hörmann 1932, pl. 8.
- Figure 128. Hörmann's reconstruction drawing of the south porch, with side doorways added. Hörmann 1932, pl. 34.
- Figure 129. Photograph of brick and mortar fill between the Lesser Propylaia and wall of the area of the Mirthless Rock. Hörmann 1932, pl. 41a.
- Figure 130. Photograph of kistephoros in the Eleusis museum.
- Figure 131. Drawing of the back of the kistephoroi. Hörmann 1932, pl. 15, 1.
- Figure 132. Libertini's reconstruction of the south porch of the Lesser Propylaia. Libertini 1916, pl. 13.
- Figure 133. Side elevation of the Lesser Propylaia. Hörmann 1932, fig. 33.
- Figure 134. Hörmann's proposed first phase for the Lesser Propylaia. Hörmann 1932, pl. 22.
- Figure 135a. Hörmann's proposed second phase for the Lesser Propylaia, including fountains. Hörmann 1932, pl. 28.
- Figure 135b. Lesser Propylaia, photograph of the eastern side of the south porch, with the basins in the foreground.
- Figure 136. Reconstruction of the coffered ceiling of the Lesser Propylaia. Hörmann 1932, pl. 31.
- Figure 137. Lesser Propylaia, plan of original design. Hörmann 1932, pl. 26.
- Figure 138. Lesser Propylaia, plan with later modification. Hörmann 1932, plate 30.
- Figure 139a. Section drawings of the Lesser Propylaia. Detail of Hörmann 1932, pl. 5.
- Figure 139b. Lesser Propylaia, photograph of the western parastade wall and toichobate.
- Figure 140. Plan of the sanctuary at Eleusis during the 2nd century A.D. and the later Roman period. Drawn by J. Palinkas and A. Day.
- Figure 141a. Inscribed bench associated with the Lesser Propylaia.
- Figure 141b. Bench associated with the Lesser Propylaia.
- Figure 142. Rolled-out reconstruction of the kiste held by the kistephoros in Cambridge. Hörmann 1932, fig. 35.
- Figure 143. Plan of City Eleusinion during the Roman period. *Agora XXXI*, fig. 11.
- Figure 144. Detail of actual state plan of the City Eleusinion. *Agora XXXI*, pl. 2.
- Figure 145. Kore head assigned to the proposed Inner Propylon of the City Eleusinion. Palagia 1997, fig. 9.
- Figure 146. Fragments assigned to the karyatids of the proposed Inner Propylon of the City Eleusinion. Palagia 1997, fig. 10.
- Figure 147. Photograph of Doric frieze assigned to the proposed Inner Propylon at the City Eleusinion. Built into the Little Metropolis Church in Athens.
- Figure 148. Plan of the forecourt at Eleusis. Ziro 1991, fig. 47.
- Figure 149. Plan and reconstruction drawing of fountain in forecourt. Ziro 1991, fig. 48.
- Figure 150. Actual state plan of northwestern corner of forecourt. Ziro 1991, fig. 51.
- Figure 151. Reconstruction drawing of temple of Artemis. Ziro 1991, fig. 51.
- Figure 152. Photograph of the point where the paving stones of the forecourt meet and change orientation. Ziro 1991, pl. 43b.
- Figure 153. Photograph of Greater Propylaia steps over forecourt paving. Ziro 1991, pl. 53b.
- Figure 154. Photograph of eastern arch and fountain in the forecourt at Eleusis. Willers

- 1996, fig. 19.
- Figure 155. Plan and reconstruction drawing of west arch in forecourt. Ziro 1991, fig. 49.
- Figure 156. Statue bases assigned to the arches of the forecourt. Drawings compiled from Willers 1996, figs. 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, and 46.
- Figure 157. The decorated sima near the eastern arch. Willers 1996, fig. 25.
- Figure 158. Arch of Hadrian in Athens. Willers 1990, pl. 8, no. 1.
- Figure 159. Ziro's measured plan of the Greater Propylaia. Ziro 1991, fig. 55.
- Figure 160. Northeastern corner of krepis of Greater Propylaia. Ziro 1991, fig. 59.
- Figure 161. Doric capital profiles of Greater Propylaia and Mnesiklean Propylaia. Ziro 1991, fig. 75.
- Figure 162. Photograph of Doric capital with relieving surface.
- Figure 163. Photograph of Doric capital without relieving surface.
- Figure 164. Photograph of southwestern Ionic base.
- Figure 165. Ionic capital. Detail of Ziro 1991, fig. 81.
- Figure 166. Elevation, northern porch of the Greater Propylaia. Ziro 1991, fig. 129.
- Figure 167. Section of the Doric superstructure. Ziro 1991, fig. 92.
- Figure 168. Ceiling coffers preserved from the Greater Propylaia. Ziro 1991, fig. 106.
- Figure 169. Reconstruction drawing of ceiling. Ziro 1991, fig. 108.
- Figure 170. Tympanon blocks. Ziro 1991, fig. 109.
- Figure 171. Reconstruction of tympanon. Ziro 1991, fig. 110.
- Figure 172. Blocks of the raking geison. Ziro 1991, fig. 111.
- Figure 173. Thranos block with both pi- and T-clamps. Ziro 1991, fig. 85.
- Figure 174. The roughly finished underside of a geison block. Ziro 1991, pl. 48a.
- Figure 175. Photograph of a fragment of the Ionic epistyle.
- Figure 176. Photograph of northern steps of the Greater Propylaia.
- Figure 177. Inscribed epistyle fragments. Ziro 1991, fig. 87.
- Figure 178. Photograph of pedimental portrait.
- Figure 179. Photograph of fragment of second pedimental portrait.
- Figure 180. Plan of the Propylaia from the Athenian Acropolis. Tanoulas 1994, p. 55.
- Figure 181. Profiles of Ionic bases from Greater Propylaia and Mnesiklean Propylaia. Ziro 1991, fig. 78.
- Figure 182. Comparison of the horizontal geison of the Greater Propylaia and the Athenian Propylaia. Ziro 1991, fig. 94.
- Figure 183. Reconstruction of the central tympanon block tenon from the Athenian Propylaia. Dinsmoor 1910, fig. 2.
- Figure 184. Photograph of sacred way over lower southern step of Lesser Propylaia. Hörmann 1932, pl. 41b.
- Figure 185. Temple F sculpture, casts in the Eleusis museum. Preka-Alexandri 2000, fig. 20.
- Figure 186. Reconstruction of the pediment of temple F. Lindner 1982, fig. 55.
- Figure 187. Plan of the sanctuary at Eleusis after the new fortifications of the mid-3rd century A.D. Ziro 1991, fig. 137.
- Figure 188. Plan of the Greater Propylaia and the Kallichoron Well, after the new fortifications of the mid-3rd century A.D. Ziro 1991, fig. 140.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Gateways were the most public structures within the architectural fabric of a sanctuary, marking the transformative and liminal place of entrance. They could be simple entrances within the line of the wall, or they could be embellished with inner or outer porches, elements that transformed a gateway into a propylon. For the pilgrims who entered into the temenos, they set the tone of arrival and established a sense of anticipation for the proceedings inside. For those exiting a sanctuary, the gateways signaled departure from the temenos and provided closure to experience in the sanctuary. Several ancient Greek sanctuaries employed gateways not only to frame the experience of pilgrims who visited the sanctuary, but also to promote specific religious or political aims.

Nowhere is the close connection between place and experience more suggestive than in the gateways leading into the sanctuaries of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion in Athens, the host sanctuaries for the Eleusinian Mysteries. The phases documented in the available archaeological record, along with epigraphical evidence detailing the performance and regulations of the Mysteries, make these sanctuaries well-suited for diachronic analysis. Such investigation can clarify the relationships between the gateways at different points of time and can shed light upon how the entrances shaped the experience of visitors to these sanctuaries. The gateways at the sanctuaries framed the departures and arrivals of the prospective initiates and *hiera*, the sacred objects, as they moved in processions from the sanctuary at Eleusis to the City Eleusinion and back again. The form and decoration of the gateways impacted the experience of the prospective initiates, but these entrances did not work in isolation. They were intimately

connected with the wall circuits of the sanctuaries, as well as other built and topographical features, as part of the processional route into each sanctuary.

The constant reworking of the gateways and processional routes over the course of several centuries and the push toward increasing monumentality in the form of the gateways signals a desire to do more than simply frame the entrance of the pilgrims into the sanctuary. There was a desire to create an experiential space, to direct the pilgrims along a prescribed path to the entranceway and then to enter the sanctuary in a particular way through the gateway at a prescribed time. In this dissertation, I explore how and why the gateways and their associated processional routes affected religious experience at the sanctuaries during the procession of the Mysteries as it occurred through several phases, beginning with the 8th and 7th centuries B.C. and culminating in the 2nd century A.D. Through a close analysis of architectural, archaeological, and epigraphical evidence, I demonstrate that the entrance to the sanctuary included both the gateway itself as well as the whole experience along the processional route. These material data, and not the literary evidence, are the focus of my analysis. In this way, I present a new thesis of entrance for these sanctuaries. The entire celebration of the festival of the Mysteries was split between Athens and the sanctuary at Eleusis, creating a tension between city center and the sanctuary on the periphery, in the westernmost area of Attica. The gateways at the sanctuaries, which directed prospective initiates in and out of the sanctuaries and on and off the sacred way, were volatile places marking this transition, as pilgrims moved from one ritual context into the other. The gateways also framed the link between Eleusis and Athens, as they were connected by a central aspect of the

Mysteries, the transport of material and personnel, as well as the passage of prospective initiates, between the sanctuaries.

Against the backdrop of the architecture and topography of the processional routes and gateways of each phase, throughout the dissertation I address certain significant questions. To begin, where are the entrances located in each phase? What is their form? How are they related to the processional route into each sanctuary? As the entrances to the sanctuaries were reworked, how were new gateways and propyla balanced with older forms of entrance at the sanctuaries? In the earliest periods, when can the architecture of the sanctuaries point to a key aspect of the Mysteries, the transport of material and personnel between the sanctuaries? The next line of inquiry concerns the accessibility of the sanctuaries, particularly concerning the sturdy walls at the sanctuary at Eleusis, and to a lesser extent, the peribolos wall at the City Eleusinion. Were the walls at Eleusis always intended to be militarily defensive, or were they intended to preserve the secrecy of the proceedings taking place inside the sanctuary? Next, to what extent did the political relationship between Athens and Eleusis influence the orientation of the entrances to the sanctuaries? How does the architectural development of the sanctuaries of the other major Athenian cults, the Panathenaia and the City Dionysia, correspond to the Eleusinian sanctuaries? Concerning the historical context of each phase of the entrances, what historical or political circumstances generate change? Finally, how do the gateways at the sanctuaries at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion relate to the entranceways developed at other sanctuaries in each of the nine phases, and to sanctuaries of Demeter and Kore elsewhere in the Greek world? By addressing these questions throughout this diachronic study, I aim to show that the gateways at the

sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion monumentalized the close link between these two sanctuaries, serving as the architectural manifestation of their topographical, historical, and ritual relationships.

The Sanctuaries

The sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis was the site of initiation into the Greater Mysteries. Located 22 km. from the center of Athens, near its border with Megara and on the Thriasian Plain, the sanctuary at Eleusis could be approached on its northern side by the sacred way that came from Athens and on its southern side by a port located less than half a kilometer away (Figure 1). The sanctuary was built around the eastern side of an acropolis, with the deme of Eleusis on its western side. At the center of the sanctuary, a terrace marked the location of initiation into the Mysteries and acted as the focus of architectural development. The areas outside the walls of the sanctuary included structures that probably were intended for initiates, prospective initiates, and non-initiates, while the facilities inside the walls may have been accessible only to initiates and prospective initiates during the festival. In the early phases of the sanctuary, the central terrace was open-air and framed by a peribolos wall. In later phases, the Telesterion, the hall that housed initiation, was built on this terrace. The Telesterion, the peribolos walls, and the terrace went through several phases of construction, often with an increase in size that corresponded to the increased monumentality and elaboration of the gateways to the sanctuary.

The City Eleusinion, located in the heart of ancient Athens, on the north slope of the Acropolis and just south of the Classical Agora, served as the sanctuary of Eleusinian Demeter in central Athens (Figure 2). The sanctuary stood on the eastern side of the

Panathenaic Way, where this path begins to rise up toward the slopes of the Acropolis. In the sanctuary's early phases, a peribolos wall surrounded an open-air shrine. In later phases, a temple and monument bases elaborated the City Eleusinion, and its peribolos eventually boasted a propylon. It is certain that the City Eleusinion as excavated does not represent the entirety of the sanctuary. Because no definite limit for its eastern side has yet been found, the extent to which the sanctuary could continue in this direction remains open to interpretation. It is possible that to the east there could have been an area of the sanctuary accessible only to initiates, as present at the sanctuary at Eleusis.¹

Recognition of the interconnectedness of the two sanctuaries, as well as the distinctions between their physical relationship to the city of Athens and their independent ritual functions, is necessary to appreciating the layered significance of their gateways. Each sanctuary hosted part of the festival, so that the whole of the process of initiation was split between the two. The City Eleusinion hosted preliminary aspects of the festival, including the Lesser Mysteries, which were, during the Classical and Hellenistic periods at least, a necessary preliminary to initiation during the Greater Mysteries.² The City Eleusinion also housed the *hiera*, the sacred objects, during the festival. Other preliminary events, such as the gathering of the prospective initiates and the proclamation, took place in the Agora, near the City Eleusinion. The sanctuary at Eleusis hosted the final act of initiation inside the Telesterion. Thus, the City Eleusinion was conceptually oriented toward the sanctuary at Eleusis, the site of initiation, but its physical and performative setting was centered in Athens, between the Agora and the

¹ *Agora XXXI*, pp. 32, 91.

² The Lesser Mysteries, including a preparatory ritual and sacrifice, took place during the month of Anthesterion, and may have been celebrated at the City Eleusinion. Clinton 2003, pp. 51-52 suggested that this preliminary ritual, called *myesis*, could have taken place at Eleusis or the City Eleusinion.

Acropolis. The sanctuary at Eleusis was in some ways conceptually oriented toward Athens, particularly in the first days of the festival with both the *hiera* and cult personnel removed from the sanctuary and temporarily located in Athens. Yet the sanctuary housed the central rites of initiation and was physically separated from Athens by a wide area of land, some of it agriculturally rich, which was marked by ritually and topographically significant features.

The sanctuary at Eleusis and this territory were part of Athens from the mid-6th century B.C., if not from the very beginning of Athens as a polis in the 8th century B.C., but the sanctuary retained an identity separate from the polis and its other cults. Several ancient authors described this circumstance as dating back to a legendary battle between Eumolpos of Eleusis and Erechtheus of Athens, in which Erechtheus was victorious.³ Pausanias, who saw a bronze statue group on the Acropolis that he identified as Erechtheus and Eumolpos engaged in a struggle, recorded that as part of a peace agreement Eleusis maintained control of the Mysteries but was otherwise subject to the Athenians.⁴ Two local families, the Eumolpidai, descendants of Eumolpos, and the Kerykes, perhaps descendants of Eumolpos' son, provided the two most important religious officials for the cult, the hierophant, or revealer of the *hiera*, and the dadouchos, or the torch-bearer, respectively.⁵ These remained the officials of the cult despite later Athenian and Roman attempts to overshadow their administration. The focus of the sanctuary's main festival, the Mysteries, continued to take place at the sanctuary at Eleusis, unlike other cults, such as that of Dionysos Eleutherios, in which the focus

³ Pausanias. 1.36.4, 1.38.3 (mid-2nd century A.D.); Thucydides 11.15 (late 5th century B.C.); Apollodorus 3.15.4-15 (2nd century B.C.).

⁴ Paus. 1.27.4.

⁵ Burkert 1983, p. 254 noted the persistent importance of these families.

shifted to central Athens.⁶ The Athenians had a home for the Mysteries in the city, at the City Eleusinion, but it was equally important for Athens to maintain the sanctuary at Eleusis, as well as the area in between it and the city. Controlling this area meant that the city could feed its population, and the ability to do this was the gift of Demeter.

The Eleusinian Mysteries

The Eleusinian Mysteries was an Athenian cult open to a Panhellenic audience, in which initiates and prospective initiates worshipped Demeter as the goddess who gave agrarian prosperity through her gift of grain as well as the promise of a happier afterlife through the loss and return of her daughter Kore, or Persephone, from the underworld.⁷ The second gift of the goddess, in particular, set the Mysteries apart from other cults of Demeter. The Mysteries were unique in that this festival only took place in Athens and Eleusis, while other cults of Demeter, such as the Thesmophoria, could be celebrated all over the Greek world.⁸ Additionally distinctive is that although the two host sanctuaries for the Mysteries, the City Eleusinion and the sanctuary at Eleusis, were also home to other festivals of Demeter, such as the Thesmophoria, the Eleusinia, and the Haloa, these

⁶ The ancient image of Dionysos was originally brought from Eleutherai to the sanctuary of Dionysos on the south slope of the Acropolis. During the annual festival of the City Dionysia, the statue was taken to the Academy and brought back to the sanctuary in a ritual mimetic of the first transfer to Athens, but without going far beyond the limits of Athens. For the City Dionysia, see Connor 1990; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003b.

⁷ For recent studies of the Eleusinian Mysteries, including literary and epigraphical evidence, see Dillon 1997, pp. 60-70; Clinton 1988, 1993a, pp. 110-24, 2003, pp. 50-60; Parker 1996, pp. 97-101, 293-97; Robertson 1998, 1999, pp. 14-25; Sourvinou-Inwood 1997, 2003a; Pakkanen 1996, pp. 29-47; Lippolis 2006.

⁸ Pausanias claimed that the Eleusinian Mysteries were also celebrated at the sanctuaries of Demeter and Kore at Megalopolis (Paus. 8.31.7) and Pheneos (Paus. 8.15.1). Jost 2003, pp. 152-54 argued that these sanctuaries replicated certain aspects of the Mysteries at Eleusis, but that it was unlikely that the rituals connected with the central acts of initiation were performed.

other festivals were celebrated in these locations only by the Athenians themselves. By contrast, the Eleusinian Mysteries sought participation from Greeks outside of Athens.⁹

The Mysteries, along with the City Dionysia and the Panathenaia, formed a triad of polis-cults promoted by Athens as it sought to attain greater cultural and political prominence among the Greek poleis.¹⁰ The celebration of the Mysteries shared the same spaces in Athens with these other two cults, centered at and around the Acropolis and Agora.¹¹ Moreover, the architecture of the sanctuaries of Dionysos Eleutherios and the Acropolis included phases of development that were often contemporary with construction at the sanctuaries at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion, suggesting a program of monumentalization on the part of the city in certain periods. Among these Athenian state cults, however, the Eleusinian Mysteries was distinctive in that the location of the culminating event of the festival, which for the Mysteries was initiation, did not take place in the center of Athens. For this reason, the approach to the sanctuary at Eleusis and its gateways are of great importance, because they stood as a physical manifestation of this defining characteristic of the Mysteries, that the prospective initiates had to depart from Athens, traverse a large part of Attica by means of the sacred way, and then enter into the sanctuary at Eleusis in order to be initiated.

The festival of the Mysteries occurred annually over nine days in the month of Boedromion, corresponding approximately to late September or early October.¹²

⁹ For a description of other festivals of Demeter celebrated at these two sanctuaries, see *Agora XXXI*; Clinton 1993, 1998. Other festivals of Demeter celebrated elsewhere in the Greek world are discussed by Brumfield 1981; Cole 1994; Nixon 1995.

¹⁰ A polis-cult is one which was integral to a polis' self-identity and which was promoted by the polis. A manifestation of a polis' interest in a polis-cult was often monumentalization of its sanctuary. For the definition of a polis-cult, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1990.

¹¹ The topographical relationships among the festivals are noted by Wickkiser 2003, pp. 162.

¹² The festival's place in the calendar of ancient Athens is based on several epigraphical and literary sources, particularly *IG II² 1078* (A.D. 220), which described the dates of the processions. See Mikalson

Initiation into the Mysteries was open to all Greeks (defined as those who spoke Greek), Athenians and non-Athenians, including men, women, and slaves.¹³ The only requirements for initiation, which were outlined in the *prorrhesis*, or the proclamation that took place on Boedromion 15, were that an individual be innocent of blood crimes and know Greek. There was a fee collected from the prospective initiates as well.¹⁴ First time initiates were called *mystes* and, after one year, a *mystes* could again take part in the festival, this time as an *epoptes*.¹⁵

During the festival, prospective initiates participated in events in Athens, Eleusis, and along the sacred way between the two sanctuaries. The first five days of the festival took place in Athens, beginning with a small procession on Boedromion 14. Eleusinian priests and priestesses left the gate of Eleusis carrying the *hiera* from Eleusis to Athens in *kistai*, or sacred baskets, which would be returned to Eleusis later during the festival.¹⁶ Ephebes, citizen youths who had military training, met the procession at the Rheitoi Lakes and escorted it the rest of the way to Athens (for a plan of the route, see Figure 3). As the procession approached Athens, it rested at the Sacred Fig Tree, where Athenians met the group and joined the procession on its way to the City Eleusinion.¹⁷ The procession arrived at the City Eleusinion, probably in the evening after several hours of

1975, pp. 54-62 for an outline of the days of the festival and the pertinent epigraphical and literary sources for the identification of what took place on each day.

¹³ Dillon 1997, p. 61. With the exception of the hearth initiate, a child who was initiated at public expense, children did not participate in Mysteries. See Dillon 1997, p. 200 and Clinton 1974, pp. 98-114 for discussions of the hearth initiate. For the initiation of slaves, see the discussion of *IG II/III*² 1672, line 207 and *IG II*² 1673, line 24, 4th century B.C. inscriptions that record the initiation of slaves working as builders at the sanctuary at Eleusis, in Pakkanen 1996, p. 34, n. 68. As Gawlinski 2006, p. 119 noted, slaves were accepted into most mystery cults.

¹⁴ Clinton 1974, p. 13.

¹⁵ For the terminology of initiates, see Clinton 2003, pp. 50-60.

¹⁶ For the procession, see *IG II*² 1078, lines 9-15 (A.D. 220). According to Plutarch *Phokion* 28.3 (late 1st century A.D.), the *kistai* were closed with ribbons. Mylonas 1961, pp. 245-47 described the procession on this day and suggested that the procession could have begun at a Pompeion just outside the sanctuary at Eleusis, perhaps indicated by rectangular foundations uncovered by Kourouniotes and Mylonas.

¹⁷ Philostratos, *Vitae Soph.* 2.602 (3rd century A.D.); Pausanias 1.37.2 (mid-2nd century A.D.).

walking, and deposited the *hiera* within the sanctuary. The arrival of the *hiera* was announced to the priestess of Athena on the Acropolis.¹⁸

The next day, Boedromion 15, the *prorrhesis* took place, when the *hierokeryx*, the sacred herald, called for participants for the festival, under the direction of the hierophant, the revealer of the *hiera* or the chief priest of the Mysteries. This announcement, which took place during a gathering, or *aghyrmos*, at the Stoa Poikile in the Agora, stated that participants be innocent of murder and know Greek.¹⁹ A journey to the sea at Phaleron followed the *prorrhesis* on Boedromion 16, when the prospective initiates purified themselves, and perhaps the piglets they would later sacrifice to Demeter, by bathing in the sea.²⁰ On Boedromion 17, the Epidauria, the annual festival of Asklepios in Athens, took place.²¹ According to Pausanias and Philostratos, Asklepios originally came to Athens on this day to be initiated into the Mysteries, and, because he was late, an extra festival day was created to accommodate him.²² In practice, this extra day allowed late

¹⁸ SIG⁴ no. 885=IG II² 1078, line 16. Reference from Mylonas 1961, p. 246, n. 113.

¹⁹ Mylonas 1961, pp. 247-48; Clinton 1993, p. 116; Parker 1983, p. 283; Dillon 1997, p. 62, n. 8. Hesychius, *s.v.* *aghyrmos* (5th century A.D.). Robertson 1999, p. 16 argued that this day was not intended for a gathering of would-be initiates at the Stoa Poikile, but rather referred to a gathering of the piglets for sacrifice later during the festival.

²⁰ The march to the sea was known as the *halade mystai*, or “To the sea, mystai.” See Hesychius, *s.v.* *halade mystai* and Plutarch, *Phokion* 28.3. See also Mylonas 1961, pp. 249-50. Dillon 1997, pp. 62-63 suggested that the piglets were sacrificed immediately after this purification. Clinton 1988, pp. 76-78 argued that the piglets were carried alive to the sanctuary at Eleusis, where they were sacrificed to Demeter and thrown into *megara*, or pits, adjacent to the Telesterion. Robertson 1999, pp. 16-18 argued that this event is based on an older Eleusinian tradition of a purifying sea bath at the Rheitoi Lakes, and that during the Mysteries the bath was originally held in Eleusis on Boedromion 17 and 18. Robertson argued that later, when Athens took over Eleusis and its Mysteries, they were moved two days earlier to Boedromion 15 and 16 and to Athens.

²¹ Clinton 1994b, pp. 18-27; Wickkiser 2003, pp. 126-28. Mylonas 1961, pp. 250-51 argued that on Boedromion 17 a sacrifice took place, while the Epidauria occurred on Boedromion 18. Clinton 1993, p. 116 argued that both the Epidauria and the sacrifice took place on Boedromion 17. Dillon 1997, p. 63 described the difficulty in distinguishing the precise events of Boedromion 17 and 18, with the Epidauria on one day and a sacrifice on one day, with the conclusion that these events may have occurred on the same day, rather than on separate days. See Mikalson 1975, pp. 56-58 for a summary of the problem of assigning days for the sacrifice and Epidauria.

²² Pausanias 2.26.8, Philostratos *Vita Apollonii* 4.18 (3rd century A.D.) References from Wickkiser 2003, p. 126, n. 443.

arrivals to join the festival. The following day, Boedromion 18, was a day of rest, likely created so that prospective initiates could prepare themselves for the processions that took place on the next days.²³

On Boedromion 19 and 20, the annual processions of the festival of the Eleusinian Mysteries, which ranked among the most famous and most conspicuous in ancient Greece, took place.²⁴ The processions moved sacred personnel, prospective initiates, and the *hiera* from the City Eleusinion in the heart of Athens to the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis. Today the walk from the City Eleusinion to the sanctuary at Eleusis is a five-hour journey along a paved, busy highway, although progress would have been much slower for a prospective initiate within the crowds participating in the annual procession on the ancient road.²⁵ Sacred officials, perhaps led by the ephebes, escorted the *hiera* to Eleusis on Boedromion 19.²⁶ Iacchos, the personification of the shout of the

²³ Clinton 1993, p. 116 suggested this day as one for rest.

²⁴ This schedule for the procession is argued by Clinton 1993, pp. 116-18 and Clinton 1988, pp. 70-71, and accepted in part by Graf 1996, pp. 61-64, who argued for two different processions on the same day, Boedromion 19. Mylonas 1961, pp. 252-58 proposed that the procession took place only on Boedromion 19, and included the *hiera*, prospective initiates, and officials. Robertson 1999, pp. 550-51, 559-61 suggested two days of procession, with the new initiates accompanying the *hiera* to Eleusis on the first day, and the *epoptai* going to the sanctuary at Eleusis on the second day. The variety of proposals is based on a divergence between information on the procession from two different sources. Plutarch *Phokian* 28.2-3 (late 1st to early 2nd century A.D.) reported that Iacchos went to Eleusis on Boedromion 20, while *IG II²* 1078 (A.D. 220) recorded that the ephebes escorted the *hiera* to Eleusis on Boedromion 19. For discussion of the sources and various proposals for the schedule of the procession, see Dillon 1997, pp. 60-70. For further discussion of the ephebes and the problems with determining their roles in the processions, see Graf 1996, pp. 61-64; Kennell 1997; and Clinton 1988, pp. 70-71. Several ancient sources describe the processions to Eleusis, including Aristophanes *Frogs* 315-459 (early 5th century B.C.) and Plutarch *Phokian* 28.1-3, which describe rituals and actions along the way, and Herodotos 8.65.1-6 (c. 430 B.C.) and Plutarch *Themistokles* 15.1 (late 1st century A.D.), which in particular address the size and spectacle of the procession.

²⁵ I walked the sacred way between the City Eleusinion and the sanctuary at Eleusis on September 28, 2003 (during the month of Boedromion), with Laura Gawlinski. The topography of the sacred way itself was not challenging. Except for one uphill stretch (through the hills of Aigeleos, about an hour and a half into the walk), the route was otherwise fairly level.

²⁶ The hierophant was positioned near the start of the procession, while the priestesses further behind him in the procession carried the *hiera*. For the order of officials within the procession, see Clinton 1974, pp. 35-36. Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a, pp. 38-39 called the transference of the *hiera* “an advent schema,” in which the most sacred objects to Demeter, the *hiera*, signified the goddess’s presence in the festival. She argued that when the *hiera* were brought to Athens and when they were returned to Eleusis, their arrival also meant

prospective initiates, perhaps along with some of the ephebes, led the prospective initiates along the route on the second day.²⁷ The prospective initiates wore crowns of myrtle, while carrying the *bacchos*, a bunch of myrtle branches tied with wool; they also likely carried the supplies needed for initiation and their stay at Eleusis.²⁸

The processions moved from Athens to the sanctuary at Eleusis along the sacred way, about 22 km. long (Figure 3).²⁹ The first procession on Boedromion 19, which carried the *hiera*, began at the City Eleusinion and traveled along the Panathenaic Way through the Agora. At the gates of the city, the procession left the center of Athens and followed the sacred way to the sanctuary at Eleusis. During the second procession on Boedromion 20, it is likely that the prospective initiates gathered near the city gate, possibly at the Pompeion or Sacred Gate, rather than at the City Eleusinion. Here, it could have been easier for a large group of prospective initiates to gather, and they would have been positioned in close proximity to the Iaccheion, the shrine of Iacchos, where the statue of Iacchos could be retrieved and carried with them to Eleusis.³⁰ Both Herodotos and Aristophanes record the chant of the prospective initiates to Iacchos as a jubilant sound performed by the participants during their long journey.³¹

the advent of Demeter, in an act that duplicated the search for Kore and Demeter's final arrival to Eleusis in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.

²⁷ For a discussion of Iacchos, see Clinton 1992, pp. 64-71.

²⁸ As Gawlinski (forthcoming) noted, it is difficult to know what clothing prospective initiates may have worn, although visual evidence, such as the Ninnion plaque (Figure 4), suggests that their clothing may have been everyday attire. Mylonas 1961, pp. 252, 279 and Dillon 1997, p. 162, with references the *scholium* on Aristophanes' *Ploutos* line 845 (produced in 388 B.C.) and Melanthios *FGrHist* 326 F4 (4th century B.C.), noted that the clothing worn during initiation could have been donated to Demeter. Gawlinski (forthcoming), following Mylonas 1961, p. 279, n. 214, also noted the mention of a *himatiotheke*, or storage place for clothing, in the building inscription *IG II² 1672*, line 229 (329/8 B.C.), supporting the tradition of dedicating one's clothing to the sanctuary.

²⁹ Pausanias 1.36.3-1.38.7 described the monuments along the route from Athens to Eleusis. The route of the procession and the procession itself were the subject of a lost book by Polemon (2nd century B.C.), which only survives in fragments. See Dillon 1997, p. 241, n. 26 for reference.

³⁰ Plutarch *Aristides* 27. Dillon 1997, p. 63; Clinton 1993, p. 116.

³¹ Aristophanes *Frogs* especially 315-353 and 397-435, and Herodotos 8.65.1.

Immediately outside of the city walls, the procession passed the Academy, and then proceeded along the sacred way toward the hills of Aigeleos (Figure 3). This part of the journey was the longest, between the city limits of Athens and its border with the territory of Eleusis at the Rheitoi Lakes, with the mountains and the Athenian Kephisos river as major features of the landscape along the way.³² Pausanias recorded several graves, built for Athenian heroes from various battles, and important precincts located between the city walls and the Kephisos River, along the first part of the route.³³ In the area before the Kephisos River, Pausanias described a sanctuary to Demeter and her child, where Athena and Poseidon were worshipped, and where an altar to Zephyros, the West Wind, was located.³⁴ An inscribed grave monument there recorded that at this location Demeter gave Phytalos a sacred fig tree in thanks for receiving the goddess into his home. It was at this tree, the so-called Sacred Fig Tree, that the Athenians met the procession of the *hiera* a few days earlier on Boedromion 14, as they were carried to Athens.

The sacred way continued on the other side of the Kephisos River, through the hills of Aigeleos, toward the border between the territories of Athens and Eleusis at the Rheitoi Lakes. Pausanias recorded an altar of Zeus Meilichios near the river, where Theseus was purified by descendants of Phytalos after killing Sinis.³⁵ Near the altar were two graves, one built in honor of a physician who donated a statue of Iacchos. Further along the sacred way was a shrine to Kyamites, whom Pausanias identified as either the first person to sow beans or a hero invented by the Athenians as a sort of proxy for

³² There are two rivers with the name Kephisos between the city of Athens and the sanctuary at Eleusis, which are called the Athenian Kephisos and the Eleusinian Kephisos (Figure 3).

³³ Pausanias 1.36.3-1.37.3.

³⁴ Pausanias 1.37.2.

³⁵ Pausanias 1.37.4.

Demeter, who actually gave beans.³⁶ As the procession followed the sacred way toward the bay of Eleusis, it passed two important sanctuaries. The sanctuary to Apollo was first, which Pausanias noted was built initially in honor of Apollo, but later added statues of Demeter, her daughter, and Athena.³⁷ Only a short distance from the bay, the sacred way passed a sanctuary of Aphrodite, which excavations have shown included a temple and propylon, as well as a preserved section of the sacred way.³⁸

At the Rheitoi Lakes, according to Pausanias, the procession entered the territory of Eleusis.³⁹ These lakes, or streams as they are sometimes called, contained sea water and were sacred to Demeter and Kore, the exclusive property of the cult personnel of Eleusis. Near the lakes, Pausanias found the tomb of Eumolpos, the legendary leader of Eleusis.⁴⁰ At the bridge that crossed the Rheitoi Lakes, prospective initiates had ribbons tied onto them by descendants of Krokos, whom Pausanias described as the first man to live on the Eleusinian side of the Lakes.⁴¹

The last topographical landmark on the way to the sanctuary at Eleusis was the bridge over the Eleusinian Kephisos. Pausanias described the river as more violent than the Athenian Kephisos River, and also as the location where Pluto (Hades) descended to the underworld with Kore.⁴² At the bridge over this river, the *gephyrismoï* took place, when onlookers shouted insults at the prospective initiates. Finally, about dusk, the procession approached the sanctuary after many hours of walking. When the prospective

³⁶ Pausanias 1.37.4-5. Horden and Purcell 2000, p. 436 argued that the shrine was located in a village that housed a bean market in an agriculturally rich suburb of Athens.

³⁷ Pausanias 1.37.6-7. The 11th century A.D. monastery at Daphni incorporates ancient building material that may be the remains of this sanctuary of Apollo.

³⁸ Pausanias 1.37.7. Camp 2000, pp. 130-31.

³⁹ Graf 1996, p. 63 argued that the boundary was at the Athenian Kephisos.

⁴⁰ Pausanias 1.38.1-3.

⁴¹ Pausanias 1.38.2.

⁴² Pausanias 1.38.5.

initiates arrived at the sanctuary at Eleusis, they got as far as the Kallichoron Well, located just outside the sanctuary, in front of the gateway, where they may have participated in dances, ritual ablutions, and perhaps sacrifices.⁴³

Eleusis hosted the next two days of the festival, from the arrival of the procession on the evening of Boedromion 20 until Boedromion 22. After a day of rest and preparation, which may have included fasting, the prospective initiates at last entered the sanctuary in order to be initiated during the evening of Boedromion 21.⁴⁴ After passing through the gateway, the prospective initiates walked along the sacred way, past the Mirthless Rock (previously identified as the Plutonion), perhaps participated themselves in the search for Kore, and finally went into the Telesterion.⁴⁵ There, it is believed that the prospective initiates experienced three acts to achieve their goal of initiation, the *legomena*, or things spoken, the specifics of which remain unknown, the *dromena*, or things acted out, which included a sacred drama in which the prospective initiates witnessed the reunion of Demeter and her daughter, and the *deiknumena*, or the things shown, which must be the revealed *hiera*.⁴⁶ The day after initiation, Boedromion 22, may have included a large public sacrifice outside the walls of the sanctuary, perhaps in

⁴³ Mylonas 1961, pp. 256-57; Clinton 1992, pp. 27-28, Clinton 1993, p. 118. Pausanias 1.38.6; Euripides *Ion* 1076 (c. 414 B.C.). Clinton 1988, pp. 70-71 suggested that sacrifices were offered to Demeter and Kore, Iacchos, and Pluton.

⁴⁴ Dillon 1997, p. 65 suggested that fasting may have taken place during the day before the prospective initiates entered the sanctuary on the basis of a recitation of the prospective initiates recorded by Clement of Alexandria *Exhortation* 2.18 (late 2nd century to early 3rd century A.D.), in which the prospective initiates state that they have fasted before drinking the *kykeon*, a liquid consumed by initiates during initiation. In addition, Ovid *Fasti* 4.535-36 (early 1st century A.D.) recorded that prospective initiates ate when the stars came out, but it is not clear which day is meant. Clinton 1988, p. 71 also argued that fasting was likely practiced by the prospective initiates on this day.

⁴⁵ For the Mirthless Rock and its previous identification, see Clinton 1992, pp. 14-27.

⁴⁶ Clinton 1993, pp. 118-19 distinguished separate stages of initiation inside the Telesterion, with the *mystes* and *epoptes* witnessing the sacred drama, but only the *epoptes* seeing the grain. Mylonas 1961, pp. 258-78 also described the events inside the sanctuary, although he argued they took place on the evening of Boedromion 20. For the sacred drama of the reunion of Demeter and Kore and for the revealed objects, see Clinton 1992, pp. 84-90 and Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a, pp. 29-37. On the objects revealed during initiation, see Chapter 9 below, in a discussion of the sculptural decoration of the Lesser Propylaia.

the area around the Kallichoron Well.⁴⁷ On this day or the next, libations were offered to the dead from *plemochoai*, vessels for just this purpose, an act connected with the promise for a better afterlife, which the initiates had just received.⁴⁸

The participants left Eleusis for Athens on Boedromion 23, but this time their journey was accomplished without an organized procession.⁴⁹ Athenians could have walked back along the sacred way, while non-Athenians could have returned to their homes by sea from the harbor at Eleusis or from other roads near the sanctuary.⁵⁰ On the last day of the festival, Boedromion 24, the Boule, the Athenian council, met at the City Eleusinion to evaluate the performance of the festival for that year.⁵¹ With the *hiera* safely returned to their storage place in the Telesterion at Eleusis, and with the newly initiated participants on their way home, the festival ended.

Pilgrimage and Procession During the Mysteries

The procession was one of the defining characteristics of the Mysteries and participation in it was required of all prospective initiates. But in order to participate in the procession from Athens to Eleusis, prospective initiates first had to undertake individual pilgrimages to Athens. Beginning with the *prorrhesis* and *aghyrmos* on Boedromion 15, the pilgrims from all over the Mediterranean, including the Athenians themselves, became members of a single group of prospective initiates, linked by their shared goal of initiation as well as their common knowledge of Greek, despite economic,

⁴⁷ Clinton 1993, p. 119, 1988, pp. 71-72.

⁴⁸ Clinton 1993, p. 119 argued that the ritual with the *plemochoai* took place on Boedromion 23, while Mylonas 1961, p. 279 supported its performance on Boedromion 22. For a discussion of *plemochoai*, including their use and archaeological contexts, see *Agora XXXI*, pp. 93-105. For ancient sources on *plemochoai*, see Athenaios 11.496a-b (early 3rd century A.D.) and Hesychius *s.v.* *plemochoe*.

⁴⁹ Clinton 1993, p. 119.

⁵⁰ Dillon 1997, p. 69-70 noted that non-Athenians could have used the bay at Eleusis as their departure point.

⁵¹ Mylonas 1961, p. 280; Clinton 1993, p. 119; *Agora XXXI*, pp. 8, 33. A structure suitable to house such a meeting has not yet been identified at the City Eleusinion.

social, and gender differences. This group then traveled together in the procession from Athens to the sanctuary at Eleusis on Boedromion 20. As Elsner and Rutherford termed it, this procession was itself a “mini-pilgrimage” because it made all participants in the festival, even the Athenians, who also had to leave their homes and the boundaries of their city, pilgrims.⁵² Although for most prospective initiates the distance between Athens and Eleusis was relatively minor compared to the great distances they had earlier traveled to get first to Athens, the journey to Eleusis was far more ritually potent because it was this trek through which they could gain entry into the sanctuary at Eleusis and be initiated.

The ritual of the procession created a single community out of the prospective initiates, and two further rituals performed along the way emphasized the unity and distinction of the prospective initiates in the procession compared to those watching the procession.⁵³ These rituals also marked the physical transition into the territory of Eleusis. The crossing of the bridge by the Rheitoi Lakes, sacred to Demeter and Kore, marked the first important transition.⁵⁴ These lakes signaled the moment when the procession moved out of Athens’ central territory and into the area of Eleusis.⁵⁵ Here, descendants of Krokos tied a saffron-colored ribbon, a *kroke*, on the right hand and left

⁵² Elsner and Rutherford 2005, pp. 17-18 called this an example of an “initiation pilgrimage,” similar to the travel of individuals to Samothrace for initiation into the Samothracian Mysteries. Dillon 1997, p. 61 noted the way in which the Athenians became pilgrims. The format of this “mini-pilgrimage” was similar to that performed during the festival at the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros. Most pilgrims came to the harbor at the town of Epidauros by boat, then joined the Epidaurians on a 10km. trek by land to the sanctuary located outside of the city. I walked this route in June 2003, in just under four hours. Parts of an ancient road remain visible.

⁵³ Turner 1974, pp. 200-30.

⁵⁴ During my walk to Eleusis, I crossed the area of the Rheitoi Lakes about 3.5 hours after leaving Athens.

⁵⁵ Pausanias 1.38.1.

leg of each prospective initiate during a ceremony known as the *krokosis*.⁵⁶ This ritual provided a physical attribute to distinguish the prospective initiate from non-initiates. The second ritual marking a point of transition in the procession occurred when the prospective initiates came to the bridge over the Kephisos River near Eleusis.⁵⁷ Men stood on the bridge and shouted obscenities and insults, called *gephyrismoï*, to the prospective initiates as they silently passed by.⁵⁸ This event could have been either apotropaic or meant to humble the prospective initiates; either way it fostered a sense of belonging to the prospective initiates in the procession, who as a community endured the insults.⁵⁹ As Graf noted, this ritual also emphasized to the prospective initiates the extent to which they were physically and socially removed from the city and its hierarchies.⁶⁰

The procession not only served to unify the prospective initiates and convey them to the sanctuary at Eleusis. The journey also celebrated Demeter's presence in the city, at Eleusis, and, no less significant, in the landscape between Athens and the sanctuary at Eleusis. Prospective initiates during the festival of the Mysteries may have been focused on Demeter's promise of a happier afterlife, but this trek reminded them that Demeter's other gift, agrarian prosperity, was closely linked to it.⁶¹ The prospective initiates passed several shrines and altars dedicated to Demeter; they also visited places connected with agriculture and food production, such as the Sacred Fig Tree given by Demeter, the shrine of Kyamites (Beanman), the Rheitoi Lakes, which gave salt for food preservation,

⁵⁶ Mylonas 1961, p. 256; Graf 1996, pp. 63, 241, n. 27; Pausanias 1.38.2 mentions Krokon, but the ancient references for the ritual are Hesychius, *s.v. Rheitoi* and Photius, *s.v. krokoun* (9th century A.D.).

⁵⁷ Hesychios, *s.v. gephyris* placed this act at the Eleusinian Kephisos. Dillon 1997, p. 64 argued that this event took place at a bridge over the Rheitoi Lakes. During my walk to Eleusis, I crossed the Roman bridge over the Kephisos river about 4 hours and 45 minutes after leaving Athens.

⁵⁸ Examples of insults are described in Aristophanes *Frogs* 415-39.

⁵⁹ For apotropaic interpretation, see Mylonas 1961, pp. 256-257.

⁶⁰ Graf 1996, p. 63.

⁶¹ As Burkert 1983, p. 255 argued, these two gifts are not completely distinct from one another, but are intertwined.

and the fertile Thriasian plain around the sanctuary.⁶² The sacred way traversed the land that was used to feed the city, with the food given by Demeter.

The procession of prospective initiates on Boedromion 20 was the primary public aspect of the festival of the Mysteries, conducted along the sacred way between the sanctuaries. Similar to other religious festivals, the procession was a public action that traversed a particular space, created a community of its participants, and led them to a particular religious location. In two ways, however, the processions during the Mysteries were distinctive compared to processions in other religious festivals. First, by the fact that as many as three (or perhaps even four) processions took place, including the first transfer of the *hiera* to the City Eleusinion on Boedromion 14, the journey with the piglets to Phaleron on Boedromion 16 (this may not have been a formal procession, but certainly involved all prospective initiates traveling at the same time to Phaleron, then back to the center of the city), and the processions of the initiates and the *hiera* to Eleusis on Boedromion 19 and 20. In the first two, the center of Athens was given prominence as the end point, while in the last two Athens was the starting point. Graf further differentiated the latter two processions, with the procession of the prospective initiates as what he called “centrifugal” or moving outside of the city, and the procession with the *hiera* as linking the city to the sanctuary.⁶³ For Graf, the different starting points of the processions, one at the City Eleusinion and the other near the city gates, emphasized the distinction.

A second characteristic of the processions during the festival of the Mysteries differing from other religious festivals is that most processions covered a much shorter

⁶² Horden and Purcell 2000, pp. 425-427. Herda 2006, pp. 259-384 emphasized the importance of the “in-between” area covered by the procession from Miletos to Didyma, punctuated by monuments and rituals.

⁶³ Graf 1996, pp. 62-63.

distance, with a few exceptions.⁶⁴ The distance and difficulty of the processional route, together with the activities carried out along the way, helped build the prospective initiate's desire for final arrival at Eleusis. Only through participation in the procession to Eleusis could a prospective initiate be a part of the rites in the Telesterion. Therefore, it was essential for the prospective initiates to be removed from their geographical, social, class, and gender roles, in order to be part of the festival. The spaces traversed and the actions performed during the processions were fundamental to the experience of the pilgrim; the propylon at each sanctuary was the culmination of this experience. The gateways and propylaia that marked the entrances (and exits) to the host sanctuaries of the Eleusinian Mysteries were granted an elevated status because they marked the processions' beginning and end. Any consideration of the deployment of the gateways must take the procession into consideration.

Historiography and Excavation History

Previous scholarship on the gateways and processional routes at the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion began with archaeological investigation and continued with studies of individual phases or buildings. The City Eleusinion was first investigated by K.S. Pittakys from 1848-1852, who uncovered important fragments of inscriptions related to the Mysteries, several of which were found

⁶⁴ Examples of processions of comparable length to that between Athens and Eleusis (22km.), include the sacred way between Miletos and Didyma (16.5km.; see Dillon 1997, p. 36; Graf 1996, pp. 60-61; Herda 2006, pp. 167-79) and the route between Messene and the Karnasian grove where the Mysteries of Andania were celebrated (16km.). On April 25, 2004, I walked with Laura Gawlinski during her tracing of the processional route between Messene, beginning at the Arkadian Gate, and the Karnasian grove. For this route and directions, see Gawlinski 2005, pp. 81-91. Two processional routes of exceptional length are those between Elis and Olympia (c. 30km. from Pheia, the port of Elis, to the sanctuary; see Dillon 1997, p. 31) and between Athens and Delphi (c. 175 km; Dillon 1997, p. 37 recorded that many pilgrims traveled to Delphi by sea, but that a land route was also used).

in the post-Herulian wall, as well as sculpture and architectural fragments.⁶⁵ Similar remains were excavated by Konstantinos Kourouniotes in 1910. The American School of Classical Studies conducted full excavation in 1937 and 1938, with further study and publication by Margaret Miles in 1998.

At the sanctuary at Eleusis, the first explorations of the visible remains began with travelers as early as the 1676 visit of George Wheler and Jacob Spon, who identified the remains of the Lesser Propylaia as the temple of Ceres.⁶⁶ To the southwest of the foundations, Wheler and Spon saw one of the kistephoroi from the Lesser Propylaia, which they identified as a statue of Ceres. In 1801, E.D. Clarke visited the site, and ultimately removed the exposed kistephoros to England.⁶⁷ Members of the Society of Dilettanti traveled to Eleusis in 1811-1812, and Francis Bedford and other visitors were the first to identify the remains as the Lesser Propylaia.⁶⁸ They also investigated the Greater Propylaia, considering it so similar to the Propylaia of the Athenian Acropolis that the two buildings must have been contemporary Classical structures. At mid-century, François Lenormant investigated the inscriptions on site, including the epistyle of the Lesser Propylaia and the fragments assigned to the Greater Propylaia.⁶⁹

Systematic excavations were begun by the Greek Archaeological Society in 1882. At first under the direction of Demetrios Philios, followed by Andreas Skias, Konstantinos Kourouniotes, Anastasios Orlandos, John Travlos, and George Mylonas, these excavations resulted in uncovering the extent of the walls of the sanctuary. In

⁶⁵ For the history of excavations at the City Eleusinion, see *Agora XXXI*, pp. 3-6 and *Agora XIV*, pp. 229-30.

⁶⁶ Wheler 1682, pp. 425-30 and Spon 1683, pp. 275-85. For a summary of early travelers and excavations of the sanctuary at Eleusis, see Mylonas 1961, pp. 9-13.

⁶⁷ Clarke 1818, pp. 601-28.

⁶⁸ Society of Dilettanti 1817, pp. 1-40.

⁶⁹ Lenormant 1862, pp. 46-48, 391-401.

addition to the reports of the excavators, two syntheses of the excavated material have been offered. The masterful publication of the architecture of the sanctuary at Eleusis by Ferdinand Noack included all the work done up to the time of his publication in 1927.⁷⁰ His study outlined phases for the architecture, including the sanctuary walls and the Telesterion. Although further excavation has rendered some of his conclusions obsolete, Noack's study remains a valuable compilation of the excavated material up until that point. Mylonas offered a study that integrated excavation results up through the 1950s, in which he refined Noack's chronological phases and outlined the worship of Demeter and the Mysteries.⁷¹

Subsequent to Mylonas, interest became mainly focused on specific time periods or certain buildings.⁷² For the 8th and 7th centuries B.C., Travlos proposed an extensive Geometric sanctuary at Eleusis, with further study and revisions offered by Michael Cosmopoulos and Alexander Mazarakis-Ainian.⁷³ Other studies have concentrated on particular gateways, such as Demosthenes Ziro's proposed Classical propylon, Guido Libertini and Hans Hörmann on the Lesser Propylaia, and Ziro on the Greater Propylaia.⁷⁴ These architectural studies carefully consider individual propyla at the northern entrance to the sanctuary, but generally offer little reference to the contemporary wall circuit or its other gateways, or to the experience of the initiate at the gateways. Recently, Lippolis has offered a synthesis of the cult and archaeology at Eleusis, including discussions of literary and iconographical representations of the goddesses, the

⁷⁰ Noack 1927.

⁷¹ Mylonas 1961.

⁷² Previous scholarship and reconstructions are further discussed in each chapter as they relate to the phase under discussion.

⁷³ Travlos 1983; Cosmopoulos 2003; Mazarakis-Ainian 1997.

⁷⁴ Libertini 1916; Hörmann 1932; Ziro 1991.

various festivals celebrated at Eleusis, and a survey of the topography and architecture of the sanctuary through several phases.⁷⁵ Even with the lengthy history of scholarship, several significant questions concerning the entrances remain, as outlined above, as does the need for a diachronic study of the phases of the entrances to the sanctuaries. Such a study can track the changes in the form of the entrances over time, particularly considering the architecture and decoration of the entrances and their experiential impact on prospective initiates.

⁷⁵ Lippolis 2006.

Chapter 2: Pre-Archaic Phase (Late 8th and 7th century B.C.)

Introduction

The earliest archaeological evidence for cult practice at the City Eleusinion and the sanctuary at Eleusis belongs to the late 8th and 7th century B.C., thus predating the first written evidence for the Eleusinian Mysteries by at least two centuries. While votive deposits provide the primary source of evidence for early cult practice at the City Eleusinion, architectural forms, including a peribolos wall, a monumental stepped entrance, and a pyre, as well as votive deposits, define the sanctuary at Eleusis.⁷⁶

In this chapter, I outline the archaeological and architectural evidence for each sanctuary, highlighting the ritually significant elements in the landscape as well as the various deposits found at the City Eleusinion, while for Eleusis, I reevaluate the architectural and archaeological evidence and propose a revised reconstruction for the sanctuary, with particular attention to the form of its entrance. In considering the deposits and architecture at the sanctuary at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion, I aim to address the question of when the architecture of the sanctuaries can point to a key aspect of the Mysteries, the transport of material and personnel and prospective initiates between the sanctuaries. In other words, if the sanctuaries indicate the worship of Demeter, if the minimum architectural requirements of this movement, storage facilities for the *hiera*, can be identified in this phase, and if a connection between the sanctuaries is established, it may be possible to suggest that this aspect of the Mysteries existed by

⁷⁶ The date for this activity in the City Eleusinion is based on stratified fills, and has been carefully studied and dated by Miles in *Agora XXXI*. The structures at the sanctuary at Eleusis had been previously dated to the Geometric period (dated to the 8th century B.C. by their excavators, see Mylonas 1961, p. 55 and Travlos 1988, p. 92). Recent work has shown that they could date to the end of 8th century B.C. or to the 7th century B.C.

the 7th century B.C. I argue that the architecture, topography, and votive deposits of the sanctuaries at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion during the Pre-Archaic Phase suggest that the movement of objects and personnel between the sanctuaries did in fact exist by this time.

Athens

In the 7th century B.C., the City Eleusinion was likely an open-air shrine that may have been dedicated to Demeter. Three large deposits provide evidence for ritual offerings starting in the late 8th century B.C. (Figure 5).⁷⁷ The northern pit (T 19:3) included late 8th century B.C. material, while two other deposits (T 20:2 and T 20:3) included objects mostly from the 7th century B.C. Although these deposits included some pottery and terracotta objects, terracotta figurines, particularly female figurines, are the most frequent offering. From the evidence of the deposits, it can be concluded that ritual activity occurred in the area certainly from the mid-7th century B.C., and possibly as early as the late 8th century B.C. As the sanctuary was monumentalized in subsequent centuries, it incorporated the areas in which these deposits were made within its limits.⁷⁸

The predominance of columnar females among the terracotta figurines in the three deposits (T 19:3, T 20:2, T 20:3) suggests that a female deity was worshipped at the City Eleusinion in the 7th century B.C.⁷⁹ More specifically, that the shrine may have been a sanctuary dedicated to Demeter is suggested by a topographical feature located to the west of these deposits, known today as the Rocky Outcrop. Indeed, the Rocky Outcrop may have inspired the Athenians to designate this area as a sacred space. Although the

⁷⁷ For a complete discussion of these deposits and their fills, see *Agora XXXI*, pp. 16-20, 109-12.

⁷⁸ Deposits T 20:2 and T 20:3 were within the limits of the First Archaic Phase wall (Figure 5), and deposit T 19:3 was within the wall of the 5th century B.C. (Figure 6).

⁷⁹ *Agora XXXI*, pp. 18-20.

Rocky Outcrop projects only slightly above the ground level between it and the deposits, the steep slope of the sanctuary toward the south gave the feature visual prominence from this direction. As Miles noted, there is no direct evidence to indicate that the outcropping was sacred or that ritual was performed here, but such a hypothesis is appealing. It is the most prominent feature in close proximity to the three deposits, and it was incorporated within the limits of the First Archaic Phase peribolos wall (Figures 5 and 7).⁸⁰ Even more significant, the first sanctuary entrance in the First Archaic Phase wall, dating to the first half of the 6th century B.C., was built only a few meters from the southern side of the Rocky Outcrop. Throughout the later phases of the sanctuary's architectural history, the primary entrance remained in close proximity to the Rocky Outcrop, a persistent prominence that can perhaps be projected back into the 7th century B.C.

Rock outcroppings are a frequent feature of Greek sanctuaries, both as objects of worship and locations of ritual.⁸¹ They also have a particular connection to Demeter. In literary and iconographic traditions, Demeter sits on a rock while searching or lamenting for her daughter. The most famous example is the Mirthless Rock at the sanctuary at Eleusis (Figure 8, number 9), where Demeter mourned Kore.⁸² Like the Rocky Outcrop at the City Eleusinion, the Mirthless Rock was located just inside the entrance to the sanctuary, bringing these two similar features together in topographical setting. This topographical relationship does not likely extend to similarity in ritual function, however. Clinton has argued that the Mirthless Rock was the setting for part of the sacred drama at Eleusis, where Demeter and her daughter were reunited before their appearance to

⁸⁰ *Agora XXXI*, pp. 20-21. The highest point of the outcropping is 83.10.

⁸¹ *Agora XXXI*, pp. 20-21 and Kron 1992, pp. 63-70 provide further discussion and examples of rock outcroppings at Greek and Roman sanctuaries.

⁸² For a discussion of Demeter's association with the Mirthless Rock at Eleusis, see Clinton 1992, pp. 14-27.

prospective initiates inside the Telesterion.⁸³ Such an interpretation cannot easily be applied to the Rocky Outcrop at the City Eleusinion. Although the Rocky Outcrop is larger than the Mirthless Rock, only the Mirthless Rock includes a smooth area that could be used as a seat.⁸⁴ Also, unlike the Mirthless Rock, the Rocky Outcrop is not concealed behind precinct walls and within a cave, but was instead available to be viewed by those entering the sanctuary. Thus, any part of a sacred drama connected with the Rocky Outcrop would have been exposed to view. To summarize, the Rocky Outcrop at the City Eleusinion was a natural feature that, due to its prominence in the sanctuary, probably had a role in ritual experience, but one likely connected to entering the sanctuary. Although it may not have been the setting of the performance of a sacred drama at the City Eleusinion, the Rocky Outcrop still evoked Demeter.

Based on a late sixth-century B.C. altar inscribed with a sacred law of the Mysteries found in the vicinity, Miles has argued that since the shrine was known both as a sanctuary of Demeter and the City Eleusinion by the 6th century B.C., this identification can plausibly also be applied to the 7th century B.C.⁸⁵ Miles argued, moreover, that as early as the 7th century B.C., it could have been a sanctuary for the Mysteries, and a suitable place to house the *hiera*.⁸⁶ Although there is no evidence for monumental construction at the City Eleusinion during the Pre-Archaic Phase as one might expect for the storage of the *hiera*, it is possible that facilities for the *hiera* could have been wooden

⁸³ Clinton 1992, pp. 84-89.

⁸⁴ The Mirthless Rock is 2.5m. wide and 1m. deep. For dimensions, see Clinton 1992, p. 24. The Rocky Outcrop is 2 x 3m., but its top surface is rounded. For dimensions, see *Agora XXXI*, p. 20.

⁸⁵ *Agora XXXI* pp. 19, 22. An inscribed altar of the late 6th century B.C. (*Agora XXXI*, cat. I, 39) included a sacred law referring to the Mysteries. Findspots of some of its fragments were in and near the City Eleusinion, helping to secure the identification of the sanctuary in the 6th century B.C. Connelly 2007, pp. 64-65 noted that this inscription provides the earliest mention of the priestess of Demeter and Kore at Athens.

⁸⁶ *Agora XXXI*, p. 22.

structures leaving no trace in the archaeological record. There is no evidence of a monumental entrance to the sanctuary during this phase.⁸⁷

Eleusis

In contrast to the more modest form of the sanctuary at the City Eleusinion, the sanctuary at Eleusis already included monumental architecture from the late 8th and 7th centuries B.C. The cult being practiced at Eleusis demanded a wall, a level terrace with a stepped entrance, a pyre, and other structures. Votive objects associated with the Pre-Archaic Phase terrace, including terracotta figurines and painted plaques, indicate religious activity.⁸⁸ The high percentage of female figurines points to a female deity honored by the pyre's dedications, most likely Demeter, based on the sanctuary's dedication to her in subsequent centuries.⁸⁹

The form of the Pre-Archaic Phase sanctuary at Eleusis as reconstructed by Mylonas and Travlos has been widely accepted, in particular the plan and reconstruction published by Travlos (Figure 9).⁹⁰ On the basis of this reconstruction, several important conclusions have been drawn regarding the early history of the Mysteries and the relationship between the sanctuaries, such as whether the Mysteries were a continuation of a Mycenaean cult, and if the orientation of its entrance indicated Athenian control of the sanctuary. A re-evaluation of the evidence used by Travlos is necessary because the

⁸⁷ See *Agora XXXI*, p. 17, in which Miles noted that there was no evidence for walls or other structures during this phase. No mention is made of post holes.

⁸⁸ These objects come from pyre Alpha, located in front of wall E1. The pyre and its finds were published by Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, pp. 54-60, 197-216. The majority of the objects from the pyre are columnar female figurines, with the other figures including female protomes and some animals. The painted decoration on the plaques included mostly birds and tripods. The pottery was primarily proto-Attic, with some Corinthian aryballoi.

⁸⁹ According to Binder 1998, p. 139, dedications found on the Pre-Archaic Phase terrace suggest that a cult of Demeter was being practiced here, but without citation of which objects in particular were under consideration. Noack 1927, p. 11-15 also suggested that the terrace was dedicated to Demeter at this time.

⁹⁰ Mylonas 1961, pp. 55-63; Travlos 1983, pp. 326-37, 1988, p. 92.

restorations of several of the key structures included in his reconstruction are based on more modest evidence than his plan or discussion would suggest. Once a revised reconstruction is presented, it is possible to reconsider these earlier conclusions.

Reconstruction of the Sanctuary

In Travlos' plan of the sanctuary in the 8th century B.C. (Figure 9), he postulated an outer peribolos wall that surrounds the sanctuary on the northern, southern, and eastern sides of the sanctuary, with the hill serving as the western limit. Entrances are located in the northern, southern, and eastern walls. An inner peribolos wall (including E1, E2, and E5) delineates an inner sanctuary within the confines of the outer peribolos wall. The northern entrance to the inner sanctuary is connected to the entrance in the outer peribolos wall by a sacred way. A broad stairway of seven steps comprises the southern entrance to the inner sanctuary (E2), and a curving retaining wall (E3) built in front of two older structures, stands at the top of this stairway. The complex created by these two adjacent buildings included Megaron B, the southern structure with a single chamber fronted by a porch on its eastern side, and its extension, the northern structure composed of three rooms on a central axis. Travlos identified the southern building as a megaron or house for the Eumolpidai, the locally important family from which the hierophant was selected, which was built in the Bronze Age but later dedicated to Demeter in the 8th century B.C. Outside the inner peribolos wall, but still within the outer peribolos wall, is Well W, which was accessed from the inner peribolos entrance (E2) through a cross wall pierced by a gateway. An apsidal structure, considered part of an auxiliary sanctuary, appears approximately 70m. north of the outer peribolos wall, near

the later temple of Artemis.⁹¹ Mylonas and Travlos dated this plan of the sanctuary to the mid-8th century B.C.

A systematic investigation into the individual features associated with the Pre-Archaic Phase at the sanctuary at Eleusis suggests an alternative plan for the sanctuary during this period (Figure 10). The revised plan calls the form of the outer peribolos wall into question, because sufficient evidence for its previously reconstructed form is lacking (compare Figures 9 and 10). It also disassociates the curving wall 70m. to the north from the sanctuary. On the central terrace, the curving wall (E3) is now identified as a retaining wall built over the earlier Bronze Age remains. Well W is to the east of the central terrace. These revisions are important because they impact conclusions made about the early history of the Mysteries. In the following paragraphs, I outline the preserved architecture for the sanctuary, in order to substantiate the alternative plan for the 8th and 7th centuries B.C.⁹²

The inner peribolos wall is composed of three preserved sections, E1, E2, and E5, the first two to the south of the terrace, and the last to the north. E5 is an L-shaped wall section preserved north of the terrace (E5 on Figures 8, 11, and 12), built of blocks of various shapes. The blocks at the corner are long and flat, some are more regularly square and slightly rectangular, and others are three-sided. Smaller cobbles are interspersed among these larger blocks, and the blocks themselves are not laid in regular

⁹¹ Travlos 1988, p. 92.

⁹² Recently, Lippolis 2006, pp. 145-58 offered another reconstruction for the sanctuary, in which he included an apsidal structure at E3, a sanctuary composed of an upper and a lower terrace (the lower bounded by walls Z12 and Z11, which I assign to the 6th century B.C.), and a retaining wall at E6.

courses. Mylonas noted that clay mortar was used in the wall, and that its preserved height at the eastern corner is 2.50m.⁹³

The second section of the inner Pre-Archaic Phase peribolos wall is located on the southern side of the terrace, and includes two parts at an angle to each other (E1 and E2).⁹⁴ The eastern part (E1 on Figures 8 and 11) ends in a finished anta at its western end, where the second part, composed of three steps, begins (E2 on Figures 8 and 11). Mylonas and Kourouniotes noted that the wall was finished on both sides, but that the outer face was slightly more finished than the inner face.⁹⁵ Wall E1 is built of a masonry style similar to the northern section of wall E5, with irregular square and rectangular blocks, as well as some that are three-sided, which are set with smaller cobbles and clay. Also like E5, the blocks in this section are not set in regular courses. The preserved upper course is slightly more regular, with blocks along the inner face, which could indicate that this was a wall socle with mudbrick above. Wall E1 is preserved for a length of 5.75m., has a height of c. 1.00m., and is 1.20m. thick. Walls E1 and E2 are wider than peribolos walls from most other sanctuaries in the 8th and 7th century B.C., probably because E2 included the steps and E1 matched the width of E2.⁹⁶

⁹³ Mylonas 1961, p. 56.

⁹⁴ Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, p. 279; Kourouniotes 1933, p. 26; Noack 1927, pp. 10-11.

⁹⁵ Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, p. 279. Mylonas 1961, p. 56 called these sherds "proto-Geometric."

⁹⁶ Dimensions from Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, p. 42. Only two other sanctuaries preserve peribolos walls of comparable thickness. From Haliartos, a 1.70m. thick wall north of the 6th century B.C. temple of Athena was first identified by Austin 1931/1932, pp. 183-84 as part of an earlier temple at the sanctuary (Figure 14), but reidentified by Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, pp. 242-43 as an Early Iron Age temenos wall. Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, pp. 252-53 proposed that the sanctuary of Apollo at Eretria may have been surrounded by a fortification wall, with its identification with this function based on its width of 1.00m. (Figures 26 and 27). Most commonly, peribolos walls from the 8th and 7th century B.C. are c. 0.60m. wide. For example, Wall 1 at the Apollo sanctuary at Eretria (c. 0.60m. wide) was an 8th century B.C. courtyard or peribolos wall that enclosed buildings E and A (Figure 16) (see Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, pp. 102-05; Verdan 2002, pp. 128-32). From the mid-8th century B.C., Wall C at the Apollo sanctuary on the Barbouna Hill at Asine (c. 0.60m. wide), located south of the apsidal building B, may have been a peribolos wall (Figure 17) (see Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, pp. 70-71; Wells 1988, pp. 261-266). From the early 7th century B.C., the

Wall E2 incorporates a flight of three steps that meets E1 (Figure 13). The wall at E2 has a preserved length of 4.80m., and the three steps have treads ranging from 0.25-0.30m. and rises between 0.13-0.15m.⁹⁷ Kourouniotes suggested that the staircase could have continued to include as many as seven steps, but this number may be excessive, as only the three preserved steps are needed to ascend to the level of the terrace.⁹⁸ Three observations point to the conclusion that these steps must have been used as an entrance to the terrace above: the lower two step courses included cobbles as backers, which the top step does not seem to preserve, the step blocks of the top course are set level with a well-defined outer face, and the steps were described by Mylonas and Kourouniotes as “well polished from use.”⁹⁹ In front of (i.e., to the south of) E2, a road composed of well-worn paving stones, contemporary with the wall, supports the conclusion that this was the entrance.¹⁰⁰ There may have been other entrances in the inner Pre-Archaic peribolos wall, but their positions cannot be known for certain.

The top of E1 is approximately on level with the top elevation for E5 (Figures 18 and 19), which suggests, along with the similarity of masonry style, that these belonged to the same peribolos wall for the sanctuary.¹⁰¹ The preserved wall sections indicate that a complete inner peribolos wall originally extended along the eastern side of the terrace (Figure 10). The L-shaped section at E5 shows the easternmost point for the wall, where

sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta was enclosed by a temenos wall, c. 0.70m. wide (Figure 15) (see Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, pp. 166-67; Catling 1994, p. 272).

⁹⁷ Dimensions from Mylonas 1961, p. 56.

⁹⁸ Kourouniotes 1933, p. 26; Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, p. 279. This reconstruction is accepted by Mylonas 1961, p. 56.

⁹⁹ Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, p. 279. No other sanctuary from the 8th or 7th century B.C. provides evidence of a stepped entrance. Stepped terrace walls begin elsewhere in the second half of the 6th century B.C. For a study of steps in Greek sanctuaries, see Becker 2003, especially 283-90 for a chronological survey.

¹⁰⁰ This road is more fully discussed below.

¹⁰¹ Noack 1927, p. 10, pls. 1 and 2 provided elevations for these sections of the Pre-Archaic Phase wall. The top of E1 and E2 is approximately 12.60 and the top of E5 is 12.64. Noack reconstructed the approximate ground level of this phase to be 12.64, the higher of the two preserved wall elevations.

it returns to the south, and the section at E1 most likely included a return toward the north at some point just beyond its current preserved limits. The northern and southern ends of the wall proceeded from the wall sections at E5 and E2 to the west, perhaps terminating at the hill behind the terrace. The wall sections could have been socles for mudbrick above, in which case they would have continued above ground level. Alternatively, the wall could be reconstructed as a peribolos wall that also retained fill for the terrace, in which case their top surfaces would indicate the highest possible ground level. In this case, the three preserved steps at E2 would represent the complete extent of a grand staircase to the terrace above.

The date for the inner peribolos wall (composed of E1, E2, and E5) has been determined by its stratigraphic relationship with pyre Alpha, built up against the southern face of wall E1 (Figure 20).¹⁰² The pyre and the wall are considered contemporary because the bottom of the wall and the lowest part of the pyre are at the same elevation. The pyre, comprised of thick layers with ash, carbonized wood, pottery, and figurines, extended from the base of the wall to nearly its upper edge, 0.80-1.00m. thick; the pyre lacked an architectural or built frame. The earliest material in the pyre included jewelry from the second half and third quarter of the 8th century B.C., several late 8th century to mid-7th century B.C. oinochoai, and two figurines from the late 8th century B.C.¹⁰³ The pyre and the wall could date as early as the second half of the 8th century B.C., but the majority of the finds from the pyre (and even those cited as the earliest) fall within a range of dates that suggest the establishment of the pyre (and likely the wall) in the late

¹⁰² For discussion of pyre Alpha, its dimensions, and inclusions, see Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, pp. 39-44.

¹⁰³ From Kokkou-Vyridi's catalogue, these objects are as follows: pottery A1, A2, A3-4, A5-6, A7, A8-10, 11; figurines A70, A71; jewelry A175-182, A183-184, A185. Binder 1998, p. 134 argued that many of these objects are more appropriately dated into the 7th century B.C. The latest material from the pyre dates to the early 6th century B.C.

8th or early 7th century B.C.¹⁰⁴ In support of this date for the wall and pyre, Kokkou-Vyridi noted that Geometric sherds were found directly beneath the steps of E2.¹⁰⁵ Wall E5, which is constructed in the same masonry style as E2 and E1 and has the same top elevation, must be contemporary, that is to say, from the late 8th or early 7th century B.C.

Inside the terrace framed by the inner peribolos wall (E1, E2, and E5) is a wall that curves from northeast to southwest, with a preserved length of 5.50m. and an estimated thickness of c. 0.60-0.70m. (E3 on Figures 8 and 11).¹⁰⁶ This section is of the same masonry style as the sections of peribolos wall described above (E1, E2, and E5), at least at its southeastern end, with irregularly shaped square and rectangular blocks and a few cobbles among them (Figure 21). Noack suggested that the top elevation of the wall, which is lower than the top elevations of walls E1, E2, and E5, must indicate that it belonged to a structure earlier than the Pre-Archaic Phase.¹⁰⁷ Because the wall is founded at the same level as the walls E1 and E2, however, and is at least partly of the same masonry style, it is reasonable to consider it contemporary with the peribolos wall.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁴ This conclusion was reached earlier by Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, p. 279, who noted that the wall sections at E1 and E2 surmounted an LH III fill, and that the wall should date to the end of the Geometric period (which they dated to c. 700 B.C.), on the basis of “sub-geometric” sherds around the wall’s “lower courses.” Later, Mylonas 1961, p. 57 preferred to date the peribolos wall to the middle of the 8th century B.C., on the basis of the inclusion of pottery of this date in pyre Alpha. In this publication he considered the Geometric period earlier than in his 1933 publication with Kourouniotes. Travlos 1983, p. 330 argued that the wall dates to the mid-8th century B.C. because it was built in response to a command of the Delphic oracle to build a new terrace in 760 B.C. As Binder 1998, pp. 133-36 has shown, the 760 B.C. date for this oracular response is highly problematic. The reference comes from a corrupt passage from Suidas, *s.v. eiresioni, propositai*, a very late source (10th century A.D.), which Travlos 1988, p. 92 interpreted as a motivating force behind the first monumental construction in the sanctuary, including the E walls. The reference from Suidas records a decree from the oracle to end a famine over all Greece by offering a sacrifice to Demeter, which then took place at Eleusis.

¹⁰⁵ Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, p. 43. The type or precise date of these sherds is not noted.

¹⁰⁶ Length from Mylonas 1961, p. 58; estimated width from Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, p. 148.

¹⁰⁷ Noack 1927, p. 10 recorded the top elevation as 12.525. Compare to top elevation for E1 at 12.60, and E5 at 12.64.

¹⁰⁸ The lower elevations for the walls are taken from Noack 1927, plate 1B (see Figure 19).

The reconstruction of wall E3 and its relationship to the older complex of buildings on the central terrace, Megaron B and its extension, has been hotly contested. The earliest studies proposed that wall E3 supported an apsidal or round building, beginning with Kourouniotes and Mylonas, who reconstructed this curving wall as the foundation for a round building set on the Pre-Archaic Phase terrace.¹⁰⁹ Mylonas later suggested that the curved wall could be the foundation for a round or apsidal temple with a wooden superstructure.¹¹⁰ This proposal has been accepted by Sourvinou-Inwood, who argued that the foundation supported an apsidal temple of Demeter, oriented with its opening toward the north.¹¹¹ By contrast, Travlos proposed that the curving wall could have been a retaining wall added to the complex of older buildings on the terrace, Megaron B and its extension.¹¹² He argued that Megaron B was the traditional house of the Eumolpidae that continued in use from the Bronze Age to the Geometric period, when the easternmost room housed the cult of Demeter.¹¹³ Mazarakis-Ainian accepted Travlos' proposal that the curving wall served as a retaining wall for a terrace in front of the older complex of Megaron B and its extension (Figure 22).¹¹⁴ He considered only the

¹⁰⁹ Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, pp. 274, 279.

¹¹⁰ Mylonas 1961, p. 58. Mallwitz 1981, p. 605 doubted Mylonas' reconstruction but did not rule it out entirely. Mylonas 1961, pp. 14-16, 40-48 proposed that the Mysteries had existed at Eleusis since the Mycenaean period, arguing for a sequence of Telesteria on the terrace of the sanctuary, beginning with Megaron B, followed by this apsidal temple, and later the Telesteria. According to Mylonas, the cult began as both the cult of Demeter and the Mysteries as early as the 15th century B.C.

¹¹¹ Sourvinou-Inwood 1997, pp. 133-41 argued that this apsidal temple of Demeter stood apart from both the Bronze Age past as well as the later Telesteria. The change from an apsidal temple to rectangular or square Telesteria represented to Sourvinou-Inwood a parallel change of cult practice, with the latter, represented by the Telesteria, identified as the Mysteries. Recently, Lippolis 2006, pp. 145-58 returned to the reconstruction of E3 as part of an apsidal structure.

¹¹² Travlos 1983, p. 330 suggested that this retaining wall was built in the mid-8th century B.C, as the first formalization of the terrace in the Geometric period.

¹¹³ Travlos 1988, p. 92.

¹¹⁴ Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, pp. 147-50, 347-48, followed by Coldstream 2003, pp. 390-91. Mazarakis-Ainian argued that the older complex included the Megaron, which he argued was the first Telesterion, and several adjoining rooms, which he argued were for the priesthood. Cosmopoulos 2003, pp. 2-20 has shown Megaron B was a Mycenaean residence, with evidence for animal sacrifice and the pouring of libations in front.

outer face of E3 to be dressed, which led him to conclude that only the uneven inner face would have been hidden by retaining fill. While Travlos argued that Megaron B was used continuously from the Bronze Age, Mazarakis-Ainian proposed that the complex had gone out of use in the Bronze Age, but was reused in the Early Iron Age as a ruler's house.¹¹⁵ By the second half and last quarter of the 8th century B.C., with the construction of the E walls and pyre Alpha, Mazarakis-Ainian suggested that the complex was used as a temple for the cult of Demeter.

Neither of these proposals, that E3 was the foundation for an apsidal building or that it was a retaining wall in front of Megaron B, can be accepted. While the estimated thickness of wall E3 is only slightly thicker than those of apsidal buildings of this period, such a reconstruction must still be ruled out. If E3 was indeed part of an apsidal building, its estimated dimensions would result in a building with an approximate width of 13m., with walls perhaps over 20m. long, with its opening oriented toward the northwest. Such a building's span would have been too wide to roof, even if it had included a central row of supports.¹¹⁶ Nor should the wall be reconstructed as a retaining wall for a terrace built in front of a still-functioning Megaron B. According to Cosmopoulos, his recent reinvestigation of Megaron B has shown that the latest pottery associated with this structure belongs to the mid to late 15th century B.C., the date Cosmopoulos currently

¹¹⁵ Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, pp. 147-149, 347. Mazarakis-Ainian and Travlos used the presence of two Geometric handles in a level just over the floor of the older buildings to indicate that the complex was still in use at this time.

¹¹⁶ Apsidal buildings of this length are acceptable, and would be on par with Megaron A at Thermon, which was 22m. long by 6m. wide, with walls 0.55m. thick (for dimensions, see Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, p. 44), and Building D at Eretria, which was 34-35m. long and 7-8m. wide, with walls 0.50-0.60m. thick (see Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, p. 62). The widths of these structures are narrower than that proposed for a building at E3. Even the long house at Lefkandi, dating to the 10th century B.C., which is the widest roofed structure known from the Iron Age, was only c. 10m. wide (Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, pp. 48-58).

proposes for the period when Megaron B went out of use.¹¹⁷ In addition, Megaron B was surrounded by a contemporary peribolos wall, indicated by a straight line parallel to the southern room of Megaron B (Figure 11).¹¹⁸ The curving wall (E3) appears to pass over the southern peribolos wall section. Since Megaron B was longer no extant in the 8th or 7th century B.C., as it had been reconstructed by Travlos, then wall E3 must be understood as a feature that covered the area of Megaron B.

E3 was most likely a retaining wall within the terrace framed by the inner peribolos wall (E1, E2, E5).¹¹⁹ Mylonas and Binder argued that an inner retaining wall would create an awkwardly small and unnecessary inner terrace within the Pre-Achaic Phase sanctuary, and it is indeed unlikely that E3 would support a free-standing inner terrace.¹²⁰ Since the top elevations of E3 (12.52; see Figure 18) and E1 (12.60; see Figure 18) are nearly level, and since E3's inner face as well as most of its outer face are irregular, it is likely that E3 helped to retain the terrace bounded by and approximately level with walls E1, E2, and E5. The terrace could have been the site of open-air rites or it could have supported a feature like a threshing floor. This reconstruction means that the innermost area of the sanctuary was an open-air terrace for gathering and/or performance of a ritual, which may have included a structure of ephemeral materials as its focal point.

¹¹⁷ M. Cosmopoulos (pers. comm.) reported that the latest pottery associated with Megaron B that he has found in the Eleusis storage room is "LHIIC-early" (deep bowls FS 284, Group A and ring-based kraters FS 282).

¹¹⁸ Cosmopoulos 2003, pp. 8-10. Travlos 1983, p. 328 also included this wall. Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, p. 149 doubted that the preserved wall south of Megaron B indicated an enclosure wall.

¹¹⁹ Wall E3 is similar in width to retaining walls from other sanctuaries from the 8th and 7th century B.C. Temples A and B at Kalapodi, which date to the early to first half of the 7th century B.C., stood on a late 8th or early 7th century B.C. terrace retained by walls with an estimated width of c. 0.60m. (Figure 24) (Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, pp. 137-40). From the sanctuary of Athena Polias at Gonnoi in Thessaly, a series of three retaining walls, with approximate widths between 0.60-0.90m., supported the terrace for the apsidal temple of Athena (Figure 23) (Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, p. 86).

¹²⁰ Mylonas 1961, p. 58. Binder 1998, p. 133 drew attention to the fact that Travlos does not cite evidence for this date.

Surrounding the sanctuary, Travlos reconstructed a Geometric outer peribolos or fortification wall (Figure 9), but reinvestigation has shown that evidence for its previously reconstructed form is insufficient to accept all aspects of his proposal.¹²¹ The evidence for this wall is the section at E6, about 25m. east of E5, just under the Second Archaic Phase gateway at H24, dating to the second half of the 6th century B.C. (Figures 1, 4, and 9).¹²² Composed of large cobbles and irregularly cut square blocks joined with clay, the wall is preserved for a length of 30m., with a height of 1.50m. and width of 0.90m.¹²³ In a photograph included with the reports, the wall seems to continue underneath the First Archaic Phase wall at its easternmost point (Figure 25). The 1981 reports cited another section located south of the Telesterion (preserved length 8m.) as also belonging to a Geometric fortification wall.¹²⁴ However, the published drawing of the Geometric wall by Travlos does not indicate the precise location and extent of E6 as it is preserved, nor does it indicate the location or dimensions of the second (8m. long) section of the wall (Figure 9). Travlos hypothesized that the outer peribolos wall, for most of its extent, was located underneath and on the course of the Second Archaic Phase peribolos wall (compare Figure 9 to the “H” circuit on Figure 8). He argued that it was built around 760 B.C., contemporary with the inner peribolos, on the basis of an order given by the oracle at Delphi. Binder has rightly noted that because no dating evidence is provided for the wall, its suggested date must not be accepted without hesitation.

¹²¹ Mylonas 1961, p. 63; Travlos 1983, pp. 330-333.

¹²² The E6 portion of the wall is also noted as a Geometric peribolos wall by Mylonas 1961, p. 63. The wall is also discussed by Wrede 1933, p. 5.

¹²³ Only the outer, eastern face is visible on site and in photographs, so it is not clear to me if both sides were similarly finished. The wall was excavated in 1928. Dimensions from Mylonas and Travlos 1981a, p. 155; Mylonas and Travlos 1981b, p. 45. Mylonas 1961, p. 63 noted that 12m. of the wall had been revealed.

¹²⁴ The 1981 reports include only a photograph of the E6 wall in the area of the Second Archaic Phase gateway at H24.

However, the similarity of masonry style of the E6 wall does suggest it may be contemporary with the other E walls.¹²⁵ The section of wall at E6 could have supported mudbrick courses above, and its length, direction, and dimensions lend it to reconstruction as a peribolos wall.¹²⁶ As discussed below, a paved court and road northeast of Well W suggest an area for the performance of ritual west of E6. If E6 were part of an outer peribolos wall around the sanctuary, then Well W and its surrounding area would be included within the sacred space of the sanctuary.¹²⁷ The absence of further evidence for the full extent of an outer peribolos leave reconstruction of its precise form and dimensions unresolved. Because of the road north of the sanctuary, it is possible that the outer peribolos wall would have included a northern entrance, but we have no evidence for it.

Another major feature of the Pre-Archaic Phase sanctuary includes three roads that may date to this phase, which indicate traffic patterns around the terrace (indicated by stippling on Figure 10). First, to the north of the terrace and beneath the Lesser Propylaia, dating to the late Republican period (#8 on Figure 8, Figure 10), Kourouniotes

¹²⁵ Binder 1998, pp. 135-36 argued that there may not have been a peribolos wall here at all, without, however, specifically addressing the section of the wall at E6 or the second section.

¹²⁶ Of comparable width to E6 is a section of a wall located 200m. southeast of the sanctuary of Apollo at Eretria, which Mazarakis-Ainian has identified as part of an extensive peribolos wall for the sanctuary of Apollo. The section of wall is c. 5m. long and 1m. wide, and includes part of a crosswall (Figures 26 and 27) (Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, p. 252). E6 is also similar in width to the three retaining walls on the southern side of the temple of Athena Polias in Gonnoi (Thessaly), which range in width from c. 0.60-0.90m. (Figure 23) (Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, p. 86). E6 is wider than most other late 8th and early 7th century B.C. temenos walls. The peribolos wall at the sanctuary of Artemis and Apollo at Kalapodi (late 8th/early 7th century B.C.) is c. 0.60m. (Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, pp. 139-40) (Figure 24). At the sanctuary of Apollo at Eretria, a second half of the 8th century B.C. peribolos wall (c. 0.60m. wide) surrounded several apsidal and oval structures. (Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, pp. 101-105; Verdan 2001, pp. 84-87; Verdan 2002, pp. 128-32). (Figure 16). The sanctuary of Apollo at Asine preserves a c. 6m. long stretch of a temenos wall, 0.50-0.60m. wide, located south of the apsidal temple of Apollo mid- to late 8th century B.C.). (Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, pp. 70-71; Frödin and Persson 1938, p. 149). (Figure 17).

¹²⁷ The protection of water sources was a primary concern at Greek sanctuaries, often achieved by keeping wells within peribolos walls and by establishing regulations to ensure cleanliness of the water. See Gawlinski 2006, pp. 219-24 and Cole 1988, pp. 161-62 for discussion of these means of protection.

identified a hard-packed earth layer, which he noted was oriented toward the southeast corner of the Lesser Propylaea's foundations.¹²⁸ On the basis of what he called Geometric sherds found in the fill above the layer, this road has been identified as Geometric. However, this attribution is problematic because the sherds above the layer are described as being part of fill, which would indicate that the road could be earlier than the Geometric period. The second road, composed of stones worn by foot traffic, leads to the steps of the wall E2.¹²⁹ Beneath the road were found Geometric and Bronze Age sherds, while a fill above included proto-Corinthian and Corinthian lekythoi. Kourouniotes noted that the road was likely contemporary with the wall at E2. Finally, a road was identified in the area of the wall E6 (visible in the foreground of Figure 28; Figure 29), paved with flat stones and nearly 2m. wide.¹³⁰ Oriented slightly northwest to southeast, this road is preserved from the area east of Well W almost as far as the Second Archaic Phase wall. Mylonas and Travlos suggested a likely date of the late 8th or 7th century B.C. for the road, namely because the fill below the road included late Geometric material and the fill above included proto-Attic sherds.

The roads suggest that Well W and its surrounding area were significant in the Pre-Archaic Phase. Even though Well W's precise date is not known, it at least belonged to the Pre-Archaic Phase because its position was respected by the later First Archaic Phase wall (first half of the 6th century B.C.). As described above, a paved road belonging to the late 8th or 7th century B.C. was located just east of the well. Although

¹²⁸ Kourouniotes 1935a, p. 23. This layer was found about 3m. beneath the Lesser Propylaea paving stones. No specific description of the sherds is provided in the report, nor is a precise description of how the orientation of the road was determined.

¹²⁹ Description of the road in front of E2 and its stratigraphy are from Kourouniotes 1938, pp. 32-33. The fill above the road is part of the evidence, along with pyre Alpha, that the space in front of the walls E1 and E2 was filled in at the time the First Archaic Phase wall was constructed.

¹³⁰ For description of the road and its stratigraphy, see Mylonas and Travlos 1955, pp. 54-55.

the road did not lead directly to the well, as it continued to the southeast it did pass very close to the well's east side (Figure 29). To the east of the road and the well and west of E6, a level area of packed earth has been interpreted as a court.¹³¹ In the First Archaic Phase and later, this area was ritually significant, as indicated by the construction of the stepped podium (Z14) and altar (Z13), and also by the fact that the First Archaic Phase wall incorporates Well W (Figure 30). This later significance, as well as the respect paid to earlier structures in these later constructions, suggests ritual importance in the area already by the late 8th or 7th century B.C.

The final architecture from the sanctuary that has been associated with the Pre-Archaic Phase at Eleusis is a partially excavated curving wall beneath the Roman forecourt north of the sanctuary terrace (beneath #3 on Figure 8; see also Figures 9 and 31).¹³² Although the wall is constructed of a material that seems similar to the sections from the inner peribolos wall (E1, E5) and E3, this curving wall includes primarily blocks that are long and narrow with a few that are square or irregular cobbles. That this wall is contemporary with the inner peribolos wall is indicated by Proto-Corinthian sherds in this area, which date the wall to c. 700 B.C.¹³³ The excavators believed the wall formed part of an apsidal building, which Travlos included among the structures he dated to the mid-8th century B.C. built at Eleusis, contemporary with the sections of wall E1/E2/E5 and

¹³¹ Kourouniotes 1938, pp. 37-38.

¹³² Mylonas 1961, p. 60. Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, p. 96 described the wall's uncovered length as c. 13m. (it continues under the Roman paving), with its height and width at its base equal, 1.40m. The width of the wall was divided between a c. 0.65m. bench at the bottom and then a 0.75m. wide socle above. The height of the bench is not noted. Mazarakis-Ainian further noted that pyres were described inside the structure, and that parts of two other walls are associated with it. One abuts the wall on its northeastern outer face, and the other is parallel to this wall, but passes over the wall (indicated by dotted line in plan).

¹³³ Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, p. 96 and Binder 1998, p. 135 noted that the lack of fully published finds prevents the wall from being dated securely. Binder also hesitated to accept Travlos' mid-8th century B.C. date on the grounds that 8th century B.C. masonry cannot be securely distinguished from 7th century B.C. masonry.

E6.¹³⁴ Sourvinou-Inwood accepted that the section of curving wall was an 8th century B.C. apsidal temple, oriented with its opening toward the south, and thus facing onto the sacred way.¹³⁵ Mazarakis-Ainian determined that the structure had a curved angle of nearly 90 degrees and that if it were reconstructed as an apsidal building its width would be c. 13m.¹³⁶ Because he considered this dimension too wide for an apsidal building, Mazarakis-Ainian proposed to reconstruct it as a monumental oval building. However, such a width for a building is an unlikely solution because the span would, at this date, be very difficult to roof.¹³⁷ Although the wall has often been considered part of the sanctuary, its distance from the sanctuary terrace, approximately 70m., suggests it was part of a separate precinct, perhaps as its peribolos wall.

The reconsideration of all the features associated with the 8th and 7th century B.C. at the sanctuary at Eleusis has produced the following sanctuary reconstruction (Figure 10). An inner peribolos wall (E1, E5) surrounded the central terrace, with a stepped entrance (E2) at the southwest, just beyond pyre Alpha. A curving wall (E3) additionally supported part of this terrace. The date for the central terrace, provided by the material in Pyre Alpha, is late 8th or early 7th century B.C. The sanctuary was likely surrounded by an outer peribolos wall, as indicated by the preserved section at E6, with perhaps a northern entrance, but its precise extent is uncertain. A separate northern precinct was located approximately 70m. from the sanctuary.

¹³⁴ Mylonas 1961, p. 60; Travlos 1988, p. 92; Travlos 1983, fig. 2.

¹³⁵ Sourvinou-Inwood 1997, pp. 135-36.

¹³⁶ Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, p. 96.

¹³⁷ Comparison with other oval buildings from the 8th century B.C. indicates that an appropriate width for an oval building is c. 5-6m., as for example at Oropos, Building Theta 2, Late Geometric (9.80m. long x 4.70m. wide, with a stone bench 1.00m. wide along the interior walls) (Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, p. 101), Xeropolis/Lefkandi, house, before 700 B.C. (c. 10m. long x c. 6m. wide) (Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, p. 105), and Miletus, Building A, before 700 B.C. (6.00m. preserved length x 5.20m. wide, with hearth at center) (Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, p. 109). The long house at Lefkandi, dating to the 10th century B.C., was c. 10m. wide. (Mazarakis-Ainian 1997, pp. 48-58).

The only preserved entrance to the central terrace of the sanctuary, its main sacred precinct, was to the south, at the steps at E2. The processional route to this entrance likely came from the north (from the direction of Athens), approaching the sanctuary along the road to the north (under the Lesser Propylaia). The route continued along the road near E6, where suppliants could have purified themselves with water at Well W.¹³⁸ From here, the processional route continued around the eastern side of the terrace (between the inner and outer peribolos walls), past pyre Alpha, where libations and food offerings could have been made. Kokkou-Vyridi suggested that the pyres were used in *enagismo*i rituals, in which burnt offerings were made in order to honor the dead and to ensure fertility of the earth, and the former, in particular, is supported by the great amount of aryballoi and alabastra, common grave offerings, in the deposit.¹³⁹ The position of pyre Alpha, located next to the steps at E2, which led to the terrace, and compared to the later pyre Beta, which was also located next to the entrance to the central terrace, suggests that the pyres at Eleusis were connected to burnt and poured offerings made upon entrance to the terrace of the sanctuary.¹⁴⁰ Finally, the processional route arrived at the steps at E2, where suppliants ascended the steps to the terrace. Because the area near Well W was at a lower elevation than the inner terrace, this route meant descending slightly toward the east and rising once again, this time more steeply, toward the south and onto the inner terrace (Figure 18).

¹³⁸ In Greek sanctuaries, water was used for ritual as well as everyday cleansing. See Cole 1988, pp. 161-62 and Gawlinski 2006, pp. 219-24 for discussion of the functions of water within Greek sanctuaries, both with bibliography.

¹³⁹ For discussion of the ritual, including literary evidence and archaeological comparanda for it, see Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, pp. 159-85.

¹⁴⁰ Pyres have been found in the Industrial District of the Agora at Athens. These are similar to the pyres from Eleusis in form, but differ in the inclusion of bone, which are not found in the pyres at Eleusis. As Rotroff 1997, pp. 212-17 has shown, the pyres from the Agora are unusual and of unknown function. Bones and the burning on pottery suggest sacrifice, drinking cups suggest poured libations, and alabastra and unguentaria suggest a funerary aspect.

Using this new reconstruction, the conclusions made in previous scholarship have been readdressed. First, the architectural evidence indicates that there is no continuity of cult on the central terrace from the Bronze Age to the 8th century B.C. because Megaron B went out of use in the Bronze Age and wall E3 covered its remains.¹⁴¹ Second, the orientation of the sanctuary's entrance does not necessarily indicate Athenian control of the sanctuary, a hypothesis that has been commonly argued. For example, Mylonas argued that Athenian control of the sanctuary occurred in the second half of the 6th century B.C., under the direction of Peisistratos, because a gateway was built at this time on the northern side of the sanctuary; during the 8th century B.C., the southern entrance at E2 indicated to Mylonas local Eleusinian control of the sanctuary.¹⁴² Most recently, using Travlos' plan of the 8th century B.C. sanctuary, Sourvinou-Inwood argued that Athens must have had control by this date because of the northern entrance proposed by Travlos in his outer peribolos wall.¹⁴³ Consideration of the entrance together with the roads around the sanctuary has shown that the entrance to the central terrace was from the south, and that the processional route to this entrance approached the sanctuary from the north, by a land route from the direction of Athens.

The architectural evidence is inconclusive because it could be used to support either hypothesis, depending on which entrance is considered the main entrance, the steps at E2 or a proposed northern entrance. Therefore, it is necessary to introduce literary evidence into the discussion, which makes it possible to argue that the sanctuary at Eleusis was part of Athens from at least the mid-6th century B.C. if not from its first

¹⁴¹ This conclusion was earlier reached by Darque 1981, pp. 593-605.

¹⁴² Mylonas 1961, pp. 103-105.

¹⁴³ Sourvinou-Inwood 1997, pp. 133-36.

formation as a polis in the 8th century B.C.¹⁴⁴ According to Aristotle and Andokides, the Mysteries existed by the 7th century B.C., and Athens may have had control from that time.¹⁴⁵ The passage from Aristotle states that the *archon basileus* was in charge of the sacrifices and administration of the Mysteries. Since this position can be traced back to 683/682 B.C., the Mysteries could have been administratively part of the Athenian domain since at least this date.¹⁴⁶ The passage in Andokides states that there was a Solonian law indicating that the Boule was to meet in the Eleusinion after the Mysteries, which could indicate that the sanctuary and the festival were under Athenian control by the 590s.¹⁴⁷ This passage shows that the connection between the sanctuaries goes back into the early 6th century B.C., while the possibility of the early history of the position of *archon basileus* provides a tantalizing possibility that such a connection between Athens and the sanctuary at Eleusis could have been made a century earlier. A land route from Athens to the sanctuary could be a manifestation of Athenian control, but not the orientation of the sanctuary's entrance, which was related to the choices made locally for the processional route within the sanctuary. The revised reconstruction for the sanctuary at Eleusis indicates that the needs of the cult demanded an elaborate processional route around the eastern side of the sanctuary, a well and a pyre as sites of ritual, and monumental steps up to the open-air terrace on its southern side. Many of these features,

¹⁴⁴ Parker 1996, pp. 24-26 argued that the cult of Demeter at Eleusis could have been set up by Athens during the 9th and 8th centuries B.C., at a time when other sanctuaries were being established in the Attic countryside. The fertile Thriasian plain was very suitable to the worship of Demeter. Clinton 1993, p. 110 has shown that Eleusis was a part of Athens from the mid-6th century B.C. Sourvinou-Inwood 1997, p. 150 suggested that Eleusis was a part of Athens when Athens became a polis, in the late 8th century B.C.

¹⁴⁵ Aristotle *Athenaion Politeia* 57.1-2 (c. 329-28 B.C.); Andokides *On the Mysteries* 1.111 (399 B.C.); Clinton 1993, p. 112; *Agora XXXI*, p. 21.

¹⁴⁶ Aristotle *Athenaion Politeia* 57.1-2. Clinton 1993, p. 112; *Agora XXXI*, p. 21.

¹⁴⁷ Andokides *On the Mysteries* 1.111. Clinton 1993, pp. 112, 121, n. 6; Clinton 1982, p. 29.

circling the eastern side of the terrace, pyres, and the well, remained important in subsequent centuries, until the 5th century B.C.

The Sacred Way

The land route from Athens to the sanctuary at Eleusis was the sacred way, which began near the city walls of Athens and ended north of the terrace at Eleusis. Although the earliest stratified layers along the sacred way do not begin until the 5th century B.C., graves of the 7th and 6th centuries B.C. were found along the route, indicating that an established road existed as early as the 7th century B.C.¹⁴⁸

Conclusion

Reconsideration of the architecture and topography of the sanctuaries at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion, as well as the sacred way, has shown the potential for the transport of people and objects between the sanctuaries to have existed in the 7th century B.C.¹⁴⁹ The minimum requirements for the Mysteries would be some sort of facility for the storage of the *hiera* at each sanctuary and a processional route linking sanctuaries dedicated to Demeter. For the first concern, the archaeological evidence from the sanctuaries does not indicate a permanent or monumental facility in either location. The sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion may have maintained

¹⁴⁸ Costaki 2005, p. 497 (in the Kerameikos), p. 552 at (at Chalkidis Street 56-58).

¹⁴⁹ This date is also argued for by Clinton 1993, pp. 110-112 and Miles in *Agora XXXI*, pp. 21-23, who included bibliography on earlier scholarship on this issue. By contrast, Robertson and Sourvinou-Inwood have not accepted the 7th century B.C. date for the Mysteries. Robertson 1999, pp. 14-15, 25-30 argued that Mysteries began as a festival celebrated only at Eleusis, which included offerings for agrarian prosperity and a local procession. Only later, when Athens took over Eleusis and its sanctuary, did the Mysteries add events at Athens as well as the procession from Athens to Eleusis. Sourvinou-Inwood 1997, pp. 136-41 argued that, while the sanctuary was under Athenian control since the 8th century B.C., the Mysteries did not begin until the early 6th century B.C., when, among other new architectural forms, the first Telesterion is built. Sourvinou-Inwood 1997, p. 151 and 2003, pp. 26-27 further argued that although the Mysteries did not yet exist, the City Eleusinion and the sanctuary at Eleusis were linked by a polis cult and connected by a procession.

an open-air form that was typical of other sanctuaries in Attica during this period.¹⁵⁰ However, it is possible that a wooden structure could have been set up at the sanctuaries as needed for the *hiera*; such structures would leave little trace in the archaeological record. If indeed the central terrace did not include a Telesterion of ephemeral materials during this phase, it follows that there may not have been a requirement that the rites of initiation take place indoors. Further, although the sanctuary at Eleusis included peribolos walls, it is not certain if their primary purpose was to provide separation and privacy for the proceedings, or if their main function was for terracing. Because in the phase immediately following the Pre-Archaic Phase, the outer peribolos was covered and put out of use and, importantly, not replaced, it may be that a wall was not essential for protection or defense until later in the sanctuary's history.

As for the second concern, the sacred way existed in the 7th century B.C., based on graves lining the route. It could be argued that this road may have been only utilitarian and not processional, or that it could have served both functions. Nevertheless, there is in the 7th century B.C., the strong possibility of a physical connection between the sanctuaries, which suggests that the procession could have been practiced by this time. With the possibility that the procession could take place and that the *hiera* could have had ephemeral storage facilities at the sanctuaries, and since both sanctuaries were likely dedicated to Demeter in this period, it is reasonable to suggest that the processional aspect of the Mysteries could have existed in the 7th century B.C.

¹⁵⁰ At Brauron and Sounion, for example, the sanctuaries are without monumental architecture. See Parker 1996, pp. 17-20 and Langdon 1997, pp. 113-24 for general review of sanctuaries in Attica at this time. For Sounion, see Camp 2001, pp. 305-309 and Travlos 1988, p. 404, both with bibliography. For Brauron, see Camp 2001, pp. 277-81 and Travlos 1988, p. 55, both with bibliography. Two preserved limestone capitals from the Acropolis suggest it may have included a temple or other monumental structure in the 7th century B.C. See Hurwit 1999, p. 85-98 for a review of the archaeological evidence from the Acropolis during the 8th and 7th century B.C. Sanctuaries outside of Attica as well show evidence of cult activity without monumental architecture, as for example on Samothrace. See Lehmann 1998, pp. 33-41, 52.

Thus, through this cult, Athens had established an important connection with its periphery by the 7th century B.C., much as it did later with the cults of Artemis Brauronia during the Classical period or Dionysos Eleuthereus in the later 6th century B.C. In the case of Dionysos Eleuthereus, the procession during the City Dionysia reenacted the original transfer of the cult's statue from Eleutherai, on the northern border of Attica, in an example of what Graf called a centripetal procession, pulling the divine presence into the heart of the city of Athens.¹⁵¹ Connected by movement in the opposite direction, away from city center, in what Graf termed centrifugal, processions linked the city of Athens with the sanctuaries of Eleusis and Brauron.¹⁵² Where Eleusis marked part of the western border of Attica, Brauron marked part of its territory on the eastern coast. One of the goals of participating in the Brauronia festival was the protection and fertility of women for the benefit of Athens, similar to the celebration of Demeter's gift of agrarian fertility for Athens. In both cults, it was necessary for a journey to take place from Athens across the intervening part of Attica, as a way to lay claim to the territory and to draw the sanctuary in the countryside with the center of the polis. For the Mysteries, this requirement meant the performance of a procession and transfer of the *hiera* from Eleusis to the City Eleusinion and back again. Compared to the other cults that were celebrated at the sanctuaries, primarily local in nature, only the Mysteries could have connected these two places in this way, through its ritual of the procession.¹⁵³

¹⁵¹ Graf 1996, pp. 57-59.

¹⁵² Graf 1996, pp. 61-64 outlined the procession of the Mysteries at Eleusis. For the cult of Artemis Brauronia and the sanctuary, see Cole 2004, pp. 201-18.

¹⁵³ As Cole 1994, pp. 202-203 noted, cults of Demeter in Attica were most often celebrated at the local, deme level.

Chapter 3: The First Archaic Phase (600-550 B.C.)

Introduction

The First Archaic Phase (600-550 B.C.) is the earliest in which the practice of the Mysteries at both the sanctuary at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion was given a substantial architectural frame. During this phase, the sanctuaries demonstrate contemporary architectural monumentalization, with peribolos walls and monumental entrances included at each sanctuary. At the City Eleusinion a peribolos wall and a gateway were built, while well closures west of the sanctuary indicate provisions for a wider Panathenaic Way. The sanctuary at Eleusis was expanded beyond its 7th century B.C. limits with a new peribolos wall that increased the size of the terrace and replaced most of the Pre-Archaic Phase wall around the central terrace, including its entrance. A stepped podium and altar were constructed near Well W, creating a space that I call the Stepped Podium Area, which provided a location for the performance of ritual before proceeding to the sanctuary's entrance.

The addition of walls at both sanctuaries during this phase indicates a contemporaneous desire to articulate carefully the sacred space of the sanctuaries. Moreover, these walls are physically unified by the use of limestone local to each sanctuary and by their similar masonry, underscoring the architectural and visual connections between them.¹⁵⁴ The changes to the entrances at the sanctuaries, as well as the approaches to these entrances demonstrate a desire to formalize the processional route at each sanctuary. They also mark the push towards increasing monumentality in the

¹⁵⁴The similarity of polygonal masonry is noted by Miles in *Agora XXXI*, p. 28, n. 12. Each wall is built of local limestone, with Acropolis limestone used for the City Eleusinion and Eleusinian limestone for the sanctuary at Eleusis.

form of the entrances at each sanctuary, begun with the stepped entrance at Eleusis during the previous phase. Both of these objectives are in the same spirit as contemporary monumentalization of the approach to the Acropolis by means of a wide ramp that ascended its western side. In this chapter, I demonstrate that the widening of the Panathenaic Way as it approached the City Eleusinion and the new wall and gateway at that sanctuary, together with the addition of a new entrance and the Stepped Podium Area at the sanctuary at Eleusis, framed the space of the procession between the two sanctuaries for the Mysteries and made the first formal link between the two sanctuaries through their architecture.

Athens

At the City Eleusinion, the First Archaic Phase is marked by the construction of a peribolos wall enclosing two of the three votive deposits from the Pre-Archaic Phase, as well as the Rocky Outcrop (Figures 32 and 33). Composed of blue Acropolis limestone and set into the bedrock, the wall's foundation course consisted of roughly cut boulders while the upper courses included Lesbian style polygonal blocks. The wall at the west extended 22m., whereas at the north it is exposed for 26m., and at the south for 28m., so that although the eastern extent of these walls is uncertain, the known area of the sanctuary is itself significant.¹⁵⁵ Miles dated the wall to the first half of the 6th century B.C. on the basis of layers of fill adjacent to and beneath it.¹⁵⁶ The entrance to the sanctuary was located at the western end of the southern side of the peribolos wall, set somewhere within an opening in the wall that has a preserved width of approximately

¹⁵⁵ Dimensions of the wall are given by *Agora XXXI*, pp. 25-26.

¹⁵⁶ *Agora XXXI*, pp. 25-26, 113-16. The layers of this fill are catalogued as a single deposit (Context Pottery Description 7). Layers of fill beneath the wall date to the first half of the 6th century B.C. (layers 6 and 7), with the lowest layer against the wall dating to the mid-6th century B.C. (layer 5).

5m. Oriented toward an east-west road that led to the Panathenaic Way, the start of the route that connected the sanctuary with Eleusis, this entrance was likely a simple gateway without porches, built in line with the wall.¹⁵⁷

Several wells outside of the sanctuary were closed between c. 575-550 B.C. (Figure 35).¹⁵⁸ The close proximity of these wells to one another and to the entrance of the City Eleusinion, coupled with their closures within a generation of one another, suggests that the Panathenaic Way, as it approached the City Eleusinion, was widened at this time. This change gave increased space along the route that would have facilitated the organization of crowds of people outside the City Eleusinion and the movement of the procession between the two sanctuaries.

Because the Panathenaic Way was also the processional route to the Acropolis, its increased width affected access to this sanctuary as well. The precise form of the entrance to the Acropolis for this period is uncertain, but it is clear that it was approached by means of a 10m. wide ramp that ascended the western slope of the Acropolis (Figure 36), perhaps built during the second quarter of the 6th century B.C.¹⁵⁹ The change seems to be contemporary with reforms in the Panathenaia.¹⁶⁰ Therefore, the expansion of the processional route near the City Eleusinion and the addition of a peribolos wall are not

¹⁵⁷ Its form was similar to a gateway from the sanctuary of Hera on Samos, located near the excavated end of the sacred way (Figure 34). Two non-structural monument bases framed the entrance. For this gateway, see Kienast 2002, pp. 323-35.

¹⁵⁸ The first well (S 22:1), sealed c. 575 B.C., was located over 20m. southwest of the peribolos wall. Two more wells were closed c. 550 B.C., one, approximately 20m. to the west of the peribolos wall (S 21:2), and another in the road north of the sanctuary (R 17:3). For these wells, see *Agora XXXI*, pp. 26-27.

¹⁵⁹ Vanderpool 1974, p. 159. Eiteljorg 1995, pp. 9-11 hesitated to accept this specific date, and instead preferred a more general 6th century B.C. date. Shear 1999, pp. 105-106, Shear 2001, p. 672, and Hurwit 1999, p. 106 emphasized that the ramp was also constructed to aid in the movement of building materials for structures built on the Acropolis at this time. The numerous examples of architectural sculpture from the Acropolis indicate the presence of monumental architecture between c. 575-550 B.C. See Hurwit 1999, pp. 105-106 for a survey of this sculpture and bibliography.

¹⁶⁰ See Parker 1996, pp. 89-92 for a discussion of the Panathenaia during this period, and Shear 1999, pp. 105-107 for a discussion of the Acropolis at this time.

solely related to the Mysteries. They demonstrate that in the first half of the 6th century B.C., Athens was concerned with formalizing and organizing religious space near the Acropolis. For the Acropolis itself, the ramp was constructed, perhaps a new gateway was built, and there is also evidence for several monumental structures within the sanctuary. For the Mysteries, the changes indicate a monumentalization of the two aspects of the festival associated with its celebration in Athens, the City Eleusinion and the adjacent start of the processional route to Eleusis.¹⁶¹

Eleusis

During the First Archaic Phase at the sanctuary at Eleusis, the central terrace of the Pre-Archaic Phase was enlarged by the addition of a new peribolos wall (Z12) that began in line with the older wall at the north (at E5), which then expanded the space of the terrace about 20m. to the east (Figures 8,12, and 30).¹⁶² This wall, composed of Eleusinian limestone in Lesbian polygonal masonry, was partly excavated by Philios in the 1880s, and then further by Mylonas and Kourouniotes in the 1930s.¹⁶³ Three sections of the peribolos wall from the First Archaic Phase are preserved, at Z12, near Well W, and at Z6 (Figures 8 and 30). Its foundation courses consist of irregularly coursed small blocks surmounted by two courses of flatter stones. The lower two wall courses above the foundations are polygonal with some curving joints, while the upper two wall courses, which are composed of rectangular blocks, are stepped at Z6 to provide

¹⁶¹ *Agora XXXI*, p. 28.

¹⁶² With this addition, the total preserved length of this section of the combined Pre-Archaic and First Archaic Phase walls is 3.50m.; its preserved height is 2.60m. Dimensions from Mylonas 1961, p. 64. Lippolis 2006, pp. 158-63 reconstructed this phase at the sanctuary as similar to that proposed by Ziro, with a rectangular Telesterion, and without the Stepped Podium Area or Well W.

¹⁶³ For excavation reports of the wall, see Philios 1884, pp. 60-61; Philios 1885, pp. 75-76; Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, p. 280; Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 26-28. Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, p. 280 noted that the polygonal courses of this wall are the same masonry as the contemporary Telesterion, and that the upper foundation courses are similar to the foundation course below the contemporary Telesterion.

additional support for the fill of the central terrace (Figures 37 and 38).¹⁶⁴ Contemporary ground level of the central terrace was nearly level with the top step of the wall in this area.¹⁶⁵ Pyre Gamma was constructed in front of Z12 (Figure 20), with the material from this pyre dated from c. 560 B.C. to c. 480 B.C. Since the pyre and the wall are founded at the same stratigraphic level, they are likely contemporary. Similarly, the earliest material of pyre Beta, constructed in front of and at the same level as Z6, dated to the second quarter of the 6th century B.C.¹⁶⁶ Thus, the pyres provide evidence for the date of the wall.¹⁶⁷ Along with construction of the wall, the space between the Pre-Archaic and First Archaic Phase walls was filled in, including pyre Alpha, walls E1 and E2, and the road in front of E2, with the result that the stepped entrance at E2 went out of use (Compare figures 10 and 30).¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁴ Mylonas 1961, p. 66 recorded that the tread depths of the steps are between 0.23m. and 0.35m. Philios 1884, pp. 75-76 compared this section of the wall to the steps at E2. Noack 1927, pp. 23-25, fig. 7, pl. 14 provided the rise for the steps: the middle step is 0.27-0.315m, the third step is 0.33-0.37m. Kourouniotes 1933, pp. 26-27 described further exploration of wall Z6 and the evidence of burning on its surface. The only other sanctuary with a stepped wall at approximately this time, although perhaps slightly later (c. 560-530 B.C.), is the acropolis at Selinous (Figure 41). The propylon to the sanctuary, on the western side of the temenos, was located on the north-south road of the city. For the wall at Selinous, see Mertens 2003, pp. 88-92 and Østby 1995, pp. 87-92.

¹⁶⁵ This is the case in a sketch drawing by Travlos, which is included in Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, plan 11b. Noack 1927, pp. 23-25 also proposed that the top of the stepped wall was at the level of the contemporary courtyard. Philios 1885, p. 76 described excavation of the stepped wall, and was the first to propose that the ground level of the central terrace was at the same elevation as the upper surface of the foundation wall's top foundation course.

¹⁶⁶ Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, pp. 143-44; Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, pp. 281-82.

¹⁶⁷ For descriptions of the pyre's excavation, see Philios 1884, pp. 60-62 and Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, pp. 49-51; 247-259. The pyre is not described as having an architectural form, but rather was an accumulation of layers of burnt earth and ash with material finds. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, p. 30 suggested that Pyre Gamma could belong to the next phase of construction, the Second Archaic Phase, based partly on the date of the material in the pyre, but also on Kourouniotes 1935b, p. 70, n. 1, following the idea that the main entrance shifted to the north at the time of the Second Archaic Phase.

¹⁶⁸ Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, pp. 142-43 showed that Pyre Alpha was put out of use by the new terrace built at the time of the First Archaic Phase wall. The latest material is dated to c. 600 or 590-80 B.C.

The entrance to the central terrace may now have been located at Z7 (Figures 8, 11, and 30), just beyond the stepped foundations at Z6.¹⁶⁹ Here, the foundations are vertical on its outer, southern face, in clear distinction to the adjacent stepped foundations at Z6. The western end of the foundations is not preserved, with the result that the total preserved width for the foundations is just over 5m. Because the ground level outside of the wall was approximately at the elevation of the lowest course above the foundations, nearly a meter separated the ground levels inside and outside of the wall in this area. To allow visitors access to the central terrace, the excavators proposed an earthen ramp built over these foundations.¹⁷⁰ It is also possible that a gateway could have existed here, with a ramp used to approach it, but with the absence of a preserved top course of the foundations, it is not possible to offer a certain reconstruction of the entrance.

The southern face of the wall (Z6) was covered with black patches from burning, presumably of offerings, on pyre Beta, which was constructed against the wall (Figures 11 and 20).¹⁷¹ The earliest of the pottery and figurines in the pyre date to the second

¹⁶⁹ Noack proposed two gateways in the First Archaic Phase wall, but these were disproved by later excavations. First, at Z11, just inside the curve of the peribolos wall, there is a straight diagonal wall cutting at an angle through the curving eastern end of the peribolos wall. Noack 1927, pp. 25-30 took this cross wall to be a support wall for the corner of the terrace, in part meant especially to support the niche in the wall (the location of Well W). Noack reconstructed at the niche a doorway, which he called the "Alte Pforte," that opened to a staircase rising to the level of the terrace above. As discussed below (in this chapter; pp. XXX), this niche was constructed to accommodate Well W. Second, in the location of the wall projection southeast of Z11, Noack 1927, pp. 30-32 reconstructed the "Alte Zwingertor," a narrow gateway between the projection and the Second Archaic Phase wall (Noack understood this outer wall to be contemporary with the curving First Archaic Phase wall). Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 10-11, however, determined that the outer wall belonged to the Second Archaic Phase, and therefore that there could not be a gateway here contemporary with the First Archaic Phase wall. Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 15-18 further investigated Z11 and the projection and determined that the wall projection belonged to an earlier wall that may have been part of a gate, which Mylonas also accepted, but a description of the form of this gate and its other side are lacking.

¹⁷⁰ Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, p. 280 noted that "unfortunately that part of the wall is not so well preserved, but enough remains to prove that the archaic terrace was entered at this point by means of a ramp." Mylonas 1961, p. 66 also suggested an unspecified type of entrance here.

¹⁷¹ Pyre Beta is composed of an ash layer 0.80-1.00m. thick, with an area of 2.50-3.00m. Description and dimensions from Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, p. 46. First noted by Philios 1884, p. 76 and later further revealed by Kourouniotes 1933, pp. 26-27, during the 1931 excavations. Also discussed by Mylonas and

quarter of the 6th century B.C.¹⁷² The arrangement of pyre Beta outside and to the south of the entrance at Z7 is reminiscent of the relationship between pyre Alpha and the stepped entrance at E2 during the Pre-Archaic Phase. The repeated use of this arrangement suggests that the pyres were related to entrance, and could have been the site of ritual performance before ascending to the central terrace.

On its way to the entrance at Z7, the processional route passed through the Stepped Podium Area, located to the east of the sanctuary's wall (Figures 8, 30, and 40).¹⁷³ This area contained three features during this phase, Well W, a monolithic altar (Z13), and the stepped podium (Z14), all surrounding a court paved with a hard-packed surface. In their discussions of the area, Ziro and Sourvinou-Inwood, following Ziro, did not accept this conclusion, and instead believed that wall E6 from the Pre-Archaic Phase cut across the area, separating the altar and stepped podium from the well.¹⁷⁴ Despite this reconstruction, Sourvinou-Inwood argued that these features could still have formed a single performance area, connected by the gate proposed by Travlos in his reconstruction beyond E6 (Figure 9). However, the reports from the excavation of the area east of the central terrace, and especially the road discussed below, do not mention the wall or

Kourouniotes 1933, pp. 281-282. Kokkou-Vryidi argued that pyre Gamma, like pyres Alpha and Beta, was used for *enagismoi* rituals, offerings made in honor of the dead. See the discussion of these rituals in Kokkou-Vryidi 1999, pp. 159-85.

¹⁷² Kokkou-Vryidi 1999, pp. 143-144 has found that the earliest material in pyre Beta dates to the second quarter of the 6th century B.C., and the latest to the first quarter of the 5th century B.C. Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, pp. 281-82 dated the finds from the pyre to the late 7th or 6th century B.C., and believed that it was built at the time or just after the time when the First Archaic Phase Telesterion and terrace were built, since by their construction the Pre-Archaic Phase pyre Alpha and structures were put out of use. Mylonas 1961, pp. 66-67 noted that the pyre contained pottery from the late 7th to early 5th century B.C., as well as figurines.

¹⁷³ Part of the route, paved with a hard-packed surface, was excavated by Kourouniotes and Mylonas. The lowest layer of the road, which Kourouniotes called "early Archaic," seems to run underneath the Second Archaic Phase wall, but along the bottom of the First Archaic Phase wall, indicating that it is contemporary with the First Archaic Phase. The next road layer, which Kourouniotes called "pre-Peisistratean," runs up against the bottom of the Second Archaic Phase wall, indicating that it could be contemporary with the Second Archaic Phase wall. See Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 10-15, and fig. 16.

¹⁷⁴ Ziro 1991, pp. 20-21; Sourvinou-Inwood 1997, pp. 134-35.

include it in drawings, which suggests that wall E6 was covered during the first half of the 6th century B.C., even though the reports do not explicitly state this observation. Supporting this hypothesis, in his plans of this area, Mylonas did not include the wall (Figure 40). If this conclusion is correct, the Stepped Podium Area would be stratigraphically above the wall.¹⁷⁵ Mylonas identified these features as the three elements delineating a court where sacred dances were performed and watched by prospective initiates outside the entrance to the sanctuary. He argued that Well W was the first Kallichoron Well, which was described in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* as the feature above which Demeter wanted her temple built.¹⁷⁶ This topographical comment is tantalizingly close to the relationship of Well W to the terrace above. Located along the processional route and just below the central terrace, the area must have been used for the performance of ritual as the prospective initiates made their way to the entrance.

The well was an integral part of the performance area, and must have had ritual significance since the Pre-Archaic Phase, when it was enclosed by the outer peribolos wall (indicated by the preserved section at E6) (Figure 10). During the First Archaic Phase, the well's position was protected by a niche created along the northeastern side of the sanctuary's peribolos wall. The well, however, was also partly covered by the wall Z11, an internal retaining wall for the terrace.¹⁷⁷ Because wall Z11 covered part of the

¹⁷⁵ Kourouniotes 1938, pp. 34-38 did not describe the wall's presence in the excavation of the area. Travlos 1983, p. 333 did not specify the top elevation of E6.

¹⁷⁶ *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 270-272. Based almost solely on this passage, Mylonas 1961, pp. 45, 65, 72-73 argued that Well W dated to the late Mycenaean or early Geometric period, but continued to be an important ritual marker through the First Archaic Phase. The identification of the well has been called into question by Binder 1999, pp. 137-38, who has highlighted the fact that Well W does not have any securely datable finds. The lack of a floor described for it in the excavation reports led Binder to conclude that the well was in fact a deep pit. The depth of the feature, however, along with the lack of a change of diameter below the level of the mouth, indicates that this feature was most likely a well.

¹⁷⁷ The well was cut into the rock, 6.10m. deep, and the mouth had a preserved diameter of 0.80m. Noack 1927, pp. 28-29 reconstructed the niche in the First Archaic phase wall as the "Alte Pforte." Once Well W

well, Ziro has argued that Well W went out of use at the time the First Archaic Phase wall was constructed, that the Kallichoron Well to the north of the sanctuary (next to the Greater Propylaia; see Figure 8) was constructed at this time to replace it, but that this new well was not given architectural form until the early 5th century B.C.¹⁷⁸ Because the precise extent to which Well W was covered by wall Z11 is unclear, however, it is not certain if the well went out of use in this phase. It seems that enough of the opening may have been left unimpeded so that it could have continued in use.¹⁷⁹ The well was certainly covered entirely during the Early Classical Phase, when the space between the First and Second Archaic Phase walls was filled, making this the more likely time for a new well to have been installed, corresponding to the date of the architecture of the well.¹⁸⁰

Although some scholars would prefer a single Kallichoron Well, always to the north of the sanctuary (as it is located at #4 on Figure 8), it seems more than likely that the earlier well in the Stepped Podium Area, Well W, could have been the first Kallichoron Well, with the second Kallichoron Well built at the time of Early Classical

was revealed in 1930, this reconstruction became untenable. Well W was described by Kourouniotes 1935a, p. 17, who noted that it was partly covered by the cross-wall Z11, which prevented further cleaning. Mylonas 1942, pp. 74-75, n. 29-31, explained that Well W was revealed in 1930, and that it was not only partly covered by Z11, but it was also filled with large stones. It was further investigated by Mylonas and Travlos in their excavations of 1952. See Mylonas and Travlos 1955, pp. 56-58, including dimensions and objects found. They record two late Helladic II sherds, four late Geometric sherds, and six Archaic sherds, all found 5.40m. below the level of the mouth of the well. Pieces of wood in the upper fill indicated to Mylonas and Travlos that the upper fill was modern, and the small number of sherds led Mylonas to hypothesize that it had been previously excavated by Philios.

¹⁷⁸ Ziro 1991, p. 21.

¹⁷⁹ My suggestion is based on the fact that excavation of the well was possible before wall Z11 was removed from its surface. See note 177 above.

¹⁸⁰ Ziro 1991, pp. 42-47 has shown that the architecture of the well dates to the early 5th century B.C, but he suggested that the well existed before its architectural elaboration. According to Mylonas 1961, pp. 98-99, no archaeological evidence was found in the investigation of the Kallichoron Well to date its introduction securely.

construction in the sanctuary.¹⁸¹ The reluctance to accept that one name could be assigned to features in two successive locations is based on the hesitation to “move” a monument that is named by ancient sources in connection to the Mysteries. Through all the phases at Eleusis, however, the location of the sanctuary entrances, the path of the processional route, and the facilities at the entrance, were variable. The Kallichoron Well was located along the processional route, in a performance area where activities must have taken place preliminary to entrance. Because of this association, the Kallichoron Well should not be exempt from the alterations made to entrances and processional routes to the sanctuary. When the well was moved at the time of the construction of the Early Classical wall, the new location must have been selected so that the well would be situated in a larger and more accessible space, but still located before an entrance to the sanctuary.¹⁸² This move may have reflected a need to accommodate larger numbers of participants in the festival of the Mysteries at the north of the sanctuary where development was less restricted by elevation changes and the encroaching of sanctuary walls. Whether the earlier well should be identified specifically as the Kallichoron Well cannot be known for certain, but it does seem possible, particularly because its position fits closely with the description of the temple location set out in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.

The other two structures in the Stepped Podium Area are the altar and the stepped podium (Figures 8, 40b, and 40c). The altar (Z13) was monolithic, square in shape

¹⁸¹ Richardson 1974, pp. 326-328 doubted that the Kallichoron Well could have been shifted from one place to another, and argued that the Kallichoron Well would always have been in the position next to the later Greater Propylaia.

¹⁸² Mylonas 1961, pp. 45-47 argued that Well W was originally called the Kallichoron Well, and that the well next to the Greater Propylaia was called the Parthenion, or the well of the Maidens. When Well W was covered by fill, the name “Kallichoron Well” was transferred to the only remaining well, the former Parthenion well.

without moldings or other decoration; the earth around the altar showed signs of burning.¹⁸³ The stepped podium (Z14) is oriented northwest to southeast, with the top step on the eastern side. The northern end of the stepped podium is preserved, but its southern end is cut off by the later Classical wall. Composed of three steps which descend toward the west, the podium has a preserved length of 8.40m., and is 1.05m. high. The steps have an average rise of 0.20m. The tread of the lower steps is 0.41m., while for the top step it is 0.58m. The stepped podium as preserved could have held as many as 50 spectators. Kourouniotes revealed a floor at the level of the bottom step of the podium; the fill beneath the floor provided the date for the podium.¹⁸⁴

The altar, stepped podium, and Well W are “ingredients of entrance,” that is, monuments, facilities, or architecturally defined spaces that suggest a ritual before an entrance. On a practical level, the steps and the paved court provided an area for the gathering of prospective initiates together before final ascent to the central terrace. After the long journey from Athens, such an area for the prospective initiates to regroup,

¹⁸³ Kourouniotes 1935a, p. 15 noted that the earth around the altar, at the level of the base of the Second Archaic Phase wall (which framed the altar in a niche), had traces of burning, perhaps from the use of the altar. The burned earth he noted is actually from the inner or western side of the Second Archaic phase wall, but Kourouniotes still associated it with the use of the altar in the First Archaic phase. Philios 1884, p. 62 noted the niche in the Second Archaic Phase wall, but not the altar, perhaps indicating the depth of his excavation. The earliest mention I have found of the altar is in Kourouniotes 1935a, p. 15, with a further reference in Kourouniotes 1935b, p. 73, n. 1. The altar is not mentioned by Noack, or included in his plans. I have not been able to locate dimensions for the altar. Clinton 1988b, p. 72 associated pottery found by Philios to this altar. Philios 1885b, pp. 170-173 noted that the pottery was found 2.00-2.50 French Meters under the level of Philo’s porch, and 1.00-1.50 FM under the paving of the courtyard of the Telesterion, in a level of burned earth, which does not immediately support this association. Philios dated the pottery from between the Mycenaean period to the second half of the 5th century B.C.

¹⁸⁴ Dimensions for the stepped podium from Kourouniotes 1938, p. 34 and repeated by Mylonas 1961, p. 71. Kourouniotes 1938, pp. 37-38 found an older floor beneath the floor contemporary with the podium. He recorded that the fill below the earlier floor had only Mycenaean sherds, while between the older and upper floors (the upper was contemporary with the podium), the fill had a Corinthian aryballos fragment. Although a precise description of this fragment and an exact date are not provided by Kourouniotes, the fragment must date to before the mid-6th century B.C.

perhaps an entire day after their arrival, could have reinforced the sense of community achieved during the procession.

Places for viewing and gathering are common near sanctuary entrances, and there are several examples from Greek sanctuaries of comparable stepped features in such areas.¹⁸⁵ Most examples come from inside the gateway to a sanctuary, however, such as the examples of rock-cut steps in the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth (Figure 42) or the steps of the Oikos of the Naxians next to the propylon at Delos (Figure 43).¹⁸⁶ More similar in spatial arrangement to the stepped podium and entrance at Eleusis are the steps next to the entrance to the Athenian Acropolis in the Early Classical period (Figure 44), where L-shaped steps were adjacent to the gateway.¹⁸⁷ The closest parallel in the concept of a gathering place located along the processional route is the much later Theatral Circle at the sanctuary of the Great Gods on Samothrace. After the sacred way came down from the city and entered the sanctuary, it passed through the circle on its way toward the central sanctuary area (Figure 45). Approximately nine meters in diameter and enclosed by concentric rows of seats, the Theatral Circle, dating to the late 5th/early 4th century B.C., was likely used for a ritual preliminary to entrance into the heart of the sanctuary, such as sacrifice, *thronosis*, or instructions.¹⁸⁸ The stepped

¹⁸⁵ There are also examples of similar, although much larger, stepped seating areas from non-sacred contexts. A stepped theater at Argos, likely dating to the mid-5th century B.C., contained nearly 40 tiers of rock-cut steps and was used for political meetings. The linear theater at Syracuse, also likely built in the 5th century B.C., could hold as many as 1000 spectators on its 17 rows of rock-cut steps. See Ginouves 1972, pp. 17-36 for the stepped theater at Argos, and Ginouves 1972, pp. 61-62 for Syracuse.

¹⁸⁶ There are two examples of rock-cut stepped spaces from the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth, both of which were located at the end of the sacred way. The Theatral Area, dating to the 5th century B.C., could hold about 80 standing spectators, who could look down on the actions performed on the Middle Terrace below. The Theater, perhaps dating to the 4th century B.C., was located higher up the slope of Acrocorinth. Replacing the earlier Theatral Area, the Theater could hold just over 80 people. For descriptions of both features, see *Corinth* XXVIII.3, pp. 256-66. For Delos, where a new propylon was built adjacent to earlier steps, see Gruben 1997, pp. 350-56 and Étienne 2002, pp. 285-86.

¹⁸⁷ Hurwit 1999, pp. 124-25.

¹⁸⁸ Wescoat 2006; Lehmann 1998, pp. 96-100; McCredie 1968, pp. 216-31.

podium at Eleusis is not only related to Samothrace in its topographical relationship to the processional route, but also in its chronological relationship to the sanctuary's other architecture. In both cases, these performance areas are among the earliest monumental architecture constructed at each respective sanctuary. Provisions for preparatory ritual before an entrance were a primary concern in planning the sanctuaries, and point to preparation as a key to proceeding toward initiation.

Based on this comparison to Samothrace, admittedly much later in date, as well as the types of structures and the arrangement of the space of the Stepped Podium Area, and what is known about the Mysteries, several possibilities emerge for its function. The stepped podium could have been a viewing platform for ritual activity at the altar, where a preliminary sacrifice could have been made, or for purification at Well W. The steps could also have been a space for the prospective initiates to sit or stand as some other type of ritual preliminary to entrance was performed on the paved court, such as the presentation of final instructions to the prospective initiates or as the location of *myesis*, a purification ritual necessary to admission to the status of prospective initiate.¹⁸⁹

During the First Archaic Phase, the processional route likely came by land from the north, as it had during the Pre-Archaic Phase. As the procession came into the sanctuary from the north, prospective initiates would walk alongside the high Pre-Archaic and First Archaic Phase walls (at E5 and Z12; preserved height 2.60m.), and perhaps make an offering on pyre Gamma, before descending toward the Stepped Podium Area. Just beyond Z12, the ground level began to slope downward, ending at a depth about 2m. lower at the Stepped Podium Area (Figure 18). There, members of the procession

¹⁸⁹ For a discussion of *myesis* as a ritual preliminary to participation in the Mysteries as a *mystes*, or first-time initiate, see Clinton 2003, pp. 50-60. Simms 1990, pp. 183-95 argued the traditional view that *myesis* was part of the entire ritual of initiation, and not distinct from it as a primary stage.

engaged in some sort of ritual at the altar (Z13), the Well W, and/or the court with spectators watching from the stepped podium. To the right of the procession, on the western side of the route, the First Archaic Phase wall stood some three meters above them, but the ground level rose as they continued on their way, with the wall becoming less and less imposing (the ground level rose some three meters between the Stepped Podium Area and pyre Beta). After making an offering at pyre Beta, the procession could ascend to the terrace at the entrance (at Z7), and at last arrive at the Telesterion.

On the terrace above the Stepped Podium Area, the first Telesterion of permanent materials was built.¹⁹⁰ The long rectangular building (about 24m. long by 14m.) was composed of Eleusinian limestone in the same Lesbian polygonal masonry as the sanctuary wall (Figure 30). Mylonas suggested that the position of the doorway to the Telesterion was at the northern end of the east side, while Travlos proposed the north side. In fact, there is no archaeological evidence cited for the location of the entrance.¹⁹¹ If the entrance were on the east, as it is in later phases, the Telesterion would face the Stepped Podium Area, and provide another viewing place for the Stepped Podium Area.

The First Archaic Phase at Eleusis is similar to the Pre-Archaic Phase in its features and the path of its processional route. In both phases, the processional route approached the sanctuary from the north and continued toward Well W. From here it

¹⁹⁰ A few foundation blocks below the 4th century B.C. temple in the area of the Mirthless Rock were considered part of the First Archaic Phase by Travlos 1983, fig. 125, but this dating is not certain (See Figure 8, #9). The blocks have been reconstructed as parts of two side walls for a small temple (2.90m by 2.50m). The form this construction might have taken and its date, however, cannot be securely established. Travlos' dating of the building must be inferred from its inclusion in his Solonian phase plan, because it is not mentioned in the text. Mylonas 1961, pp. 99-100 and note 40, following Noack 1927, p. 79 and Philios 1886, pp. 29-31, dated the earlier phase of the temple to the Peisistratēan period (included in the Second Archaic Phase). Dimensions from Mylonas. The blocks are visible in Noack plates 6 and 30 (labeled as "alpha" on both plans).

¹⁹¹ Mylonas 1961, pp. 67-70; Noack 1927, pp. 16-23; Travlos 1988, p. 93, fig. 125; figs. 127 and 128 show the sima and geison from this Telesterion.

wrapped around the sanctuary's east side, and terminated at a pyre next to a stepped entrance to the sanctuary. In the Pre-Archaic Phase the entrance included pyre Alpha and the steps at E2, while in the First Archaic Phase, it included pyre Beta and the entrance at Z7. The primary differences between the two phases are the addition of the Stepped Podium Area and the Telesterion that housed initiation, which may have been performed in the open air or perhaps in a wooden structure on the Pre-Archaic Phase terrace. The continuity of features along the path of the processional route and the direction of its movement suggest that the cult did not change between the Pre-Archaic and First Archaic Phases, but that certain aspects of the procession and initiation were newly framed with architecture.¹⁹²

Conclusion

During the First Archaic Phase, the sanctuaries were first linked through their architecture by the building of contemporary peribolos walls at each sanctuary, and by the attention paid to their entrances. The processional routes at both were formalized, including the contemporary widening of the Panathenaic Way near the City Eleusinion, and construction along the approach to the entrance at Eleusis. More monumental entrances, a gateway at the City Eleusinion and the built entrance at the sanctuary at

¹⁹² In contrast to this conclusion, Sourvinou-Inwood 1997, pp. 138-40 argued that during this phase at Eleusis, there was a marked change in the nature of the cult, based primarily on the older plan of the sanctuary by Travlos. Considering the new pyres Beta and Gamma, construction in the so-called Ploutonion, expansion of the terrace, and the addition of the first Telesterion (from the apsidal temple of Travlos' plan of the sanctuary in 8th century B.C., which she identified as the temple of Demeter), including reorientation of its entrance to the east, Sourvinou-Inwood argued that these changes do not reflect an increase in cult participants, as the sanctuary remains small-scale. Rather, they suggest that the "cultic needs" had changed, since she identified different spatial relationships among the architectural elements. She argued that this change indicated that the Eleusinian cult had at this point transformed into the Mysteries. Furthermore, Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a, p. 27 described the new peribolos wall at the City Eleusinion as part of a desire to formalize the space of the sanctuary, a desire that she believed supported her thesis that the Eleusinian cult became mysteric in the early 6th century B.C.

Eleusis were also added.¹⁹³ Elsewhere in the Greek world, the first propyla were built at other sanctuaries, but at the sanctuaries associated with the Mysteries, the emphasis in the design of the entrance was less on the moment of entrance through a gateway, and more on the process of approaching the entrance with preparedness for initiation reinforced through physical journey. The processional route, especially at Eleusis, was in this way a further continuation of the lengthy and challenging sacred way traversed by prospective initiates between Athens and the sanctuary at Eleusis.

During the First Archaic Phase, the sanctuary at Eleusis was provided with features to direct the procession, to frame ritual, and to house initiation. The new wall and entrance at the City Eleusinion, along with the widening of the Panathenaic Way, indicate that this ritual space was also newly articulated within the heart of Athens. The monumentalization and formalization of the space of the sanctuaries serve as a moment of reciprocal development at these sanctuaries. This development not only elaborated the space of each sanctuary and delimited each at its end of the sacred way, but also visually and architecturally unified the sanctuaries.

¹⁹³ For example the propylon at the sanctuary of Aphaia at Aegina (c. 570 B.C.) (Figure 46), the propylon built c. 570 B.C. against the older Oikos of the Naxians at the sanctuary of Apollo on Delos (Figure 43), and the propylon to the acropolis at Selinous, built between 580-560 B.C. (Figure 47). For Aegina, see Fürtwangler 1906, pp. 150-51. For Delos, see Gruben 1997, pp. 350-56 and Étienne 2002, pp. 285-86. For Selinous, see Mertens 2003, pp. 80-88.

Chapter 4: The Second Archaic Phase (c. 560-508/7 B.C.)

Introduction

During this phase, architectural space was reconfigured in ways that substantially altered the worshipper's experience at each sanctuary. The architectural connection between the sanctuaries was less pronounced than it had been during the First Archaic Phase, but one shared feature was the need for more space. An expansion of the City Eleusinion was begun, while a new peribolos wall greatly increased the amount of ritual space at Eleusis, where a larger Telesterion suggests that the cult was gaining ever more participants. Along with these changes, several new gateways were added to the sanctuary at Eleusis, but the processional entrance to the central terrace remained at Z7.

In this chapter, I demonstrate that the new architecture, particularly at Eleusis, indicates not only expansion but also alterations to the space in which ritual was performed. The pattern of entrance at the sanctuary was modified, as was the course of the processional route inside the sanctuary. The cultic facilities discussed in chapter three, including the stepped podium (Z14), the altar (Z13), Well W, pyres Beta and Gamma, and the Telesterion, remained visible, but were divided by the new peribolos wall. These modifications reconfigured the space of ritual in order to maintain the traditional processional route around the eastern side of the sanctuary, but enclosed it within protective walls. Because the stepped podium and the altar were now left outside the peribolos wall and excluded from the processional route, it is clear that the Stepped Podium Area as a required stop along the way to the entrance was short-lived and limited to the previous phase. The established processional route was maintained at the City

Eleusinion, with the same entrance in its southern side. Preparations for sanctuary enlargement at the City Eleusinion, as well as the new peribolos wall and Telesterion at Eleusis, were undertaken in response to the changing needs of the cult that resulted from the increased prominence of the Mysteries in the Athenian religious calendar and the increased number of people participating. Similar to other Athenian sanctuaries during the second half of the 6th century B.C., the sanctuaries connected with the Mysteries moved toward increased monumentality of their sacred space and architecture. These trends coincided with the need for a defensive wall at Eleusis to enclose and protect the sanctuary against threats posed by its position on the border with Megara.

Athens

At the City Eleusinion, houses were demolished and wells were closed north of the sanctuary in preparation for the construction of a new peribolos wall and the temple of Triptolemos (Figure 5).¹⁹⁴ This expansion is dated to the end of the 6th century B.C. on the basis of the latest material on the floors of the demolished houses and in the wells (T 19:1 and U 19:2). Otherwise the form of the sanctuary remained the same, with its entrance located at the south and the Rocky Outcrop visible near it. A new votive deposit between the entrance and the Rocky Outcrop may indicate increased cultic activity near the entrance to the sanctuary (T20:4; Figure 5).¹⁹⁵ This pit, which included columnar figurines and plaques, as well as Geometric and Archaic pottery, could represent the performance of a ritual action newly added to the act of entering the City Eleusinion,

¹⁹⁴ Miles in *Agora XXXI*, pp. 28-31 noted that most of the material in well U 19:2 dated to the late 6th century B.C., but it also included material of c. 480 B.C., indicating that post-Persian material was added to the out-of-use well.

¹⁹⁵ *Agora XXXI*, p. 17; see also Context Pottery Description 6. The pit was about 1.5m. in diameter and located about 5m. inside the entrance to the sanctuary.

perhaps one to mark entrance into the sanctuary or one performed in veneration before the sacred landmark of the Rocky Outcrop.

Eleusis

Several important building projects were undertaken during this phase at Eleusis, including construction of a larger Telesterion and an extensive peribolos wall around the sanctuary, and the introduction of inner and outer gateways.¹⁹⁶ The Second Archaic Phase Telesterion, built on the site of its First Archaic Phase predecessor, with most of its western half constructed over the earlier structure and maintaining its same orientation, was a square building with an added front porch, approximately 25 x 25m., composed of Kara limestone (Figures 8 and 48).¹⁹⁷ Three doorways (each 1.30m. wide) are indicated by the preserved doorwall on its eastern side and a large front porch has been reconstructed as 27.15m. by 4.55m., with three steps all around.¹⁹⁸ The eastern orientation during this phase meant that the porch and entrance faced the processional route and the important cultic features of this and previous phases, such as pyres Gamma and Beta and Well W. In this position, the porch could have been a viewing platform for those waiting inside the Telesterion for the arrival of the prospective initiates along the processional route. The larger size of the Telesterion during this phase points to an increased number of people that needed to be accommodated during initiation.

¹⁹⁶ A long rectangular building was also built during this phase (H50). Kourouniotes 1935a, p. 25, citing Travlos' interpretation, dated it to the Peisistratean period and identified it as a *siros*, a building for grain storage. The start of the building is situated approximately 3.75m. to the west of the northwestern corner of the Lesser Propylaia, and its center portion is cut and covered by the Late Roman defensive wall erected behind the Greater Propylaia. This could have been a dedication itself or meant to store offerings to the sanctuary, such as grain.

¹⁹⁷ For a description of the Second Archaic Phase Telesterion, see Mylonas 1961, pp. 78-88; Noack 1927, pp. 48-70; Kourouniotes and Travlos 1938a. Foundation, wall material identification, and dimensions from Mylonas 1961, pp. 79-80, who noted that its foundations are of irregularly shaped Kara limestone, from 0.47m. to 0.50m. tall. Above these courses are two preserved courses of regularly cut flatter rectangular poros blocks. Mylonas suggested that the wall courses above, which are not preserved, would have also been composed of poros blocks.

¹⁹⁸ Noack 1927, pp. 51-52; Mylonas 1961, p. 81.

On the terrace to the east of the Telesterion, it has also been suggested that altars or a threshing floor were set up.¹⁹⁹ Because the wide space on this side of the Telesterion was so prominently positioned in front of the Telesterion and on the high terrace, it is reasonable to expect structures associated with the cult to be located here, but what features and the date of their introduction cannot be proven. Due to the intensive later construction in the area east of the Telesterion, unfortunately any evidence for these or other structures has been lost.

The most striking architectural event of this phase at Eleusis is the construction of the extensive peribolos wall around the sanctuary. It framed the First Archaic Phase sanctuary, whose peribolos wall remained intact, greatly increased the space of the

¹⁹⁹ Mylonas 1961, p. 91 suggested that altars for the goddesses were set up on the east side of the Telesterion. That altars to the goddesses existed is not in doubt, for they are mentioned in Euripides' *Suppliants* 33 and in the mid-5th century B.C inscription *IG I³ 32*, lines 16-17 (reference from Clinton 1988b, p. 71), yet archaeological evidence for them is lacking. Additionally, the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 270-272 includes Demeter's direction to build a temple and an altar below it. As an alternative hypothesis, Clinton 1988b, pp. 71-72 argued that the altars were always located outside the sanctuary walls, citing additional passages from the *Suppliants* to locate more precisely the altars beside the later Kallichoron Well. Clinton suggested that these passages, as well as the location of the Archaic pyres outside the sanctuary walls (at least during the First Archaic Phase) and the location of Roman altars outside of the walls, provide sufficient evidence to support altars to the goddesses located outside the sanctuary. Clinton offered neither a specific location nor a specific date for the altars. Following the argument for altars outside the sanctuary, Evans 2002, pp. 245-51 proposed that these loci of ritual were excluded from the events connected with initiation because the ritual of *thusia*, bloody sacrifice of a large animal at an altar, usually followed by a meal of its meat, excluded some of those who could participate in the Mysteries, such as women and slaves. Instead, the performance of the Mysteries included sacrifice of an inexpensive sacrificial animal, the piglet, and a procedure more accessible to the varied character of the initiates, with the throwing of the piglets into pits. Recently, Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, pp. 147-59 has argued for altars located within the sanctuary. She proposed that the location of the altars cannot be inferred from either the Roman altars or the Archaic pyres, especially because the pyres are not altars to the goddesses. In addition, she cited the 4th century B.C. inscription *IG II² 1672*, lines 140-141, which indicate that the altars were located inside the sanctuary (these lines indicate that the altars of the goddesses were located near the altar of the Plutoneion, which Kokkou-Vyridi placed inside the sanctuary). As an alternative arrangement in the projecting space to the east of the Telesterion, Vanderpool 1982, pp. 172-74 suggested that the sacred threshing floor of the sanctuary was located here, in addition to the proposed altars. Considering together the passage in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 270-272, in which Demeter dictates that her temple and altar be built on a projection of hill, above the Kallichoron Well, and a mention of a sacred threshing floor in a 4th century B.C. inscription (*IG II² 1672*, line 233), Vanderpool postulated that the threshing floor would be suitable in the space east of the Telesterion, among the most prominent places in the sanctuary. Vanderpool does not specifically date the threshing floor to the Second Archaic Phase, but he suggested its position with reference to Travlos' reconstruction of the sanctuary at this time.

sanctuary, and even stretched to include the city (the wall is labeled H in Figure 8; Figure 48).²⁰⁰ The wide (2.65m.) socle for this wall was composed of foundations with long and irregularly rectangular limestone blocks, with two courses of Eleusinian limestone in polygonal masonry above. The socle contained an infilling of soil and small stones, and was surmounted by a mudbrick superstructure that survives in a few places, with a preserved height reaching up to 4.50m. at tower H25. Around the sanctuary, the wall included as many as seven square towers, four gateways within its circuit (H30, near H39, H12, and a proposed northern gateway next to tower H18), and one internal gateway (H24).²⁰¹ Of these entrances, only the gateway next to tower H18 and the inner gateway at H24 were connected with the processional route. Two other entrances provided access to the city from the west (H12) and from the sea (near H39).²⁰² The entrance at H30, located close to the entrance at Z7, provided direct access to the central

²⁰⁰ For excavation of the wall, see Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 8-9; Philios 1906, pp. 77-106; Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, pp. 272-73. For subsequent discussions of the wall see Ziro 1991, pp. 13-17 (who also provided dimensions); Mylonas 1961, pp. 91-96 (includes discussion of material); Noack 1927, pp. 23-32, pl. II. Noack considered some of the Second Archaic Phase wall to be contemporary with that of the preceding phase. This hypothesis was specifically refuted by Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 8-9 and Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, pp. 282-283. One course of the lowest foundations is visible in Noack 1927, pl. 27a and Ziro 1991, pl. 4.

²⁰¹ Noack 1927, pp. 30-32, fig. 8 suggested a gateway located near H27, projecting from the First Archaic Phase wall, which he called the Zwingenthor. Noack had reconstructed a defensive court in the corner of the space between the First and Second Archaic Phase walls, near tower H25. The court and the gateway at H27 were disproved by Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 10-11, n. 1. Several narrow drainage openings, c. 0.50m. wide, also punctuate the peribolos wall: next to H14, at H52, at the opening between H21 and H25, just south of tower H25, just north of tower H34, and south of H38.

²⁰² The gateway near tower H39, with a preserved width of 3.50m., is located slightly up the slope of the hill. Dimension from Mylonas 1961, p. 92. Kourouniotes 1935a, p. 8. Its opening is oriented toward the west and leads directly to the acropolis. The postern gate next to the tower at H12 gave access to the area around H50. Mylonas 1961, p. 97 noted that the area could be approached by a narrow road that extended from the northern side of H50 toward to the west, and then turned to the north. A *horos* stone found in the area opposite tower H14 suggests that the area of the sanctuary ringed the hill to the west as far as this point. If this stone can be trusted, this would mean that the gateway at H12 led into an area outside of the sanctuary, and ultimately to the slopes of the acropolis. For the *horos* stone, see Kourouniotes 1935a, p. 31; Travlos 1949, p. 142; Mylonas 1961, p. 97. The boundary stone was found in a "later" house, and the inscription is said to be late, by Mylonas, but no more specific information is given.

terrace, perhaps for the transport of building materials, as well as for visitors who approached the sanctuary from the sea.²⁰³

This wall differs from the earlier peribolos walls at the sanctuary in its undeniably defensive character, with its imposing size and numerous square towers. In addition, in contrast to the two earlier phases in which the sanctuary wall seems to have used the hill behind the west side of the sanctuary as a natural boundary, the new wall extended beyond the hill to include the acropolis of the city. It is distinctive in that no other sanctuary in Greece to our knowledge at this time included a peribolos wall of this extent, nor did any other sanctuary include towers, which highlights this aspect.²⁰⁴ While it could be argued that such a wall served solely to restrict the access of the uninitiated into the sanctuary, its kinship to fortification walls suggests that more than assuring privacy

²⁰³ The opening for the gateway is approximately 4m. wide. See Kourouniotes 1935a, p. 8; Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, pp. 282-283. Because construction of the later Classical Phase Telesterion damaged the tower and the opening, it is difficult to provide specific details about the gateway, but the width of the opening and the location inside the protective arm of the tower together suggest an entrance into the sanctuary for those arriving from the sea, not as part of the processional route. Mylonas 1961, p. 92 referred to this gateway near tower H34 as the “South Gate of the Sanctuary area, ‘the gate towards the sea’.”

²⁰⁴ Several sanctuaries received new or expanded temenos walls during the second half of the 6th century B.C., but none were as extensive or as imposing as the wall at Eleusis. On the acropolis at Selinous, the sanctuary was expanded at its eastern end, c. 560-530 B.C. The eastern and northeastern sections of the new temenos wall were composed of a stepped retaining wall, including over twenty steps (Figure 41). The entrances to the sanctuary included the propylon at the west side of the acropolis, along the city’s primary north-south road, and an entrance along its southern line. See Mertens 2003, pp. 88-92; Østby 1995, pp. 87-92. At the sanctuary of Athena at Haliartos, the temple and temenos wall date to c. 550-500 B.C. (Figure 49). Although the form and location of the entrance to the sanctuary is uncertain, approach to the temenos was made by a passage between the southern temenos wall and a building known as the Long Hall. The passage, 1.35m. wide, led to steps 1.10m. wide, which ascended to the temenos on the southern side of the temple. See Austin 1931/32, pp. 182-86, 203-4. The sanctuary of Apollo at Aegina also acquired a temenos wall during the second half of the 6th century, before 520 B.C. See Hoffelner 1999, pp. 129-32. At the end of the 6th century B.C., the temenos wall for the sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia extended toward the east, with a northern propylon added (Figure 50), and perhaps also a second propylon in the east of the sanctuary. See Gebhard and Hemans 1992, pp. 47-51. In the 4th century B.C. the city and sanctuary of Zeus at Dodona received a wall similar to the Second Archaic Phase wall of the sanctuary at Eleusis (Figure 51). Within the wall circuit, there were several gateways next to towers that led into the sanctuary, some in the wall between the city and sanctuary, and others from the area outside the walls. The main entrance from the city was a propylon located at the northwestern corner of the sanctuary. See Katsikoudi 2005, pp. 5-8; Ekschmitt 1998.

must have been the goal.²⁰⁵ As Clinton also noted, the defensive character of the wall must indicate that it was built in response to or in preparation for an invasion of the sanctuary. The nature of this threat and its timing remain in question, however. Clinton proposed that such an event would likely not have occurred during what he termed the peaceful time of Peisistratos and his sons. He argued instead that the Athenians chose to construct a protective wall around one of its most important sanctuaries after Eleusis was occupied by the Spartans in 506 B.C.²⁰⁶ This late sixth-century B.C. date coincides with recent re-dating of the contemporaneous Telesterion to the last decade of the 6th century B.C. on the basis of comparisons with the Old Temple of Athena.²⁰⁷ The convergence of the revised dates for the Telesterion and the new peribolos wall could suggest that a late 6th century B.C. date for the so-called Peisistratean constructions is possible, putting construction in the first years of the Athenian democracy, which began with the Kleisthenic reforms of 508/7 B.C.

Despite the conjoining of these recent revisions in chronology, several problems remain unresolved with assigning these projects to the final years of the 6th century B.C. In the years just after 508/7 B.C., the new democracy was a government in transition, undergoing a series of political reforms in order to achieve a state of *isonomia*, or equality of law for Athenians.²⁰⁸ The city was in an unstable political and financial

²⁰⁵ Fortification walls from the mid to late 6th and early 5th century B.C. at Eretria, Karystos, Miletos, and Oiniadai are similar to the peribolos wall at Eleusis in their scale as well as the inclusion of towers. See Winter 1971, pp. 297-300 for discussion of fortification walls during this period.

²⁰⁶ Clinton 1994a, p. 162.

²⁰⁷ Hayashi 1992, pp. 19-29 has dated the Telesterion to the last decade of the 6th century B.C. on the basis of compared architectural members, such as the rams-head waterspout, to the Old Temple of Athena following its re-dating to end of 6th century B.C. by Childs 1994, pp. 1-6. Childs' conclusions have been widely accepted, but problems remain in his analysis of the architectural members. Korres 1994, pp. 38-39, 1997a, pp. 242-43 maintained the date of the temple to the mid-6th century B.C., and the attribution of the temple to the Peisistratids.

²⁰⁸ Fornara and Samons II 1991, pp. 40-41, 72-74.

situation, and Kleisthenes himself was exiled briefly at the start of these upheavals. In addition to this climate of uncertainty, it seems that Kleisthenes and his reforms were focused internally, on the city of Athens and its politics; the troublesome past with Megara and its border with Attica were of small concern. By contrast, during the rule of Peisistratos (and to some extent his sons after him), Athens and Attica were both politically and financially stable. Attica was militarily secured as far as Megara's port, which Athens, under the leadership of Peisistratos himself, finally captured in order to end the long Megarian War, c. 565 B.C.²⁰⁹ The city and its leader had the resources to pay for the massive wall around the sanctuary at Eleusis and the motivation for its construction, to ensure the protection of the sanctuary and the city next to it. Not only did this guarantee the protection of the important sanctuary of Demeter and Kore against any retaliatory actions by the Megarians, but also, notably, the wall provided the Athenians a strategic position from which to protect the fertile Thriasian plain, vital to feeding the growing population of the city. Therefore, although the new democracy has been cited as patron for these constructions, the evidence and historical circumstances still favor Peisistratos.

Two aspects of the earlier sanctuary were maintained in the Second Archaic Phase. First, the road that wraps around the First Archaic Phase terrace wall continued in use. As described in chapter three, three distinct road layers were identified by Kourouniotes in the area of H27, with the uppermost road layer apparently contemporary with this new Second Archaic Phase wall; another section of this road was identified near

²⁰⁹ Lavelle 2005, pp. 30-45 described the background to the Megarian War and Peisistratos' role in its successful end by the Athenians. See Lavelle 2005, pp. 157-62 for a discussion of the amount of financial resources controlled by Peisistratos.

tower H34, opposite the First Archaic Phase wall Z6 (Figure 48).²¹⁰ Second, no feature along the earlier processional route was entirely covered or put out of use by the new wall or the area it enclosed. The reshaping of this area partly covered the stepped podium, but its top two steps remained exposed, and a special niche built into the Second Archaic Phase wall preserved and framed the altar.²¹¹ Pyres Beta and Gamma were neither covered nor went out of use in this phase, with both including material into the early 5th century B.C. (Figure 20).²¹² Taking the road together with the fact that individual elements of the Stepped Podium Area are preserved, as are the pyres, it is clear that there was continued interest in ensuring that traffic circle the eastern edge of the sanctuary wall. The processional route wrapped around the terrace, as it had in earlier phases, but now with a larger peribolos wall that protected the road but excluded certain features, changing the series of rituals performed along the processional route. The channeling of the processional route between the First and Second Archaic Phase walls impeded views and narrowed passages, heightening the experiential impact of ascending toward the entrance at Z7.

The introduction of inner and outer gateways also altered the prospective initiate's experience during this phase by marking the stages of physical progress toward the sanctuary's entrance at Z7. As it circled the eastern side of the terrace, the processional route went through the inner gateway at H24. This is the earliest well-preserved gateway within the sanctuary at Eleusis, located in the wall to the east of Well W and below the terrace (Figures 8 and 28). With preserved antae and supports for the doorframe, this

²¹⁰ For the road near H27, see Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 10-17, 21; Mylonas 1961, pp. 100-101. For the road near H34, see Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, p. 283.

²¹¹ Kourouniotes 1938, pp. 39-41 observed that the lowest step and the face of the second step were covered by fill contemporary with the construction of the Second Archaic Phase wall.

²¹² Kourouniotes and Mylonas 1933, pp. 281-282; Kokkou-Vyridi 1991, pp. 92-141, 150-57, 185-241.

gateway appears to be the only substantially built one from the Second Archaic Phase peribolos wall. The eastern anta, 2.38m. wide, projects 3.50m. from the Second Archaic Phase peribolos wall, while the western anta, which meets the First Archaic Phase peribolos wall, includes a cobble and earth core with rectangular block facing; the gateway is approximately 2.5m. wide (Figures 25 and 28).²¹³ On the inner side of each anta, a support for the doorframe is preserved. There is no indication of the type of doors included or the direction they opened. Just before the gateway is Well W, while inside the gateway is the road described above, which wrapped around the First Phase Archaic retaining wall. The system of having an internal passage within the sanctuary, bounded by the First and Second Archaic Phase walls, is unparalleled in sanctuary architecture of the second half of the 6th century B.C. This extraordinary arrangement must be based on the desire to maintain the older processional route around the eastern end of the sanctuary, perhaps to close off part of the route at a prescribed place during the procession.

The first outer gateway, a monumental northern entrance, was built during this phase, in the location of the Republican period Lesser Propylaia (next to tower H18 on Figure 48; under #8 on Figure 8).²¹⁴ While there is not sufficient evidence to reconstruct the form of this entrance, its position is indicated by archaeological evidence beneath the Lesser Propylaia. In his excavation report of 1933, Kourouniotes observed no direct evidence for an earlier gateway in the course of his investigation, but he did note that below the northeastern end of the Lesser Propylaia and near its southeastern corner, two courses of poros limestone terminate at the western end of the Second Archaic Phase

²¹³ Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 10-21; Mylonas 1961, p. 100. Width of the gateway is estimated from Mylonas 1961, fig. 6.

²¹⁴ Ziro 1991, pp. 16-17; Mylonas 1961, pp. 93-94.

tower H18 and could have belonged to an earlier phase (Figures 54 and 55).²¹⁵ These courses suggest a gateway a meter or less wide that is roughly in line with the north face of tower H18. A Second Archaic Phase gateway in this position would be a simple gateway in line with the course of the wall, set slightly back from the tower (Figure 48).²¹⁶ In contrast to the unusual inner gateway at the sanctuary, this outer gateway is more typical in position to gateways built at other sanctuaries in Greece at this time.²¹⁷

Three topographical features in the area north of the Telesterion may have been developed during this phase and, if so, demonstrate monumentalization of this part of the sanctuary during this phase (Figure 48).²¹⁸ Although none can be securely dated to this phase, the possibility of each is suggestive of attention now given to the area north of the

²¹⁵ Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 22-28. The courses under the Lesser Propylaia are as follows (see Figure 55): the lowest course is composed of small, irregularly shaped poros blocks. The second course terminates at the Second Archaic Phase tower and is composed of conglomerate ashlar that are taller and narrower than the ashlar of the other courses. This course gradually projects from the face of the foundations above, beginning near the western end of the foundations, and increasing until about 0.25 m at the tower on the east. The third and fourth courses of the foundations are of whiter limestone ashlar that share the same height and the same worked surfaces. The third course terminates at the tower block, while the fourth extends to further to cover the tower's northwest corner. The euthynteria is composed of limestone ashlar that are set approximately flush with the outer face of the lower marble step. Under the northeastern corner of the Lesser Propylaia's paving, Kourouniotes reached "stereo stones." Because he was working under the assumption that there was a Peisistratean gateway in this area, he referred in general to such a structure without firm evidence to support it. Kourouniotes is very direct, however, when he states that he did not find any sign of a propylon here before the Lesser Propylaia. Kourouniotes postulates that if a pre-Lesser Propylaia propylon existed, it might have had a form similar to the Early Classical Phase gateway at Th5.

²¹⁶ The reconstruction presented in Figure 48 reflects the position of the gateway set back just slightly from the tower. In previous reconstructions, the gateway has been set back behind the tower (see the hatched line below the Lesser Propylaia in Figure 8).

²¹⁷ Propyla were built at several Greek sanctuaries during the second half of the 6th century B.C., such as those described above, as well as the propylon that may have existed in the eastern side of the peribolos wall of the temple precinct at the sanctuary of Poseidon at Kalaureia, dated to 525-500 B.C. (Figure 52). See Carpenter 1971, pp. 62-64. For recent investigation into the sanctuary and temple precinct at Kalaureia, see Wells 2003, pp. 337-47. At the sanctuary of Apollo on Delos during the end of the 6th century B.C., the propylon was expanded, with a tetrastyle prostyle porch added to its southern side and two columns in antis on its interior side (Figure 53). See Gruben 1997, pp. 356-72, 410-14.

²¹⁸ Mylonas 1961, pp. 98-99 suggested that the Kallichoron Well dated to the second half of the 6th century B.C. on the basis of construction techniques. In his study of the Kallichoron Well, Ziro 1991, pp. 17, 42-47 has shown that the architecture of the well dates to the early 5th century B.C., but he also suggested that the well existed before its architectural elaboration. See also the discussion of the Kallichoron Well above, in which I argue that Well W served as the first Kallichoron Well, and was replaced by the present Kallichoron Well in the Early Classical Phase (#4 on Figure 8). Although Mylonas stated that excavation of this well provided no clear evidence of its date, due to its continued use through the Ottoman period, nonetheless it is still argued that the well is "very ancient" and must predate the Second Archaic Phase.

Telesterion. First, there may be an early phase to the temple in the area of the Mirthless Rock (no. 9 on Figure 8, Figure 56), but this feature cannot securely dated.²¹⁹ Second, a short line of stones along the western edge of the sacred way indicates a pre-Roman phase of the road (gray shaded oval south of no. 10 on Figure 8; Figure 57). Noack identified the blocks as belonging to an earlier sacred way, c. 0.50m. below the level of its Roman paving.²²⁰ Though this line has been thought to indicate an Archaic phase of the sacred way, the date cannot be confirmed.²²¹ Finally, a road has been identified that extended from the area of the northern entrance next to H18 and led to the inner gateway at H24.²²² To sum up, although these topographical features cannot be securely dated, the structure in the area of the Mirthless Rock, combined with the suggested Archaic phase of the sacred way and the road coming from this area, indicate emphasis on defining architecturally this part of the processional route at the northern end of the sanctuary.

During the Second Archaic Phase at Eleusis, the following path for the processional route can be reconstructed (Figure 48). The processional route from Athens arrived at the sanctuary from the north as it had in earlier phases, and then entered the

²¹⁹ As discussed in the previous chapter, although Travlos considered the blocks to belong to the First Archaic Phase, Mylonas dated these blocks to the Second Archaic Phase. See discussion of the blocks above (in First Archaic Phase chapter). See Travlos 1983, fig. 125; Mylonas 1961, pp. 99-100, n. 40, following Noack 1927, p. 79. Philios 1886, pp. 29-31, dated the earlier phase of the temple inside this area to the Peisistratenean period.

²²⁰ Noack 1927, pp. 81-85, pl. 8, 14, 15, 32d. Noack reconstructed the early sacred way as turning from a northern entrance (under the later Lesser Propylaia) down toward the east, then turning back up toward the south and the Telesterion. Mylonas 1961, pp. 100, 174 simplified this arrangement, and suggested instead that the earlier sacred way followed the same straight course as its Roman successor. Mylonas did not accept another line of stones ("u-v" on Noack 1927, pl. 8) as part of the sacred way (these are the stones that Noack used to reconstruct the eastern swing of the path); Mylonas believed the second line of stones to be too undatable to be trusted.

²²¹ Mylonas 1961, p. 174. Philios 1888, p. 50, n. 3 observed that the blocks represented an earlier phase, but did not offer a more specific date.

²²² Kourouniotes 1935a, p. 21 described the road as a continuation of the road between the First and Second Archaic Phase walls, between H29 and H27, which then passed through the gateway at H24 and continued toward the northern entrance. This is likely the same road described by Mylonas 1961, p. 100.

sanctuary through the outer gateway (next to tower H18). From here, the processional route followed the older path that passed pyre Gamma then descended toward Well W, before passing through the inner gateway at H24. At this point, the members of the procession were at the lowest and narrowest point of their journey, some six meters below the level of the terrace and framed by imposing walls on either side (Figure 18). The processional route then ascended toward pyre Beta and entered the terrace at Z7, where the procession could continue to the Telesterion. The descent and ascent of the procession mimicked the experience of Kore, descending first to Hades then returning again to her mother, and for this reason may have been ascribed another layer of meaning.

An important consequence of the Second Archaic Phase wall's construction is that it cut across the Stepped Podium Area (Figure 48). Not only was the space physically split apart, causing the podium (Z14) and altar (Z13) to be outside the wall and Well W to be inside the wall, but this division also visually separated these elements from one another.²²³ The preservation of these features likely indicates that they were left in place to ensure their continued use for the performance of ritual, but their exclusion from the protected space of the walls and from the processional route signify a change in their role related to the procession. No longer did the processional route include a court with a viewing platform for the gathering of prospective initiates. Because it is unlikely that such actions were eliminated altogether from the festival, the area for the presentation of final instructions or other rituals preliminary to entrance may have been moved to the area in front of the northern entrance. Actions performed at the well, such as purification,

²²³ It must be noted that if the steps did continue further to the southeast, then maybe the line of sight to the altar would not have been completely lost.

continued in the same location, but in a space whose shape was transformed. The well was located now in an enclosed area, just before a gateway. The topography of the processional route during this period suggests two stages in the transition from the journey from Athens and final entry to the central terrace at Z7, once before the outer entrance and once before the inner entrance. The new characteristics of the processional route introduced during the Second Archaic Phase, including the northern entrance, the elimination of the Stepped Podium Area, the inner and outer gateways, the retention of a well located before a gateway, and the enclosure by defensive walls, continued to be key features of the sanctuary in later phases, and most remained particular to the sanctuary at Eleusis.

Conclusion

During the Second Archaic Phase, architectural attention was devoted to the sanctuary at Eleusis, and preparations were underway at the City Eleusinion for the dramatic enlarging and monumentalizing of the sanctuary that took place in the next century. Construction and preparation work at the sanctuaries indicates that the two remained connected, but Eleusis was architecturally dominant. The extensive space within the peribolos wall and enlarged Telesterion indicate that an increased number of participants needed to be accommodated; the peribolos wall also provided protection and better control of the processional route. The revised processional route that directed the procession around the eastern end of the sanctuary show a desire to channel the procession carefully through narrow spaces in order to utilize the older cultic features of the pyres and the entrance at Z7 and the processional route itself, as it circled the eastern side of the terrace.

In previous scholarship, it was often argued that during the Second Archaic Phase, Peisistratean involvement with the festival of the Mysteries led to these architectural developments and, at Eleusis, is the reason behind a new processional entrance to the sanctuary located in the north wall, oriented in the direction of Athens (Figure 48).²²⁴ However, it has been shown here that the processional entrance to the central terrace remained at Z7, on the southern side of the terrace, and that the outer, northern gateway next to tower H18 served to monumentalize the pre-existing approach of the processional route from the north. A shift in the orientation of the sanctuary entrance did not occur. Thus, Mylonas' assertion that a reorientation was due to Peisistratos in order to bring the sanctuary into communication with "his beloved Athens" must be reconsidered.²²⁵ Moreover, the introduction of a northern gateway did not signal new control of the sanctuary by the Athenians, which had been established well before this phase.

Despite efforts to downdate development at the sanctuary, the involvement of Peisistratos, and his sons, should not easily be discounted. The increase in representations of Demeter, Persephone, and Triptolemos between 540 and 520 B.C. indicates increased interest in or participation in the Mysteries. While these representations cannot be directly associated with the Peisistratids, such a connection is

²²⁴ The Second Archaic Phase wall and Telesterion at Eleusis were dated by Mylonas 1961, pp. 77-105 to the reign of Peisistratos, and accepted by Ziro 1991, pp. 9-17. The connection between Peisistratos and his sons and Eleusis has been standard in scholarship, though not without question. See *Agora XXXI*, pp. 27-28 for a useful summary of the problem. Shapiro 1989, pp. 67-69, for example, accepted Mylonas' archaeological evidence, but noted that although the connection could be substantiated by "indirect literary evidence," it cannot be known for certain. Even Mylonas 1961, p. 77 noted that there is no direct evidence for the connection, though his subsequent discussion of the phase and its attribution to Peisistratos became deeply embedded in later scholarship. Boersma 1970, pp. 24-25, 135 discussed attribution to Peisistratos and/or his sons.

²²⁵ Mylonas 1961, pp. 103-105 supported his hypothesis with his belief that the Kallichoron Well was moved to the north of the sanctuary during this phase, that a structure was built in the so-called Plutonion, and that the sacred way was first established. He also proposed that the blocks beneath the Roman *eschara* in the Roman forecourt were Peisistratean. In short, if the Kallichoron Well and its dances moved to the northern end of the sanctuary, then the entrance would be moved as well.

likely.²²⁶ Recent studies of the Second Archaic Phase peribolos wall and its corresponding Telesterion at Eleusis, which argue that both structures could be dated to later in the 6th century B.C., perhaps even during its last decade, after the demise of the Peisistratid dynasty, should be viewed with caution. These studies rely heavily on comparison with the Old Temple of Athena, for which the re-dating to the last decade of the 6th century B.C. still remains in question. The impetus for the development at both sanctuaries cannot simply be credited to the Peisistratids, but consideration of financial, political, and military concerns during the Peisistratean period tip the balance in their favor.

Athens grew into a major urban center over the course of the 6th century B.C. under the leadership of Peisistratos and, as the city changed into a significant political powerhouse, its population and wealth increased. Cults associated with the city were woven into this fabric of progress, both to satisfy the religious needs of its growing population and to accommodate the city's desire to display and promote its prominence in great civic festivals.²²⁷ Such is the case with the Panathenaia, the City Dionysia, and the Mysteries, all of which were transformed over the course of the 6th century B.C. from more modest, rural, or local cults and celebrations into major civic festivals that took place (at least in part) in Athens and were administered by the city.²²⁸ Architectural

²²⁶ Shapiro 1989, pp. 74-77 suggested that these scenes might be connected to the Peisistratids. Boardman 1975, pp. 1-12 argued that the Peisistratid connection to the Mysteries is iconographically attested by the scenes of Persephone with Herakles and the Kerberos, who guards the entrance to the underworld, a subject created by the Peisistratids to connect themselves, through Herakles, to the Mysteries.

²²⁷ Shapiro 1989, pp. 164-65.

²²⁸ For the Panathenaia, see Shapiro 1989, pp. 40-47; Shear 2001; for the rise of cults of Dionysos, see Shapiro 1989, pp. 84-86; for the Mysteries, Eleusis, and the City Eleusinion, see Shapiro 1989, pp. 53, 67-83. The attribution of architecture built at Athenian sanctuaries and cult promotion during the second half of the 6th century B.C. to the early democracy has been argued for other Athenian cults, such as the City Dionysia and the Panathenaia. For the City Dionysia, although Conner 1990, pp. 8-16 suggested that the City Dionysia was created as part of the Kleisthenic reforms, Sourvinou-Inwood 2003b, pp. 100-104

development corresponded with these changes, some attributed to the Peisistratids and others to the democracy.²²⁹ These Athenian sanctuaries included new temples and other structures, but neither temenos walls nor gateways like those constructed at Eleusis.²³⁰ The architectural dominance of Eleusis compared to these sanctuaries demonstrates the intensity of Athens' desire to monumentalize the home of the Mysteries, and the fact that the City Eleusinion did not receive equal attention emphasizes the focus of Athens on the sanctuary at Eleusis.

The architecture at Eleusis demonstrates the centrality of this cult to Athen's self-identity as it developed between 560 and 508/7 B.C. The scale and monumentality of the peribolos wall and the Telesterion emphatically demonstrated Athens' control of the region, especially important after the defeat of Megara, as well as the extensive financial resources of the polis that provided the funds for its construction. The increased promotion of the cult in the city's religious calendar suggests that the political value of the Mysteries had been realized during this phase as a means to bind Athenians with non-Athenians, and even to unify briefly the population of Athens, including women and

argued that the foundation of the cult of Dionysos Eleuthereus was pre-Kleisthenic. The earliest architecture of the sanctuary of Dionysos on the south slope of the Acropolis dates to the second half of the 6th century B.C., including a temple and a semi-circular retaining wall, which created a terrace for a seating area, to the north of the temple. See Travlos 1971, p. 537; Pickard-Cambridge 1946, pp. 1-6. A fragment of pedimental sculpture has been assigned to this temple, and dated by Boardman 1978, p. 155, fig. 201, to c. 540-30 B.C.

²²⁹ Childs 1994, pp. 1-6 dated the Old Temple of Athena on the Acropolis to after 508 B.C., with its sculpture dating to c. 500 B.C., but problems remain with this attribution.

²³⁰ The Acropolis included the imposing walls built during the Mycenaean period. See Shear 1999, pp. 105-107 for a description of the walls and entrance to the Acropolis at this time. Below the Acropolis, the Olympieion, the great Peisistratid temple to Olympian Zeus, was begun either in the 520s B.C. or perhaps a decade later. Travlos 1971, pp. 402-403 argued that the Olympieion must only have been begun c. 515 B.C., because of the small amount completed before the project's abandonment. This date also accords well with Aristotle *Politics* 5.11.4. Wycherly 1964, p. 163 suggested that the project could have been conceived of and started by Peisistratos, but then continued by his sons. This date agrees with the pottery found in the construction fill for the temple, the latest of which is c. 530 B.C. Shapiro 1989, pp. 112-13 proposed that a date in the 520s might be more appropriate because this would place the new temple in close competition with the temple at the Polykratean Heraion on Samos.

slaves, in ritual actions performed in common. The procession of prospective initiates across the vast and fertile territory between Athens and Eleusis was a political tool that manifested the agrarian wealth of Athens, given by Demeter's favor, and the physical extent of the polis, inviting non-Athenians to seek alliance with the powerful polis of Athens. The Mysteries were recognized as a cult with personal resonance for initiates that would easily appeal to a wide audience; this attraction could be harnessed to generate political and economic dominance.

Chapter 5: The Late Archaic and Early Classical Phase (c. 508/7-460 B.C.)

Introduction

During this phase, architectural development at both sanctuaries corresponded to the growing popularity of the Mysteries, a stronger promotion of the cult's values, and an increased number of participants, due particularly to the successes of the Persian Wars, first the victory at Marathon, then driving back the Persians from Athens a decade later. An Athenian inscription (*IG I³ 6*) dating to c. 470-460 B.C. demonstrates the administrative relationship between the sanctuary at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion during these latter years.²³¹ This sacred law, which provides the first surviving epigraphical record of the administrative connection between the sanctuaries, was found in fragments within the Agora, including several near the City Eleusinion.²³² It documents regulations for the administration of the sanctuaries in both Athens and Eleusis, as well as for cities whose citizens visited the sanctuaries under the guidelines of the sacred truce. The establishment of the *spondai*, the sacred truce that allowed passage to the sanctuary, is recorded (lines 8-47), which indicates that the safe travel of larger numbers of people to the festival needed to be ensured.²³³ As Clinton noted, this provision implies that the sanctuary and the Mysteries had reached a pan-Hellenic status at least by c. 460 B.C.²³⁴ Concerning the administration of the sanctuaries, the sacred law indicates that the Eleusinian *hieropoioi* oversaw the proceeds of the *aparche*, the first-fruit dedications to the goddesses, and that these were kept on the Athenian

²³¹ Clinton 2005a, pp. 21-30, cat. 19; Clinton 1994a, pp. 162-63; *Agora XXXI*, p. 64, cat. I, 41; Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 73-77; Wickkiser 2003, pp. 161-63.

²³² *Agora XXXI*, p. 64.

²³³ Sakurai and Raubitschek 1987, pp. 263-65.

²³⁴ Clinton 1994a, pp. 162-163.

Acropolis (lines 36-38).²³⁵ In other words, the dedications were under the administration of Eleusinian officials, but stored in the most prominent religious center of Athens. The *hieropoioi* also oversaw sacrifices made during the Mysteries at Eleusis, according to *IG I² 5*, an inscription from the early 5th century B.C. (490-80 B.C.).²³⁶

At the start of the century, before Marathon, the wall circuits at the City Eleusinion was expanded so that the sanctuary incorporated even more space, and the foundations for a new temple were erected. The annex to the City Eleusinion provided the necessary area for the sanctuary's first temple, completed sometime in the decades after the Athenian successes at Salamis and Plataea and dedicated to Triptolemos, a hero integral to the workings of the Mysteries. The entrance to the sanctuary, which may have been embellished with a porch near the end of this phase, and the processional route into the sanctuary remained in the same position as in earlier phases, in the southern wall of the sanctuary.

At Eleusis, the processional route continued to wrap around the eastern side of the central terrace to enter at Z7, but some of the features associated with ritual in the 6th century B.C. were abandoned. These projects at Eleusis were considered by the excavators to be a work of Kimon, in response to a Persian invasion of the sanctuary. Recent study of the Telesterion, as well as the reevaluation of the walls and terrace fill presented here, demonstrates that most of these projects may have been begun after Marathon, before 480 B.C., with the project at the Telesterion abandoned for several decades.

²³⁵ Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 73-77, 121-124; Clinton 1974, pp. 10-12. The first-fruit dedication was not offered to Demeter as part of the Mysteries, but instead in honor of her role more generally as goddess of grain.

²³⁶ Clinton 1979, pp. 3-4, Clinton 2005a, pp. 16-18, cat. 13; Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 73-74.

In both sanctuaries, the increased amount of space and available amenities reflect an increase in Athenian regulation of and interest in the cult as well as an increase in the number of participants in the Mysteries, as documented in the sacred law *IG I³ 6*. Taken together, the epigraphical and architectural evidence suggests that the impetus for this development was a drive on the part of Athens to promote the Mysteries as pan-Hellenic. The cult of the Mysteries was not alone in receiving this promotion. As the new democracy took shape and Athens claimed its place as head of the Delian League after the Persian Wars, its politicians made an effort to display the power and piety of Athens by ensuring that Athenian cults and festivals, such as the City Dionysia and the Panathenaia as well as the Mysteries, could compete on the world stage with other pan-Hellenic festivals.²³⁷

Athens

At the City Eleusinion, an extension to the peribolos wall doubled the size of the sanctuary towards the north and a temple of Triptolemos was built within this new extension (Figures 6 and 58). The wall's eastern line was built on top of the First Archaic Phase peribolos wall, which was partly dismantled to allow for the new wall's construction.²³⁸ Based on pottery found in a trench for the wall base and in packing fill around the wall blocks themselves, Miles dated the wall to the early 5th century B.C. The opening in the southern line of the First Archaic Phase wall continued to be the entrance the sanctuary.

²³⁷ For the City Dionysia, see Sourvinou-Inwood 2003b; Connor 1990. For the Panathenaia, see Neils 1994; Shear 2001.

²³⁸ Description of the wall, its date, and materials are provided by *Agora XXXI*, pp 31-32. Portions of the wall are preserved in both its western and northern line. The lowest course of the new wall was 1.10m. wide and included several blocks likely reused from the older wall. A north-south curving wall, visible from U18 to U19 in Figure 58, may also date to this phase.

A second major addition to the City Eleusinion was the temple of Triptolemos, the first monumental building constructed at the sanctuary.²³⁹ Triptolemos, an Athenian hero who learned agriculture from Demeter, was an important player in the Eleusinian Mysteries, whose mission included both the distribution of the seed of Demeter's fruit and the announcement of the Mysteries.²⁴⁰ Because of the slope of the terrain, the foundations were set into the bedrock on the southern end, but the northern end had ten courses of foundations; fill was deposited around the foundations in order to level the terrace and to support the foundations. The remainder of the temple may have been built of marble, perhaps in the Ionic order. Based on evidence from a well closure (T 19:1) and the demolition of houses for the temple's construction, Miles dated the foundations as beginning c. 500 B.C. and continuing for another decade.²⁴¹ Stylistically, Miles argued that the marble roof tiles placed the upper parts of the temple in the second quarter of the 5th century B.C. (Figure 59).²⁴² This chronology indicates that the temple must have been affected by Persian destruction in the Agora in 479 B.C.; it is uncertain

²³⁹ For discussion of temple construction, including stratigraphy, date, and identification, see *Agora XXXI*, pp. 35-52. The foundations for the temple are 11.065 x 17.813m. A rectangular foundation, 1.10x2.70m., east of the temple may have been supported an altar or a monument base (Figures 6 and 58). Because its foundations are composed of the same material used in the temple foundations, and are also at the same level as the highest foundation courses of the temple, Miles in *Agora XXXI*, pp. 62-63 suggested the base to be contemporary with the temple foundations.

²⁴⁰ Xenophon *Hellenica* 6.3.6 (early 4th century B.C.). For discussion of Triptolemos and his relationship to Eleusis, as well as to the Mysteries, see Parker 1996, pp. 99-100; Clinton 1994a, pp. 163-70; *Agora XXXI*, pp. 48-56. For discussion of the iconography of Triptolemos, see Shapiro 1989, pp. 76-77 and Clinton 1974, pp. 38-47, 112-13. Clinton emphasized Triptolemos' association with agrarian cults of Eleusis, including the Thesmophoria.

²⁴¹ *Agora XXXI*, pp. 38-43. As Miles outlined in a discussion of the stratigraphy of the northern area of the sanctuary, the temple foundations were laid after the peribolos wall was constructed. An inconsistency with this chronology deserves further consideration. If the foundations for the temple were constructed after the peribolos wall, then the foundations should date to the early 5th century B.C. or later, not c. 500 B.C.

²⁴² Miles in *Agora XXXI*, pp. 40-41 cited comparanda provided in Ohnesorg 1993 on Cycladic marble roofs.

whether the temple experienced interruption of its construction at this time or aggressive destruction by the Persians.²⁴³

The temple has been identified as dedicated to Triptolemos on the basis of Pausanias' description of the City Eleusinion (1.14.1-4), in which he described two temples in the area of the sanctuary, one with a statue of Triptolemos and the other dedicated to Demeter and Kore.²⁴⁴ Further in the passage, Pausanias said he was forbidden in a dream to describe certain features of the City Eleusinion, presumably because they were inside the private area of the sanctuary, and that the only temple he could describe, presumably in an outer, public area of the sanctuary was the temple with a statue of Triptolemos. Miles has plausibly argued that the area excavated in the City Eleusinion is the more public portion of the sanctuary, and that the early 5th century B.C. temple in this area housed the statue of Triptolemos.

A temple of Triptolemos constructed in the first decades of the 5th century B.C. at the City Eleusinion fits well with his popularity in Athenian vase painting at this time. The earliest known images of Triptolemos in Athens began in the mid-6th century B.C. and depict a bearded man sitting on a simple wheeled cart, holding grain before an audience, presumably instructing them in agriculture.²⁴⁵ Beginning around 510 B.C., Triptolemos is shown more youthful and elegant, seated on a winged chariot, no longer sporting a beard, and often holding a scepter or phiale instead of grain. Rather than the audience of earlier representations, Triptolemos is frequently shown with Demeter and

²⁴³ *Agora* XXXI, p. 41. The use of the Ionic order at this early date in Athens, as well as the connections of the structure to developments in the Cyclades, makes this temple worthy of further research.

²⁴⁴ Pausanias 1.38.6-7 also described a temple of Triptolemos at Eleusis.

²⁴⁵ For representations of Triptolemos in vase painting during the 6th century B.C., see Shapiro 1989, pp. 76-77; Clinton 1972, pp. 38-47; *LIMC*, s.v. Triptolemos; see also the useful summary provided in *Agora* XXXI, pp. 53-55.

Kore. Although Raubitschek and Raubitschek proposed that the new representation reflected a change in the geographical scope of his mission itself, so that he would finally go beyond the borders of Attica, as Clinton noted, Triptolemos' mission probably already extended this far in the 6th century B.C.²⁴⁶ Instead, the new iconography of Triptolemos is analogous to the *spondophoroi*, bearers of the sacred truce, who traveled far from Athens to announce the Mysteries and the sacred truce, first recorded in *IG I³ 6*, to reach an international audience. Triptolemos' mission shared Demeter's gift with the world, which in turn gave Athens legitimization for administration and promotion of the Mysteries. The temple of Triptolemos at the City Eleusinion was a means of emphasizing the Athenian claim to the cult.

The entrance to the sanctuary, which remained the gateway in the southern wall, may have been elaborated with a porch during this phase. The earliest surviving dedicatory base from the City Eleusinion, dating to the mid 5th-century B.C., includes an inscription that may indicate monumentalization of this entrance to the sanctuary (*IG I³ 953*).²⁴⁷ The dedication was given by Lysistrate, the priestess of Demeter and Kore, and mentions a *prothyron*, which refers to the space in front of an entrance, or perhaps a porch at the entrance. The base probably held a pillar that supported the *agalma*, or gift, mentioned in the inscription, such as a portrait, relief sculpture, or other dedication. If

²⁴⁶ Raubitschek and Raubitschek 1982, pp. 111-14; Clinton 1994a, p. 166.

²⁴⁷ *Agora XXXI*, pp. 62, 66, cat. I, 1. The base was found in the Post-Herulian wall west of the southwest corner of the sanctuary. Pritchett 1940, pp. 97-101 argued that the base held a pillar with two attached crowns. This view accepted by Clinton 1979, p. 69. In *Agora XI*, pp. 121-22, Harrison instead argued that the base held a herm. As Connelly 2007, pp. 64-65, 135 has shown, the inscription recorded that Lysistrate was a *propolos*, or servant, of the goddesses, who gave gifts to them from her wealth. The office of the priestess of Demeter and Kore was a lucrative one, and the most prestigious of the cult, but inscriptions do not refer to priestesses until the 4th century B.C. Shear 2003, pp. 168-74 demonstrated that pillar monuments were very common in Athens, particularly along the Panathenaic Way, where they were often offered to commemorate victories in the Panathenaic games. The early date of Lysistrate's dedication and the fact that it was offered by a woman distinguish it from these other monuments, otherwise similar in type and location.

this base had originally been set up next to the entrance, this would indicate that a porch was added to the gateway, which would highlight its prominence as the processional entrance to the sanctuary. This porch, which could have been built of ephemeral materials, would have transformed the gateway into a propylon.

The intensive architectural development at the City Eleusinion during this phase corresponds to the pattern of construction taking place on the Acropolis and at other Attic sanctuaries in the first half of the 5th century B.C. The doubling of the size of the City Eleusinion and the start of construction of a lavish new temple under the new democracy and around the time of Marathon, followed by the repair or completion of the temple and the possible addition of a propylon to the sanctuary dating closer to the middle of the 5th century B.C., is in keeping with the push of the Athenians to monumentalize their sacred spaces as Athens sought an upsurge in pan-Hellenic interest in its cults, first under the new democracy and then during the mid-5th century B.C. The changes to the space of the City Eleusinion were probably deemed appropriate to frame the experience of increased numbers of people visiting the sanctuary and to provide a place for the temporary housing of the *hiera* during the festival. All of these projects communicated to pilgrims the rising prominence of Athens in the regulation of Mysteries. Through this architecture, Athens concretized its connection to Eleusis by emphasizing its expensive new temple, drawing the public's awareness to the fact that part of the venue for the Mysteries was located within the heart of the city.

Eleusis

At Eleusis, expansion of the space of the sanctuary also occurred during this period, begun after Marathon, with the focus of architectural attention on altering the

processional approach to the sanctuary and expanding the Telesterion terrace. An extension wall was added to the northeastern end of the Second Archaic Phase peribolos wall, which included a propylon at its southern end (Th5) and possibly another entrance at the northern end under the later Greater Propylaia (walls and gateways labeled with “Th” in Figure 8; see Figure 62). Also at the northern end of the sanctuary, next to this proposed entrance, the Kallichoron Well was constructed. At the same time, most of the space between the First and Second Archaic Phase walls was filled in, covering the inner gateway (H24) and road, as well as two loci of ritual activity present at the sanctuary for over a century, pyre Gamma and Well W. Another important change was that the gateway next to tower H18, which had been the outer gateway of the Second Archaic Phase, became the inner gateway of this phase. The changes in the form of the sanctuary during this phase suggest that the location of gathering and perhaps other rituals preliminary to entrance may have been moved with the well, to the area near the proposed northern entrance.

The northeastern extension wall extends for 110m., from opposite tower H25 of the Second Archaic Phase wall as far as beneath the Greater Propylaia of the 2nd century A.D. (Figures 8, 62, and 63).²⁴⁸ It is between 1.70-1.80m. thick, composed of a socle of rectangular poros blocks with an infilling of earth, surmounted by mudbrick courses. When the wall was excavated, Kourouniotes noted that there were no datable sherds included in fills associated with the wall’s construction. He proposed a Kimonian date based on its construction technique, which set it apart from that of the Second Archaic Phase wall and the Classical Phase wall, and on his observation that the wall base for the

²⁴⁸ For discussions of the extension wall, see Ziro 1991, pp. 49-50; Mylonas 1961, pp. 108-111; Kourouniotes 1938, pp. 33-34; Travlos 1988, p. 94.

new wall was lower than, and therefore earlier than, the Classical Phase wall.²⁴⁹ Ziro provided additional evidence to refine the construction date proposed by Kourouniotes.²⁵⁰ In his study of the architecture of the Kallichoron Well, Ziro determined that the well was given architectural form contemporary with the new extension wall, and that the wellhead, the floor paving around the well, and its enclosure walls were all part of the same building project. The well sat in a horseshoe-shaped unroofed precinct, with the new extension wall joining the rear wall of the straight side, and the curved walls, pierced by three doorways, projecting toward the sacred way (Figure 67).²⁵¹ On the basis of the geison block that he assigned to the original enclosure walls for the well, Ziro argued that the date for the wall and the well enclosure is between 490-80 B.C.²⁵²

At the southern end of the new extension wall, a propylon was built where the extension wall reached tower H25 of the Second Archaic Phase wall (Th5; Figures 63 and 64).²⁵³ This propylon is the earliest preserved at the sanctuary. It was approximately

²⁴⁹ Kourouniotes 1938, p. 40, n. 1 offered the Kimonian date. Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 21-22 observed that the earlier and later walls each had a distinctive masonry style, isodomic for the Classical wall, polygonal for the Second Archaic Phase wall. Kourouniotes 1938, p. 39 noted the difference in the elevation of the wall foundations. Clinton 1988, p. 72, n. 32 was hesitant to accept the attribution of the extension wall to Kimon, because he did not find conclusive evidence for dating in the reports of Kourouniotes, and because he argued that the wall was not epigraphically attested until the 2nd century B.C. in *IG II² 1028*, in which bulls are presented for sacrifice on altars inside the walls. Because Clinton argued that altars for sacrifice were always located outside the walls of the sanctuary, the only place such altars inside the walls could be located is inside the space between the extension wall and the earlier peribolos wall.

²⁵⁰ Ziro 1991, pp. 38-55.

²⁵¹ Ziro 1991, pp. 17-47. Mylonas 1961, pp. 97-99 considered the well to date to the Second Archaic Phase. The well-head was composed of three concentric circles of limestone blocks, the upper two courses joined using double-T clamps. The inner circle is 1.00m. in diameter, the outer is 2.80m., and the lowest course, of Eleusinian stone and without clamps, is 3.40m. in diameter.

²⁵² Ziro 1991, pp. 38-47, figs. 19-20 compared this block in particular to elements from Building D of the Acropolis. The cyma reversa of the geison crown from the Kallichoron Well enclosure is similar to Building D, but the bed molding is less convincing. This block deserves further study.

²⁵³ First revealed by Philios 1883, p. 92. For subsequent discussions, see Kourouniotes 1938, pp. 33-39; Noack 1927, pp. 32-39, who called this gateway the "Alte Propylon"; Ziro 1991, pp. 50-55; Mylonas 1961, pp. 108-110.

3m. wide with a porch on its inner, northern side; it did not include an outer porch.²⁵⁴ Its western anta was composed of mudbrick courses on the northern and eastern sides of the tower H25, with the courses on the north side supported by a poros block. The eastern anta was composed of double pillars at the southern end of the expansion wall, preserved to their original height of 3.67m., set 0.60m apart, and connected with a lintel block.²⁵⁵ Bases preserved next to the antae, 2.895m. apart, contain cuttings for the wooden doorframe as well as the door leaf pivots, indication that two doorleaves opened toward the north.²⁵⁶ Between the doorframe bases is a third, non-joining, central block, several centimeters higher than the doorframe bases, which does not contain cuttings on its surface for receiving the doorleaves and so must have been a doorstep against which the doorleaves rested.²⁵⁷ The inner porch was 2.60m. deep, as indicated by the position of two square stylobate blocks, 0.85m. on each side and 0.50m. tall, for the porch columns.²⁵⁸ The western base supporting a column drum is still in situ (visible in Figure 66), while the eastern has been shifted slightly out of position.

²⁵⁴ Ziro 1991, p. 52 noted that a space of 0.90m. was left open between the northern faces of the doorframe bases and the outer faces of tower H25 and the extension wall (Figure 64). While he suggested that this space could be a small porch, the space was left uncovered.

²⁵⁵ Dimensions from Ziro 1991, p. 52. Mylonas 1961, p. 109 recorded the height of the pillars as 3.60m. The space between the pillars was filled with mudbrick.

²⁵⁶ Shallow, roughly picked ledges on the inner side of each doorframe base may indicate the position of an original threshold block. Ziro 1991, p. 52 reconstructed the opening with the wooden doorframe in place as 2.30m. wide.

²⁵⁷ Ziro 1991, p. 52 suggested it could be a base for the closed doorleaves, but the block is without cuttings for such a purpose, and it is set back a few centimeters from the line of the doors as indicated by the cuttings for the door pivots. Noack 1927, pp. 36-37 previously reconstructed a wooden threshold to connect the doorframe bases (Figure 64).

²⁵⁸ Dimensions from Ziro 1991, p. 52, n. 183. The second stylobate block may have been shifted during construction of the Classical Phase storage building. The entrance to the Delion on Paros may have been similar in form to the propylon at Th5 (Figure 65), built sometime between the end of the 6th century B.C. and c. 490-80 B.C., and including a small porch on its interior side. The foundation blocks suggest a porch 1.5x2m. Rubensohn 1962, pp. 12-13 had earlier suggested that this entrance was made of marble, which Schuller 1991, p. 83 did not accept. Dimensions from Rubensohn 1962, pp. 12-13.

Just outside Th5, the area of the stepped podium was modified during this phase. The top of the second step of the stepped podium and the face of the third step were concealed, and a square base was set up next to the remaining step at the level of the Early Classical Phase fill (Figures 62 and 72). Located at the southeastern preserved end of the stepped podium, the base included two elements, a square foundation block of black Eleusinian limestone (1.02m. on each side and 0.33m. high) surmounted by a square marble base with a square cutting (0.32m. on each side, 0.063m. deep) in its upper surface.²⁵⁹ Kourouniotes suggested, based on its location near the propylon at Th5, that the base held a statue of Hermes Propylaios.²⁶⁰ A contemporary road extended from the propylon at Th5 along the eastern face of the Second Archaic Phase wall, toward the northwest.²⁶¹

On the opposite end of the Early Classical Phase extension wall, a new northern entrance must have been introduced as a pendant to the propylon at Th5, as suggested by the Kallichoron Well and its proximity to the gateway next to H18, as well as the form of the sanctuary during the Classical Phase, when this gateway was the processional entrance to the sanctuary (Figures 62 and 63; compare to Figure 75).²⁶² Ziro suggested that the proposed northern gateway took the same form as the extant southern propylon

²⁵⁹ Dimensions and material description from Kourouniotes 1938, p. 41.

²⁶⁰ Kourouniotes 1938, p. 41; Mylonas 1961, p. 110.

²⁶¹ Kourouniotes 1935a, p. 29; Mylonas 1961, p. 111.

²⁶² This proposed gateway has received various names in previous scholarship. Kourouniotes 1932, p. 206 considered the gateway to be post-Persian (following the attribution of the extension wall to Kimon), and suggested that this gateway was the one whose repairs were described in the first few lines of the *Eleusiniaka* inscription. The inscription is discussed below in Chapter 7, pp. XX. Travlos 1949, p. 142 called this the North Pylon, and identified it as the pylon discussed in *IG II² 1672*, line 24. The inscription is discussed below in Chapter 7. Mylonas 1961, p. 104 argued that this was the Propylaia of Demeter and Kore named in *IG II² 1187*, lines 25-26. Ziro 1991, pp. 49-50 called this gateway the North Pylon. A small entrance was added during the Early Classical Phase at Th7, as a secondary access point to the area north of the Telesterion terrace. See Mylonas 1961, p. 111; Kourouniotes 1935a, p. 22.

(Th5), which is possible but cannot be confirmed since no excavations have been conducted beneath the Greater Propylaia.²⁶³

The function of the Early Classical extension and wall, as well as its entrances, is not immediately clear. The area remained a distinct space delimited from the center of the sanctuary through the Roman period, and most of the remains excavated in the area were small buildings, mostly Roman in date, identified as utilitarian in nature. This function, as an auxiliary area for the sanctuary, may have begun as soon as the Classical Phase, when a storage building and other smaller structures were constructed (and the propylon at Th5 and the stepped podium were covered). During the Early Classical Phase, however, the area seems not yet to have had this function, given the absence of smaller structures, the intramural road, the propylon, and the proposed northern entrance. Because this area had to provide access to the gateway next to H18, which became an inner entrance to the sanctuary, it was part of the processional route during this phase, and perhaps this was its function during the Early Classical Phase.

There remains difficulty, however, in the reconstruction of this route. If the proposed northern gateway were the processional entrance to the sanctuary, as it is in the Classical Phase, some problems emerge. Strongly in its favor is that a northern gateway would provide direct access from the area of the Kallichoron Well to the inner gateway, so that the processional route would circle the eastern side of the sanctuary once, between the inner gateway next to tower H18 and the entrance at Z7. This reconstruction, however, leaves out the stepped podium and the propylon at Th5, both monumental features of the sanctuary that likely should not be excluded. In other words, if the

²⁶³ Ziro 1991, p. 50.

northern entrance were the processional one, why include the propylon at Th5 and mark it with these features?

At the other end of the extension wall, the southern propylon at Th5 for many reasons could be reconstructed as the processional entrance to the area during this phase. Weighing in its favor are the propylon's monumental form, its location next to the stepped podium, the erection of the statue base, and the intramural road. If this propylon were the processional entrance, the procession could have gathered at the Kallichoron Well, then circled the northeastern side of the extension wall, and passed the stepped podium as it entered the propylon at Th5. From here, it would have traversed the intramural road along the Second Archaic Phase wall, and entered the sanctuary at the inner gateway. In this way, the processional route of the Early Classical Phase would have retained an aspect of the processional route of the Second Archaic Phase, in being channeled between two walls while approaching the inner gateway. From the inner gateway, the route would once again circle the eastern side of the Telesterion to approach the terrace at Z7. Although circuitous, this reconstruction has several appealing aspects, particularly in its use of the stepped podium and the intramural road. Yet several factors also highlight problems with it. These include the problem of a particularly circuitous route that traces a path around the walls of the sanctuary three times, the limited space available on the stepped podium for the prospective initiates to gather, and the awkward access to the propylon at Th5 created by tower H25.

Comparison with the contemporary entrance to the Acropolis in Athens (Figure 44) may tip the scales in favor of the processional entrance at Th5, despite these

hesitations.²⁶⁴ The propylon to the Acropolis also included a stepped feature in front of it, to which was added a monument base. At the Acropolis, the feature included five steps in an L-shape, which could have provided space for many spectators, while at Eleusis, the stepped podium during this phase was reduced to a single step, and thus could have accommodated fewer viewers; others may have stood near the stepped podium or on a temporary addition. Yet the position of the feature, outside of the propylon and to the right of the procession as it entered the sanctuary, was parallel to the arrangement in Athens. Also similar to the propylon at Th5, the propylon to the Acropolis was built with respect to an older peribolos wall, which created an indirect path from the end of the processional route through the propylon and into the sanctuary. On the Acropolis, the members of the procession as they approached the propylon were framed by the older walls, then forced to turn fairly sharply to the northeast to enter the propylon. At Eleusis, members of the procession had to walk around two sides of tower H25 in order to proceed to the propylon. Although several aspects of the approach to the propylon at Th5 may seem awkward, the entrance to the Acropolis, home of the city's most important festival, the Panathenaia, also included a propylon with similar characteristics. Thus, the propylon at Th5 could have been the processional entrance to the sanctuary at Eleusis during the Early Classical Phase. An entrance must have existed at the northern end of the sanctuary next to the Kallichoron Well contemporary with the

²⁶⁴ Several reconstructions and dates have been offered for the entrance to the Acropolis during the Late Archaic and Early Classical periods. Dinsmoor 1980 proposed an entrance to the Acropolis with three phases in quick succession during the 480s B.C. with the stepped forecourt at the first phase, an intermediate krepidoma, and finally a propylon. Eiteljorg 1995 proposed an entrance without a propylon, with the forecourt creating a lower courtyard and the krepidoma of Dinsmoor's reconstruction creating an upper courtyard, both in front of the Mycenaean entrance to the Acropolis. Shear 1999 proposed a single phase propylon, whose design included the forecourt, the krepidoma, as well as superstructure, built between the end of the 6th century B.C. and 490 B.C. (Figure 44).

propylon at Th5, but it may not have been the processional entrance during this phase, although it certainly gains this significance during the Classical Phase later in the century.

Inside the main area of the sanctuary (within the limits of Second Archaic Phase wall), the Telesterion terrace was leveled and expanded as part of the project to build a Telesterion twice the size as that of the Second Archaic Phase. This enormous task was completed by filling in the low areas to the north, south, and east of the Telesterion terrace, particularly most of the space between the First and Second Archaic Phase walls (compare Figures 48 and 62).²⁶⁵ The leveling fill extended from the northern retaining wall at Th3 to H29.²⁶⁶

In order to support the extensive fill required to level the Telesterion terrace, three retaining walls were used. The first was the northern retaining wall at Th3 (Figures 8 and 68), which was 9.50m. long, and stretched between the tower at H21 and the eastern end of the new sacred way.²⁶⁷ When the wall was revealed, Kourouniotes noted that the wall was 0.85m. high, and composed of a socle of polygonal blocks with mudbrick above.²⁶⁸ Because at this point the ground level was just starting to become lower, this mudbrick wall at Th3 could have easily supported this part of the fill. The second wall was the northeastern retaining wall formed by reinforcing the Second Archaic Phase wall between H21 and the eastern anta of the gateway at H24 (which was covered by the fill) with a mudbrick wall (Figures 68 and 69).²⁶⁹ The additional brick wall was 2.00m. wide

²⁶⁵ For the filling in of the space between the First and Second Archaic Phase walls during the Early Classical Period, see by Kourouniotes 1935b, pp. 73-75; Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 18-22; Mylonas 1961, pp. 107-108; Travlos 1988, p. 94.

²⁶⁶ Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 9-12 suggested that the southern extent of the fill must have been located near H29.

²⁶⁷ Dimensions from Mylonas 1961, p. 108.

²⁶⁸ Kourouniotes 1935a, p. 21.

²⁶⁹ Discussion and dimensions for the wall are provided by Mylonas 1961, p. 108 and Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 18-21.

and formed by courses of bricks with clay mortar. Kourouniotes observed that the well-preserved mudbrick courses on the interior side of the wall at tower H21 must have been covered by fill not long after their installation, that the brick wall partly overlay the Second Archaic Phase road in the area, and that the brick wall would serve to reinforce the Second Archaic Phase wall where the ground level dropped down to the northeast.²⁷⁰

The third retaining wall at the southeastern limit of the fill reused the Second Archaic Phase wall socle between tower H25 and H29 (Figures 70 and 71).²⁷¹ Above the original socle, the earlier mudbrick was replaced by a stone wall of pseudo-isodomic masonry. The exterior face of the reconstructed wall presents regular courses of limestone headers and stretchers, but the interior face is rough and irregular with a rubble fill in the spaces. The reconstructed part of the wall was 1.70m. wide, and preserved to a height of over 5m.²⁷² Similar to the retention of the stepped podium during the Early Classical Phase, the Archaic altar at Z13 was again framed by a niche in the rebuilding of the wall, as it had been in the wall's original form.

The excavators believed the extension wall and the expansion of the Telesterion and its terrace to be contemporary events that were undertaken as repairs to the damage caused by a Persian invasion of the sanctuary.²⁷³ According to Herodotos (9.65.2), the Persians managed to invade the sanctuary, and the excavators noted that there was archaeological evidence for it in the destruction of the Second Archaic Phase Telesterion, repair to the Second Archaic Phase wall, and damage at the sacred house (#12 on Figure

²⁷⁰ Kourouniotes 1935a, p. 18.

²⁷¹ For discussion of this wall, see Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 9-12; Kourouniotes 1935b, pp. 73-78; Noack 1927, pp. 30-32, 90-92; Mylonas 1961, pp. 107-108; Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, pp. 282-283.

²⁷² Dimensions from Noack 1927, fig. 12.

²⁷³ Kourouniotes 1938, pp. 39-41; Mylonas and Travlos 1955, p. 56; and Mylonas 1961, p. 71 noted that the fill was contemporary with the construction of the Early Classical Phase extension wall.

8).²⁷⁴ Of these, further investigation has shown that only the sacred house preserved signs of this damage.²⁷⁵ By contrast, Shear has shown that the Second Archaic Phase Telesterion was not destroyed by the Persians, but was systematically dismantled before their arrival in order to prepare for the construction of an early 5th century B.C. Telesterion, just before c. 480 B.C.²⁷⁶

Similarly, the pseudo-isodomic reconstruction of the Second Archaic Phase wall between H25 and H29 done during the Early Classical Phase was considered by the excavators to be part of the post-Persian repairs at the sanctuary.²⁷⁷ Without evidence for burning or destruction to the Second Archaic Phase wall, however, it seems more likely that the mudbrick was removed and replaced with stone masonry in order to serve as a strong retaining wall for the leveling fill.²⁷⁸ The pseudo-isodomic retaining wall would have provided better support than the mudbrick superstructure of the Second Archaic Phase wall where it was needed the most, at the point with the lowest ground level east of the Telesterion terrace (Figure 18, see also Figure 71).

Herodotos' comment and the evidence of destruction noted by the excavators indicate that the invasion happened, but it is clear that resulting damage was less extensive than originally proposed. The Persian presence interrupted construction of the new Telesterion and perhaps the project of expanding the Telesterion terrace but did not

²⁷⁴ Philios 1885, p. 73, n. 2 observed that he had not seen evidence of the Persian destruction, but that Herodotos' comment is so explicit that it cannot be doubted. The Persian destruction of the sanctuary was characterized by the excavators as extensive: see Philios 1906, p. 102; Kourouniotes 1935b, p. 73, Mylonas 1961, pp. 88-90, 106-107; Travlos 1988, p. 94.

²⁷⁵ See Kourouniotes 1937, pp. 42-52 and Mylonas 1961, pp. 101-103.

²⁷⁶ Shear 1982. For the earlier view, see Kourouniotes and Travlos 1938a, esp. 111; Mylonas 1961, pp. 88-90, 111-113.

²⁷⁷ This view has persisted in scholarship. Shear 1982, p. 133 and Ziro 1991, p. 49 accepted that this section of the wall was a post-Persian repair.

²⁷⁸ Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, p. 35 also suggested that the reconstructed wall could have been undertaken as a retaining wall, without also being a post-Persian repair.

cause significant damage to the walls of the sanctuary. Rather than a response to historical circumstances, then, these architectural changes were deliberately initiated to modify the appearance of the sanctuary.

During the Early Classical Phase, an alteration of the processional route inside the sanctuary occurred. The fundamental characteristics of the route were maintained, including circling the eastern side of the Telesterion terrace, approach to the central terrace at Z7 and the inclusion of a well before a gateway, as well as having inner and outer gateways, but the configuration of these elements changed. First, no longer did the path around the sanctuary include two pyres. Instead, the path included one pyre, pyre Beta, which must have been sufficient to receive the offerings of those along the route.²⁷⁹ Next, Well W and the inner gateway at H24 were covered. To replace one of these lost features, the northern end of the sanctuary now included the Kallichoron Well. If the processional entrance to the sanctuary was the propylon at Th5, the Well was approached before the propylon, just over 100m. away. If the processional entrance had been a gateway beneath the Greater Propylaia, this would place the well immediately in front of the gateway. In either reconstruction, the Kallichoron Well would be located physically and experientially ahead of the entrance. Although the arrangement of the well before the gateway was the same as during the Second Archaic Phase, the features were in a very different topographical setting. Previously, Well W had been located in a niche within the First Archaic Phase wall, in a narrow passage before the gateway at H24. By contrast, during the Classical Phase, although the Kallichoron Wall was itself enclosed, the feature projected into the large open space before the gateway. Finally, the

²⁷⁹ Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, pp. 35-37. The latest date of the material in pyre Beta is cited by Kokkou-Vyridi as belonging to the first half of the 5th century B.C.

processional route continued to include an inner and outer gateway, with the gateway next to tower H18 changing in function from the outer entrance to the sanctuary to the inner entrance. As the inner gateway, the entrance next to H18 may have served as a marker of progress toward the Telesterion; perhaps it could have been closed at a certain time during the procession to restrict movement at a prescribed time.

Finally, two further characteristics of the processional route that had a particular impact on the prospective initiate's experience were eliminated in the Early Classical Phase, the effect of being channeled through a narrow passage and the movement of descent and ascent along the path. The fill needed to expand the Telesterion terrace brought the area between the First Archaic Phase wall and the Second Archaic Phase peribolos wall up to the level of pyre Beta on the south and the sacred way on the north. This change meant that the members of the procession circled the Telesterion without experiencing the descent or ascent of the previous phases, which had perhaps had a connection to the journey of Kore to the underworld and back again; without this association, circling the Telesterion would have lost this additional layer of meaning. The expansion fill also eliminated the narrow passage between the First and Second Archaic Phase walls. In its place, the members of the procession followed the path with only the Second Archaic Phase wall to their left, on the eastern side of the route. To their right, at the west of the route, they could have had full view of the abandoned foundations of the Telesterion as they made their journey.

The ways in which the processional route was reconfigured suggest that the objectives in design were to have a gathering area in front of the northern end of the sanctuary, in other words at the end of the sacred way from Athens, and a wider path

around the Telesterion. At the northern end, the Kallichoron Well stood in a large, level space, presumably unimpeded by earlier structures, which provided an area for gathering, and perhaps dancing, before the well. The well was also located in a public area, outside of the sanctuary's walls, which made it accessible to a larger audience. The wider path around the Telesterion would have facilitated the movement of the procession of prospective initiates, whose numbers continued to steadily increase during this period.

At the end of their journey from Athens, participants in the procession during the festival confronted at Eleusis the propylon at Th5, reminiscent of the propylon many would have seen at the Acropolis above the City Eleusinion in Athens. The path to the Telesterion passed through an inner gateway next to tower H18, then proceeded around the eastern side of the Telesterion terrace to the entrance at Z7. In the years between c. 480 B.C. and the middle of the century, in place of the Telesterion the prospective initiates saw an abandoned construction site, with some foundations for a new building prepared. It is likely that the central acts of initiation during these years may have been performed in a temporarily built structure. These modifications were intended to elaborate the sanctuary in order to impress and accommodate its Athenian and international audience as the festival of the Mysteries was brought to a pan-Hellenic status, as documented in *IG I³ 6*, but the interruption caused by the Persians left the heart of the sanctuary in an unfinished state.

Conclusion

From the start of the 5th century B.C., and especially in its second decade, monumental changes were undertaken at the host sanctuaries for the Mysteries. At the City Eleusinion, the project of expansion begun at the end of the Second Archaic Phase

was completed and at the sanctuary at Eleusis expansion of the sanctuary also occurred, resulting in a new processional route, a larger Telesterion terrace, and the start of a bigger Telesterion. Between the sanctuaries, this period is the earliest for which there are road layers of the sacred way.²⁸⁰

The sanctuaries were monumentalized on scale with other major building projects in Athens and Attica in the first years of the democracy, and particularly after Marathon, when the Athenians had great confidence in themselves and their ability to defeat, with divine favor, a powerful enemy.²⁸¹ On the Acropolis, the Older Parthenon was begun after 490 B.C., designed as a large Doric temple built of Pentelic marble, in perhaps the first major use of this local Athenian material.²⁸² The entrance to the Acropolis may have been monumentalized by a propylon about this time (Figure 44). These building projects indicate the self-confidence felt by most Athenians after Marathon, but at least one voice stood out from the majority, that of Themistokles, who advised the Athenians to prepare themselves for Persian retaliation. Heeding his advice, the city was fortified and its naval fleet strengthened.

²⁸⁰ The best evidence for this comes from the part of the Sacred Way inside the Kerameikos, where the road pre-dated the Themistoklean wall of 478 B.C. Costaki 2006, pp. 493-98, cat. VI.16.

²⁸¹ Parker 1996, pp. 122-41. Other sanctuaries in Attica were also expanding during this period, including the construction of propyla and temples. One example is the propylon for the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion, preserved in poros foundations, on which the Classical propylon was later built (Figure 60). For a general description, see Carpenter 1971, pp. 67-69. In his handbook of Greek architecture, Dinsmoor 1950 dated this propylon at Sounion to c. 498 B.C. (in chart after p. 340), but later Dinsmoor 1974, pp. 24-28 doubted that the poros foundations indicated an earlier building phase for the Classical propylon, as did Travlos 1988, p. 404. Goette 2000, pp. 23-25 confirmed that the poros foundation indeed belonged to an Early Classical propylon. The form of this propylon is not known for certain, but presumably was similar to that of the Classical propylon. At the sanctuary of Aphaia on Aegina, a propylon was built in the 490s B.C. (Figure 61). See Carpenter 1971, pp. 42-46. Dinsmoor 1950 dated the propylon to 495-85 B.C. (chart after p. 340). Williams 1987, pp. 669-80 outlined the revised chronology for the sanctuary of Aphaia on Aegina, and dated the building of the new temple (and contemporary sanctuary development) to the 490s B.C. This propylon included distyle in antis porches on both sides of the doorwall, and had a single door. In front of the northern porch, steps led up to the level of the main part of the sanctuary.

²⁸² Camp 2001, p. 52.

When the Persians returned to Attica in 480 B.C., Themistokles' warnings became prophetic, with Athens sacked and Attica ravaged. Fortunately, quickly after this destruction, Athens was soon able to defeat the Persians later in 480 B.C. at Salamis, and again in 479 B.C. at Plataea. This time, however, other Greeks joined together with the Athenians to fight the Persians. With these victories and the knowledge that their leadership led to military success, Athens took the first steps in its imperial aspirations, particularly in the establishment of the Delian League in 478/7 B.C. Major building began once again in Athens with the north wall of the Acropolis constructed in the 460s B.C., and the Stoa Poikile and the Tholos built in the Agora about this time or c. 470 B.C. Construction at the City Eleusinion followed approximately the same timetable, with the temple of Triptolemos completed, and perhaps a porch added to the sanctuary's entrance, during these decades. The primary buildings associated with the Panathenaia on the Acropolis and the Mysteries at Eleusis, however, were not immediately rebuilt, perhaps following the terms of the Oath of Plataea. As was the case with the Telesterion, left unfinished in the wake of the Persian advance on Attica, the Older Parthenon and the propylon of the Acropolis were left incomplete. Later in the 5th century B.C., all three structures would be rebuilt in more elaborate forms.

Between the start of the 5th century B.C. and the 460s B.C., the building projects at the sanctuary at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion reflect the development of Athens' self-identity during these decades. After Marathon, construction at Eleusis followed on par with the new construction on the Acropolis in Athens, with both sanctuaries meant to gain new propyla and other venues for their primary festivals. Construction at the City Eleusinion, as well as the monumentalization of the sacred way between Athens and

Eleusis, both of which took place not long after Plataea, may indicate a desire to draw attention to the role of Athens in the cult and festival, with its new temple highlighting visually this sanctuary of the goddesses in the city of Athens. The contemporary prominence of Triptolemos in Athenian vase painting also highlighted the connection of Athens to the goddesses at Eleusis. These projects may reflect the confidence and pride felt by the Athenians after the victories over the Persians. In the years after Plataea, cult administration, as recorded in epigraphical evidence, demonstrates Athens' promotion of the cult within its development of imperialist objectives. As documented in *IG I³ 6*, provisions were made, through the sacred truce, for larger number of prospective initiates to travel to the sanctuary at Eleusis, which may indicate promotion of the cult to a greater audience than ever before. The inscription also recorded that the first fruit dedications to the goddesses were now stored on the Acropolis, further linking the sanctuary at Eleusis with the Acropolis, as accomplished through architectural projects begun earlier in the century.

The unfinished character of the Telesterion terrace also linked the sanctuary at Eleusis to the Acropolis in Athens. On the Acropolis, Persian destruction had left the Old Temple of Athena and the Older Parthenon as charred ruins. As Ferrari has shown, these remains were utilized in what she called a “choreography of ruins,” in which burned and damaged pieces of architecture were employed to create highly visible memorials of this important event in Athenian history, as evident in the pieces of the Older Parthenon and the Old Temple of Athena used in the northern wall of the Acropolis.²⁸³ Furthermore, the remains of the foundations of the Old Temple of Athena were left in place and were a key

²⁸³ Ferrari 2002, pp. 25-28.

element in the design of the Acropolis in the Classical period.²⁸⁴ Ferrari argued that the remains were left in place until the Roman period, with the Parthenon, Erechtheion, and Propylaia designed with respect to them, as a monumental signifier of the ultimate victory of the Athenians against a destructive enemy. Recently, Gerding has proposed that the remains of the foundations of the Old Temple of Athena were covered over during development of the Acropolis in the Classical period, in order to create a large area for gathering before the altar of Athena, which remained in place east of the Old Temple of Athena (#12 on Figure 84).²⁸⁵ In this proposal, the loss of the ruined foundations signified only the success of the Athenians, without visual reference to the realities of Persian presence in the city. A balance between these two proposals may be a better solution. The designers of the Acropolis building program in the Classical period clearly intended references to Persian destruction, considering the prominent display of pieces from the Older Parthenon and the Old Temple of Athena in the rebuilt walls of the Acropolis, with the latter visible from the Panathenaic Way in the Agora. Even if the top of the foundations of the Old Temple of Athena were covered to create a level terrace before the altar, the northern side of the foundations remained visible on the western side of the Erechtheion. In addition, the caryatid porch of the Erechtheion, built over these foundations, physically linked the old and new structures. At Eleusis, the construction of the Telesterion had been interrupted by the arrival of the Persians in Attica, as Shear has shown. Yet the unfinished foundations of the Telesterion were left visible for nearly as

²⁸⁴ Based on his study of a fragment of an Ionic capital from the Acropolis and the the foundations of the Old Temple of Athena, Korres 1997b argued that a tall free-standing Ionic column stood north of the Old Temple, in the area of the Kekropion. After the destruction of the Old Temple by the Persians, the remains of this column were built into the north wall of the Acropolis and another monument was erected in its place.

²⁸⁵ Gerding 2006, pp. 390-93.

long as the foundations on the Acropolis. Further, epigraphical evidence indicates that parts of this building were to be reused in places visible to those traveling along the sacred way to Eleusis, in the bridge over the Rheitoi Lakes and in the sanctuary's peribolos wall, similar to the visibility of architectural elements for those on the Panathenaic Way in Athens.²⁸⁶ Finally, the Classical Telesterion was built over the remains of the Telesterion of the Early Classical period, parallel to the location of the caryatid porch of the Erechtheion with respect to the foundations of the Old Temple of Athena. Therefore, although the heart of the sanctuary at Eleusis was not destroyed by the Persians, the treatment and use of the foundations of the Telesterion created a story that linked both sacred places to the same fate. Buildings in both sanctuaries signified the ultimate triumph of Athens.

²⁸⁶ Shear 1982, pp. 130-31. The re-use of blocks from the temple for both purposes is indicated in *IG I³ 81*, lines 5-9.

Chapter 6: The Classical Phase (460-404/3 B.C.)

Introduction

During the second half of the 5th century B.C., the Mysteries and the sanctuary at Eleusis came under increasingly stricter Athenian administration as the cult of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis became a key part of Athens' imperialist agenda.²⁸⁷ Athenian administration over the course of the century increased with the establishment of the *epistatai*, a board of officials to supervise the money of the Two Goddesses, first referred to in the so-called Koroibos decree (*IG I³ 32*), most likely dating to 432/1 B.C.²⁸⁸ In this inscription, the *epistatai* were set up to act as administration for the sanctuary at Eleusis under the direction of the Athenian *boule*. The First Fruits decree of 435 or the 420s B.C. (*IG I³ 78=IG I² 76*), in which Athens stated for the first time that the first fruits must be given to Athens by its allies and then by Athens to the *hieropoioi* from Eleusis, was the most explicit expression of Athens' imperialist objectives with regard to the Eleusinian cult of Demeter and Kore and the Mysteries.²⁸⁹ Even more than supervising the

²⁸⁷ For a discussion of the transfer of administrative authority, see Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 73-77; Clinton 1979, p. 4; Clinton 1974, p. 11, n. 8.

²⁸⁸ Clinton 2005a, pp. 40-42, cat. 30. The inscription was found at Eleusis, but within the text are instructions to place a copy at the City Eleusinion. The *epistatai* are not mentioned by name, but can be inferred as the board of five men mentioned as reporting to the *boule*. See *Agora XXXI*, p. 42, n. 20, cat. I, 44, in which Miles argued for c. 450 BC as the date for the inscription, so that the Eleusinian board and the Parthenon board were both established about the same time. Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 25-27 dated the inscription to after 433/2 B.C., after the *epistatai* in charge of the Parthenon were put out of office because she argued that two such building committees could not co-exist. Clinton 1987, p. 256 dated the inscription to 432/1 B.C., because the inscription referred to the *epistatai* of the Parthenon as no longer in service, presumably because construction of the Parthenon was complete. This inscription is called the Koroibos decree because the architect Koroibos is called for an audit and is referred to as involved in projects at the City Eleusinion.

²⁸⁹ Clinton 2005a, pp. 37-39, cat. 28a, and pp. 39-40, cat. 28b. For discussions of the First Fruit decree, see Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 29-95 and Wickkiser 2003, pp. 299-303. Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 73-95 dated the inscription to 435 B.C. because it did not link the *epistatai* with the first fruit dedications. This connection is not mentioned until *IG I³ 391* (422/1 B.C.), in which the *epistatai* received money from the *hieropoioi* from the first fruits. Wickkiser 2003, pp. 160-63, supported a date of 420s B.C. because it restricted construction in the Pelargikon, perhaps in response to building activity there at the start of the Peloponnesian War, and because the collectors of the first fruits are called *εκλογεῖς*, the same term used for

dedications made to the goddesses, here Athens advised its allies to participate in the cult at Eleusis, just as Athens insisted its allies take part in the Panathenaia.²⁹⁰ Later, the *epistatai* came to have a supervisory role over the first fruit offerings, which had previously only been under the authority of the *hieropoioi*, as is recorded in *IG I³ 6* and *IG I³ 391* (422/1-419/8 B.C.).²⁹¹ Near the end of the 5th century B.C., *IG I³ 386* and *387* (408/7 B.C.) recorded that the *epistatai* assumed complete administration and supervision of the first fruit offerings and the assets of the sanctuary at Eleusis, the City Eleusinion, as well as the treasures of the goddesses on the Acropolis.²⁹²

Storage of the first fruit dedications and treasures of the goddesses on the Acropolis, as is first referred to in *IG I³ 6* (470-60 B.C.) and then again in *IG I³ 386* (408/7 B.C.), demonstrated the close connection between Athens and the sanctuary at Eleusis.²⁹³ Moreover, introduction of the Lesser Mysteries, a preliminary stage to initiation that occurred in Anthesterion, some seven months before the Greater Mysteries, indicated the deepening link between Athens and the Mysteries during the 5th century B.C.²⁹⁴ Attendance at the Lesser Mysteries, which may have taken place either in Agrai,

collectors of the imperial tribute, whose position was established in 426 B.C. The decree gave instructions for the Athenians to build three storehouses for offerings at Eleusis (lines 11-12). A narrow extension of the Classical Phase wall (2m. wide) from tower I15 to the Second Archaic Phase tower H21 created a structure of triangular shape identified as one of these storehouses (Figures 8 and 73). For the connection of this structure to the storehouse of the inscription, see Noack 1927, pp. 193-94; Mylonas 1961, pp. 126-128; Clinton 1987, p. 259; Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 28-29. Associating this structure with the inscription is problematic, however. The inscription dated either to 435 or the 420s B.C., and was in any case later than the wall and storehouse. In addition, the inscription referred to three storehouses, but this structure is the only example of the type.

²⁹⁰ For the obligatory participation by Athenian allies in the Panathenaia, see Shear 2001, pp. 139-43; 542-52.

²⁹¹ Clinton 1974, p. 15, Clinton 2005a, pp. 56-57, cat. 45. In *IG I³ 391*, the sale of the first fruits by the *hieropoioi* to the *epistatai* is recorded. Cavanaugh 1996, p. 74 dated the inscription to 422/1-419/8 B.C. The *epistatai* are referred to by name for the first time in this inscription.

²⁹² Cavanaugh 1996, p. 75.

²⁹³ Wickkiser 2003, pp. 160-63; Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 73-74; Clinton 1984, pp. 51-55.

²⁹⁴ Wickkiser 2003, pp. 125-26; Parke 1977, pp. 56-58, 122-24; Mylonas 1961, pp. 239-43; Dillon 1997, pp. 2, 156-57.

just outside the walls of Athens on the Ilissos river, or at the City Eleusinion, seems not to have been required for initiation at Eleusis, but it was an important part of the program, at least in the 5th and 4th centuries B.C.²⁹⁵

Corresponding to the increased Athenian administration of the Mysteries and the closer connection of the sanctuary at Eleusis to the Acropolis, construction at Eleusis, in particular, equipped the sanctuary to accommodate the large number of prospective initiates encouraged by Athens to attend the festival. This project formed part of the great program of Athenian building in the mid-5th century B.C. With the new Telesterion and terrace, the last remaining cultic features of the Archaic period, pyre Beta, the entrance at Z7, the altar (Z13), the stepped podium (Z14), and the statue base, were eliminated. These changes affected the processional route, and they indicate the final transformation of the sanctuary from its form in the Archaic period to its Classical arrangement, which remained at the sanctuary through the Roman period. The earlier features had been connected to movement around the eastern side of the central terrace and the performance of several rituals by prospective initiates along the way. In its place, the processional route of the 5th century B.C. focused on large spaces for gathering and ritual performances by groups of prospective initiates, in front of the outer northern gateway and inside the Telesterion.

Furthermore, during the Classical Phase, the experience of the processional route between the sanctuaries was changed by the framing of its start and end by monumental architecture. The City Eleusinion was indirectly framed by its position below the major construction taking place on the Acropolis, while the path at Eleusis was marked by the

²⁹⁵ Simms 1990, p. 183, n. 1; Clinton 1974, p. 13, n. 13. Clinton 1989b, pp. 1502-03 noted a lack of testimony for the Lesser Mysteries in the Roman period.

new Telesterion, similar in scale and form to contemporary major sacred architecture of the Acropolis and its slopes. The end of the sacred way at Eleusis was therefore linked visually by its architecture during the Classical Phase to the Acropolis, the historical and religious heart of Athens.

Athens

During the Classical Phase, the City Eleusinion retained the First Archaic Phase entrance on its southern side (Figure 6), perhaps embellished with a porch earlier in the 5th century B.C. The only new construction of this period was a long monument base located to the east of the temple of Triptolemos, dated by Miles to the third quarter of the 5th century B.C. on the basis of pottery from a footing trench for its foundations.²⁹⁶ The path of the processional route into the sanctuary seems not to have been altered during this phase, but the monument made a dramatic impact on the landscape of the sanctuary. The foundations for the base, composed of two courses of poros blocks, are 2.20m. wide and are oriented east-west (Figure 58). The preserved length of the base is 14.10m., and its maximum length could have been as much as 15.60m. Miles suggested that the narrow foundations likely supported a long monument base for the display of stelai.²⁹⁷ Alternatively, its dimensions and location near the temple could also support identification as foundations for an altar.²⁹⁸ If correct, these remains could indicate the

²⁹⁶ Material, dimensions, and date from *Agora XXXI*, p. 63.

²⁹⁷ Another possibility is that the foundations could have supported a base for statues. Its dimensions are comparable to monuments such as the Progonoi monument dedicated at Delos by Antigonos Gonatas (c. 272-39 B.C.), which was 1.30m. by c. 21m. (*Delos V*, fig. 103), or the monument of the Eponymous Heroes in the Agora, built in the mid-4th century B.C., which was c. 16m. long and contained bronze statues of the ten Eponymous Heroes (Mattusch 1994, pp. 74-76).

²⁹⁸ The long and narrow foundations are similar to those of some examples of rectangular altar foundations. The Argive Heraion included an altar with foundations that were 17x2.40m. See Ohnesorg 2005, p. 214; Roux 1961, pp. 62-65, fig. 8. At the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros, the altar (c. 425 B.C.) was 15.80x3.70m., and located opposite the temple. See Ohnesorg 2005, pp. 172-175, 213. These examples included steps in front of the altar, but other long altars, such as the altars of the 5th century B.C. at the

location of two types of sacrifice known from literary and epigraphical sources. First, during his visit to the sanctuary, Pausanias described seeing a bronze statue of a bull being led to sacrifice in front of the temple of Triptolemos; this dedication may have commemorated the sacrifice of bulls as the First Fruits decree instructed should be offered to Triptolemos.²⁹⁹ Second, two 4th century B.C. inscriptions record the sacrifice of ewes during *myesis*, which Clinton has shown could have taken place at either the City Eleusinion or Eleusis.³⁰⁰ In both examples, the sacrifices described could most appropriately occur in the public area of the sanctuary. It is possible that other, more substantial construction activity took place in the unexcavated area to the east associated with the sanctuary because in *IG I³ 32* (432/1 B.C.), the architect Koroibos was called to take part in the audit of money spent at the City Eleusinion, which implies that he was working there at this time.³⁰¹

Eleusis

The focus of architectural attention in this phase was construction at Eleusis. Since the locus of initiation, the Telesterion, had been left in an unfinished state after the Persian Wars, the sanctuary needed a hall of initiation of appropriate scale to accommodate and impress those encouraged by Athens to participate in the Mysteries. In order to support a larger Telesterion, the central terrace had to be expanded to the east;

sanctuaries of Aphaia on Aegina (28.50x3.80m.) and Zeus at Nemea (nearly 41m. long and 2.42m wide), did not. There is no evidence cited for steps from the foundations from the City Eleusinion. For the altar on Aegina, see Yavis 1949, pp. 124-25. For Nemea, see Miller 1989, pp. 148-52. From the Archaic period, the sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros at Selinous included an altar 16.15x3.15m. See Ohnesorg 2005, p. 218. The sanctuary of Apollo Pythios at Argos included a 4th century B.C. altar 16.20x5m. See Ohnesorg 2005, p. 214; Roux 1961, pp. 77-78, fig. 9. From the Hellenistic period, the sanctuary of Artemis at Orchomenos included an altar 17.30x3.54m. See Ohnesorg 2005, p. 217. In the discussion of this monument and the area around it, Miles in *Agora XXXI*, pp. 62-63 did not note the presence or absence of signs of burning at the monument.

²⁹⁹ Pausanias 1.14.4. *IG I³ 78*, lines 35-40.

³⁰⁰ *IG II² 1673*, line 62 and *IG II² 1672*, line 207. Clinton 1988, pp. 69-70 discussed these epigraphical references.

³⁰¹ *Agora XXXI*, pp. 42-43; Clinton 1987, pp. 256-58.

expansion to the west was made impossible by the acropolis. The fill required for the massive terrace, extending 10-20m. further to the east and 40m. further to the southeast than the Second Archaic Phase wall, covered the remains of the cultic features of the Archaic period, including pyre Beta, the entrance at Z7, the stepped podium (Z14), the statue base, and the altar (Z13) (the Classical Phase is labeled with “T” on Figure 8; also compare Figures 62 and 75).³⁰² To support this fill, a new wall was built around the eastern and southeastern sides of the sanctuary, from H21 to just south of H38. The design of the new wall created a three-sided structure, identified as a storehouse, at the wall’s northern end. The storehouse measured approximately 33 x 13.50m. and was delimited by the walls of three different phases (Figures 8, 73, and 74).³⁰³ Its construction blocked the propylon at Th5 with a brick wall and modified the intramural road that had previously extended from the propylon at Th5 toward the northwest. New layers were built to take the road from the storehouse entrance at S1 toward the entrance next to the Kallichoron Well.³⁰⁴

The last connections with the processional route of the Archaic period, therefore, were eliminated. Without the pyre or the entrance at Z7, there would be no reason to circle the eastern side of the central terrace before approaching the Telesterion. Thus, circling the sanctuary was no longer part of the experience of entering the sanctuary during the Classical Period. It is clear that the processional route entered through the gateway next to the Kallichoron Well, passed through the inner gateway, and proceeded

³⁰² Kourouniotes 1938, p. 34. An additional structure dated to the Classical Phase is located in the so-called Plutonion (the Mirthless Rock), dated to the second half of the 5th century B.C. by Noack 1927, p. 79.

³⁰³ The entrance to the storehouse was located at S1. For a detailed description of the structure and identification as storehouse, see Noack 1927, pp. 189-93.

³⁰⁴ For these two phases for the road, as well as a description of a Roman stoa that covered the road, see Kourouniotes 1935a, pp. 28-29.

directly to the Telesterion. The offerings made at the pyre, perhaps in honor of the dead, could have been moved to another part of the sanctuary. It could also be possible that the actions performed at the pyre could have been eliminated from the process of approaching the Telesterion, as indicated by the gradual loss of both pyres over the course of the 5th century B.C. The lack of firm evidence leaves either possibility open to consideration. The loss of the last elements of the Stepped Podium Area may signal the final transfer of gathering and other actions preliminary to entering the sanctuary to the northern end of the sanctuary. Combined with the closing of the propylon at Th5, this resulted in an entirely new form of the entrance to the sanctuary. In place of the indirect and somewhat awkward arrangement of the propylon and the stepped podium, which could not support large numbers of people, the northern entrance could be approached directly from the sacred way. Upon arrival at the sanctuary, members of the procession encountered a gateway or propylon, which they could see immediately in front of them, with the Kallichoron Well and a place for gathering before it. It is possible that one or more altars were located in this space in front of the gateway, to replace the Archaic altar covered by Classical fill. These changes ensured that all the spaces used during the procession and for any rituals connection with it were now located in spaces large enough to accommodate a large crowd in a monumental setting.

The wall built during the Classical Phase framed the eastern and southern side of the sanctuary (Figure 75).³⁰⁵ Its lower courses, composed of Eleusinian stone set in regular courses 0.41-0.48m. high, formed a base for the wall between 1.67-1.80m. in height. The upper courses were composed of poros blocks in isodomic courses, with

³⁰⁵ For wall description, including material and dimensions, see Noack 1927, pp. 183-188. Mylonas 1961, p. 124 also presented discussion of the wall. For additional photographs of the wall, see Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, figs. 17 and 20.

course height varying between 0.38 and 0.45m. The outer faces of the lower blocks were left with a slightly bulging rusticated finish, while the faces of the upper blocks were carved with smoothly drafted masonry, 0.03m. wide, around a slightly rougher face projecting 0.012-0.013m. (Figure 76). Two round towers (I12 and I15), between 9m. and 10m. in diameter and c. 75m. apart, marked the northeastern and southeastern corners of the wall.³⁰⁶

The Classical Phase wall was 3.30m. thick, significantly wider than any of the earlier walls at the sanctuary.³⁰⁷ It was also wider than peribolos walls from most other sanctuaries and fortification walls during the Classical period, and was more akin in scale and purpose to the walls built around the Acropolis or the Long Walls in Athens, with which it was contemporary.³⁰⁸ The walls around the Acropolis were built between the 460s and c. 430 B.C., and included reused elements from the Older Parthenon and the Old Temple of Athena, as well as sections of new Classical construction of isodomic masonry, similar to the wall at Eleusis. The Long Walls were begun in the 450s B.C., and ensured protection of the port of Athens, and safe passage from Athenians from the city to the sea. The walls at Eleusis served a similar purpose.

The thick wall at Eleusis may have been necessary to retain the immense amount of fill needed to support the extension of the central terrace for the new Telesterion, but

³⁰⁶ Skias 1895, pp. 164-168 described excavation of the area around tower I12.

³⁰⁷ Thickness of Classical Phase wall from Noack 1927, pp. 183-88. Thicknesses of other walls at the sanctuary at Eleusis are as follows. E1 from the Pre-Archaic Phase is 1.20m. thick (dimension from Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, p. 42), the Second Archaic Phase wall is 2.65m. thick, (dimension from Ziro 1991, pp. 13-17), and the Early Classical Phase wall is 1.70-1.80m. thick (dimension from Ziro 1991, pp. 49-50).

³⁰⁸ The walls that surrounded the Acropolis at this time were thicker than those at Eleusis, up to 6m. wide. The walls around the Acropolis were built in stages between the 460s and c. 430 B.C. For discussion of the walls around the Acropolis, see Shear 1999, pp. 95-105; Hurwit 1999, pp. 142, 159-60. In his study of Attic fortifications, McCredie 1966, pp. 33-34 noted that the fortification wall at Thorikos (410/9 B.C.) is 2.60m. thick and the Dema wall (McCredie 1966, pp. 63-66) in its widest masonry is 2.70-2.80m. thick (dating perhaps to the later 4th century B.C.). The mid-4th century B.C. fortification wall at Halikarnassos is up to 2.60m. thick, and the wall at Priene is generally 2.00m. thick. See McNicoll 1997, pp. 17-22 for Halikarnassos and McNicoll 1997, pp. 49-51 for Priene.

the scale of the Classical wall also gave it a distinctively defensive character similar to that of the Second Archaic Phase.³⁰⁹ During the earlier phase, the location of the sanctuary at Eleusis on the border with Megara, which at the time was a hotly disputed territory, may have necessitated the additional protection offered by the heavy walls. Once again in the Classical period this region was problematic. After the so-called First Peloponnesian War of the 450s B.C., Megara and Boeotia became part of the Peloponnesian League; in other words, Athens once again lost control of its northern borders.³¹⁰ Fortification walls at Eleusis would have protected the sanctuary, but they also provided a defensible position from which the Athenians could protect the border and the fertile Thriasian plain. While the walls were built for a defensive purpose, they also had an experiential impact on visitors to the sanctuary. The walls would have added to the sense of entitlement or inclusion on the part of the prospective initiates, as much as the facilities and proceedings inside the walls would remain unknown to the uninitiated.

A propylon was included in the southern length of the Classical Phase wall (I10), next to a square tower (I11) (Figure 75).³¹¹ The propylon was about 3m. wide and included an inner porch, but further details of its form are not preserved. Two poros blocks from the foundations of the propylon's threshold are preserved, each 1.60m. long and 0.70m. wide. In addition, two footings for columns on the northern side of the

³⁰⁹ The fill was described by the excavators as primarily sand, with some pebbles and cobbles, and included pottery in its lowest levels. The pottery and material finds were not further described. Kourouniotes 1938, p. 36; Philios 1885, pp. 70-74; Noack 1927, p. 186.

³¹⁰ Kagan 1991, pp. 77-97.

³¹¹ For description of the propylon at I10, see Mylonas 1961, pp. 124-25 and Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, pp. 24-26. Ziro 1991, p. 50, n. 174, suggested that the doorframe of this gateway was reused in the 4th century B.C. gateway next to K6. For photographs of the preserved elements of the propylon at I10, see Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, pp. 5, 21, and 22. The tower (I11) measured 4.80 by 6.60m. Noack 1927, p. 184; Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, p. 283.

gateway, about 2m. north of the threshold, indicate the inner porch.³¹² The propylon was located at a lower elevation than the level of the contemporary Telesterion terrace, so that a ramp or steps may have been used to ascend from the gateway to the terrace.³¹³ In front of I10, traces survive of an ancient road leading up to the gateway from the south.³¹⁴

The design of this propylon, including an inner porch with a lack of corresponding elaboration on the outer façade, is reminiscent of the propylon at Th5 built earlier in the century. For the propylon at Th5, the lack of an outer porch may have been due to practical considerations. The small space before the propylon and its position tucked just inside tower H25 may have made the addition of a porch undesirable. If a porch had been added, it would have used some of the space between the door and the stepped podium, which already was quite limited. Moreover, the tower occupied the ideal position on the ground for a column to support the roof of a porch. For the propylon at I10, the design could have been intended to quote that of the propylon at Th5, since a porch could have fit next to the tower I11. Further, a question of visibility and audience may have also have had a role in design of the propylon at I10. Since the southern entrance was not the processional entrance to the sanctuary, it was more utilitarian in character, providing access to the sanctuary for visitors coming from the sea. The embellished side of the propylon did not face these visitors. Instead, the propylon directed its porch toward the Telesterion, and was even aligned with one of the southern

³¹² These footings include square stylobates supported by a rectangular foundation block 1.60m. long, 0.75 m. wide, 0.45m. thick, and preserved to 0.90m. high, with the western stylobate also using part of the Second Archaic Phase wall as part of its foundation. Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, p. 26; Mylonas 1961, p. 125 noted the use of the Second Archaic Phase wall as foundation.

³¹³ Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, pp. 24-26 observed that the gateway was c. 1.80m. lower than the southern courtyard of the Telesterion. Mylonas 1961, p. 126 and Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, p. 283 also noted that the ascent to the Telesterion must have necessitated steps or a ramp.

³¹⁴ Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, p. 25 argued that the road was contemporary with the propylon at I10 because both were at the same elevation.

doors of the Telesterion. Prospective initiates in and around the Telesterion could have seen the porch while they were in the heart of the sanctuary. After the festival, when the initiates departed for their home cities, the porch monumentalized the departure of those who would leave Eleusis by sea. Therefore, the porch of the propylon at I10 seems to have been directed towards initiates and their use of the gateway, both from vantage points inside the sanctuary.

For a few years, however, the southern propylon took on special significance because it briefly served as the “processional” entrance to the sanctuary, when the annual procession on land was suspended during the Peloponnesian War between 413 and 403 B.C. (with the exception of the procession of 407 B.C. led defiantly by Alkibiades).³¹⁵ Throughout these years, the prospective initiates could not participate in the procession that took place on land, but instead were forced to travel to the sanctuary by sea. Approach to the Telesterion from the southern entrance may have included a processional route that moved from the entrance at I10, and circled the Telesterion on its eastern side in order to approach the Kallichoron Well, where preliminary activities such as dancing must have occurred. Because entering the sanctuary at I10 and then quickly exiting and re-entering through the gateway at the north may have been awkward or confusing for the prospective initiates, it is possible that the procession approached the sanctuary from the south, but then skirted the outside of the peribolos wall to arrive at the Kallichoron Well. In either situation, the newly initiated would most like have exited through the gateway at I10, to return by sea to Athens. The experience of arrival at the sanctuary during these years was, therefore, markedly different than the usual approach, which included

³¹⁵ Dillon 1997, p. 42 suggested that the land procession could have resumed after the Thirty Tyrants were removed. The account of Alkibiades and the procession is recorded in Xenophon, *Hellenica*, 1.4.20 (early 4th century B.C.).

procession across the 22km. sacred way, the outer gateway and Kallichoron Well, the inner gateway, and the path up to the Telesterion. The sense of anticipation, which usually would have been created by the long procession and rituals performed along the way, was instead achieved by the process of travel by sea, perhaps heightened because the journey was made during a dangerous time of war. Following this journey the prospective initiates traversed a processional route that was a reversal of the earlier tradition of circling the eastern side of the sanctuary, whether inside or outside the peribolos wall.

At the northern side of the sanctuary, the processional route passed first through the outer gateway, built during the Early Classical Phase, located next to the Kallichoron Well (Figure 75). About 30m. uphill, it passed through an inner gateway, built during the Second Archaic Phase, which may have been embellished with a marble porch during the Classical Phase (Figure 77).³¹⁶ The remains of this porch, which indicate a Doric distyle in antis porch with a central passage wider than its side passages, are currently reused on the so-called Mithraion south of the sanctuary, dating to the Roman period (east of #12 on Figure 8).³¹⁷ Preserved are its euthynteria course and two step courses of Pentelic marble, which had long been recognized by previous excavators as Classical.³¹⁸ In his study of the porch, Ziro concluded that the side blocks, worked with the claw chisel, were

³¹⁶ See Ziro 1991, pp. 57-85 for the complete description of these architectural members and reconstruction of the porch.

³¹⁷ These pieces were all re-used at the southern end of the sanctuary, at the so-called Mithraion and the gateway at K6, and perhaps could have originally belonged to a structure in the southern area. The width of the krepidoma of the marble porch is just over 6m., which would fit well in front of the southern propylon at I10, centered on the opening and next to tower I11. The threshold for the propylon at I10 is about 3m. wide but the opening through the center of the porch is 2.010m. wide, which means that a facing c. 0.50m. thick could have been used at the opening.

³¹⁸ For discussion of so-called Mithraion, see Mylonas 1961, p. 183; Kourouniotes 1934, pp. 50-51; Ziro 1991, pp. 61-62. Clinton 1997, pp. 170-72 argued instead that this building could be the site of imperial cult, a shrine dedicated to Augustus. This building has only been broadly identified by the excavators as Roman, without further specific information for its date provided.

re-used blocks from a Classical porch, while the center blocks, which were worked with the Roman coarse tooth chisel, were a later addition.³¹⁹ He assigned these elements to the inner northern entrance, which he considered the main entrance to the sanctuary, perhaps that referred to as the Propylon of Demeter and Kore in *IG II² 1187* (mid-4th century B.C.; lines 25-27).³²⁰ Further, since the Lesser Propylaia built during the Late Republican Period in this location was dedicated to Ceres and Proserpina, the Roman names for the goddesses, Ziro argued that the dedication to the two goddesses could have been used here first in the Classical period.

Ziro suggested that the porch dated between 437 and 431 B.C. based on comparison to features of the propylon of the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion (which he dated to after 440 B.C.), the Athenian Propylaia (437-32 B.C.), and the temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous (which he dated to 446 B.C.), particularly the use of lifting bosses, the wider central passage, the recessed edge of the krepidoma, and the anta capital.³²¹ Based on these comparisons, Ziro estimated the date of the porch to after the start of the Athenian Propylaia, begun in 437 B.C., and before 431 B.C., the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. These comparisons rightly place the marble porch from Eleusis within this group of buildings, but the date Ziro drew from them may be too early. The propylon at the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion and the temple of Nemesis at

³¹⁹ In addition, Ziro noted that the side blocks have a ledge across the back side to support the paving stones, while the center block does not have this feature, and that the end stylobate and step blocks have lifting bosses (although the two on the northeastern stylobate block have been cut down). Ziro estimated the column height to 5.70 x the lower column diameter (0.668m. at the outer edge of the flutes, taken from the markings on the stylobate), so that the height would be 3.807m. The evidence for reconstructing the superstructure of the porch is limited to marks on the surfaces of the re-used stylobate blocks and a single Doric anta capital found re-used in the threshold of the Roman phase of the 4th century B.C. gateway next to tower K6 (Figures 8 and 78). Wheel ruts cut across the euthynteria, 1.40m. apart, indicating wheeled traffic through the porch.

³²⁰ *IG II² 1187* is further discussed in the following chapter.

³²¹ Ziro 1991, pp. 73, 80-82.

Rhamnous have been shown to date c. 420 B.C. and c. 430-20 B.C., respectively, which means that the marble porch from Eleusis should date to between 437 and 420 B.C., or perhaps a little later.³²² Thus, the marble porch was built at the time when an increase in construction activity occurs in other Athenian and Attic sanctuaries, c. 425-15 B.C.³²³

The form of the propylon as reconstructed by Ziro was similar in design to the two earlier preserved propyla from the sanctuary, the Early Classical propylon at Th5 and the propylon at I10, just a few decades older, but it can be distinguished from these examples in two ways. First, although all three propyla included only one porch, in the earlier examples, the porch was located on the inner side of the propylon. The marble porch added to the gateway next to tower H18 was the first porch at the sanctuary to be directly toward prospective initiates as they entered the sanctuary along the processional route. It emphasized the propylon's function along the path as the entrance to the heart of the sanctuary, by presenting its most elaborate side to the prospective initiates. Second, also in its use of marble the propylon at I10 stood apart from the earlier examples, which had used limestone. The use of Pentelic marble also set the porch apart from most of its contemporary propyla, which were more typically built of local limestone.³²⁴ The

³²² Miles 1989, pp. 226-35 argued for revised dates for the temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous. For the date of c. 420 B.C. for the stoa and propylon at Sounion, see Dinsmoor, Jr. 1971, pp. 25-28.

³²³ Miles 1989, pp. 227-35.

³²⁴ The propylon to the sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros at Selinous, built in the later 5th century B.C., was Doric distyle in antis, with a staircase of six low steps leading up to its front porch (Figures 82 and 83), constructed of limestone. Description of the propylon from Miles 1998, esp. 38-40. The propylon to the Pelopeion at Olympia, also dating to the later 5th century B.C., was built of limestone. Carpenter 1971, pp. 100-102. In its form, the propylon at Eleusis was typical of its contemporaries, which were most often Doric, frequently with porches in antis like the porch at Eleusis, and with various arrangements of the doorwall. The Doric propylon within the stoa at Brauron, which dated to 425-416 B.C., did not include a doorwall (Figure 79). Coulton 1976, pp. 42-43, 226-227. The propylon at the Herakleion on Thasos, for example, approached by six steps, had a single door (Figure 80). It was part of a building phase at the sanctuary that dates as early as the mid-5th century B.C., and perhaps as late as the later 4th century B.C. See Carpenter 1971, pp. 110-13 and Bergquist 1973, pp. 49-50. The propylon at the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion is an example with three doors (Figure 81). Carpenter 1971, pp. 108-110; Dinsmoor, Jr. 1974, pp. 24-28. Built of Pentelic marble on poros limestone foundations, it included a ramp through the wider

Pentelic marble had particular resonance within the closer relationship between the heart of Athens and the sanctuary at Eleusis in the 5th century B.C. Quarried at Mt. Pentele in Athens, this marble was used in the major 5th century B.C. buildings on the Acropolis, the Parthenon, the Propylaia, and the Erechtheion (Figure 84). Its use at Eleusis, therefore, provided a visible connection of the sanctuary at Eleusis to Athens and its Acropolis.³²⁵

The inverse of this relationship may have been intended by the use of Eleusinian limestone in the Athenian Propylaia.³²⁶ Arrival at the inner gateway of the sanctuary at Eleusis, then, would remind the prospective initiate of the major religious architecture of the Acropolis in Athens, and secure the connection between them.

At the end of the processional route and in the heart of the sanctuary, the Classical Phase Telesterion was begun in the early 440s B.C. and completed later during that decade (Figure 85, building d).³²⁷ The first stage of work should be assigned to Iktinos,

central doorway. The Propylaia of the Acropolis, built between 437-32 B.C., was unique in including five doorways.

³²⁵ The propylon at the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion also used Pentelic marble. This connected the sanctuary to Athens just a few years before Athens erected a wall around Sounion, during the Peloponnesian War. Wescoat 2003, pp. 114-16 considered the use of Pentelic marble for the porch of the dedication by Philip III and Alexander IV at the sanctuary of the Great Gods on Samothrace, where the material demonstrated a Macedonian claim to Athens.

³²⁶ The Propylaia of the Acropolis, built between 437-32 B.C., included Doric and Ionic elements, five doorways, northern and southern wings, and an architect known by name, Mnesikles (Figure 84). Built of Pentelic marble with some Eleusinian limestone, the Propylaia had six Doric columns across the eastern and western façades and two rows of three Ionic columns along the central passageway. The northern and southern wings each had three Doric columns in antis. The Propylaia was approached by a stepped ramp up the western side of the Acropolis. The most recent and thorough study of the Athenian Propylaia is Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor, Jr. 2004. Shoe 1949, pp. 343-44 argued that the very idea of using dark stone in monumental architecture originated at the sanctuary at Eleusis, beginning in the second half of the 6th century B.C. with its peribolos wall of local limestone. Shoe further argued that the fully realized use of the dark stone is due solely to Athenian architects, in particular Mnesikles.

³²⁷ The date for the stages of the Classical Phase Telesterion has been the subject for great discussion, which is primarily based on passages by Plutarch (Perikles 13.7), Strabo (9.1.12 [395]), and Vitruvius (7 *praef.* 16), which refer to several architects for the Telesterion, Iktinos, Koroibos, Metagenes, and Xenokles, compared to epigraphical evidence, especially the so-called Koroibos inscription (*IG I³ 32*). In his analysis of these passages, Clinton 1987, pp. 256-62 offered the most plausible conclusion, that the first stage was begun by Iktinos but completed soon after by Koroibos, Metagenes, and Xenokles. Plutarch's comment that the latter two architects finished the building after the death of Koroibos is less reliable than the fact that, first, Plutarch stated that the Telesterion was among the projects completed under Perikles, and that Koroibos was alive and working at the City Eleusinion at the time of *IG I³ 32* (432/1 B.C.). In

who took on the project just before he began work in Athens on the Parthenon.³²⁸ This stage was never completed, due either to technical difficulties resulting from the great spans of roof that would be supported by only twenty columns (in five rows of four), or to the fact that Iktinos was called to work on a more prominent building in Athens, the Parthenon. Little remains from the first stage, but it is clear that the building had a nearly square plan (49.45 x 51.50m.), almost twice as wide as the interrupted Early Classical Phase Telesterion.³²⁹ The first stage of the building included two entrances on each northern, eastern, and southern side and tiers of eight steps along all four walls. The foundations for two rows of columns are preserved in the southern half of the Telesterion.³³⁰

The second stage was begun and completed soon after the first stage was aborted.³³¹ The plan was nearly square (51.20 x 51.55m.), and included double the

addition, this inscription calls for an audit of recent spending at the sanctuaries at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion, and does not mention the Telesterion or Koroibos working at Eleusis. Clinton therefore concluded that both stages of the Telesterion must have been completed some time before the inscription. Studies of the architecture of the Classical Phase Telesterion still base their discussions of chronology on analysis of literary sources. For architectural discussions of the Classical Phase Telesterion, see Kourouniotes and Travlos 1938a; Dinsmoor 1950, pp. 195-96; Gruben 2001, pp. 243-45. Noack 1927, pp. 139-83 reconstructed the Classical Phase Telesterion with an outer row of columns around its eastern, northern, and southern sides, employing the rock-cut steps at the northwestern and southwestern ends of the Telesterion, and supported by the arrow-shaped foundation projects at its eastern side. Kourouniotes and Travlos showed that both these features belong to the 4th century B.C. Telesterion.

³²⁸ See McCredie 1979, pp. 71-73 for discussion of Iktinos, in which the strikingly open plan of his Telesterion is noted as an identifying characteristic of Iktinos' style.

³²⁹ For discussion on the first stage of the Classical Telesterion, see Noack 1927, pp. 139-83; Mylonas 1961, pp. 113-117; Cooper 1996, pp. 374-376. Dimensions and materials noted here are from Mylonas.

³³⁰ Vitruvius (*7 praef.* 16) commented that the Doric order was used by Iktinos in the Telesterion, which was accepted by Noack 1927, pp. 139-83. As an alternative, Cooper 1996, pp. 374-376 argued that the large bases are comparable in size to the Ionic bases in the Parthenon, which led to his conclusion that these Telesterion bases supported Ionic columns (with up to 1.6m. diameter column bases). To support this reconstruction, Cooper cited the Ionic bases listed in the inventories *IG I³ 386* and *IG I³ 387*, which he argued came from the first stage (Iktinian) of the Telesterion. The combination of the broad interior space and the mixed Ionic and Doric orders, according to Cooper, are hallmarks of Iktinos' design. Shear 1982, p. 132, n. 15 assigned these Ionic bases from the inscription to a planned porch for the Classical Telesterion. The extant bases are sufficient to support Cooper's proposal, however, without the additional bases known only by their mention in the inscriptions.

³³¹ For discussion on the second stage of the Classical Telesterion and for dimensions, see Mylonas 1961, pp. 117-124.

number of interior columns of the first stage (seven rows of six) (Figure 85, building e, and Figure 75). As in the first stage, eight tiers of steps were located around all four sides of the building.³³² On the western side and the western end of the northern and southern sides, these were cut from the rock. Six doorways provided access to the Telesterion, two on each of the northern, eastern, and southern sides. The doorways to the northern and southern sides of the Telesterion were aligned with the sacred way (to the north) and the Classical Phase propylon at I10 to the south. The walls of the Telesterion were Eleusinian limestone, but the corridors leading into the Telesterion from these doorways were marble. According to Plutarch, Xenocles built the central opaeion, which is thought to have been part of Iktinos' original plan.³³³

The Telesterion, designed by Iktinos and similar to the Odeion of Perikles, cemented the architectural connection between Eleusis and the Acropolis in Athens.³³⁴ The Odeion sat on the south slope of the Acropolis, adjacent to the Theater of Dionysos, where it was cut into the slope of the Acropolis and built of limestone (Figure 84). The Odeion was similar in plan to the Telesterion, nearly square, c. 62.4 x 68.6m., with 8-10 rows of internal columns to support its peaked roof.³³⁵ Built c. 440-30 B.C., the Odeion housed musical contests during the Panathenaia, as well as presentations of dramas in preparation for the City Dionysia. Therefore, it was a venue for performances during two of Athens' important civic festivals, and, as the largest of the Periklean buildings, was a well-known Athenian landmark. The formal similarities between the Telesterion and the

³³² Mylonas 1961, p. 121, n. 34 recorded that the tread of the steps ranges between 0.60m. at the top step, to 0.72m. for the lower steps.

³³³ Gruben 2001, p. 243; Mylonas 1961, pp. 119-120.

³³⁴ The Odeion is described by Hurwit 1999, pp. 216-17. Wickkiser 2003, pp. 124-25, 156-57 emphasized the similarity of the Telesterion to the Odeion.

³³⁵ Dimensions from Hurwit 1999, p. 317.

Odeion aligned initiation during the Mysteries with these other festivals. While the experience of the prospective initiate between the outer gateway and the Telesterion at Eleusis was not precisely parallel to ascending the slopes of the Acropolis, the initiate, who had previously spent at least four days in Athens in preparation for the journey to Eleusis, would have recognized the similarities of the two buildings, distinctive in scale and design.

Because the wall and the filling of the Telesterion terrace took place to accommodate construction of the Telesterion, the two must have been planned as part of the same project. Little archaeological evidence exists to determine a secure date for the Classical Phase wall and fill, as discussed by the excavators in their reports of removing the fill.³³⁶ Instead, the date for these projects can be determined by the date of the Telesterion, for which there is literary and epigraphical evidence.³³⁷ Plutarch (13.7) listed the Telesterion among the other great works of Perikles' building program, and Strabo (9.1.12 [395]) and Vitruvius (7 *praef.* 16) named Iktinos as the architect for the Telesterion. Plutarch noted that Koroibos was an architect of the Telesterion, as well as Metagenes and Xenokles. The most convincing date for the Classical Telesterion is that it was begun around 449 B.C. and had a second stage during the 440s B.C., which means that the fill and the wall were built c. 449 B.C. or just before construction on the Telesterion began. The Telesterion, therefore, was nearly contemporary with the Parthenon, the first of the structures built on the Acropolis. This chronology indicates that the Eleusinian building was a priority within the Athenian building program. Since

³³⁶ The excavators mentioned that occasionally pottery was found, but they did not offer further information on the pottery or other material finds. The excavators noted the difficulty in securing a date for the fill and wall, but they continued to associate both projects with Perikles. See Philios 1885, pp. 70-74; Kourouniotes 1938, pp. 34-39.

³³⁷ Noack 1927, p. 183 also noted that these were part of the same project, designed by Iktinos.

the Telesterion begun during the Early Classical Phase still remained in its abandoned state until the construction of the Classical Phase Telesterion, this priority demonstrates the urgent need to erect a permanent covered building in its place.

During the Classical Phase, the architecture of the sanctuary at Eleusis indicates that great numbers of visitors could be accommodated, not only with the addition of a new peribolos wall that doubled the size of the sanctuary, but also by the massive Telesterion that was complete by the end of the 440s B.C. Later in the century, the marble porch built c. 420 B.C., which may have been added to the inner gateway, indicates that the sanctuary at Eleusis participated in the increase of building activity in Athenian sanctuaries after the start of the Peloponnesian War. It cannot be coincidental that the form of the approach to the Acropolis underwent similar changes during the Classical period, with both the awkward angled approach and the stepped feature eliminated by the construction of the Mnesiklean Propylaia in the 430s B.C. As during the Early Classical Phase, the sanctuary at Eleusis was linked visually and experientially by its architecture to the Acropolis. This connection was strengthened by the Telesterion, similar to the Odeion of Perikles built on the south slope of the Acropolis, and the use of Pentelic marble in the porch of the sanctuary's inner entrance.

Conclusion

Given the increasing emphasis placed on the cult by the Athenian administration during this period, it is perhaps surprising that the City Eleusinion did not have a major building program. Even though the administration of the Mysteries was based in Athens, the heart of the Mysteries, including the *hiera* and the locus of initiation, was still located in Eleusis. Similarly, although four of the six days of the festival took place in Athens,

they did not occur solely in the City Eleusinion. Various parts of the city were involved, and perhaps this was part of the reason that the City Eleusinion was not further developed with new buildings, at least in the part excavated. Indeed, the City Eleusinion was literally in the shadow of the building projects taking place on the Acropolis, where four major buildings were erected during the second half of the 5th century B.C., the Parthenon, the Erechtheion, the temple of Athena Nike, and a new entrance, the Propylaia.³³⁸ The City Eleusinion, located just below the Acropolis' north slope, was connected to the Acropolis by the Panathenaic Way, and by the storage of the treasures of the goddesses on its summit. The City Eleusinion was therefore not excluded from the development on the Acropolis, but connected by topographical proximity and the presence of the goddesses in both sanctuaries.

Plutarch attributed development at the three most important sanctuaries of Athens, the Acropolis, the sanctuary of Dionysos Eleutherios, and the sanctuary at Eleusis, to Perikles. The impetus also came from two events that prompted changes in Athens' self-identity at the start of the Classical period, when the treasures of the Delian League were moved to the Acropolis in 454 B.C. and a peace with Persia was finally secured in 449/8 B.C. Therefore, although large parts of these projects were completed during the 440s and 430s B.C., these were due less to one statesman's decision than to the discretion of the *boule* and the administrative boards for each sanctuary.³³⁹ Earlier in the 5th century B.C., the Athenians had defined themselves against and designed their sanctuaries to reflect triumph over Persian destruction. About the time Perikles came to power, the Athenians were prepared to re-shape this self-image to one of power, wealth, piety, and

³³⁸ For discussion of the mid 5th-century B.C. construction projects and dedications on the Acropolis, see Hurwit 1999 and Hurwit 2004.

³³⁹ Hurwit 2004, p. 98. For discussion of Perikles and the building program, see Hurwit 2004, pp. 87-105.

empire. Construction at its main sanctuaries indicates that Athens now sought to shape each sanctuary in new ways that would embody all three characteristics. These projects were partly financed by the Athenians themselves, but also by the resources of the Delian League. In this way, Athens could claim that the elaboration of its sanctuaries was not only for its own benefit, but for the good of all its allies. Moreover, Athenians, allies, and visitors were asked to participate in these cults and to visit these sanctuaries. This required participation of non-Athenians was central to Athens' self-identity because it created a physical manifestation of empire.³⁴⁰ The presence of great numbers of non-Athenian participants, and their offerings, at these sanctuaries was a visible sign of the extent of Athens' control over its allies and their resources. Drawing Athenians and non-Athenians together during these festivals created links between these two groups, and pulled the allies ever closer to the heart of Athens. Of these three festivals, the Panathenaia, the City Dionysia, and the Mysteries, it was the last that included a personal aspect for all the participants, one which could have resonance for individuals as each sought the benefits achieved through initiation, and one which could be manipulated by Athens. Through their shared experience during the process of initiation, Athenians and non-Athenians alike would forever be connected with the sanctuary at Eleusis, the city of Athens, and Demeter.

³⁴⁰ Parker 1996, pp. 142-43.

Chapter 7: Late Classical Phase (4th Century B.C.)

Introduction

During the 4th century B.C., Athenian architecture made dynamic new use of materials, orders, and design.³⁴¹ The polis sponsored many of these projects, but private patronage, which increased over the 4th century B.C., was responsible for others. New gods like Asklepios, who had arrived in the city during the 5th century B.C., received corresponding architectural elaboration of his sanctuary. At the same time, devotion toward older cults continued as well, manifested in new facilities for the festivals of the Panathenaia, the City Dionysia, and the Eleusinian Mysteries. This spirit led to constructions inside Athens, at the Agora, the City Eleusinion, and the south slope of the Acropolis, as well as the sanctuary at Eleusis. Most of the work at the Eleusinian sanctuaries included maintenance and repairs of their existing facilities, but attention was also devoted to entirely new structures, including a new wall around part of the sanctuary at Eleusis and a porch for the Telesterion, as well as a viewing platform and a second entrance to the City Eleusinion.

These projects modified the processional route followed by the prospective initiates and reshaped their experience of traveling between and into the sanctuaries. In previous phases this was accomplished in part by the constant reworking of the entrances to the sanctuaries, with the objective of increased monumentality at the gateway, or by changing the path itself. During the 4th century B.C. repairs and maintenance of entrances are recorded in several inscriptions, but this work seems not to have been for

³⁴¹ As Townsend 2004 has shown, architecture in Athens during the 4th century B.C. could use Classical forms and traditions in new configurations to achieve new meaning. Knell 2000 explored the variety of buildings erected in Athens during the 4th century B.C., reflecting a larger range than the traditional structures of previous centuries.

the purpose of increased monumentality; attention focused on maintaining the existing entrances, without further elaboration. Nor were the processional routes changed.

However, these paths were now framed by new structures, varying from platforms to rock-cut steps built along the paths used by prospective initiates at both sanctuaries, to a porch added to the eastern side of the Telesterion at Eleusis. At both ends of the sacred way, the architecture of the processional routes reshaped the experience of the prospective initiate by adding new spaces for viewing, gathering, and the performance of ritual.

Other evidence from the 4th century B.C. demonstrates a change in the experience of prospective initiates in non-architectural ways as well. Two sacred laws suggest the desire to affect the experience administratively, by allowing all prospective initiates to experience the festival in the same way and from the same vantage point. One law, dating to c. 350 B.C. included provisions for exegesis to be available to Athenians and foreigners, so that the rules for participation were available for all.³⁴² The other law, attributed to Lykourgos, prohibited the use of carts by wealthy women in the procession.³⁴³ According to Parker, this law was intended to ensure that all participants in the procession were, at least temporarily, of an equal social status.³⁴⁴

The 4th century B.C. also differed from the 5th century B.C. because polis-cults, like the Panathenaia, the Mysteries, and the City Dionysia, no longer included festivals

³⁴² *SEG* 30.61. This law, found at the City Eleusinion, also demonstrated that the number of initiates continued to grow. The inscription outlined the procedure for selecting and supervising the *spondophoroi* who traveled to other Greek cities, it described the sacred truce, which was now several weeks longer than before, and it recorded that the *epimeletai* assisted the *basileus* in the management of the festival, which Clinton 1980, pp. 258-88 suggested was necessary because of the growing size of the festival and the amount of administration it required. For the inscription and additional bibliography, see *Agora* XXXI, cat. I.42.

³⁴³ Lykourgos was the first to have to pay the fine, on behalf of his wife. Plutarch, *Moralia* X.842a (early 2nd century A.D.), Aelian, *Varia Historia* xiii.24 (early 3rd century A.D.).

³⁴⁴ Parker 1996, p. 248.

that called for the mandatory participation of allies or other forms of “imperial display.”³⁴⁵ According to Isocrates, many cities continued to make First Fruit offerings to the goddesses on their own.³⁴⁶ The sustained interest in the Mysteries and the sanctuaries of the goddesses during the 4th century B.C., and particularly the continued offering of first fruits although no longer ordered by Athens was, as Parker remarked, “a tribute in this case less to Athens than to the genuine religious prestige of the Eleusinian cult.”³⁴⁷

Even without this promotion, the Athenian connection to the cult at Eleusis did not diminish. In fact, the results of political upheavals at the turn of the 4th century B.C. between Athens and Eleusis demonstrate the unbreakable link of Athens to the cult and sanctuary at Eleusis. In 404/403 B.C., just after the end of the Peloponnesian War, an independent polis at Eleusis was created with oligarchs from Athens and certain Eleusinians, and Eleusis became a member of the Peloponnesian League. As part of the reconciliation agreement, Athens and Eleusis were to share the sanctuary at Eleusis and the Mysteries. Thus, even though Eleusis was (briefly) independent of Athens, the sanctuary and cult were never separated from Athens.³⁴⁸ In the 4th century B.C., once Eleusis and Athens were restored to their traditional relationship, achieved by the invasion of the city of Eleusis by the Athenians in 401/0 B.C., some of the more valuable treasures from the sanctuary at Eleusis were transferred to Athens. This relocation is indicated by the record of several items in *IG II² 1404* (390/89 B.C.) that were stored on

³⁴⁵ Parker 1996, p. 221. Parker 1996, pp. 218-255 discussed Athenian cults in the 4th century B.C. For the Panathenaia in particular, see Shear 2001.

³⁴⁶ Isocrates *Panegyric* 31 (c. 380 B.C.). Reference also discussed by Clinton 1994a, p. 161 and Parker 1996, p. 222.

³⁴⁷ Parker 1996, p. 222.

³⁴⁸ For a history of the city of Eleusis during 404/3-401/0, see Hansen 2004, p. 637. For a study of the reconciliation agreement between Eleusis and Athens as it related to the sanctuary and the Mysteries, see Loening 1987, pp. 30-34. Ancient sources which described the attack by Athens on Eleusis include Xenophon *Hellenica* 2.4.43 (early 4th century B.C.) and Lysias *Subverting Democracy* 25.9 (c. 401 BC).

the Acropolis, which had earlier been listed in an inventory of the sanctuary at Eleusis in 408/407 B.C. (*IG I*³ 386-387).³⁴⁹ In addition, the connection between the sanctuary in Eleusis and the City Eleusinion was reinforced by instructions included in two inscriptions set up in one sanctuary that a duplicate be set up in the other, one of these from the City Eleusinion, a decree (367/6 B.C.) dealing with an infraction of the sacred truce, and the other from Eleusis, *IG II*² 204 (352/1 B.C.) dealing with a dispute over sacred land boundaries.³⁵⁰

Several building inscriptions that describe construction at the gateways of the sanctuaries, discussed below, also demonstrate the administrative connections between Athens and the sanctuary at Eleusis. These inscriptions and archaeological evidence indicate that the entrances to the sanctuaries remained modest during the 4th century B.C., but at each the processional routes were elaborated with features for the performance of ritual.

Athens

At the City Eleusinion, archaeological and epigraphical evidence indicates that the 4th century B.C. was a period of lively building activity at the sanctuary. Repairs or modifications took place along the three preserved sides of the sanctuary's peribolos wall and a stepped viewing platform, as well as an additional southern entrance, were introduced.³⁵¹ The path of the processional route did not change, but, for the first time,

³⁴⁹ Clinton 1984, pp. 58-61 suggested that the Treasurers of Athena and the Other Gods supervised the treasures, rather than the Eleusinian *epistatai*. *IG I*³ 386-387=Clinton 2005a, pp. 64-70, cat. 52.

³⁵⁰ *Agora XXXI*, p. 65. The former inscription is included in *Agora XXXI*, cat. I, 26 (*Agora XVI*, no. 48=I 4384+I 7259). The latter, *IG II*² 204, is from Eleusis. For this inscription, see Clinton 2005a, pp. 141-45, cat. 144.

³⁵¹ A building inscription from Eleusis (*IG II*² 1672; 329/8 B.C.) indicated additional building activity in the City Eleusinion (Clinton 2005a, pp. 188-206, cat. 177). *Agora XXXI*, p. 62 noted passages in this inscription that referred to constructions at entrances in or near the City Eleusinion. Lines 129-134 describe a threshold block and other poros blocks, as well as their dimensions, belonging to an entrance

viewers had established places from which to watch the processions along the Panathenaic Way, including the arrival of the *hiera* on Boedromion 14 and their departure on Boedromion 19. A great number of inscribed dedications and votive reliefs dedicated to the goddesses demonstrate personal devotion to the goddesses.³⁵²

Archaeological and epigraphical evidence indicates repairs and construction at the entrance to the sanctuary, located in its southern wall (Figure 6). Fill found between the foundations for sidewalls at the entrance may indicate modification, such as the introduction of a threshold block (Figure 58).³⁵³ A second entrance in the southern wall was introduced about 20m. to the east of this gateway.³⁵⁴ A north-south trench cut across the bedrock and the peribolos wall may have been a foundation for a sidewall for the gateway (Figure 58; the north-south trench is indicated on the plan by a vertical line at the eastern end of the peribolos wall). The eastern cutting for the other side of the gateway is not preserved; it is located beneath the unexcavated area to the east. The fills associated with both of these projects along the southern peribolos wall date to the third quarter of the 4th century B.C.³⁵⁵ The older gateway remained the processional entrance, as the first one approached by visitors as they turned from the Panathenaic Way to the east-west road that led to the sanctuary. This entrance presented the visitor with a direct view of the Rocky Outcrop and the façade of the temple of Triptolemos. The view presented from the second entrance is uncertain, since it partly led into the unexcavated

within the sanctuary. The blocks had previously been assigned to the propylon to the sanctuary located in the western peribolos wall. Miles in *Agora XXXI*, pp. 61-62, 74-75 has shown that this propylon should be dated to the 2nd century B.C. At line 166 doors of the *prothyron* are described, which may be a porch added to one of the southern entrances to the sanctuary. Lines 168-69 refer to lattice-doors to the shrine of Pluton, perhaps located in the City Eleusinion.

³⁵² For a description of the types and quantities of 4th century B.C. inscribed and sculpted dedications, see *Agora XXXI*, pp. 65-67.

³⁵³ *Agora XXXI*, p. 61. Deposit T 21:2. Fill labeled as T 21:1 on the actual state plan (Figure 58).

³⁵⁴ *Agora XXXI*, p. 61.

³⁵⁵ *Agora XXXI*, p. 61.

area of the sanctuary. However, because it was located some distance from the Panathenaic Way and it certainly did not lead to these two important monuments, it was likely not a processional entrance into the sanctuary; it may have served as a utilitarian entrance instead.

Two platforms added to the northern and western sides of the wall around the City Eleusinion provided positions for viewing the processional route to the sanctuary. On the northern side of the sanctuary, a thick retaining wall was built on top of the peribolos wall (Figure 58).³⁵⁶ Composed of yellow poros blocks, the new wall was built up to six courses high. Because it was significantly thicker (3-4m.) than the Second Archaic Phase peribolos wall (1.10m.), Miles suggested that it could also have served another purpose, such as a viewing platform for the Panathenaic Way. At the northwestern corner of the peribolos wall, the return for the thick wall was stepped down toward the west (Figures 58; see also Figure 86).³⁵⁷ The position of these steps along the Panathenaic Way made it a well-placed viewing platform for processions through the Agora, both the Panathenaic procession as well as the processions during the festival of the Mysteries. In addition, several stelai cuttings preserved on the steps show that this was a prominent area for display directed towards those engaged in activities on the main thoroughfare of the Agora.

Compared to building projects taking place elsewhere in Athens during the 4th century B.C., such as the stoa in the Asklepieion on the south slope of the Acropolis, the

³⁵⁶ *Agora XXXI*, p. 60 noted that the wall is dated by construction technique, in the absence of undisturbed fills associated with the wall. See *Agora XXXI*, p. 31 for the width of the Second Archaic Phase wall.

³⁵⁷ *Agora XXXI*, p. 60. Dimensions for the steps and the *stelai* cuttings are not provided. The top step was only c. 1m. lower than the level of the interior of the sanctuary (see Figure 7). Miles noted that the elevation of the steps indicates that they were built when the Panathenaic Way was 1.50m. higher than its current preserved elevation (the Panathenaic Way was cut down to receive paving by the 2nd century A.D.).

skene, or stage building, for the theater of Dionysos, also on the south slope, or the Panathenaic Stadium, across the Ilissos river, these features at the City Eleusinion were modest in scope. Yet all these projects shared the same purpose of framing ritual. The stoa (c. 300 B.C.) provided shelter for suppliants to Asklepios, the *skene* (end of the third quarter of the 4th century B.C.) provided the stage for performances in the theater of Dionysos, and the stadium (c.340 B.C.) housed athletic contests of the Panathenaia.³⁵⁸ At the City Eleusinion, work at the gateway ensured that the entrance to the sanctuary was in good repair, and was suitable to frame the arrivals and departures of processions to the sanctuary. The viewing platforms offered a place to watch the processions on the Panathenaic Way, and also to display dedications prominently. For prospective initiates, gathered in Athens for the start of the festival, watching the arrival of the sacred officials and *hiera* could have built their anticipation for initiation. Their journey to Eleusis a few days later ended in the revelation of the *hiera* inside the Telesterion.

Eleusis

At the other end of the sacred way in Eleusis, the processional route between the outer northern entrance and the Telesterion was reframed at its beginning, middle, and end during the 4th century B.C. These alterations, which provided new or reshaped spaces for the performance of rituals along the processional route, suggest changes to the experience of the prospective initiates as they processed toward the Telesterion.

³⁵⁸ For descriptions of the stoa at the Asklepieion and the theater of Dionysos, see Townsend 2004, pp. 309-14. For the sanctuary and cult of Dionysos Eleutherios, see Pickard-Cambridge 1946; Connor 1990; Polacco 1990. The first phase of construction at the sanctuary of Dionysos probably took place under Euboulos, and included the construction of the stoa, the start of expanding the auditorium, and the construction of a *skene* with a platform. The second phase included the completion of the auditorium and a permanent *skene*, and was completed under Lykourgos. During the second half of the 4th century B.C., several structures were built at the sanctuary of Asklepios, a neighbor to the sanctuary of Dionysos. For the sanctuary and cult of Asklepios, see Wickkiser 2003; Townsend 1982, p. 284.

At the start of the processional route into the sanctuary, the Early Classical Phase wall was thickened and a new tower added (K20) next to the Kallichoron Well (Figure 8 and 87).³⁵⁹ The socle for the new wall and tower, composed of Eleusinian limestone, was built on top of the Early Classical Phase wall and behind it. At 2.42m. tall and 3.85m. wide, it doubled the width of the older wall. The northern outer face of the socle was constructed in pseudo-isodomic trapezoidal masonry (Figure 88), but the inner face was not as well-finished, with irregular joins between blocks and slightly uneven horizontal courses (Figure 89). The northern wall of the sanctuary was also thickened to the west of the northern entrance up to tower H14, along the Second Archaic Phase wall, to c. 3.80m. wide.³⁶⁰ Ziro referred to the wall between H14 and K20 as the “reception wall”, where he argued that the hierophant would receive the procession, as he interpreted from *IG II² 1672*, lines 8-9, in which a feature with this name is provided funds for repair. Additional information, such as the location or specific nature of this feature are not provided in the inscription. It therefore remains open to question if this part of the wall could be identified as that referred to in the inscription.³⁶¹

This change near the Kallichoron Well, likely dating to the third quarter of the 4th century B.C. rather than the early 4th century B.C. as Ziro suggests, created a formidable façade at the northern entrance to the sanctuary (Figure 90).³⁶² The thick wall and tower

³⁵⁹ Mylonas 1961, p. 149 dated the project broadly to the 4th century B.C. The tower is 7.16 x 7.37m. Dimensions and material description provided by Ziro 1991, p. 89. Noack 1927, pl. V included this tower as part of the Roman modifications to the sanctuary.

³⁶⁰ Dimension and description of wall east of tower H14 from Ziro 1991, p. 92.

³⁶¹ Ziro 1991, pp. 89-92 argued that in this area the hierophant would receive the procession. Clinton (pers. comm.) does not accept Ziro’s conclusion, for reasons which will be discussed in Clinton (forthcoming).

³⁶² Ziro 1991, pp. 93-94 observed signs of damage to the wall behind the Kallichoron well, which he attributed to violent destruction. He dated the repair to the Kallichoron Well and the wall behind it to date to 393 B.C., contemporary with the repair to the city walls of Athens undertaken by Konon. According to Ziro, at the time the sanctuary was held by the Thirty, 403-400 B.C., the Athenians stormed the sanctuary to take it back, attacking at the northern entrance. Ziro’s conclusions concerning the repair to the

augmented the defensive character of the walls around the sanctuary, as well as providing protection next to the well and gateway. For the prospective initiates arriving from Athens, even as they may have celebrated their arrival in dances around the Kallichoron Well, the prospect of admission into the sanctuary must have seemed daunting. For a full night and day before entry into the sanctuary, the prospective initiates waited outside and were left to speculate about the well-guarded proceedings that would take place inside the protective walls of the sanctuary.

Once inside the sanctuary, structures that may date to the 4th century B.C. framed the western side of the sacred way as it ascended toward the Telesterion (Figure 87). First, in the area of the Mirthless Rock a peribolos wall and a small temple may have been built over the earlier (First or Second Archaic Phase) remains (Figure 8, number 9, and Figure 56).³⁶³ The second feature, located just beyond the Mirthless Rock, included rock-cut steps with a platform for monuments above (Figure 8, to the left of number 10,

Kallichoron Well and the wall behind it must be re-evaluated, however, because the sanctuary was never attacked in this way. It is clear that the Athenians attacked the polis, not the sanctuary. Ziro considered repair between H14 and the proposed northern gateway to be several decades later, 329/8 B.C., as projects described in *IG II² 1672* (for the reception wall, lines 8-9; for the northern entrance to H14, lines 1-78; for repair to northern entrance and tower, lines 28-32), due to general construction work at the sanctuary, not due to damage caused by violence. It is more likely, however, that all of the construction work behind the Kallichoron Well and the wall behind it, from K20 to tower H14, was part of the widespread repair and construction in the sanctuary during the later 4th century B.C.

³⁶³ Mylonas 1961, pp. 146-49 dated these foundations on the basis of *IG II² 1672* lines 168-187 (329/8 B.C.), which describe work conducted in the Plutonion. Clinton 1992, pp. 14-27 has shown, however, that the Plutonion was located in or near the City Eleusinion, rather than in the cave behind the Lesser Propylaia. In this inscription Clinton argued that one of the expenses listed is for antae of an entrance to be polished. In addition, these lines refer to coating roofs with pitch by men who would use the same scaffolding to polish the antae. Because the area of the Mirthless Rock does not have antae at its entrance, and because the only roofs mentioned in the inscription are at the City Eleusinion, Clinton concluded that the Plutonion must be located somewhere near the City Eleusinion. *Agora XXXI*, pp. 101-102 provided additional evidence to support Clinton, noting that although no foundations at the City Eleusinion can be specifically identified with the Plutonion, other inscriptions indicate that a Plutonion existed in Athens near the Acropolis, and fragments of *plemochoai* were found in the area. Without the association of the structures to the inscription, it becomes more difficult to establish a date for these structures. The few preserved foundation blocks of the temple and wall cannot be easily dated. Noack 1927, p. 49, for example, dated both to the second half of the 5th century B.C. Preserved technical features on some of the blocks, including a few pry marks and anathyrosis worked with a claw chisel, could belong to the 4th century B.C. as well.

and Figure 91).³⁶⁴ The L-shaped stepped feature, 10.50m. long and 6.25m. wide, had 8 steps its west side and 6 steps on its south side. A rectangular terrace above the steps (9.50 x 3.15m.) included projections that could have served as foundations for statue bases. Third, a rectangular building, approximately 6 x 2.90m., was added to the sacred way south of the steps. The similar poros material and facing of this building compared to the wall and temple in the area of the Mirthless Rock suggest that they are contemporary.

These three projects framed the western side of the sacred way as it ascended to the Telesterion, channeling prospective initiates from the inner gateway to the hall of initiation. The structures also suggest changes to the actions performed by the prospective initiates and their experience at the sanctuary. The enclosure of the Mirthless Rock indicates a desire to conceal or protect the precinct. Since this provision was not included in earlier phases at the sanctuary; it suggests two possibilities, either a change in the use of the space or the same use, but protected or delimited in a new way. If the precinct of the Mirthless Rock was used for part of the sacred drama that took place during initiation, as Clinton has suggested, perhaps the architectural change can pinpoint when this part of the ritual was introduced.³⁶⁵ According to Clinton's reconstruction, prospective initiates could hear Demeter's wailing inside the precinct on their walk along the sacred way, but they did not enter the precinct or see Demeter. Later, Demeter and Kore, reunited inside the precinct while the prospective initiates waited in the Telesterion, arrived together before the prospective initiates inside the hall of initiation. Hearing, but not seeing, the lament of Demeter could have intensified their feelings of distress,

³⁶⁴ Dimensions and dating from Mylonas 1961, pp. 143-45.

³⁶⁵ Clinton 1992, pp. 84-90.

uncertainty, or even fear as they continued, in the dark, up to the Telesterion. The stepped feature provided a platform for viewing, either for sacred officials to observe the procession or for members of the procession to gather and view an action performed on the sacred way. A few suggestions for the use of the rectangular building beyond the steps are possible as well, despite its poor state of preservation. Given its position above the sacred way, perhaps it served as a treasury for offerings displayed prominently, or it may have provided an additional place for viewing events on the sacred way.³⁶⁶ These features demonstrate the architectural articulation of spaces for the performance of actions connected with the cult, although whether old or new, or performed or watched by the prospective initiates remains uncertain.

At the end of the processional route, Philo's porch was built against the eastern side of the Telesterion (Figures 8 and 92).³⁶⁷ The dodecastyle prostyle Doric porch,

³⁶⁶ Although primarily dedicated in the 6th and 5th centuries B.C., treasuries were built at other Greek sanctuaries during the 4th century B.C., such as the treasuries of Thebes and Cyrene at Delphi. See Dinsmoor 1950, p. 233. The dedication of Philip and Alexander at the sanctuary of the Great Gods on Samothrace may be a comparable example from the 4th century B.C. of a building that provided an area for viewing activities along a sanctuary's processional route, with its Doric façade tangent to the Theatral Circle and the rear Ionic porch overlooking the sacred way. For this dedication, see Wescoat 2003, pp. 107-108. These examples are more similar in topographical relationship to the sacred way, rather than form, since none have a doorwall.

³⁶⁷ Two arrow-shaped foundations (K 16 and K17), built in the mid-4th century B.C. (Figures 8, 92, and 93), indicate the project of an expanded Telesterion that was never completed. The foundations for Philo's porch were built on top of the K16 and K17 foundations. Mylonas 1961, p. 133, followed Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, pp. 28-31 in dating the foundations to the first half of the 4th century B.C. Scranton 1941, pp. 123-128 argued that these foundations dated to the 340s or 330s B.C. Noack 1927, pp. 146-56 proposed a radically different date for the foundations since he believed the foundations to be contemporary with the Classical Phase Telesterion, and intended to support a peristyle around the Telesterion. The presence of re-used Classical Phase blocks, noted by Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, pp. 14, 19, in the foundations instead indicates a post-Classical Phase date, however. Although there has been some debate about the function of these foundations, it is most likely that the foundations were intended for an enlarged Telesterion that was never completed. In their earlier report on the subject, Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, pp. 40-42 (also initially accepted by Mylonas 1961, p. 132) suggested that the foundations were designed to support a terrace in front of the Telesterion. Because the foundations are lower than the Telesterion by about 3m., they reconstructed a grand, stepped terrace, across the length of the east side of the Telesterion (as wide as the arrow-shaped foundations), from the level of the Telesterion's cella down to the level of the foundations. In a later report, Mylonas and Travlos 1983, pp. 148-50 (also Travlos 1988, p. 95) revised their earlier reconstructions, and instead proposed that the foundations were intended to support an enlarged Telesterion. Jeppesen 1958, pp. 105-106 and figure 70 also proposed such a reconstruction.

dating to the second half of the 4th century B.C., was built on foundations formed of yellow Aeginetan poros, up to 18 courses deep at the southeastern end of the porch.³⁶⁸ The krepidoma was composed of Eleusinian limestone, with some blocks belonging to the original structure but others to the Roman reconstruction; the extant stylobate is entirely Roman. The porch is 54.49 x 11.55m., or in other words slightly wider than the eastern side of the Classical Phase Telesterion. The porch included 12 columns across the front, two at the sides, and returning steps. Inscribed building accounts indicate that the columns and entablature of the porch were probably Pentelic marble, with the exception of poros triglyphs, fragments of which survive.

The new porch altered the experience of prospective initiates as they approached the Telesterion in two ways. First, three *megara*, or pits, attached to the eastern foundations of the porch may indicate a ritual action performed by the pilgrims (Figure 92). One *megaron* was located near each corner of the foundations, while the third was located at the center. The top of each *megaron* was nearly level with the euthynteria for the porch, indicating that the mouth of each pit was at ground level; the pits were nearly as deep as the foundations themselves. Two other features are attached to the foundations of K16 and K17. One, located at the outermost corner of the northern

Jördens 1999, pp. 365-67, 372-78 argued that the foundations were built to support a colonnade around the Telesterion, on the basis of *IG II² 1682*, which he argued described the establishment of these foundations and which he dated to 354/3 B.C. This inscription is more typically dated to the 3rd century B.C., however, and considered to refer to the construction of a stoa at the south side of the sanctuary.

³⁶⁸ The date of Philo's porch has been the source of debate, particularly with the question of whether or not a porch dating before the one preserved was planned. The basis for this discussion has primarily been epigraphical, particularly *IG II² 204* (352/1 B.C.) and *IG II² 1666* (between 366/5 and 353/2 B.C.), but using architectural evidence, Townsend 1982, pp. 165-67 has shown that only one porch was ever planned and executed. Townsend argued that work on the porch took several decades, begun c. 350 B.C. and completed between 317 and 307 B.C. The latest date for the porch is taken from Vitruvius (*7 praef. 17*) who stated that the porch was finished by the architect Philo at the time of Demetrios of Phaleron, between 317-07 B.C. Material and dimensions from Townsend 1982, pp. 144-47. Mylonas 1961, p. 134, n. 11 recorded the dimensions for the steps of the porch: the tread ranged from 0.33-0.39m., while the rise of the top two steps was 0.40m., and the lower step was 0.32m. Mylonas also recorded that the lower column diameter was 1.97m.

foundations (K17) included a square foundation projecting 1.30m. from the main foundations, with an interior width of 1.76m.³⁶⁹ The other, on the eastern side of the southern foundations (K16), is attached to the foundations (0.60m. wide), and more similar in form to the three *megara* on the eastern side of the porch.

These *megara*, found by the excavators to contain rich soil and animal bones, may have been used for the deposition of piglets during the Mysteries, as Clinton has argued.³⁷⁰ Piglets, an offering commonly given to Demeter, particularly during celebrations of the Thesmophoria, were also well-known part of the celebration of the Mysteries.³⁷¹ On one of the earlier days of the festival in Athens, Boedromion 16, the prospective initiates traveled to Phaleron where they may have purified piglets as well as themselves for the next days of the festival.³⁷² Four days later, according the Clinton's reconstruction, the prospective initiates may have brought the piglets with them during

³⁶⁹ Dimensions from Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, pp. 11-12.

³⁷⁰ Clinton 1988, pp. 73-78. Clinton noted that the fill included animal bones, but did not indicate specific descriptions of the bones. Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, pp. 11-12 described these features as "well-like," and observed that the difference in dimension and positioning of these attachments suggests that they were not built for the same purpose.

³⁷¹ Images of piglets or of initiates holding piglets were dedicated at the sanctuary, permanently commemorating the offering to Demeter. For examples, see Mylonas 1961, pp. 200-205, 250. Evans 2002, pp. 247-48 noted that piglets were a particularly inexpensive animal that most participants in the festival could afford. Clinton 2005b discussed the various uses of pigs in Greek religion. See Jameson 1994, pp. 98-99 for discussion of rearing pigs in Classical Greece. For literary evidence for piglets at Eleusis, see Dillon 1997, p. 63, n. 11. The Thesmophoria was a festival for women only, which took place throughout the Greek world. Participants celebrated Demeter and sought agricultural fertility as well as personal fertility for children. The festival varied in length according to local traditions, anywhere from three to ten days, anytime of the year between late summer and mid-fall. See Dillon 2002, pp. 110-20 for a useful summary of the festival. A scholiast on Lucian (who wrote in the mid-2nd century A.D.) described the retrieval of the remains of piglets during the Athenian Thesmophoria.

³⁷² Dillon 1997, pp. 62-63 argued that the piglets were sacrificed immediately after this purification, therefore avoiding pollution of the sacrificed animals upon their return to Athens. Burkert 1983, pp. 258-59 argued that the sacrifice of the piglets was a preliminary part of initiation, in which the animals died in replacement of the initiates themselves, necessary to receiving Demeter's promise for their afterlife. Although Burkert argued that there is no evidence of the piglets being taken to Eleusis during the festival, Clinton 1988, pp. 76-77 demonstrated that literary sources, such as Aristophanes *Frogs* 313, 377, indicate that the piglets may have been carried in the procession.

the procession to Eleusis.³⁷³ On the evening of initiation the next day, after they entered the Telesterion, the prospective initiates may have deposited the piglets into the *megara*, as a bloodless offering to Demeter.³⁷⁴ During celebration of the Thesmophoria, held the next month at the sanctuary, Clinton argued that the celebrants removed the rotted remains of the piglets from the *megara* and distributed it as a type of fertilizer.³⁷⁵

If this reconstruction is correct, the porch added a second space for the performance of rituals to the Telesterion, in addition to the initiation itself. It is difficult to know if this means that the ritual was not introduced to the sanctuary until the 4th century B.C., or if it may have been performed earlier at the sanctuary in another location.³⁷⁶ In his discussion of the *megara*, Clinton did not specifically address the question of date, especially when the ritual was introduced and whether it pre-dated the construction of the porch in the 4th century B.C.³⁷⁷ For these reasons, as well as other aspects of the proposal, such as the identification of the animal bones as piglets and the logistics of their deposition and decay, this hypothesis has not been universally accepted.

The porch added onto the Telesterion affected experience not only through the prospective initiate's use of its space, but also through its architectural language. As Townsend noted, the porch fits within a style of architecture developing in Athens during

³⁷³ Clinton 1988, pp. 76-77.

³⁷⁴ Evans 2002, pp. 244-51 argued that the absence of *thusia*, or bloody sacrifice, at the Mysteries reflected the diversity of the participants in the festival. Because the piglet was an affordable animal, women, slaves, and non-elites were able to make the offering. In addition, in a traditional *thusia*, the sacrifice and division of meat were conducted by elite men and sacred officials, which excluded the character of participants in the Mysteries.

³⁷⁵ Clinton 1988, pp. 73-74 argued that this action would not only connect the two festivals of Demeter, but it also served a logistical purpose. The number of participants in the Mysteries would be much greater than the number in the Thesmophoria, as would the corresponding number of piglets offered. In addition, the elapsed month between the two festivals would allow time for the remains of the small piglets to decompose.

³⁷⁶ Such as, for example, in two shallow pits in the area of the Mirthless Rock. See Burkert 1985, p. 243 for the variable forms of *megara*.

³⁷⁷ Clinton 1988, p. 72, n. 41 observed that the only epigraphical evidence for a *megaron* at the sanctuary is found in a 4th century B.C. sacred calendar (*IG II² 1363*, line 22).

the 4th century B.C., in which Classical forms were used in new and non-traditional ways.³⁷⁸ For the porch at the Telesterion, this language was used in its plan, elevation, and material. In its plan, the prostyle porch with returning steps is similar to other projects in Athens during the 4th century B.C., which is otherwise unusual and distinctive to Athenian architecture of this period.³⁷⁹ In elevation, the new proportions of the low entablature and low geison mixed with more canonical elements from the 5th century B.C. As Townsend noted, this was an example of the radical transformation of the Doric order that occurred in the 4th century B.C. In its material, the porch at first consideration seems not to fit within the aspects of Athenian style because the contrast in color between the local limestone of the foundations and the Pentelic superstructure fit very much into what Townsend called “the Classical formula” of a dark base with a lighter color material above. The porch becomes visually dynamic especially when its architectural context is considered. The porch, with its Pentelic superstructure, contrasted with the wall of the 5th century B.C. Telesterion, which was composed of blue Eleusinian limestone.³⁸⁰ In other words, there was a vertical division between the Pentelic porch and the blue Eleusinian limestone wall of the Telesterion. The porch added a new façade to the Telesterion, and the experiential effect of this addition is particularly striking. The processional entrance into the Telesterion was located on the northern side of the building, so that the new porch did not frame the entrance. Instead the north side of the Telesterion presented an asymmetrical façade to the prospective initiates as they ascended the sacred way. Before

³⁷⁸ Townsend 2004, pp. 306-307.

³⁷⁹ Wescoat 2003, p. 107 observed this characteristic in the plans of the choregic monument of Nikias on the south slope of the Acropolis, the Temple of Dionysos also on the south slope, the Temple of Apollo Patroos in the Agora, and the dedication of Philip and Alexander at the sanctuary of the Great Gods on Samothrace.

³⁸⁰ Mylonas 1961, p. 121 noted the blue limestone for walls of Telesterion.

them and to their right, the Telesterion was a canonical, Classical Doric structure of blue Eleusinian limestone. To their left, the porch of the Telesterion included Pentelic marble and the proportions of its 4th century B.C. Doric entablature. While the prospective initiates may not have noticed the finer details of its returning steps or low geison, for example, the overall impact may have been disconcerting. The effect would have been heightened further by the fact that the Telesterion would have been illuminated by the long shadows of torchlight as the prospective initiates encountered the building during the evening of their initiation.

The new peribolos wall of the 4th century B.C. also participated in this contemporary Athenian architectural vocabulary (Figures 8 and 94) in its use of building materials.³⁸¹ The wall presented a lively color contrast between its base, composed of grayish-blue Eleusinian limestone blocks with a tooled face, and the upper courses, composed of yellow poros blocks with a smooth face. The contrast of material and color was accentuated by the stepping down of the wall on its southern side as it follows the downward slope of the ground toward tower K7.³⁸² At the same time, however, the wall

³⁸¹ At its northern end, the wall began at the Classical Phase tower I12, turned at a right angle to the west, and continued to the Second Archaic Phase wall at K4. Between K4 to K7 and as far as its intersection with I12 the wall was c. 2.55m. thick. After K4, the wall became narrower (0.85m. average thickness) as it extended toward the west and then turned to the north. Material and dimensions from Mylonas 1961, p. 135. Additional dimensions from Noack 1927, pp. 202-204. A long rectangular structure (K15) built along the eastern side of the 4th century B.C. peribolos wall, between towers K7 and I12, was divided into six compartments (Figures 8 and 87). Skias 1895, pp. 165-74 identified the structure, 40 by 8.25m., as a subterranean storehouse because the floors of the compartments were lower than the 4th century B.C. ground level southeast of the Telesterion. Noack 1927, pp. 214-15 and Mylonas 1961, p. 150 suggested that the storage rooms were built to replace the Classical Phase *siros* (east of I14), which the earlier excavators noted was covered at the time of the expansion of the Telesterion terrace for the porch of Philo. For the filling over the Classical Phase storeroom, see Philios 1883, p. 93. Mylonas 1961, pp. 131-134 argued that the wall dated to 370-60 B.C., based on historical considerations, and following Kourouniotes and Travlos 1939, pp. 28-31. Philios 1906, p. 103 considered the wall to date to 335-25 B.C. Scranton 1941, pp. 123-128 demonstrated that the wall presented a type of tooled poros in the base of the peribolos walls which is earlier than other examples, which dates the wall to the 330s B.C.

³⁸² The wall included two towers, a round tower (K7), approximately 10m. in diameter and composed of the same materials as the wall itself, and a square tower at K6, 6.48 x 5.35m., which included a staircase

adhered to building traditions specific to Eleusis. Like earlier walls at the sanctuary, it retained great amounts of fill to support expansion of the Telesterion terrace. During the 4th century B.C., this fill covered the Classical propylon at I10 and the remains of the Classical peribolos wall. It also had a distinctively defensive character, now predictable at the sanctuary. Next to tower K6, a new southern gateway for the sanctuary was constructed in the 4th century B.C. wall (Figures 87, 95, 96, and 97). This gateway, which did not include a porch, replaced the earlier southern propylon in the Classical Phase wall at I10 as the southern entrance into the sanctuary.³⁸³

Three building inscriptions from the 4th century B.C. referred to gateways and propyla at the sanctuary at Eleusis, which call into question contemporary nomenclature for the entrances of the sanctuary in the 4th century B.C. The first inscription, *IG II² 1672* (329/8 B.C.), found in the area of the church of Agios Zacharias northeast of the sanctuary at Eleusis (Figure 1), recorded construction and repairs at entrances and other gateways at the sanctuary at Eleusis during the 4th century B.C.³⁸⁴ Most of the gateways under consideration in the inscription do not belong to the 4th century B.C, but are earlier constructions that remained in use, such the Second Archaic Phase gateways at H12, H14, H39, and next to H18. Two other 4th century B.C. inscriptions found at Eleusis (*Eleusiniaka* [1932] and *IG II² 1187*) suggest that one of these entrances may have been a

(1.34m. wide) from the eastern side of the tower up to an interior upper room. Description of tower and steps from Noack 1927, pp. 204-206 and Mylonas 1961, p. 136.

³⁸³ The width of the opening in the wall was 3.97m. wide, while the gateway itself was 3.88m. (stepped in by the wider base blocks of the wall). Dimensions from Noack 1927, pp. 205-206. Also described by Mylonas 1961, p. 136. The door was located along the inner, northern line of the entrance, its position indicated by two pivot support blocks and a central block. This gateway has been referred to as the South Pylon in previous scholarship, because of its position at the south of the sanctuary and by analyses of building inscription *IG II² 1672* (329/8 B.C.) and *Eleusiniaka* (1932) (mid-4th century B.C.). Kourouniotes 1936, p. 67, Kourouniotes 1932, p. 194, Travlos 1949, p. 146, and Mylonas 1961, p. 136 identified this gateway with the south pylon in *IG II² 1672* line 305.

³⁸⁴ Clinton 2005a, pp. 188-206, cat. 177. See also Travlos 1949, pp. 140-142; Travlos 1956, pp. 72-76; Tsountas 1894; *Agora XXXI*, pp. 61-62, 101.

propylon to the sanctuary, rather than a simple gateway. These inscriptions referred to a propylon (or propylaia) specifically, rather than using the general words of *pulis* or *pulon*, which simply mean gateway. The first of the inscriptions was published by Kourouniotes in 1932 and is dated to the mid-4th or second half of the 4th century B.C. (*Eleusiniaka* [1932]).³⁸⁵ The inscription, found by Travlos in a wall at the door of a small Roman house, is of blue-gray marble and describes repairs made to the gates and the wall of Eleusis.³⁸⁶ Travlos believed that the inscription referred to both city and sanctuary walls and gateways, but Kourouniotes argued that the inscription refers primarily to the city gates (he acknowledges as a possible exception the building at lines 37-45).³⁸⁷ Line 37 begins with a lacuna and the first letter following it is “n.” From lines 37 to 44, a building is described that has a stylobate, columns composed of three drums, and a tiled roof. It had repairs to its roof, a replacement stylobate block (lines 38-39), the addition of new columns to already existing capitals (lines 40-42), and a new capital for an already existing column (lines 43-44). Kourouniotes argued that this columned building was a propylon and restored the inscription at line 37 to read “to propylaion,” using the “n” preserved after the lacuna.³⁸⁸ At line 45, a “propyl” is mentioned within the walls, which must be restored as propylon or propylaia, but without information on its form provided. It is not clear from the inscription if a single propylon is mentioned twice in the

³⁸⁵ Clinton 2005a, pp. 179-81, cat. 174. Kourouniotes 1932, pp. 189-208 dated the inscription to the 2nd half of the 4th century B.C., on the basis of “word choices,” letter forms, and the fact that it is likely that the inscription is referring, like *IG II² 1672*, to 2nd half of 4th B.C. works at Eleusis. Also discussed by Travlos 1949, pp. 142-147; Mylonas 1961, pp. 95-96. Maier 1959, pp. 88-92 dated the inscription to just after Chaironeia, to after 330 B.C. Holland, Householder, and Scranton, unpub., no. 155.

³⁸⁶ Clinton 2005a, p. 292, cat. 290 re-identified the material of the inscription as a type of marble, instead of Eleusinian limestone as Kourouniotes observed.

³⁸⁷ Travlos 1949, p. 143; Kourouniotes 1932, p. 191. Clinton 1972a, p. 95 followed Kourouniotes, arguing that none of the gateways of the inscription can certainly be associated with the sanctuary.

³⁸⁸ Kourouniotes 1932, pp. 200-201 restored “propylon” to line 37 on comparison of the propylon mentioned in *IG II² 1187*. Clinton 2005a, pp. 179-81, cat. 174 does not restore “propylaion” here, but leaves the final “n” without an alternative restoration.

inscription, or if each reference described a separate propylon, nor are topographical indications included that might help determine where the structure(s) was located.³⁸⁹

The second inscription referring to a propylon is *IG II² 1187*, a decree which dates to the mid-4th century B.C.³⁹⁰ This stele, found at Eleusis, presents a decree honoring Derkylos from the deme Hagnous for his role in the education of the youth from the deme of Eleusis. The decree includes a sculpted relief depicting Derkylos presenting himself before Demeter and Kore. From lines 24-29, instructions are given for the fathers of the boys to set up the stele near the Propylaia of Demeter and Kore. No topographical clues are provided in the decree for the location of the propylaia.

It is not clear if the propyla or propylon mentioned in the former inscription is the same as that mentioned in *IG II² 1187*. In addition, although both inscriptions date to the 4th century B.C., we have no indication of the date of the propylon referenced, although at least it was old enough to require substantial repair. The Propylaia of Demeter and Kore named in *IG II² 1187* could have been in one of two places at the entrances at the north end of the sanctuary, either in the place of the Second Archaic Phase gateway next to H18 or the Early Classical Phase gateway next to the Kallichoron Well, since one would expect the processional entrance to the sanctuary to be the most likely candidate for a propylon dedicated to the two goddesses. If the former inscription does, in fact, refer to another propylon, it may be the other northern entrance or the southern entrance to the sanctuary next to K6, the gateways visible during the 4th century B.C.

Conclusion

³⁸⁹ Travlos 1949, pp. 146-47 argued that these are two different propyla. The first, at line 37, is a propylon at the southern entrance (next to K6), while the second propylon is that under the Lesser Propylaia (which Travlos considered the Propylaia of Demeter and Kore of *IG II² 1187*).

³⁹⁰ Clinton 2005a, pp. 103-104, cat. 99; Lawton 1995, p. 137.

During the 4th century B.C., development of the processional routes at the sanctuary at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion went beyond elaboration at the gateways. Entrance to the sanctuaries meant not only passage through a gateway, but also traversal of processional routes that included places for ritual action. In this way, the processional route at Eleusis demonstrated a sense of continuity with those of the Archaic period. Markers of entrance at the sanctuary during the Archaic period, the pyres and altar, are not visible in the archaeological record of the 4th century B.C., but places for the deposition of offerings of another sort were included in the *megara*. Places for viewing and gathering were included in the L-shaped structure, which was similar to the stepped podium of the 6th century B.C., although now located inside the sanctuary. At both sanctuaries, viewing platforms lined the processional route, including steps for spectators as well as elements for private dedications, such as the cuttings for *stelai* at the City Eleusinion and the supports for monument bases above the L-shaped steps along the sacred way at Eleusis. During the 4th century B.C., the Mysteries continued to attract large numbers of prospective initiates as one of the primary pan-Hellenic cults of Athens. The design of the processional routes during this period allowed individuals the possibility of a personal experience despite the crowds.

It is striking that in the development of the sanctuaries during the 4th century B.C., they continued to include modest propyla and gateways. Given the interest in elaborating the processional routes during this period, one might expect more monumental entrances to have been added, as elsewhere in the larger Greek world.³⁹¹ Even at Eleusis, where

³⁹¹ For example, the sanctuary of Zeus at Labraunda in Caria was elaborated with several buildings in the mid-4th century B.C., including two Ionic propyla (Figure 98). From the courtyard in front of them, a monumental processional staircase led up toward the heart of the sanctuary (Figure 99). For the remains of Labraunda during the Archaic period, see Thieme 1993, pp. 47-55; Hellström 1996, pp. 133-38; *Labraunda*

the inscriptions describe ordered elements for the propyla, these entrances remained otherwise humble. It is clear that financial resources were directed towards construction at the Telesterion and the wall of the sanctuary, built at least in part to facilitate work on the Telesterion. As in earlier phases, this attention reflected the importance of the hall of initiation to the sanctuary, with the entrance to the sanctuary formed by an imposing wall contrasted against a modest threshold into the sacred space.

I.1. From the sanctuary of Asklepios at Troizen, the propylon was approached by a ramp, and was located on the northern side of the sanctuary (Figure 100). The Doric propylon was distyle in antis on both porches, with a doorwall that included three doorways. See Carpenter 1971, pp. 113-15.

Chapter 8: The Hellenistic Period

Introduction

During most of the 3rd century B.C., Athens suffered political and economic decline as it endured Macedonian control. Nearly a century of occupation as well as frequent attempts to free itself left Athens at a disadvantage. Even its traditional polis cults, the Panathenaia, the City Dionysia, and the Mysteries were affected by the situation in which Athens was obliged to introduce new ruler-cults and to allow the participation of foreign royalty.³⁹² In his biography of Demetrios Poliorketes (*Demetrios* 26), Plutarch recorded a particularly shameful episode, in which Demetrios wanted to be initiated into the Mysteries all at once and in only one stage, instead of the required three stages.³⁹³ His request was accepted, and the Athenians agreed that it first be Anthesterion, so that Demetrios could undergo preliminary initiation as if taking part in the Lesser Mysteries, and then Boedromion, so that Demetrios could become a *mystes* and *epoptes* at the same time, as if during the Greater Mysteries in two different years.³⁹⁴ Little architectural development occurred at the Eleusinian sanctuaries during the first part of the 3rd century B.C.

³⁹² Parker 1996, pp. 258-275. Athens accepted dedications by foreign kings related to the central votive object of the Panathenaia, the peplos. In 298 B.C., Lysimachos offered Macedonian timber for the Panathenaic ship's mast, and in 282 or 278 B.C., Ptolemy gave Egyptian linen-cord for the ship's rigging. The Dionysia was renamed the Dionysia and Demetrieia. Parker 1996, p. 275 noted that the Eleusinia was promoted during the 3rd century B.C. to the level of the Panathenaia and the Dionysia, and participation of a wider scope was encouraged.

³⁹³ For the discussion of the stages of initiation, see Clinton 2003. In Plutarch's account, only Pythodoros stood up against Demetrios' request and the Athenians' acceptance of it.

³⁹⁴ Parker 1996, pp. 258-59 outlined the ruler-cult devoted to Demetrios Poliorketes, in which he and his father were honored as divine saviors of Athens after the liberation of Athens in 307 B.C. from Demetrios of Phaleron. Miles in *Agora* XXXI, p. 71, n. 2 observed that Demetrios' request was particularly disruptive because the Mysteries calendar was rooted in agricultural events in the spring (Anthesterion) and the fall (Boedromion). For further discussion of the initiation of Demetrios Poliorketes, see Gattinoni-Landucci 1983, pp. 117-24 and Clinton 2003, pp. 51, 58.

Near the end of the 3rd century B.C., thanks to aid from the Ptolemies, Athens managed to rid itself of Macedonian control. Athens regained its independence and its reputation as a cultural and philosophical center in the Greek world, even as its former political and economic prestige remained diminished. Beginning with the Ptolemies, various Hellenistic kings offered buildings to Athens as a way of connecting themselves with the Classical heritage of the city.

During the 2nd century B.C., Athens enjoyed renewed attention to its cultural legacy and an increased prestige of its religious festivals, particularly the Panathenaia.³⁹⁵ It was also an era of several important building projects, most of them sponsored by foreigners, such as the Attalids, who dedicated monuments on the Acropolis, its south slope, and the Agora, and Antiochos IV of Syria, who sponsored work on the temple of Olympian Zeus.³⁹⁶ Of these, the two Attalid stoas are particularly indicative of the 2nd century B.C. interest in traditional Athenian festivals. The stoa of Eumenes on the south slope was built just west of the sanctuary and theater of Dionysos and served as a shelter for participants and audience members of the performances in the theater during the City Dionysia.³⁹⁷ The stoa of Attalos in the Agora was built along the Panathenaic Way, in order to provide shelter and a viewing platform to those watching the Panathenaic procession and the procession of the Mysteries, as well as shops for the commercial aspects of the Agora. It is clear that Athens, and not Attica, held special value in the eyes of these foreign dynasties. Reflecting this circumstance, the City Eleusinion received

³⁹⁵ Shear 2001, pp. 603-23.

³⁹⁶ The Attalid monuments on the Acropolis included the Smaller Attalid Group (200 B.C.), the Attalid Monument at the northeast corner of the Parthenon, and the Monument of Eumenes II (both dedicated after 178 B.C.). On the south slope, Eumenes II dedicated a stoa. Antiochos IV's work on the temple of Olympian Zeus is recorded by Vitruvius 7 *praef.* 15. Hurwit 1999, pp. 269-82; Camp 2001, pp. 170-82.

³⁹⁷ Lefantzis 2008 has shown that the north wall behind the stoa dates to the second half of the 4th century B.C., and that the stoa fronted a stadium.

more architectural attention than the sanctuary at Eleusis. For the first time, the drive toward increasing monumentality at the entrance to the sanctuary occurred at the City Eleusinion, with the construction of the sanctuary's first propylon. The processional route into the sanctuary changed as the orientation of its entrance shifted to be linked directly with the Panathenaic way.

Athens

During the 2nd century B.C., a propylon and stoa framed an expanded City Eleusinion and redefined the entrance into the sanctuary (Figure 86).³⁹⁸ The stoa lined the southern limit to the sanctuary, and a platform attached to its western end abutted the Panathenaic way.³⁹⁹ The preserved length of the stoa is 25.40m., stretching across the entire preserved length of the sanctuary and continuing under the modern road to the east. The stoa included a front colonnade and lacked back rooms; its interior width was 5.90m. The date for the stoa is based on two fills, both located close to the northwest corner of the stoa, one dating to the late Hellenistic period and the other to the 2nd century B.C.⁴⁰⁰ One fill (CPD 38) included working chips of Pentelic and Hymettian marble, which points to the use of these marbles in the stoa. Given this evidence and the dimensions of the stoa, Miles suggested a one-story Doric stoa with Hymettian marble paving and steps and Pentelic marble columns and entablature. A platform, composed of poros blocks set into bedrock, was built adjacent to the western side of the stoa (Figure 101).⁴⁰¹ Approximately 5m. long and 2m. wide, it was likely intended for the display of a statue

³⁹⁸ A circular building that also dates to the 2nd century B.C. was built south of the sanctuary. *Agora XXXI*, pp. 81-83. The purpose of the structure is not certain, but Miles suggested that the five poros altars in the area and deposits with plemochoai indicate that this was a sacred area, perhaps connected with dining in honor of Pluton.

³⁹⁹ Description of stoa, materials, and construction from *Agora XXXI*, pp. 75-78.

⁴⁰⁰ *Agora XXXI*, p. 75. The fills are CPD 38 and 39 (deposit T 21:1).

⁴⁰¹ *Agora XXXI*, p. 77.

group or other monuments. The platform projected slightly from the line of the western peribolos wall limits, and was in a prominent position along the Panathenaic Way. Construction of the stoa and the terrace in front of it covered the earlier southern gateways.

The sanctuary's first propylon, contemporary with the stoa, cut through the western side of the First Archaic Phase wall (Figures 86 and 101).⁴⁰² The foundations for the propylon, composed of a mix of poros, conglomerate, white marble, and Hymettian marble, with some of the blocks included in a reused position, were set into the bedrock, with one course necessary on the higher southern side and three courses on the northern side. The foundations were covered by a paving course of Hymettian marble, preserved in one block on the northern side and three blocks on the southern side. The better preserved southern blocks include a T-clamp, dowel holes, and pry marks, as well as a contrast between a smoothly and more roughly finished upper surface, all of which indicate the position of the sidewalls and the central crosswall (Figure 101). The preserved foundations of the propylon indicate an H-shaped plan, 6.10m. long and 4.75m. wide, with an inner and outer porch divided by a single crosswall.⁴⁰³ Given the preserved

⁴⁰² The propylon is described by *Agora XXXI*, pp. 71-75. Earlier excavators dated the propylon to the 4th century B.C. as part of the constructions and repair at the sanctuary documented by *IG II² 1672*, lines 128-33 (329/8 B.C.). See *Agora XIV*, p. 152. In these lines, the purchase of a poros threshold block and other blocks for a doorway are described. As Miles in *Agora XXXI*, pp. 61-62 has shown, although the dimensions of the blocks in the inscription could fit the western sanctuary propylon, they could also fit either of the southern sanctuary entrances. Moreover, as Miles in *Agora XXXI*, pp. 74-75 noted, these lines in the inscription do not refer to a doorway into the City Eleusinion, but rather to a doorway within the City Eleusinion. Finally, Miles noted several fills dating to the 2nd century B.C. in the area of the propylon which support a 2nd century B.C. date for the propylon's construction. The date provided by these fills is corroborated by the 2nd century B.C. construction date for the stoa, which certainly put out of use the southern sanctuary entrances.

⁴⁰³ The sculpted frieze in the Little Metropolis church, which was assigned by Miles to the proposed Inner Propylon of the City Eleusinion could perhaps fit on this propylon (the frieze fragment is 0.60 x 1.65m.). Dimensions for the frieze from Steiner 1906, p. 338.

evidence, Miles reconstructed a distyle in antis plan for the propylon.⁴⁰⁴ The propylon was smaller than most other propyla from the Hellenistic period, with the amount of space between the antae on each porch c. 3.79-3.67m. (the total width of the foundations 4.75m. less the minimum and maximum wall thicknesses).⁴⁰⁵

The elimination of the southern gateways and the introduction of the new propylon on the western side of the sanctuary indicated a specific reorientation of the sanctuary toward the Panathenaic Way. Previously, visitors entered the sanctuary by turning from the Panathenaic Way onto an east-west street, then turning once again into a gateway on the southern side of the sanctuary. With the new buildings, the form of the processional route changed. The stoa was built over the east-west road, the terrace before the stoa covered the southern gateway, and the propylon was located on the western side of the sanctuary, along the Panathenaic way. The propylon presented a formal façade to those traversing the Panathenaic Way, who had previously seen only the Archaic peribolos wall as they passed through the Agora up to the Acropolis. Now, the processional route to the City Eleusinion passed the 4th century B.C. stepped podium at the northern end of the sanctuary, likely with *stelai* and other dedications on display, and

⁴⁰⁴ Miles in *Agora* XXXI, p. 74 noted an additional paving slab fragment that joins the western end of the pavement, which included a square cutting (1.35m. preserved width) on its surface. Miles suggested that this cutting may represent the position of a Herm or other monument set on the paving of the propylon's outer porch, against the wall. In contrast, Thompson 1960, p. 336 proposed an earlier reconstruction of the propylon without columns, given the absence of any preserved column fragments and the small size of the propylon.

⁴⁰⁵ The propyla closest in size to that at the City Eleusinion are the late 4th and early 3rd century B.C. examples from the sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia. The northern propylon is 4.90m. x 6.13m., while the eastern propylon is 4.80m. x 4.65m. Both of these propyla have been reconstructed as distyle in antis Doric structures, on the basis of fragments of Doric capitals and the cornice (from the northern propylon) and a fragment of the Doric frieze (from the eastern propylon). See Gebhard and Hemans 1998, pp. 51-57 (Figure 102). Another propylon of similar size is that built at the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth during the late 4th and early 3rd century B.C., a Doric distyle in antis propylon that was 8.30m x 4.80m. (Figure 42). See *Corinth* XXVIII.3, pp. 214-27. Also similar is the propylon of the sanctuary of Demeter at Pergamon, which was 8.28 x 5.04m. See Bohtz 1981, pp. 17-20. In many of these examples, lack of preservation prevents reconstruction of the width of the inner opening, so comparisons here are based on the dimensions across the walls.

then through the new 2nd century B.C. propylon. The platform on the western side of the contemporary stoa, projecting out from the sanctuary limits, probably also displayed statues or other dedications. The propylon provided a new line of sight for visitors as they entered the sanctuary. The Rocky Outcrop, the venerable topographical landmark, and the temple of Triptolemos were no longer on axis with the entrance. Instead, visitors were presented with an oblique view into the sanctuary toward the northeast, and directed into an area delimited by the sanctuary's largest built structures, the monument base, the temple of Triptolemos, and the stoa. The Rocky Outcrop was shielded from view as visitors entered the sanctuary, but was visible once they were inside the sanctuary. Since the primary role of the City Eleusinion in the festival of the Mysteries was to house the *hiera* during their time in Athens, and later to serve as the departure point for the procession toward Eleusis, perhaps the new plan of the sanctuary was also designed to accommodate those gathered for the procession and for their departure from the sanctuary, as much as for their arrival.

Eleusis

In striking contrast to earlier phases at the sanctuary at Eleusis, during the Hellenistic period, there was not a major construction project (Figures 8 and 103).⁴⁰⁶ Given the prominence of Athens compared to Attica during these centuries, this is not surprising. The processional route at the sanctuary was only slightly affected by architectural development at the sanctuary, which was focused almost entirely on the southern side of the sanctuary. A modification of the southern gateway next to tower K6

⁴⁰⁶ Mylonas 1961, p. 152 noted that a fortification wall was built in the early 3rd century B.C. above the sanctuary, beginning near the Roman temple on the hill, and continuing for a preserved length of 48m. The c. 2m. wide wall is composed of an Eleusinion block socle, and must have been intended to delimit the eastern end of the city on the acropolis. Evidence to support this 3rd century B.C. date is unclear.

took place and the so-called Bouleuterion (K13) was built, but the precise date for these structures is unclear. They are certainly both later than the 4th century B.C. peribolos wall and storerooms (K15), which only provides an approximate terminus post quem of the later 4th century B.C.⁴⁰⁷

In its original form, the doors of the gateway next to tower K6 were on the inner, northern side of the gateway, indicated by the placement of two side blocks to support the door pivots, and a central block for the door stop (Figures 95, 96, and 104).⁴⁰⁸ During the modification, the threshold for the door was moved to the southern, exterior line of the wall.⁴⁰⁹ When the new threshold was added, new antae were added to each side of the doorway, narrowing the doorway space to 2.88m. wide.⁴¹⁰

On the western side of the gateway, Skias identified a polygonal wall as the footing for a ramp up to the acropolis above the sanctuary (Figures 8 and 105).⁴¹¹ The wall socle, composed of polygonal masonry with a hammered face and an upper course of polygonal masonry with a tooled surface, socle has a preserved height of 1.15m., and the preserved wall course above is 0.79m. tall.⁴¹² Because the polygonal style of the wall

⁴⁰⁷ A general Hellenistic date for the gateway modification and the so-called Bouleuterion was assigned by Skias 1896, pp. 171-73, and followed by Noack 1927, p. 271 and Mylonas 1961, pp. 153-54, with the latter putting a slight emphasis on a date in the 3rd century B.C. in particular.

⁴⁰⁸ Skias 1896, pp. 179-80; Noack 1927, p. 217.

⁴⁰⁹ The threshold was some 0.30m. higher than the earlier door pivots, perhaps indicating ground level at the time the Bouleuterion was built. Height difference estimated from Noack 1927, fig. 81.

⁴¹⁰ Noack 1927, p. 217. Noack 1927, fig. 81 includes a gateway width of 2.85m. The width of the original doorway was 3.88m. wide.

⁴¹¹ Skias 1896, p. 181; Mylonas 1961, p. 153. Noack 1927, pp. 215-16 agreed with Skias' identification, but did not offer further discussion of the date.

⁴¹² Description of faces from Scranton 1941, p. 49. Dimensions from Wrede 1933, p. 33. Noack 1927, p. 215 recorded the wall height as 1.12m., the thickness as 1.03m., and the preserved length as 1.60m.

is similar to the east wall of the Bouleuterion, Mylonas, following Skias, considered them both as contemporary Hellenistic structures.⁴¹³

On the southeastern side of the gateway, the so-called Bouleuterion (K13) was built along the interior of the 4th century B.C. peribolos wall, partly over the storerooms (K15) in the southeastern corner of peribolos wall (Figures 8 and 106).⁴¹⁴ The rectangular structure (about 34 x 14m.) was composed of three rooms, with the central room including a semicircular back wall and a front porch (3.70m. from north to south) paved with stone slabs. The northern face of the crosswall between the porch and the back room was well-finished, but the southern face of the wall was irregular, possibly to accommodate seats.⁴¹⁵ Skias reconstructed the porch as having six columns across the front, and also four columns at the crosswall between the rounded room and the porch, and he observed that at the time the so-called Bouleuterion was constructed, footing for steps at tower K6 was installed (Figures 8, 95, and 104).⁴¹⁶

The sole project at the northern end of the sanctuary may be the modification of the Kallichoron Well (Figure 107).⁴¹⁷ In his study of the architecture for the well, Ziro

⁴¹³ Mylonas 1961, p. 154; Skias 1896, p. 181. In their studies of Greek and Attic walls, Wrede 1933, p. 33 and Scranton 1941, p. 49 were more conservative in their date for the ramp, admitting only that it was later than the 4th century B.C. peribolos wall.

⁴¹⁴ The Bouleuterion was first described by Skias 1895, pp. 174-80. Other discussions of the Bouleuterion were based on Skias' description, as in Mylonas 1961, pp. 153-54; McDonald 1943, pp. 187-89 (McDonald recorded the building dimensions as 34 x 16m.); Hansen and Nielsen 2004, p. 391. Gneisz 1990, pp. 139-43, 318 did not accept Skias' identification of the building, but agreed that it belonged to the 3rd century B.C. Gneisz instead identified the building as a monument with a statue podium, on the grounds that a round bouleuterion did not exist until the 2nd century B.C. at Miletus. Part of the reason the excavators identified the building as a Bouleuterion is that two later inscriptions refer to a Bouleuterion in Eleusis (*IG* II² 1078 lines 40-43; 220 A.D.) or a meeting of the Areopagos in Eleusis (*IG* IV² 83 line 8 (40-42 A.D.)). A 4th century B.C. inscription suggests that a Bouleuterion may have already existed at Eleusis, *CIA*, III, 5.

⁴¹⁵ McDonald 1943, p. 188.

⁴¹⁶ This was necessary because the so-called Bouleuterion cut off access to the tower's steps, which had been accessible from an opening on the northern side of the tower, in line with the 4th century B.C. wall. The western room of the so-called Bouleuterion was cut into at its southwestern corner to accommodate access to the tower. Skias 1896, p. 178. The steps are also discussed by Mylonas 1961, p. 153 and Noack 1927, p. 217.

⁴¹⁷ Mylonas and Travlos 1983, p. 148 considered this work at the well to be Hellenistic.

determined that the enclosure was reduced to having a low parapet wall, and that the upper wall blocks and cornice blocks were re-used for new paving at the well.⁴¹⁸ Ziro argued that this construction work could have been repair work necessitated by an attack on Eleusis by Demetrios Poliorketes in 297 B.C. This remodeling meant that the well, the locus of celebratory dancing upon arrival to the sanctuary, was visible to the members of the procession as they arrived at Eleusis. One aspect of the sanctuary was no longer concealed from view, but it still remained separated from the performance area for dancing by the parapet wall.

Conclusion

The city of Athens was the focus of great architectural attention during the middle part of the Hellenistic period, particularly during the 2nd century B.C., which included the stoa and propylon at the City Eleusinion. Like the new stoas in the Agora, the stoa on the southern side of the City Eleusinion framed this part of the sanctuary with a monumental façade. Unlike projects that were financed by foreigners, however, the buildings at the City Eleusinion may have been paid for by the Athenians themselves. If these structures had been the result of foreign patronage, we would expect an inscription or other record of the gift. The western side of the City Eleusinion was elaborated not only to formalize an entrance for those participating in the Mysteries, but also to draw attention to the sanctuary and its cult to those taking part in the processions of the Panathenaia and the Mysteries.

Eleusis was still prominent as the location of initiation, and perhaps the existing facilities were sufficient at the sanctuary for this purpose. The fact that the City Eleusinion, not Eleusis, received a monumental propylon may reflect that the older

⁴¹⁸ Ziro 1991, pp. 105-106.

propyla at the sanctuary were in good repair. It could also have been considered more important for the sanctuary of the goddesses in the city to receive elaboration so that it could compete in form, design, monumentality, and elaboration with development elsewhere in Athens during the Hellenistic period.

Chapter 9: The Late Republican Period

Introduction

Athenian sanctuaries began the 1st century B.C. in a difficult position. In 88 B.C., with the Mithridatic War looming, all public and religious gatherings in Athens were prohibited, including the Mysteries.⁴¹⁹ These prohibitions mark the instability of internal politics in Athens just as it joined allegiances with Mithridates of Pontos against the Romans.⁴²⁰ Mithridates' fleet, under the control of Archelaus, took harbor at Piraeus with the hope of encouraging other Greek cities to join their alliance with Athens. Rome had already declared war on Mithridates in 89 B.C.; attack on Athens and Piraeus in the early summer of 87 B.C., led by Sulla, took on both these enemies. Sulla spent the winter of 87/6 B.C. camped at Eleusis, but, as Clinton noted, there is no indication that he damaged or plundered the sanctuary during his stay.⁴²¹ After initial sieges and preparations, Sulla had weakened Piraeus and Athens enough so that in March of 86 B.C., he could conquer both. Damage suffered by most buildings in Athens was limited to that caused simply by the movement of troops or weapons because Sulla opted to pillage, rather than to destroy, the monuments of Athens. Repairs to structures damaged by Sulla and the sack did not begin until over twenty years later, when Pompey gave money to Athens for rebuilding; it is not clear how the money was used. About a decade later, in 51 B.C., Caesar, too, gave money to the city for the same purpose. Finally, three decades after Sulla's invasion, Athens began its process of recovery.

⁴¹⁹ Robertson 1998, p. 559. Athenaeus 5.212-213 (late 2nd/early 3rd century A.D.).

⁴²⁰ For a review of the situation in Athens during and immediate after Sulla's attack, see Hoff 1997, pp. 33-44. The primary ancient sources for this period include Appian *Mithridates* 30-41 (first half of 2nd century A.D.); Plutarch *Sulla* 12-14; Athenaeus 5.212-213.

⁴²¹ Clinton 1989b, p. 1503, citing Appian *Mithridates* 33.

The 1st century B.C. witnessed a time of new and fast-growing interest in the Mysteries on the part of Romans, which would continue to intensify during the first two centuries of the Roman Imperial period.⁴²² Clinton has demonstrated that Romans were initiated already in the first half of the 1st century B.C., including Cicero, who was initiated, perhaps along with Atticus, in 79 B.C.⁴²³ At mid-century, statues were set up at Eleusis in honor of other Romans, likely in commemoration of their initiation.⁴²⁴ Romans took a great interest in Eleusis and the Mysteries, not only because the Mysteries were so closely connected to Athens, which was a focus of cultural interest in the late Republican period, but also because of a genuine desire for initiation and the promise of a better afterlife, as Cicero remarked (*De Legibus* 2.14.36): "...and as these rites are called 'initiations,' so in very truth we have learned from them the beginnings of life, and have gained the power not only to live happily, but also to die with a better hope."⁴²⁵

At the City Eleusinion, this Roman interest during the late Republican period is primarily attested by inscribed dedications and sculpture, rather than architectural elaboration.⁴²⁶ At Eleusis, stoas were built on either side of the southern gateway next to tower K6 (Figures 96 and 108), which created a tunnel-like effect for those entering the

⁴²² For discussions of the sanctuary at Eleusis and the Mysteries during the late Republic, see Clinton 1989b, 1997.

⁴²³ Clinton 1989b, p. 1504.

⁴²⁴ Clinton 1989b, pp. 1504-1507. Another dedication by a Roman was a marble bench with an inscription noting it as the gift of Gaius Kreperius. For a discussion of this bench and its possible position within the Lesser Propylaia, see below XX.

⁴²⁵ Reference to Cicero cited by Clinton 1997, p. 161. Cicero, *De Legibus* 2.14.36: "...et mitigati sumus, initiaque ut appellantur, ita re vera principia vitae cognovimus; neque solum cum laetitia vivendi rationem accepimus, sed etiam cum spe meliora moriendi."

⁴²⁶ For these dedications, see *Agora XXXI*, cat. I, 16-I, 22. A sacred law of the 1st century B.C. was also found at the City Eleusinion, containing directions for several aspects of the Mysteries, including punishments for offenses, the order of the procession, and instructions for the participants to wear crowns. See *Agora XXXI*, cat. I, 43.

sanctuary from the south.⁴²⁷ Contemporary with the stoas must be the construction of the stepped feature between the western stoa and the Telesterion (Figure 8, north of K4), which was likely a viewing platform for an action that took place in the area in front of it.⁴²⁸ At the northern end of the sanctuary, the Archaic gateway at the inner entrance was replaced by the Lesser Propylaia at Eleusis, dedicated by Appius Claudius Pulcher and begun between 50 and 48 B.C. In contrast to the presumably simple entrance through the outer sanctuary walls (the Early Classical gateway), the Lesser Propylaia, with the walls of its entrance court reaching out to embrace the *hiera* and the procession, and its elaborately decorated front porch confronting the viewer with words and images, must have been striking as it announced that the procession was about to enter into the heart of the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore. In keeping with the Hellenistic hierarchy of orders, in which the interior would be more richly articulated than the exterior, the inner gateway was more elaborate than the outer gateway.

The Lesser Propylaia

⁴²⁷ The sidewalls for the stoas were built flush with the original walls of the gateway, so that the passage was c. 3.97m. wide by 11.50m. long. The approximate width of the passage is taken from Noack 1927, fig. 81 (Figure 96 here), the length is from Mylonas 1961, p. 181. The stoas were built against the 4th century B.C. peribolos wall, and the western was over the ramp identified by Skias (K12). The eastern stoa was built over the so-called Bouleuterion of the Hellenistic period, and was approximately the same length as its predecessor, but 4.50m. narrower. The stoas were dated by Skias 1896, p. 192 to the Republican period on the basis of an inscribed mason's mark on one of the stoa's column drums (IIN), which he compared to a mason's mark on the top of one of the Lesser Propylaia capitals (II) (Figures 109 and 110, number 2). The stoas were studied by Skias 1896, pp. 181-93, and also discussed by Mylonas 1961, pp. 181-82 and McDonald 1943, p. 188, n. 218.

⁴²⁸ Mylonas 1961, pp. 137-141 suggested this action was the *balletys*, or pelting ritual. This ritual is not very well known and the location of its performance is uncertain. Hesychius, s.v. *balletys*, defined the *balletys* as an Athenian festival in honor of Demophon, and Athenaeus 9.406d described it as a pelting with stones performed at Eleusis. Brumfield 1981, pp. 183-84 argued that this was a ritual performed in honor of Demophon during the Eleusinia. Clinton 1979, p. 5, n. 17 also followed Hesychius that the ritual was a contest performed in honor of Demophon, but argued that it was not performed during the Eleusinia. For further discussion of the *balletys*, see Richardson 1974, pp. 245-46.

Early Travelers, Excavation History, Survey of Scholarship

The remains of the Lesser Propylaia were among the first from the sanctuary that were recorded by early travelers.⁴²⁹ On their 1676 visit to Eleusis, George Wheler and Jacob Spon traveled the Iera Odos from Athens to Eleusis on horseback, covering the distance in four hours. They observed the visible remains of the Lesser Propylaia, column, roof, and wall fragments, as well as remains of what they identified as marble Ionic columns, and sculpted ears of wheat and poppies, and identified it as the temple of Ceres. To the southwest of the foundations, Wheler and Spon saw one of the kistephoroi from the Lesser Propylaia, which they identified as a statue of Ceres.⁴³⁰ Over a century later, Richard Chandler observed the sculpted poppies and wheat, as well as the colossal statue.⁴³¹ Particularly noteworthy was the visit of E.D. Clarke in November 1801, a visit which resulted in the removal of the exposed kistephoros to England.⁴³² According to Clarke's account, as soon as he saw the sculpture submerged up to its neck in a "heap of dung," the offerings of the villagers for a successful growing season, he determined it necessary to remove the statue. He rushed back to Athens, secured a firman that gave him permission to take the statue, and then returned to Eleusis prepared to fulfill what he must have considered to be a rescue mission. Clarke recorded that none of the residents was willing to assist him in his efforts, fearing the loss of an arm as punishment from St. Demetra. Ultimately they acquiesced, after the local priest took the first whack, and the

⁴²⁹ See also Mylonas 1961, pp. 9-13 and Hörmann 1932, pp. 5-13 for historical survey of travelogues, excavation reports, and other publications.

⁴³⁰ Wheler 1682, pp. 425-30; Spon 1683, pp. 275-85. Both Wheler and Spon record similar details in their accounts, though Wheler additionally measured the Ionic capital, noting it to be 3ft 9½ inches in diameter. He estimated the column diameter to be 2ft 11 inches. Both travelers include an amusing anecdote involving their druggerman who, during an attempt to capture a hare, discharged his gun with such force that he knocked himself to the ground, convincing Wheler and Spon that they were under attack.

⁴³¹ Chandler 1817, pp. 201-17. Although he does not expressly describe the remains of the Lesser Propylaia, E. Dodwell visited Eleusis in late September 1805. See Dodwell 1819, pp. 581-85.

⁴³² Clarke 1818, pp. 601-28. An account of Clarke's visit can also be found in Palagia 1997, pp. 84-5.

kistephoros was dispatched to Piraeus. As a side note, Clarke recorded that once the statue was on route to England, the ship transporting it sank; the statue was recovered. It now resides in the Fitzwilliam Museum of Cambridge University (Figure 111).

Members of the Society of Dilettanti traveled to Eleusis in 1812, and Francis Bedford and other visitors were the first to identify the remains as the Lesser Propylaia.⁴³³ They were also the first to attempt an excavation of the building, publishing its first complete plan, as well as a section drawing, elevations of Ionic capitals and the entablature, and a description of the remains. Their description provided two pieces of information that have played an integral role in subsequent discussions of the building. First, their publication discussed the two long grooves in the floor of the north porch, which they described as facilitators for a wheeled, movable platform in the propylon. As argued below, these are wheel ruts cut to facilitate the movement of wheeled vehicles into the sanctuary. Second, Bedford suggested that an Ionic capital fragment, which he noted as unfinished at the back, could be reconstructed as part of a series of columns built against the sidewalls of the entrance court. The attribution of this capital to the Lesser Propylaia and the possibility that the entrance court had Ionic colonnades, although attractive to some scholars, must be discounted, as discussed below.

Over the course of the next century, more systematic excavations of the Lesser Propylaia were carried out, and gradually the form of the propylaia's superstructure was pieced together. First, in 1860 François Lenormant excavated the site and recovered some of the Corinthian capitals and the architrave inscription of the outer porch.⁴³⁴ In 1862, Bötticher identified a head and foreleg of an animal from one of the capitals, and

⁴³³ Society of Dilettanti 1817, pp.19-26.

⁴³⁴ Lenormant 1862, pp. 391-401 discussed the earlier work and the inscription from the Lesser Propylaia.

he suggested that evidence from the capitals indicated a projecting outer porch supported by two free-standing columns.⁴³⁵ The Greek Archaeological Society of Athens began a second excavation of the Lesser Propylaia in 1882. Based on their work, Blavette was the first to suggest that the Lesser Propylaia had more than one phase, with a change from a single doorway to triple doorways.⁴³⁶

Libertini completed the first comprehensive study of the architecture of the Lesser Propylaia in 1916.⁴³⁷ He cleared the entire pavement, as well as several fragments of Corinthian capitals, the kistephoroi, and other pieces of the superstructure. Libertini agreed that the propylon had two phases, the first with a single doorway, and the second with the addition of the side doors. Hörmann, in his monograph on Eleusinian architecture, accepted most of Libertini's conclusions, but he also departed from previous reconstructions.⁴³⁸ Hörmann suggested that the Lesser Propylaia had three phases, the first with a single door and a short south porch, the second with a single doorway and a deeper south porch complete with fountains, and a third phase with three doorways, causing the fountains to be put out of use. As demonstrated below, architectural evidence from the Lesser Propylaia supports only an original plan with a later modification, rather than three phases of building.

The immediate responses to Hörmann varied. A year after Hörmann's publication, Zschiezschmann disagreed with Hörmann's sequence of phases for the Lesser Propylaia.⁴³⁹ He argued that the parastade walls of the entrance court and the south porch were contemporary, but he did agree, however, that the kistephoroi first were

⁴³⁵ Hörmann 1932, p. 8; Julius 1877, pp. 190-192.

⁴³⁶ Blavette 1884, p. 263.

⁴³⁷ Libertini 1916.

⁴³⁸ Hörmann 1932.

⁴³⁹ Zschiezschmann 1933, p. 336.

positioned against the doorwall and were later moved to the outer edge of the spur walls that exist today. Von Gerkan rejected the association of the kistephoroi with the Lesser Propylaia, at least in the first phase of the building.⁴⁴⁰ He could only accept their association with the Lesser Propylaia if they were a much later addition during the time of Hadrian. Dinsmoor proposed that the kistephoroi supported a structure like that of the distyle north porch.⁴⁴¹ In his reconstruction, the kistephoroi acted as free-standing columns. Dinsmoor based his argument on aesthetic preferences, citing that the kistephoroi neither belonged against a wall nor in antis. Although at first he followed the reconstruction of the entrance court offered by Libertini, including sidewalls without Ionic columns, in his second edition, Dinsmoor returned to the earlier idea of having Ionic columns along the parastade walls.⁴⁴²

No detailed study of the Lesser Propylaia has been offered since that of Hörmann. Ziro presented a more recent architectural overview of the Lesser Propylaia, chiefly summarizing Hörmann's work.⁴⁴³ Sauron offered the most recent treatment of the architectural sculpture of the Lesser Propylaia and its position within the Republican historical milieu.⁴⁴⁴

It has been difficult for scholars to come to agreement on the reconstruction of the Lesser Propylaia because it is a highly unusual building, and one that is not very well-preserved. The systematic study of the propylon and the remains in situ presented here, however, resolves two main problems of reconstruction. First, the Lesser Propylaia did not include three phases as proposed by Hörmann, but instead evidence indicates an

⁴⁴⁰ Von Gerkan 1934, pp. 10-14.

⁴⁴¹ Dinsmoor 1957, pp. 286-87, n. 4.

⁴⁴² Compare Dinsmoor 1927, p. 167 to Dinsmoor 1957, p. 286, n. 4.

⁴⁴³ Ziro 1991, pp. 107-114.

⁴⁴⁴ Sauron 2001, pp. 267-83.

original design with a single modification. The original design included a single doorway, the kistephoroi and a full southern porch with niches, perhaps for the display of statue bases or other votives. The later modification included two additional side doors. Second, the entrance court did not contain Ionic columns. Next, I argue that the architectural iconography of the Lesser Propylaia, the sculpted Corinthian capitals and Doric frieze of the north porch, the kistephoroi of the south porch, as well as order-mixing, communicated messages to the viewer connected with Demeter and the Mysteries, in accord with Roman taste. In addition, I consider the identity and goals of the patron, as well as the significance of the Latin dedicatory inscription. Finally, I study the experiential impact the Lesser Propylaia had on the visitor to the sanctuary, particularly when considered within its topographical context.

Description of the Lesser Propylaia

The Lesser Propylaia framed the pilgrim's first views into the inner part of the sanctuary and the sacred way, and directed the procession toward the Telesterion. As the prospective initiates approached the Lesser Propylaia from the outer gateway, they encountered a propylon far more lavish than any previously built at the sanctuary. High walls delimited an unroofed entrance court in front of the doorway (Figures 113 and 114). A smaller roofed porch, complete with lively sculpted capitals and dedicatory inscription on the architrave that commemorated the building as a prominent Roman's offering, led to the doorway through the propylon. As they passed across the threshold and into the sanctuary, the prospective initiates were flanked by kistephoroi supporting the roof of the southern porch, who gazed with them up to the Telesterion.

The krepidoma of the Lesser Propylaia is composed of two short steps of Hymettian marble, with all but the northeastern corner preserved. It is oriented from northwest to southeast and is approximately 14.785 x 14.10m., measured across the top step.⁴⁴⁵ Beneath the krepidoma, the foundations of the Lesser Propylaia are built directly on top of the Second Archaic Phase wall, entrance, and tower (H18). Under the northeast corner of the Lesser Propylaia foundations, the northwest corner of the Second Archaic Phase tower is visible today (Figures 55 and 115). Although these foundations were invisible to ancient viewers, the new entrance was embedded within the courses of the earlier walls, so that the connection between the old entrance and the new was established by the building's design. The south and west sides of the Lesser Propylaia use natural rock as foundations, while the north and east side have deeply built foundations of five courses.⁴⁴⁶

On the north side of the Lesser Propylaia, the entrance court is enclosed by two sidewalls that abut the transverse doorwall of the propylon (Figures 112, 113, and 114), creating a court 11.50m. wide and 9.50m. deep.⁴⁴⁷ The toichobate for the sidewalls, 0.26m. tall, was set a course above the paving. The top surface of the toichobate on both sides of the entrance court preserves a roughly picked band on its inner half, indicating

⁴⁴⁵ Dimensions of the krepidoma from Hörmann's actual state plan (Hörmann 1932, pl. 4; see Figure 112 here). The proportions of the Lesser Propylaia compare with the propylon of the sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros, which is smaller, 8.84 by 8.86m., but also nearly square in plan (Miles 1998, p. 42). Closer in dimensions is the propylon of the sanctuary of Apollo at Klaros, also with a square plan 12.70 by 12.90m. (Macridy-Bey and Picard 1915, p. 33).

⁴⁴⁶ The lowest three courses of foundations terminate at the Second Archaic Phase tower, while the fourth extends to the east of the foundations and continues over the limestone block of the tower's northwest corner. The darker limestone of the Second Archaic Phase tower is easily distinguished from the light gray and white limestone of the third and fourth courses of the Lesser Propylaia's foundations. Libertini 1916, p. 202 suggested that the third and fourth courses of the foundations belong to the 5th century B.C., which covered the Second Archaic Phase tower and supported the 4th century B.C. propylon that he thought existed on this site. The top course of the foundations is composed of limestone ashlar that are set approximately flush with the outer face of the lower marble step, except for the three blocks at the west that are more aligned with the courses below.

⁴⁴⁷ Dimensions for entrance court are from Hörmann 1932, pp. 22-27.

the position of a base molding that supported a facing for the wall; both were likely Pentelic marble. The superstructure of the walls includes an entablature with a triple fasciae architrave, plain Ionic frieze, and a geison of Pentelic marble.⁴⁴⁸ The architrave crown has an upper molding of a cyma reversa crowned by a cavetto.

Projecting into the entrance court, the north porch is composed of two Corinthian columns and two Corinthian pilasters supporting the entablature and roof. On each side of the porch, a short Hymettian marble stylobate supports two square plinths, the one at the north for the column and the one at the south for the pilaster base (Figures 116 and 117), all of which remain in situ today. Each plinth is carved together with an Attic-Ionic base.⁴⁴⁹ On the top surface of the upper torus of the column bases, setting lines and rough picking indicate the diameters of the base molding of the columns above, 0.96 and 0.97m.⁴⁵⁰ The height of the bases is c. 0.321m., and the height of the plinth is 0.314m. (Figure 118).

No fragments of the pilasters survive, although at the time of Hörmann's publication, three large pieces of the Pentelic column shafts were preserved (Figure 119).⁴⁵¹ One of these, the lower part of a column, was preserved to a height of 1.14m., with 8 flutes and 9 fillets remaining (Figure 119, number 3). From the bottom surface of this fragment, Hörmann measured the lower column diameter across the base molding as

⁴⁴⁸ Hörmann 1932, pp. 48-50.

⁴⁴⁹ The plinths are not all finished to the same degree or even in the same manner. On the eastern stylobate, the northern plinth has a recessed edge along its eastern side. The southern and western edges are plain, without a recessed edge, and the northern edge is not preserved. The southern plinth has a recessed edge along the northern, eastern and western sides, while the southern side is built against the doorwall. On the western stylobate, the northern plinth is recessed on all sides. The southern plinth is recessed on the northern, eastern, and western sides. The southern side is built against the doorwall. Perhaps the northern plinth of the east stylobate was not finished.

⁴⁵⁰ Hörmann 1932, p. 29. Mylonas 1961, p. 157 recorded the top surface diameter as 1.03m.

⁴⁵¹ Hörmann 1932, p. 53 reported that these fragments were resting on the eastern wall of the Lesser Propylaea and others near the Greater Propylaea. I have not been able to locate these fragments.

0.97m., which corresponds to the in situ column base on the northern porch.⁴⁵² A second surviving fragment is much longer, 2.12m. in height, and preserves enough of its surface to approximate the upper column surface (Figure 119, number 1). The profile at the crown of the column shaft consists of an apophyge, fillet, and crowning torus.⁴⁵³ The crown diameter is restored to 0.76m.⁴⁵⁴ A third column fragment has a preserved length of 1.76m, but neither end is preserved. Taking this information from the shaft fragments together, Libertini reconstructed the column height as 8 column diameters, but Hörmann reconstructed the column height as $8 \frac{1}{4}$ lower column diameters, or 7.961m. (using 0.965m. for the lower column diameter and calculated on the apophyge).⁴⁵⁵ Hörmann increased this dimension by 0.022m., to 7.983m. in order to fit more neatly with an even number of Roman feet of 0.295m. When the capital, base and plinth heights are subtracted from this total, the result is a shaft height of 6.458m. The pilaster height should be the same.⁴⁵⁶

All four Pentelic marble capitals of the north porch are preserved, two column and two pilaster capitals (Figure 110).⁴⁵⁷ The column capitals have a six-sided abacus and are decorated with winged animals and lush foliage (Figure 120). Acanthus leaves rising up through the first third of the capital's height form the lower register, while three projecting winged and horned lions alternate with lotus-like foliage decoration above.

⁴⁵² Hörmann 1932, p. 53. The lower column diameter is based on a lower column radius of 0.44m. + 0.045m. apophyge projection.

⁴⁵³ In Hörmann's drawing, the torus appears to be unmolded.

⁴⁵⁴ The upper column diameter is taken from the drawing provided by Hörmann 1932, pl. 11, no. 1.

⁴⁵⁵ Libertini 1916, pp. 211-12; Hörmann 1932, p. 97. Libertini did not specify the source of his dimensions, only noting that he considered the upper surface of the column bases, column fragments, and the number of flutes.

⁴⁵⁶ For the Propylon of Ptolemy II on Samothrace, see *Samothrace X*, p. 77; Frazer reconstructed the columns to 7.307m., or over 9 times the lower column diameter of c. 0.778m. Gruben 1996, p. 74 discussed the range of possible Ionic height restorations, which can be between 8-12 lower column diameters, measured on the diameter of the shaft.

⁴⁵⁷ Hörmann 1932, p. 57 noted that the column capital in the museum courtyard has been restored by Kourouniotes.

Between the animals and the lotus flowers, the capital is decorated with rinceaux scroll patterns. The six projecting corners of the abacus alternate in width, with the wider corners corresponding to the animals and the narrower corners to the lotus flowers. The bed surface of the capital in the museum courtyard preserves a smoothed circular area 0.68m. in diameter, matching the upper column diameter. The preserved height of the capitals ranges from c. 0.89-0.90m. (Figure 110). Hörmann assigned the capital from the museum courtyard to the western side of the north porch and the other capital to the eastern side of the north porch, based on an L-shaped mark and dowel cuttings on the upper surface of each capital (Figure 121). This arrangement orients the capitals with the animals at the front outer corners of the capital and the back center.

Both pilaster capitals share the same decorative scheme as the column capitals as well as the orientation of its abacus corners, with the wider corners of the abacus corresponding to the animals and the narrower corners corresponding to the lotus flowers (Figure 122). The abacus of the pilaster capital has five corners, so each one has the animals at the front outer corners and three lotus-like flowers at the center and back corners. The upper surface of the pilaster capital in the museum courtyard is damaged, with only faint traces of two dowel cuttings discernable, but the pilaster capital resting on the propylon wall preserves two dowels and a mason's mark, a pi.⁴⁵⁸ Just to the side of the pi and one of the dowel cuttings, the surface of the capital preserves a long narrow pour channel, running off to the broken end.

The entablature of the north porch is composed of Pentelic marble blocks that combine an Ionic triple-fasciae epistyle with a Doric frieze (Figures 123 and 124). Two

⁴⁵⁸ Hörmann 1932, pl. 14 (Figure 110 here). The mason's mark is discussed with regard to the stoas along the southern peribolos wall above.

large sections of the entablature are preserved, both resting beside the western wall of the Lesser Propylaia. One section is plain, while the other includes the dedicatory inscription and the decorated Doric frieze. The single fragment of plain entablature is preserved to a length of 1.625m., and a height of 0.995m.; and, its face preserves two full metopes, one triglyph, and part of a second triglyph.⁴⁵⁹ The preserved side has anathyrosis; the bottom is smoothly finished; and, the top surface preserves part of a double-T clamp on its side and a dowel cutting in line with the complete triglyph.

The decorated section is incompletely preserved in four fragments, but its complete height, 0.995m., and 2.40m. of its length are preserved. Its back surface is roughly worked, the underside is smoothly finished, the upper surface preserves anathyrosis across all of the surface area except for a smoothly worked margin at the front of the block, and two double-T clamps secured the block to its backer. The epistyle of the decorated section contains the building's Latin dedicatory inscription (Figure 123). Its three fasciae increase in height from bottom to top, and the epistyle is crowned with a cyma reversa. Just above the inscribed epistyle, the Doric frieze has sculpted triglyphs and metopes. One metope is completely preserved, the central metope is missing approximately its upper half, and the third is missing only its bottom-right edge. The first and third metopes contain rosettes, which have two concentric sets of eight concave petals, and a pronounced convex central eye.⁴⁶⁰ The rosettes reach nearly to the top of the metope's frame, but leave narrow margins to the side and a wide margin at the bottom. The central metope contains a boukranion (the lower portion of the skull

⁴⁵⁹ For discussion of these entablature sections and their dimensions, including descriptions of their undersurfaces, see Hörmann 1932, pp. 45-7.

⁴⁶⁰ Ziro 1991, p. 109 identified the rosettes as poppies and the wheat as ears of corn. Mylonas 1961, p. 158 also identifies the rosettes as poppies.

terminates prematurely at the metope floor) and parts of its knotted fillet to either side are preserved. The fillet to the right of the head includes three knots and a bell-shaped lotus flower. Three sculpted triglyphs are preserved; each is missing a lower side corner. The first triglyph contains a bundle of wheat bound together with a loosely knotted ribbon, and the other two triglyphs contain *kistai*. Each *kiste* is a narrow cylinder with double concentric rounded bands at the bottom, middle, and top. The lids are slightly conical, and slope down from the back of the triglyph to the edges of the *kistai*.

It is most likely that the inscribed and decorated entablature section belongs on the façade, since this is the most prominent position on the north porch, just in the line of sight of the procession as it arrived at the entrance court. Since the total length of the façade entablature is c. 5m., once this section is centered on the façade, this placement would leave only about 1.30m. on either side available for the remainder of the entablature. The preserved length of the undecorated entablature section is too long to be positioned in the remaining space of the façade, so it must belong to one of the sides of the north porch.

Above the entablature, the north porch bore a Pentelic marble geison with dentils surmounted by a cyma reversa and fillet, preserved in three fragments (Figure 125, numbers 4-6). Above the geison, the pediment of the north porch is preserved in one block. It includes the pediment's left end with the raking geison and the left corner of the tympanon (Figure 126, number 1), and is undecorated.⁴⁶¹ The north porch had a coffered ceiling, perhaps composed of two coffers per block (Figures 127 no. 3 and 136).⁴⁶²

⁴⁶¹ Hörmann 1932, pp. 53, 90-92. Hörmann restored a phiale in the northern pediment, but this is based on comparison to a block found in the area that does not belong to the Lesser Propylaea.

⁴⁶² Hörmann 1932, pp. 54-5.

In its original design, the doorwall included only the central door, 2.957m. wide (Figure 128).⁴⁶³ Composed of three blocks of Hymettian marble, the threshold lays flush against the paving stones of the north porch, but 0.07m. above the south porch paving. The central threshold block is well-worn from traffic, and it is cut by parallel wheel ruts. Two pivot holes for the door leaves are positioned inside the threshold, one at each corner. Behind the center of the threshold, two holes sitting side-by-side indicate where the door leaves were secured when closed. An arc, deeply cut to receive the rollers under each door leaf, begins at each hole and terminates at the podia of the south porch.

The later side doorways are markedly different than the central passage (Figure 112). Their thresholds are not composed of the same Hymettian marble as the propylon paving and the central door threshold, but are instead of a whitish-yellow marble, likely Pentelic. Both thresholds are set several centimeters above the level of the paving, with the threshold of the western doorway composed of two blocks, while the eastern is made of one large block. The surfaces of the threshold blocks contain two dowel holes on each side to secure the jamb and a large square socket for securing the doorpost. From these large square cuttings, it is clear that the side doors of the Lesser Propylaia were double-leaved, but they did not open on rollers as did the central door. The eastern threshold is 2.604m. wide, but the space for the doorway itself (between the setting lines and dowel) is about 1.66m. wide.⁴⁶⁴ The western doorway is also of this approximate width.

The south porch is less than half the depth of the north porch. It is framed by outer walls that terminated in antae (Figure 112), both of which are preserved. The western anta, c. 1.146m. wide, is not flush with the wall of the area of the Mirthless

⁴⁶³ Hörmann 1932, pl. 34.

⁴⁶⁴ Threshold width from Hörmann 1932, pl. 4 (Figure 112). Doorway width estimated from this drawing.

Rock behind it, and the c. 0.10m. space in between has been filled with brick and mortar (Figure 129). It is finished with a Hymettian marble plinth, 0.550m. tall, surmounted by a Pentelic marble base molding on the south and eastern sides.⁴⁶⁵ The northeastern corner of the anta shows clear evidence for the original arrangement. It is cut to nearly a 45 degree angle in order to receive a perpendicular block, and anathyrosis and a cutting for a pi-clamp preserved near the back edge of this corner indicate where it would have connected to a neighboring block. On the eastern outer wall, the anta is over 0.40m. wider than its western counterpart. Also like the western anta, the eastern anta includes a Hymettian marble plinth and a Pentelic marble base molding. The base molding on the eastern anta is broken on its northern side, but the plinth is cut back at its northwestern corner to accommodate a block before the doorwall, indicating the form of the south porch in its original arrangement. When the side doors were added to the Lesser Propylaia, the perpendicular blocks in position here and against the western anta were removed, leaving the corners of the antae awkwardly exposed.

The south porch includes two internal spur walls framing the passage from the central doorway, each supporting a kistephoros. Projecting about 3m. from the doorwall, these spur walls are not of equal width, with the western spur wall 1.525m. wide and the eastern spur wall 1.500m. wide. The spur walls are composed of a core of small limestone blocks faced with Hymettian marble socle blocks of irregular lengths and thicknesses, but with a uniform height of 0.55m.⁴⁶⁶

Parts of the Pentelic kistephoroi survive, one in the Eleusis museum and the other in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge (Figures 130 and 111). Both examples include

⁴⁶⁵ Dimension from Hörmann 1932, pl. 5 (Figure 139a).

⁴⁶⁶ Discussion of the spur walls in Hörmann 1932, pp. 40-42.

parts of their upper torso, head, and large *kistai*, but they do not have the same dimensions.⁴⁶⁷ The kistephoros in the Eleusis museum has a restored height of 1.995m., while the diameter at her torso is 0.72m., and the diameter of her *kiste* is 0.56m. By comparison, the kistephoros in the Fitzwilliam Museum is 2.09m. tall, the diameter at her torso is 0.62m., and the diameter of her *kiste* is 0.634m. Hörmann reconstructed the complete height of the kistephoroi to c. 3.80m. tall (Libertini restored them to 3.70m.).⁴⁶⁸ The back of each kistephoros is roughly finished at its center, from the *kiste* to the belt at the waist (Figure 131).

The kistephoroi wear thin chitons that are gathered at the shoulders, slipping down from their raised arms. A diplax covers the left shoulder of the Cambridge example and is caught up under the belt that crosses just below the breasts, and continues across to the right side of the waist. A corresponding belt crosses from the right shoulder to the left side of the waist. At the intersection of the belts sits a gorgoneion pendant. Palagia argued that the Eleusis kistephoros should be reconstructed as a mirror image of the Cambridge example, so that the diplax should come from her right shoulder and continue to the left side of her waist.⁴⁶⁹ The Eleusis example would also wear a second belt crossing from the opposite shoulder to the right side of her waist. This reconstruction is in contrast to the way the diplax currently gathers on the Eleusis example, over and above the two lower halves of the belt, which crosses both shoulders.

⁴⁶⁷ Dimensions from Hörmann 1932, pl. 15, with the exception of the height of the Fitzwilliam kistephoros, which is from Vassilika 1998, p. 96. The restored height of the Eleusis kistephoros is reconstructed with the total height of the *kiste* restored.

⁴⁶⁸ Hörmann 1932, pp. 72-73; Libertini 1916, p. 210. The fact that both kistephoroi are only preserved as far as their lower torso is striking, and leads to the question of whether or not the kistephoroi were only ever this tall. Libertini 1916, p. 207 also wondered about this solution, but says it does not work aesthetically. Moreover, Libertini believed that Wheeler saw more of the sculpture than what is preserved today. Wheeler 1982, p. 428 described the statue as preserved from head to “below waist,” but did not specify the amount past the waist.

⁴⁶⁹ Palagia 1997, pp. 85-7.

As Palagia has observed, the example that remained in Eleusis underwent extensive restoration in the early 20th century, so that we must exclude the right side of the chest, her right ear, nose and chin. Like the Cambridge kistephoros, a gorgoneion pendant is attached at the intersection.

Both kistephoroi have long wavy hair parted at the center and pulled loosely back at the nape of the neck, exposing the ears and revealing traces of rosette earrings.⁴⁷⁰ It is difficult to discuss the facial features of the kistephoroi since neither is well-preserved, but it is clear that both had long narrow faces with a low forehead. The Eleusis example has rounded cheeks and irregularly shaped eyes. Her left eye is more rounded than the right and her right pupil looks to the right.⁴⁷¹ Palagia noted that the head of the Eleusis example turns slightly to the right, and the head of the Cambridge example to the left.⁴⁷² Both the turn of the head and the direction of their glances can be used to reconstruct the positions of the kistephoroi, so that the Eleusis figure should be placed on the eastern plinth and the Cambridge example placed on the western. With this reconstruction, the kistephoroi turn their heads to focus their attention on the central passage through the Lesser Propylaia and onto the procession entering and exiting the sanctuary.

There is little evidence to suggest the form of the entablature of the south porch, or its roof. A single square dowel cutting is preserved on the Eleusis kistephoros according to Hörmann and Libertini.⁴⁷³ No comparable dowel seems to be preserved on the Cambridge example. Libertini reconstructed a mixed-order entablature like that of

⁴⁷⁰ Because the kistephoros in Cambridge has been built into a niche within the Fitzwilliam, it is not possible to verify if a ribbon is included. According to Lucilla Burn (pers. comm.), there are no published photographs or drawings of the back. The Eleusis example includes a ribbon, but it is unclear whether or not it is restored.

⁴⁷¹ The left pupil is not indicated. It is unclear to me if the eyes of the kistephoros are restored.

⁴⁷² Palagia 1997, p. 85.

⁴⁷³ Hörmann 1932, p. 68.

the north porch directly above the *kistai* (Figure 132), while Hörmann proposed an intermediary echinus as a sort of replacement for a *kiste* lid, which is not preserved, then an abacus to connect to an Ionic entablature (Figure 128).⁴⁷⁴ Hörmann is right to add the abacus as well as plinths underneath the *kistephoroi*. Other examples of karyatid or architectural korai figures include an abacus and a plinth, such as the Erechtheion and the Siphnian Treasury.⁴⁷⁵ Also like the karyatid porch of the Erechtheion, the southern porch of the Lesser Propylaia may have had a flat roof supported by an Ionic entablature (Figure 133).⁴⁷⁶ Although very few fragments of coffers survive from the Lesser Propylaia, it is probable that the southern porch had a coffered ceiling, composed of blocks with elongated coffers (Figures 127, nos. 1 and 2, and 136).

The Number of Building Phases and the Question of Fountains

The systematic investigations conducted by the Greek Archaeological Society in the late 19th century determined that the doorwall of the Lesser Propylaia showed evidence of two phases, the first with only the central door and the second with two side doors added. Their excavations revealed clear evidence to support this conclusion, particularly in the awkwardly exposed internal corners of the antae of the south porch, the roughly finished paving slabs before each later doorway, and the use of a yellowish marble, perhaps Pentelic, for the later thresholds, in contrast to the remainder of the paving and the central threshold, all of Hymettian marble. For these reasons, subsequent scholarship has agreed that the doorwall was at some point significantly altered from its original design. Scholars have also agreed in their conclusions regarding the north porch;

⁴⁷⁴ Libertini 1916, fig. 13; Hörmann 1932, p. 68.

⁴⁷⁵ For the Siphnian Treasury, see Daux and Hansen in *Fouilles de Delphes* II, p. 150, pl. 67, for the karyatids of the Erechtheion, see Rhodes 1995, pp. 35-47, 134-47.

⁴⁷⁶ See Hörmann 1932, pp. 82-84 for the reconstruction of the south side. For the porch of the Erechtheion, see Rhodes 1995, fig. 21.

that is, the north porch does not exhibit evidence of a change from the building's original design. For the south porch, however, questions have surrounded its reconstruction since Hörmann's publication, in which he proposed three building phases for the Lesser Propylaia, with the form of the south porch different in each phase. In his proposed first phase, there was a single doorway, a shallow southern porch, and kistephoroi against the doorwall (Figure 134). During his second proposed phase, the building had a single doorway, a deeper southern porch created by additions to the parastade walls, fountains, and kistephoroi at the end of spur walls (Figure 135a). In his third proposed phase, the fountains were removed and the side doors were added (Figure 128). With the exception of some initial hesitations noted in reviews soon after his publication, his reconstruction has persisted.⁴⁷⁷

Hörmann based his reconstruction primarily on the roughly worked back of the kistephoroi, which he argued indicated a first phase of construction, during which these figures were attached to the doorwall. Hörmann also used the four basins cut into the paving of the southern porch, which he reconstructed as part of an elaborate system of fountains during his second phase. This evidence, however, can be read differently, particularly when the kistephoroi and the basins are considered along with other observations about the building.

Re-evaluation of the paving, parastade walls, and coffers argues against Hörmann's first phase, in which he proposed a shallow southern porch with the kistephoroi set directly against the doorwall. The paving stones of the south porch are not recognizably different in material, finishing, size, or arrangement to those of the north porch. They appear to be contemporary. Next, although the eastern parastade wall and

⁴⁷⁷ For a summary of responses to Hörmann's reconstruction, see pp. XX above.

the spur walls seem to have a joint at the point where Hörmann proposed an extension as part of his second phase, the western parastade wall includes a block that crosses over this point where this line should be. The western parastade wall, therefore, does not show evidence of an extension to the southern porch. Concerning the Pentelic coffers, Hörmann considered the three preserved examples to be of two different types, with one type including two variations (for the coffers, see Figure 127). Hörmann dated one type to the 1st century B.C. (Figure 127, number 3), and determined the other to be later, on the basis of the depth of the coffer, the absence of a lower fillet, and what he described as a stiffness in the curving parts (Figure 127, numbers 1 and 2). Hörmann suggested that the earlier coffers belonged to the north porch, while the later coffers belonged to the south porch added in his second phase.⁴⁷⁸ Reconsideration of the coffers indeed confirms Hörmann's observation that the coffers are of different types. The first type (Figure 127, number 3) includes a coffer c. 0.10m. deep, with an ovolo surmounted by a fillet in its lid. Neither example of the second type (Figure 127, numbers 1 and 2) is well enough preserved to provide a complete profile or dimensions. The preserved examples indicate a coffer depth up to c. 0.180m., with a fillet followed by an ovolo, then surmounted by an additional fillet; the profile between the top fillet and the lid remains unclear. The difference in the two types of coffers cannot on its own prove that there were two phases of roof construction to the Lesser Propylaia. Ceiling coffers are particularly problematic as evidence for dating, since a thorough study of this architectural element has yet to be offered. Thus, Hörmann's suggestion that one type (Figure 127, number 3) is earlier than the other type (Figure 127, numbers 1 and 2) cannot be confirmed. It is likely that each of the two types could be assigned to one porch, as Hörmann has reconstructed

⁴⁷⁸ Hörmann 1932, pp. 54-5.

them, but this does not necessarily indicate a difference in date. Given that the paving of the southern porch seems to be contemporary with the paving of the northern porch and the western parastade wall exhibits no evidence of extension, it is possible that each type of coffer belonged to a different porch, and that the two types could be contemporary (Figure 136). Therefore, there is no reason to posit that the Lesser Propylaea included a phase with an abbreviated southern porch. This elimination of Hörmann's first phase (with the shorter southern porch) in turn means that the kistephoroi were never moved from an initial position against the doorwall (his proposed first phase) to the outer edge of plinths (during his proposed second phase). This conclusion also removes an oddity in Hörmann's proposed first phase, the reconstruction of a plinth for the kistephoroi that continued against the doorwall, from the doorway to the parastade walls.

Related to the question of the number of building phases is the question of the fountains reconstructed by Hörmann. In Hörmann's second phase, pools on the eastern and western sides of the doorwall supplied water into the four basins in the paving of the south porch (Figure 135a).⁴⁷⁹ According to his reconstruction, an upper pool of water released its contents through a lion's head waterspout into a lower pool, which then discharged its water through two holes into two corresponding basins cut into the paving of the south porch. The upper pools were formed by the southern face of the doorwall and a socle set between the exposed inner corner of each anta on the outer walls of the south porch and the internal spur wall. The lower pools were formed by the southern face of the socle of the upper pools and a short wall set on the paving behind the four basins. The sides of the lower pools were the Hymettian marble plinths of the internal spur walls and the antae of the outer wall. Hörmann claimed that the lower pools were

⁴⁷⁹ Hörmann 1932, pp. 103-110.

made waterproof with mortar, traces of which he observed on the plinth of the western anta. As part of this installation, a channel containing a lead water pipe ran in front of the two steps of the south porch (Figure 139a). This channel sloped from the west down to the east, so that the outflow was at the east. In order to facilitate a smooth pedestrian path from the central passage of the Lesser Propylaea to the sacred way, this channel was partly covered with irregular paving stones (Figure 112). Hörmann believed that the basins would have been inadequate as places for rainwater collection and suggested instead that the basins provided water for the pilgrims to wash themselves before entering the sanctuary.

While the basins imply the use of water, Hörmann's reconstruction of the fountains raises several serious issues. Most importantly, there is no evidence of pipes to bring in water to each side of the doorwall and no indication of mortar on the Hymettian marble plinths. In addition, neither the front socle for the upper pools nor the low wall for the lower pool leave a trace on the paving stones, the plinths of the internal spur walls, or the antae of the outer walls (Figures 135b and 135c). Hörmann's reconstruction also does not account for the channel that runs between each set of basins, each about 0.10m. wide and nearly a meter in length. The channels were deliberately cut into the paving, and show wear, likely from water, at both their northern and southern ends. In Hörmann's reconstruction, the shallow basins would have merely dribbled their contents onto the steps below, hardly an elegant or dramatic water display.

Perhaps a better solution is to reconstruct the four basins as plugged shallow receptacles for water that are connected to an entrance ritual. They may have been filled with water poured from a vessel, or from another means besides pipes. When the water

in the basins was no longer needed, the plug could be removed and the water released into the drainage channel that both Libertini and Hörmann describe running in front of the southern façade of the Lesser Propylaia. It is not clear when the basins were added, but it is logical that they belonged to the original design, at the time before these areas became used as passages. When the side doors were introduced, the basins may have been covered, as needed, to allow safe passage through the side doorways. The channels between each set of basins must have provided drainage for water from the paving of the south porch.⁴⁸⁰ Unlike the paving of the north porch, which sloped from the doorwall down to the north, perhaps in order for accumulated rainwater to flow out of the building, the paving of the south porch was level (Figure 139a). The channels between each set of basins could have allowed water to escape the south porch. Such provisions for the removal of rainwater would be appropriate from the Lesser Propylaia because, although it was a partly roofed building, it was located at the shallowest part of the sacred way, where water could easily accumulate.

Once the fountains are removed from consideration, however, a problem emerges. If the threshold blocks and the roughly picked blocks to the north and south of each threshold were all part of a toichobate, the doorwall would be extremely thick, over 2.5m. wide (see Figure 112). A plausible alternative reconstruction is that the 0.88m. wide roughly picked block to the south of each later side doorway formed part of the foundation for a monument base. The monument base would be supported by the roughly picked block and extend as far as the 45 degree cut in the antae, where it would form a return for the antae. In this reconstruction, the doorwall would have included the threshold and the northern blocks only. In this instance, in the original design of the

⁴⁸⁰ Libertini 1916.

Lesser Propylaia, the side areas of the southern porch (c. 2.32m. wide and c. 3m. deep) may have been a location for votive display, as was found in propyla from other Greek sanctuaries.⁴⁸¹ The blind niches of the Lesser Propylaia would not have been noticed by those walking into the sanctuary. But, for those leaving the sanctuary, the niches and the objects they displayed would have been as visible as the kistephoroi. The kistephoroi and the objects in the niches were both oriented toward the south, in other words into the sanctuary and into the line of sight of the departing procession. When the side doors were introduced during the second phase, the niches were opened, and the votives moved.

To sum up, when the Lesser Propylaia was built, it included a single doorway and niches on its southern side, perhaps for the display of monuments (Figure 137). During a later alteration to the building, the monument bases were removed and side doors were added (Figure 138). Otherwise, the form of the Lesser Propylaia remained the same when the doorwall was modified. Given the treatment of back surfaces of the kistephoroi, they must be reconstructed as engaged against a back support, with the result that each kistephoros must have stood at the end of the spur walls (as reconstructed in Figure 133) in both the original design and the later modification.⁴⁸² The south porch included a high Hymettian marble plinth, a narrow base molding for the facing of the wall, the kistephoroi, and the basins; the entrance court included a shorter Hymettian

⁴⁸¹ Pausanias' account of the Propylaia on the Athenian Acropolis (1.22.4-1.23.6), for example, includes a description of several individual statues and groups within the gateway. Within the propylon to the sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros at Selinous, part of the bench along the northern wall of the propylon included a monument base that may have supported a votive or statue in the inner side of the propylon. See Miles 1998, p. 40. The 2nd century B.C. propylon at the City Eleusinion was flanked on its southern side by a monument base attached to the 2nd century B.C. stoa (Figure 86). Although this base was not attached to the propylon, the display of votives or statues on this base would have framed one side of the approach to the propylon from the Panathenaic Way. See *Agora XXXI*, p. 77.

⁴⁸² Libertini 1916, p. 206 suggested that the figures must have been set against a support, which he suggested were pillars. Schmidt-Colinet 1977, p. 33 argued that the kistephoroi were part of the original construction, but were reworked during an Antonine restoration of the Lesser Propylaia.

marble toichobate that supported the base molding and the north porch with its inscribed and sculpted entablature. Rather than indicating that the sides of the building were not contemporary, these differences highlight eclecticism in the building's design.

The Question of Wheel Ruts

Two wheel ruts, 1.405m. apart and in line with the north-south axis of the building, are cut into the paving stones on the floor of the north up to the central doorway (Figure 112).⁴⁸³ The identification of these parallel cuts as wheel ruts has long been a source of debate, with two primary ideas paramount.⁴⁸⁴ One group of scholars, including Libertini and Philios, believed the grooves to be water conduits, cut to allow water rushing down from the sacred way and rainwater to pass under the door.⁴⁸⁵ The other group, including Noack and Ziro, argued that the grooves are wheel ruts.⁴⁸⁶ As Noack and Ziro have observed, the grooves are deepest just under and outside of the door, which would have led to an accumulation of stagnant water just at the critical point of the building, the doorwall.⁴⁸⁷ In addition, the floor level of the entrance court of the Lesser Propylaia not only slopes from the south down to the north, but it is also higher at the center than the sides. Therefore, the water coming through the doorway might just as easily run down to the sides of the building, as it would flow neatly into the grooves toward the north. Finally, it seems strange that two short and fairly shallow parallel

⁴⁸³ Mylonas 1961, p. 58 records that the grooves are 2.90m. long. The grooves are approximately 0.10m. wide and 0.20m. deep, estimated from Hörmann 1932, pl. 5 (Figure 139a).

⁴⁸⁴ A third and unlikely alternative was offered by the Society of Dilettanti 1817, pp. 19-22, who described a moving floor built on wheels that rolled back and forth at the entrance. In its resting position at back, the floor was anchored in four cuttings against the inside of the doorwall, on either side of the doorway. In its forward position, the floor was anchored in the troughs at the back of the building. The grooves in the floor allowed the wheels under the movable platform to slide up and down the slope of the entrance porch easily, and they worked to maintain the level of the movable floor, so that it did not slope like the pavement.

⁴⁸⁵ Philios 1888, p. 53, n. 1; Libertini 1916, pp. 203-204. As an alternative, Philios also suggested that the grooves could have been made for the crossing of chariots.

⁴⁸⁶ Ziro 1991, p. 112; Dinsmoor 1957, p. 287; Hörmann 1932, pp. 27-8.

⁴⁸⁷ Noack 1927, p. 265; Ziro 1991, p. 112, n. 370.

channels would be suitable to such a task, as it is difficult to imagine that the water would divide itself neatly into two streams.

The channels are the right size and position to indicate the point where wheeled vehicles might have a bumpy ride over the 0.07m. high threshold. Noack recorded that an average wheel span would be 1.30-1.50m., so that spacing of these two wheel ruts, 1.405m., fits comfortably within this range.⁴⁸⁸ Similarly, in his study of processions, Dillon noted that wheel ruts on the Sacred Way between Athens and Eleusis indicate that axles 1.45m. apart were accommodated.⁴⁸⁹ As Ziro argued, the grooves were cut in order to control their passage through the building, thereby preventing damage to the doorframe by the protruding axles. Mylonas identified one lingering difficulty with accepting this interpretation, that the steps on the northern side of the Lesser Propylaea show no sign of wear from wheeled traffic.⁴⁹⁰ The middle section of the northern steps, however, is rounded by wear, which is not matched on the eastern and western sections of the steps. Hörmann did not find this wear remarkable, and in fact suggested that the steps may have been protected from wheeled traffic by the use of a temporary ramp.⁴⁹¹

Consideration of the wheel ruts leads to the question of whether or not wheeled vehicles were allowed in the sanctuary. During the procession of prospective initiates from Athens to Eleusis, most participants must have walked, although evidence from the 5th and 4th century B.C. suggest certain elites may have insisted on traveling by cart.⁴⁹² From the 4th century B.C., a law attributed to Lykourgos prohibited the use of carts by

⁴⁸⁸ Noack 1927, p. 266.

⁴⁸⁹ Dillon 1997, p. 35.

⁴⁹⁰ Mylonas 1961, p. 159.

⁴⁹¹ Hörmann 1932, p. 29.

⁴⁹² Parke 1977, p. 66 suggested that most participants walked or occasionally rode on a donkey, while Robertson 1998, p. 553 argued that most would have used carts. Parke 1977, p. 59 noted that the carts were paid for by the state.

wealthy women in the procession; his wife may have been the first to violate the prohibition.⁴⁹³ According to the building inscription *IG II² 81* (= *IG I³ 79*; 422/1 B.C.), the bridge at the Rheitoi lakes was to be only five feet wide in order to prevent wheeled traffic from traversing it, so that foot traffic, including the priestesses, would be safer.⁴⁹⁴ When the procession approached the bridge, the priestesses may have unloaded the *hiera* from the carts, and then reloaded the *hiera* onto a different set of carts and proceeded once again. The wheel ruts in the paving of the Lesser Propylaia suggest that the carts entered the sanctuary in order for the priestesses to escort the *hiera* into the Telesterion.⁴⁹⁵

The Parastade Walls and the Question of an Ionic Colonnade

Elaborate decoration has been proposed for the entrance court, in the form of attached Ionic columns. Bedford of the Society of Dilletanti noted that the back of the Ionic capital he observed near the Lesser Propylaia was unfinished, and proposed that the capital indicated Ionic columns lining the parastade walls of the entrance court.⁴⁹⁶ A century later, Libertini proposed plain walls for the parastades, and argued that the Ionic capital fragment is similar to those of the Greater Propylaia.⁴⁹⁷ In the 1927 edition of his handbook of Greek architecture, Dinsmoor agreed that the sidewalls were best

⁴⁹³ For this law, see p. 130 above.

⁴⁹⁴ Clinton 2005a, pp. 54-55, cat. 41. The inscription records that the bridge was to be built partly with blocks re-used from the ruins of the ancient temple. As Shear 1982, pp. 130-31 has shown, these blocks came from the dismantled Second Archaic Phase Telesterion.

⁴⁹⁵ Once inside the sanctuary, it is not certain where the carts of the *kistephoroi* were stored. Building L32 bears a striking resemblance to the Pompeion in Athens, but according to Mylonas 1961, p. 183 the building is late Roman (in the lower right hand corner of Figure 140). Mylonas 1961, p. 170 noted excavations by Travlos and Kourouniotes at a large structure north of the Roman outer court, which they identified as a Pompeion. These carts may have been *carpenta*, or Roman ceremonial carts used particularly by elite women during festival processions. For the use of *carpenta*, see Hemelrigk 1999, p. 13.

⁴⁹⁶ Society of Dilettanti 1819, pp. 22-23.

⁴⁹⁷ Libertini 1916, pp. 204-206.

reconstructed without the Ionic columns.⁴⁹⁸ Hörmann followed suit, with plain parastade walls for the Lesser Propylaia, and he assigned the Ionic capitals to the Greater Propylaia. Hörmann did not trust the reconstructions of the Society of Dilettanti, and doubted that there was enough space on the toichobate for both the column bases and the walls.⁴⁹⁹ The idea of parastade columns was not abandoned, however, because in his later edition, Dinsmoor returned to the evidence cited by Bedford.⁵⁰⁰ The rough back of the capital, as well as what he believed to be rough picking on the bottom of the epistyle to receive capitals, and his observations that the capitals were too small for the Greater Propylaia, led Dinsmoor to publish Bedford's plan. Mylonas also accepted this reconstruction and suggested that the raised toichobate along the parastade walls must have supported Ionic columns.⁵⁰¹ Ziro, however, argued against Bedford and Dinsmoor, and returned to the idea of plain parastade walls.⁵⁰² In particular, Ziro noted that in Bedford's drawing of the Ionic capital, both sides are fully finished. Unfortunately, the capital in question is no longer extant.⁵⁰³

A re-investigation of the parastade walls and toichobate supports the conclusion that the entrance court did not include Ionic colonnades. The surface treatment of the toichobate, set a course above the paving, argues against identification as a stylobate. The toichobate is two blocks thick, with the inner row under the parastade walls, and the other sitting just in front (Figures 112, 139a, and 139b). The blocks of the toichobate

⁴⁹⁸ Dinsmoor 1927, p. 167.

⁴⁹⁹ Hörmann 1932, pp. 6, 54, pl. 11, no. 6.

⁵⁰⁰ Dinsmoor 1957, p. 286, n. 4.

⁵⁰¹ Mylonas 1961, p. 157.

⁵⁰² Ziro 1991, pp. 110-12.

⁵⁰³ Ziro 1991, pp. 109-110 noted that the fragments are no longer on site, and that perhaps Libertini was correct to assign the pieces to the Greater Propylaia. In general, Ziro is skeptical of information provided by Bedford, having found inaccuracies in his study of the Greater Propylaia.

range in length from c. 1.30-2.50m. and are 0.26m. high.⁵⁰⁴ The top surface of the blocks before the parastade walls is roughly picked in a band along the wall, c. 0.50m. wide, and smoothly finished on its remaining surface, c. 0.50m. wide.⁵⁰⁵ This finishing indicates that the surface provided a bedding for a course above, likely a base molding, which would have covered the roughly picked area. Dowel cuttings on the surface of the toichobate, within the roughly picked area, indicate where this base molding would have been attached. This base molding would have supported the facing for the wall above it. Both were likely Pentelic marble, suggested by the preserved marble elements of the wall's entablature and the preserved molding in situ in the southern porch. The remaining surface area of the toichobate, c. 0.50m. wide, is too narrow to accommodate Ionic bases, and its fine finish shows no traces of superimposed Ionic bases or plinths.

Furniture and Votives

The Lesser Propylaia had furniture or dedications set up in different areas of the building, as suggested by several features found on the paving of the entrance court (Figure 112). Four circular outlines, each approximately 0.40m. in diameter, are cut into the paving. One is located in the south porch, just to the north of the basins on the eastern side (Figure 135b), another to the north of the eastern side doorway, the third to the northwest of the western stylobate of the north porch, and the last is located north of this western stylobate. Two long rectangular depressions of equal size, nearly two meters long and one meter wide, are cut into the paving in front of each stylobate of the north porch. A third rectangular cutting, slightly smaller, is located in front of the western side doorway. Finally, three small rectangular cuttings are located in front of (i.e., to the east

⁵⁰⁴ Hörmann 1932, p. 23.

⁵⁰⁵ Estimated from Hörmann 1932, pl. 4 (Figure 112).

of) the toichobate of the western parastade wall of the entrance court. These cuttings are each nearly 0.40m. long and 0.20m. wide, and are spaced evenly apart, with about one meter between each cutting.

The various markings on the paving of the Lesser Propylaia must indicate the placement of furniture or other monuments. The circular outlines may have held votive columns, as suggested by Hörmann, which are perhaps indicated by a preserved column fragment (Figure 119, number 6).⁵⁰⁶ The rectangular depressions seem to have been dressed down to receive monuments, perhaps statue bases or another type of dedication.

Two stone benches have been associated with the Lesser Propylaia.⁵⁰⁷ One bench includes four free-standing animal feet that support a seat of a single piece of Hymettian marble, approximately 1.50m. long and 0.30m. wide (Figure 141a).⁵⁰⁸ The profile of the marble seat consists of an apophyge, a fillet, and a torus, with the seat continuing from the upper line of the torus. It contains a dedicatory inscription, indicating that one Gaius Kreperius, son of Gaius, dedicated it to Demeter and Kore: ΓΑΙΟΣ ΚΡΕΠΕΡΙΟΣ ΓΑΙΟΥ ΥΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙ ΚΑΙ ΚΟΡΗ.⁵⁰⁹ Clinton dated the bench and its inscription to the first part of the 1st century B.C., suggesting that the bench was originally installed elsewhere in the sanctuary, and perhaps later added to the Lesser Propylaia. The other bench is composed entirely of a single piece of marble and is of a different design than

⁵⁰⁶ Hörmann 1932, pp. 56-7, pl. 11 number 6. The upper part of an unfluted column is preserved, to just over a meter tall. The upper diameter of the column is preserved, 0.350m., but its bottom is not preserved. Hörmann did not specify either the column's findspot or its place of installation.

⁵⁰⁷ Hörmann 1932, p. 55.

⁵⁰⁸ Clinton 2005a, p. 294, cat. 293 recorded that the width of the bench was 0.30m. Hörmann 1932, fig. 13 recorded it as 0.48m.

⁵⁰⁹ *IG II²* 4708; Clinton 2005a, p. 294, cat. 293 confirmed that the inscribed bench was found east of the Lesser Propylaia, in a Roman building northeast of gateway Th7 and tower H21 (Figure 140). Clinton 1989b, p. 1507 noted that the bench likely dated to the beginning of the 1st century B.C.

the first, with the preserved animal foot supports engaged against the bench's base (Figure 141b). It is also longer than the inscribed bench (preserved length 2.350m.).

The inscribed bench is narrow enough to fit perhaps on the toichobate of the entrance court, in front of the marble facing of the parastade walls. The bench's independent feet, however, might more likely have been accommodated by a series of four individual cuttings, one for each foot, similar in arrangement to the three cuttings before the western toichobate of the entrance court. While not necessarily a reason to exclude the inscribed bench from the Lesser Propylaia, where perhaps the eastern toichobate could have included such cuttings, this observation leaves the placement of the bench open to question. The uninscribed bench could have required a dressed down resting surface as long as its entire base. Hörmann considered this bench to be later Roman, and therefore a later addition to the Lesser Propylaia, but it is not clear where it could have been positioned in the building. Hörmann suggested that the rectangular cuttings before the stylobates of the north porch could have supported benches, but it is more likely that if benches were included in the Lesser Propylaia, they should belong against the walls where they would not be obstacles to visitors passing through the propylon.⁵¹⁰

The addition of benches or other votives in the Lesser Propylaia fits in well with such features present in other propyla. Benches, for example, were included at the propyla at the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros, the sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros at Selinous, and the Archaic propylon to the Athenian Acropolis.⁵¹¹ As the first monumental building encountered upon approach to a sanctuary, the propylon was also

⁵¹⁰ Hörmann 1932, p. 31.

⁵¹¹ For the Selinous propylon, see Miles 1998, p. 40; for Epidauros, see Carpenter 1971, p. 134; for the Archaic propylon to the Athenian Acropolis, see Shear 1999, pp. 115-16.

well-suited for the display of votives, such as recorded in Pausanias' description of the Propylaia of the Athenian Acropolis.⁵¹²

Architectural Iconography

The images on the front and back of the Lesser Propylaia communicated not only generic religious messages, but also characteristics specific to Demeter, with an additional layer of meaning that particularly resonated with the Mysteries. The façade of the north porch was highly decorated, which highlighted its visibility and its importance, with carved column capitals and a sculpted Doric frieze all beckoning the pilgrim's attention. On the southern side of the Lesser Propylaia, two *kistephoroi* carry decorated *kistai* and support the roof of the southern porch. *Mystes*, first time initiates, may not have understood completely the images presented before them on the Lesser Propylaia. They might have had a general familiarity with the wheat as a gift of Demeter, of the boukrania and rosettes as indications of sacred space, of the *kiste* as the same sort of basket that had been carried in their own procession. To those about to embark on the second stage of initiation as *epoptes*, however, these images were more immediate and personally evocative. Perhaps because the Lesser Propylaia was the inner gateway to the sanctuary, it could include iconography explicitly connected to the Mysteries. The enclosed location of this inner position may also explain why Pulcher chose to build his offering here, rather than the more visually prominent outer entrance, accessible to a larger audience, including initiates and non-initiates.

The eclectic decoration of the capitals of the north porch has made them difficult to categorize. They have been called "Corinthianizing" by Wilson Jones and Chimera capitals by Ridgway, but neither of these labels exactly suits the unique character of the

⁵¹² Pausanias 1.22.8-1.23.5.

capitals.⁵¹³ The capitals relate conceptually and chronologically to Chimera capitals, but differ in several details from this type.⁵¹⁴ Chimera capitals include an animal head, usually a griffin, within a frame of wings surrounded by acanthus leaves, rising out of a lower register of acanthus leaves. The face is generally centered on the face of the capital and not projecting at a corner, where these capitals often include volutes. Similar to the Chimera capitals, the capitals from the Lesser Propylaia include acanthus leaves on the lower register and the winged creatures on the upper register. In contrast to the Chimera capitals, however, the capitals from the Lesser Propylaia include vegetal decoration surrounding the creatures, not acanthus leaves, on the upper register, and on the corners the vegetal decoration alternates with the heads. On the capitals from the Lesser Propylaia, the creatures are large protomes that project out from the capital, unlike the smaller creatures on the Chimera capitals that are in low relief. The use of a variant of the Chimera capitals on the Lesser Propylaia at Eleusis may have been related to an older tradition of animals and monsters protecting sacred spaces, such as the apotropaic gorgoneion or animal groups from the Archaic period.⁵¹⁵ The capitals were located on the north porch of the Lesser Propylaia, on its front façade, which confronted those who approached the inner entrance to the sanctuary.

Beyond this potent meaning, the Lesser Propylaia used these decorative capitals to appeal to Roman taste, for those who visited the sanctuary and were initiated into the Mysteries. Chimera capitals were used from the 1st century B.C. to the 2nd century A.D.,

⁵¹³ Wilson Jones 2000, p. 112; Ridgway 2002, p. 5.

⁵¹⁴ For illustrations and descriptions of more examples of Chimera capitals, see von Mercklin 1962, pp. 243-49 and Heinrich 1994, pp. 227-33.

⁵¹⁵ Examples include the gorgon of pediment from the temple of Artemis at Corfu and the numerous animal groups of poros limestone from the Athenian Acropolis.

with most of the extant examples of Chimera capitals coming from Athens.⁵¹⁶ Most of these are from uncertain contexts, with the exception of capitals from the theater of Dionsysos, where they were included as part of the A.D. 60/61 *scaenae frons*.⁵¹⁷ Five examples of this type were found on the Mahdia shipwreck, all of Pentelic marble, and likely created in a Neo-Attic workshop in Athens.⁵¹⁸ The motif of the acanthus and the lion-griffins is similar to marble candelabra bases that were also included on the Mahdia shipwreck and were intended for a 1st century B.C. Roman market.⁵¹⁹ The capitals from Eleusis are the only examples of the type that certainly come from a sanctuary; other examples are from reused or uncertain contexts.

This penchant for highly decorative column capitals was widespread in the late Republican and Early Imperial periods. Similarly figured capitals were used in Tiberius' reconstruction of the temple of Concord near the Roman Forum a few decades later (A.D. 7-10, dedicated by Tiberius in A.D. 10), in which the upper register contained pairs of rams leaping away from the face of the capital on alternate corners; the intervening corners contained vegetal decoration.⁵²⁰ In other examples, it is clear that the capitals were not only used in Rome for decorative appeal, but also for their connection to Athens. Capitals from the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus (dedicated in 2 B.C.), which are also a variant of the typical Chimera capital, likely copied formal

⁵¹⁶ Heinrich 1994, pp. 227-31 and von Mercklin 1962, pp. 245-47. Most examples come from reused or imprecisely known contexts, now housed in the Agora museum, Byzantine Museum, and the National Archaeological Museum.

⁵¹⁷ Von Gerkan 1941, pp. 163-77.

⁵¹⁸ Heinrich 1994, pp. 227-31.

⁵¹⁹ Ridgway 2002, p. 5. Fullerton 1998, pp. 96-97 argued that the earliest evidence of Neo-Attic workshops has been identified on the basis of the material included in the Mahdia shipwreck, dating from between 80 and 60 B.C. The origin of Neo-Attic sculpture could be placed a few decades earlier, according to Fullerton, to the time of Pasiteles, during the second quarter of the 1st century B.C.

⁵²⁰ For the capitals from the temple of Concord, see Gasparri 1979, p. 58, pls. 18-20. Kellum 1990, pp. 290-92 argued that the paired rams decorating the capitals of the temple of Concord referred to the pairing of Tiberius and Augustus, as well as creating a parallel between the ram as leader of the astronomical year and August as leader the empire.

characteristics from the examples from Eleusis.⁵²¹ On these capitals, the animals are large protomes at the corners, with vegetal decoration flanking the creatures' heads. This desire to emulate Athenian monuments is also witnessed by the use of the karyatids from the Erechtheion in the Forum.⁵²²

The decorated frieze of the north porch included generic religious imagery, the rosette and the boukrania.⁵²³ The common images of alternating rosettes and boukrania are indicative of sacrifice, and are at home on a sanctuary propylon, as found on the friezes of the propylon at the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros (first half of 3rd century B.C.) and the propylon of Ptolemy II at the sanctuary of the Great Gods on Samothrace (285-281 B.C.), while the propylon of the sanctuary of Athena at Pergamon (197-159 B.C.) added owls, garlands, and eagles. Ridgway considered this motif to be an example of a repetitive or monotonous frieze, primarily symbolic and without narrative content.⁵²⁴ Webb took their meaning one step further, by emphasizing that this motif was a reference to sacrificial animals.⁵²⁵ This motif, however, is more potent than these analyses suggest. The first documented use of the motif architecturally was on a propylon—at Epidauros—and on the interior of that building, above the Corinthian columns. The interior of the propylon at Epidauros was a gathering place, with benches included along the walls to accommodate visitors. With this first use of the motif, it was presented in a position that assumed a gathered audience to view the frieze. At Epidauros, where only the propylon marked the entrance to the sanctuary (the sanctuary was without a peribolos wall or other

⁵²¹ For the capitals from the temple of Mars Ultor, see Ganzert and Herz 1996, pp. 203-204. For the relationship between the capitals from the Lesser Propylaia and the temple of Mars Ultor, see Ward Perkins 1981, pp. 32-33; Ziro 1991, p. 109, n. 362.

⁵²² Zanker 1988, pp. 256-58.

⁵²³ Lenormant 1862, p. 398 suggested that the rosettes and boukrania could also be associated specifically with Eleusis, the rosettes related to the pomegranate flowers of Proserpina and the bulls sacred to Ceres.

⁵²⁴ Ridgway 1999, p. 79.

⁵²⁵ Webb 1996, pp. 29-30.

topographical feature delimiting its boundary), the frieze could have highlighted that the propylon marked the limits of the sanctuary. The motif did not just depict sacrificial animals, but it referred to the act of sacrificing, the rituals of killing and pouring libations, the primary actions to be performed in a sanctuary. On a propylon, the motif would have indicated that this building was the entrance to the sanctuary. At Eleusis, this subject was located on the front porch of the inner propylon, indicating the visitor's passage into the inner part of the sanctuary. It would have been a potent reminder of this most sacred act to the viewer, reinforcing that the viewer was on sacred ground.

The *kistai* and wheat sheaves, by contrast, are more specifically associated with Demeter and Kore, and, in particular, with the Mysteries. Therefore, although the *kistai* are related to mystery cults in general, as containers for objects that could be concealed from view, in the Eleusinian Mysteries, the *kistai* contained the *hiera*, the sacred objects carried from Eleusis to the City Eleusinion and then back to Eleusis during the festival, and finally revealed during initiation by the hierophant inside the Telesterion.⁵²⁶ The *kistai* were themselves publicly known objects, on display for all to see when carried during the procession of the Mysteries, but the knowledge of what was contained inside the *kistai* was reserved for the initiated. Ancient writers varied in their descriptions of the contents of the *kistai*. Clement of Alexandria, in *Exhortation to the Greeks* (II.18; late 1st/early 2nd century A.D.), referred to the *kistai* as baskets in the Eleusinian Mysteries, and described their contents as including types of cakes, pomegranates, poppies, as well other objects he called unspeakable. Porphyry (*De Abstinencia* 2.6; 3rd century A.D.)

⁵²⁶ A *kiste* is depicted on the mosaic in the Roman Upper Terrace of the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth (late 2nd or early 3rd century A.D.). See *Corinth* XXVIII.3, pp. 366-68, notes 100 and 101 for bibliography of *kistai*. Gawlinski 2006, p. 135 described the used of *kistai* in the Mysteries of Andania. On the role of the hierophant during the Mysteries, see Clinton 1974, pp. 46-47.

noted that agricultural prosperity was crucial to the Mysteries, so that perhaps agricultural implements could be contained inside the *kistai*. Hippolytus (*Refutation of all Heresies*, 5.8.39-40; first half of the 3rd century A.D.) recorded that the revealed object was cut wheat.⁵²⁷ The *kistai* depicted on the Doric frieze of the north porch are plain, without a direct reference to their contents; the *kistai* carried by the *kistephoroi* in the south porch, in contrast to the *kistai* of the Doric frieze, include several registers of sculpted imagery, discussed below.

The wheat sculpted onto another triglyph was a key image related to the cult of Demeter. Demeter, apart from her connection to the Mysteries, was an agrarian goddess, and her gift of agriculture and wheat to the world was well-known and sought after. Within the context of the Eleusinian Mysteries, however, perhaps the wheat's prominent position on the façade foreshadowed part of the upcoming initiation. According to several late authors, included in initiation was the revelation of grain. Hippolytus (*Philosophoumena* V, 38-41; first half of the 3rd century A.D.) wrote that showing the wheat to the *epoptai* was the great mystery and revelation. In addition, bringing some wheat to the initiation may have been a requirement or simply an appropriate offering, as Himerios (*Orat. Z*, 2; 4th century A.D.) recorded, in an old law that ordered prospective initiates to take a small amount of wheat with them.⁵²⁸

The revelation of wheat as a primary event during initiation has recently been considered by Sourvinou-Inwood and Clinton, analyses that are useful to determine the meaning of the sculpted wheat. According to Sourvinou-Inwood, the sacred drama during the Mysteries included finding Kore as an ear of corn (grain). It was not the grain

⁵²⁷ Burkert 1983, pp. 251, 290-91.

⁵²⁸ Mylonas 1961, p. 274.

itself that was the mystery, but the way it appeared in this “particular place and time, as part of a particular ritual, ascribed a particular meaning and significance by context” that gave it special meaning.⁵²⁹ For this reason, the grain would be appropriate on the frieze, not just as a general representation of one of Demeter’s agrarian gifts, but also as an aspect of the sacred drama, known only to the initiated. According to Clinton, grain was revealed during the *epopteia*, along with the presentation of Ploutos, to those who had already demonstrated piety toward Demeter and the Mysteries by having been a *mystes*.⁵³⁰ The grain and Ploutos highlighted the importance of Demeter’s agrarian gift to prospective initiates. This would give a double meaning to the grain on the frieze. It pointed to the general agrarian gift that Demeter gave to worshippers, and signaled to those who participated in the *epopteia* that this gift was indeed the greatest given by Demeter.

On the inner side of the Lesser Propylaia, the *kistephoroi* wear chitons and carry *kistai*. As engaged architectural members, the *kistephoroi* are a new breed of the *karyatid*. Unlike their Archaic and Classical predecessors, the *kistephoroi* of the Lesser Propylaia are non-structural and have been transformed into “façade architecture,” which, as Ridgway observed, became common in Roman architecture.⁵³¹ As with the remainder of the sculptural decoration of the Lesser Propylaia, the *kistephoroi* are based on earlier prototypes, such as the *karyatids* from the Siphnian Treasury or the Erechtheion, but they are distinguished by their non-structural position on the porch and in the distinctiveness of their ornament.

⁵²⁹ Sourvinou-Inwood 2003a, p. 36.

⁵³⁰ Clinton 1997, p. 161.

⁵³¹ Ridgway 2002, pp. 6-7; Schmidt 1982, pp. 100-102.

The *kiste* that each figure carries has five registers of decoration, which present general and specifically cult-related imagery (Figure 142). Along the left and right of the bottom edge of the *kistai*, the remains of acanthus projections indicate that the *kistephoroi* must have held onto the *kistai* by means of the acanthus leaves. The decoration of the lowest register on the base of the *kiste* contains a guilloche, with deeply carved S-curves and convex eyes.⁵³² Above a short fillet, the second register contains several elements, including a *plemochoe*, rosettes, two bundles of ears of wheat, and the *bacchoi*. In line with the central axis of the *kistephoros*'s face, the *plemochoe* is the largest and most prominently placed object. The *plemochoe* was used to pour ritual libations to the dead on the initiates' last day at Eleusis, an action that may have been connected with the initiates' newly promised better afterlife.⁵³³ As Miles observed, the *plemochoai* were "emblematic of the Eleusinian Mysteries," yet from their depositions in various Attic graves, they also had a general association with the dead, perhaps from a first connection with the Mysteries and its promise.⁵³⁴ Like the depiction of a *plemochoai* on the *kiste* of the *kistephoroi* from the Lesser Propylaea, the marble *plemochoai* highlighted a motivation for one's initiation in the Mysteries, the promise of a better afterlife. To the

⁵³² Mylonas 1961, p. 159 identified the lowest register as a ribbon and the rosettes and pomegranate flowers.

⁵³³ Mylonas 1961, p. 279; *Agora XXXI*, pp. 93-105. The primary ancient source for the use of the *plemochoe* and the ritual is Athenaeus 11.496a. For a discussion of *plemochoai*, which are particularly associated with Eleusis, see Brommer 1980. *Plemochoai* were found at the sanctuary at Eleusis and in the City Eleusinion, with the contexts from the City Eleusinion carefully studied by Pollitt 1979, pp. 205-33 and Miles in *Agora XXXI*, pp. 93-105. At the City Eleusinion, *plemochoai* were most common in the 4th century B.C., but they were found in deposits ranging from c. 400 B.C. to the second half of the 2nd century B.C.; they have also been found in graves around Athens and Attica. *Plemochoai* were also depicted on coins minted by Athens for use during the festival of the Mysteries, as late as the 1st century B.C. The sculpted Doric frieze assigned to the Inner Propylon at the City Eleusinion by Miles in *Agora XXXI*, pp. 89-91 also included a *plemochoe*. The Ninnion plaque from the sanctuary at Eleusis depicted several *plemochoai* carried by women (Figure 4). For discussion of the Ninnion plaque, see Mylonas 1961, pp. 213-21; Clinton 1992, pp. 67-68, 73-75. A monumental marble *plemochoai* (restored height c. 1m.) was dedicated at the City Eleusinion, perhaps in the 4th century B.C. (*Agora XXXI*, cat. III, 17).

⁵³⁴ *Agora XXXI*, p. 96.

initiates looking at the kistephoroi as they departed the sanctuary, the *plemochoai* would have been a potent reminder of their last act performed at Eleusis, the ritual libation, and a message of security for their life after death.

The other elements of the second register are placed in the same sequence on either side of the *plemochoe*, beginning with a large rosette composed of double rows of petals with an eye including nine unopened petals around a button eye with a depressed center. A bundle of three stalks of grain follows each rosette, which are in turn followed by another rosette. Unlike the bundle of wheat on the triglyph of the north porch, this group is unbound. The final image on the second register is a *bacchos* located between the second rosette on each side and the roughly finished raised spine behind the kistephoros. Prospective initiates carried the *bacchos*, composed of myrtle leaves tightly bound with two wool ribbons, during the procession. Like the *plemochoai*, *bacchoi* were emblematic of the Mysteries. It was a well-known attribute of prospective initiates, described in the scholia to Aristophanes's *Knights* 408a and depicted in the lowest register of the Ninnion plaque, where two crossed *bacchoi* are included below the rock (Figure 4).

The third register is a garland framed by a bead and reel astragal above and below. The leaves of the wreath point toward the right, and they are punctuated by rectangles with a six-limbed star-like element inside. The course above, better preserved on the Cambridge kistephoros, contains an alternating lotus and palmette pattern. The fifth register, only partially preserved on the Cambridge example, might also contain the palmette-rosette decoration. Further description is prevented by the broken tops of both *kistai* held by the kistephoroi.

The kistephoroi are perpetual leaders of the procession, who will forever guide the pilgrimage. In this role, they embody the very idea of procession, standing as permanent signifiers of the annual procession. This identification is similar to that proposed by Svronos, who however further suggested that Appius Claudius Pulcher had seen two karyatid portrait sculptures at the Eleusinion at Megalopolis where, according to Pausanias, Damophon sculpted images of his own daughters as kistephoroi, and that Pulcher intended the figures as idealized representations of his daughters (one married to Pompey's son and the other married to Marcus Brutus).⁵³⁵ However, individualized features that would suggest portraiture are lacking; it is more likely that they do not represent any specific historical figures. In contrast to the above interpretation of the kistephoroi as leaders of the procession and as symbols of the procession itself, Sauron argued that to identify the kistephoroi as icons of the procession was a limited conclusion.⁵³⁶ Instead, Sauron identified the kistephoroi as pious korai who display attributes of both Artemis (in their belts) and Athena (the gorgoneion), and can also be associated with Kore. Sauron connected the kistephoroi to the idea of a hierarchical cosmos, in which humanity belongs to and is dependent on the gods, and where only a pilgrim's piety can bring beneficence. This interpretation, however, undervalues the context and iconography of the kistephoroi. Their position on the sacred way, at the entrance to the sanctuary, connects the kistephoroi with the route of the procession. Moreover, as Palagia noted, their dress, including the pendant, most likely refers to the

⁵³⁵ Svronos 1914, pp. 151-210, followed by Schmidt 1982, p. 102 and Budde and Nichols 1964, p. 48. See Pausanias 7.31.1.

⁵³⁶ Sauron 2001, pp. 279-83.

clothing worn by the priestesses of the goddesses.⁵³⁷ The iconography of the *kiste* links the figures directly to the gifts of Demeter and the Eleusinian Mysteries.

The *kistephoroi* face into the sanctuary as they lead the procession, standing in a position similar to the *karyatids* of the Erechtheion, where they stand alongside the processional area of the Acropolis, and the Siphnian Treasury, where, during the Republican period, they faced in the same direction as visitors ascending the sacred way.⁵³⁸ At Eleusis, the *kistephoroi* are distinct from these other examples because they do not simply observe the procession into the sanctuary, but participate by leading it. As Palagia argued, the figures could be the hierophantids of Demeter and Kore, because they carry the *kistai* of sacred objects and because they wear the dress of the sanctuary officials, the mantle, crossbands, and chiton.⁵³⁹ The *kistephoroi* are even more than representations of these ritual figures, however. They are at the front of the procession just where these priestesses would have been, but they also stand permanently, bearing the *kistai* and the *hiera*, directing the procession and also watching over initiation in the Telesterion further up the sacred way.⁵⁴⁰

Patron and Inscription

The dedicatory inscription records that Appius Claudius Pulcher, son of Pulcher, vowed the propylon to Ceres and Proserpina while he was consul, approved it while he

⁵³⁷ Palagia 1997, p. 89.

⁵³⁸ Ridgway 2002, pp. 6, 15, n. 7 also observed that these figures seem to lead the procession. When the Siphnian Treasury was first built, the *karyatids* faced the entrance to the sanctuary, which at the time was located near the sanctuary's southwestern corner.

⁵³⁹ Palagia 1997, p. 89. The Rheitoi inscription (*IG I³ 79*; 422/1 BC) records that priestesses led the procession, carrying sacred objects with them. According to Clinton 1974, pp. 69-70, the priestesses mentioned in this inscription should be understood as the priestess of Demeter and Kore, and the hierophantids. There were two hierophantids, one for Demeter and one for Kore, and they may have crowned initiates in Athens before their departure to Eleusis (Clinton 1974, pp. 86-89).

⁵⁴⁰ For the order of officials within the procession, see Clinton 1974, pp. 35-36. The priestesses with the *hiera* would have been near the front of the procession.

was imperator, and that his nephews Claudius Pulcher and Marcius Rex built and dedicated it. The fasciae are inscribed:⁵⁴¹

[Ap. Claudi]us Ap. f. Pulche[r] propylum Cere[ri]
 [et Proserpi]nae cos. vovit, [im]perato[r coepit]
 [Pulcher Clau]dius et Rex Mar[cius fec]erun[t ex testum.]

The letters of the inscription are approximately 0.10m. high, so that they fill the entire height of the lowest fascia, most of the height of the middle fascia, but on the upper fascia the letters leave a margin above and below. The letters are evenly spaced, and they have serifs.

The inscription is one of two critical pieces of information for the date of the Lesser Propylaia; the other is to be found in Cicero's letters. Two letters of Cicero to Atticus, which date to c. 50 B.C., refer to the project and describe it as underway in the early part of the year (6.1.26) and in progress a few months later (6.6.2). Previous commentators have noted that the latter passage provided evidence that construction of the Lesser Propylaia had been interrupted. In his commentary, however, Shackleton-Bailey clarified that this passage has been misunderstood.⁵⁴² The fact that Appius Claudius Pulcher is no longer thinking of building the propylon does not mean that work on the building has been interrupted. Rather, it means that Appius "is not considering, but doing" the construction. This commentary not only suits the grammar, but also solves the problem of finding historical reasons for the suspension of the project.⁵⁴³ Finally, the inscription indicates that his nephews finished the propylon, presumably after

⁵⁴¹ Clinton 2005a, p. 292, cat. 290. ILLRP 401 (=CIL I² 775, ILS 4041). For studies of the inscription, see also Lenormant 1862, pp. 391-401; Clinton 1997, pp. 164-65.

⁵⁴² Shackleton Bailey 1968, p. 270.

⁵⁴³ (6.6.2): "me tamen Academiae προπύλων iubes cogitare, cum iam Appius de Eleusine non cogitet?"

his death in 48 B.C. Therefore, the construction began between 50 and 48 B.C., and was finished after his death.⁵⁴⁴

Appius Claudius Pulcher could boast an impressive ancestry as a descendant of the Caecilii Metelli, one of the leading families of Republican Rome. He maintained other important political connections through his sisters' marriages; and, through his daughters' marriages, he allied himself to the families of Pompey and Cato.⁵⁴⁵ To say the least, Appius was an inconsistent political ally. Coming from a family that supported Sulla, he positioned himself first with Pompey, but then finally helped to increase Caesar's following. He was praetor in 57 B.C. and was consul, along with L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, in 54 B.C. Appius Claudius Pulcher was involved in a high-profile political scandal in 54 B.C., when he attempted to influence the election of his successor for consul. At first motivated by his brother's intention to be elected consul, Pulcher maintained his position against the candidate M. Aemilius Scaurus even after his brother withdrew himself from consideration. The case took on the highest form of character defamation against Scaurus, with Pulcher actively involved; Pulcher sought reward in an appointment as proconsul. In 50 B.C., Pulcher was twice nearly brought to trial, once for *maiestas*, treason, and once for *ambitus*, bribery, likely for his connection with the consul scandal in 54 B.C. His acquittal in both cases points to Pulcher's carefully crafted links

⁵⁴⁴ Clinton 1989b, p. 1505, n. 27, suggested the possibility that the Lesser Propylaia may have remained unfinished after Appius' death for as many as twenty years, because Pulcher Claudius was *parvulus* in 52 B.C., and therefore still young at the time of Appius' death. Clinton also retained the possibility, however, that Rex Marcius, the older nephew, could have had primary responsibility in the project, so that its completion could have been soon after 48 B.C. Since there is no evidence for the Lesser Propylaia sitting unfinished for any amount of time, it is most likely that the project was completed soon after Appius' death.

⁵⁴⁵ For discussions of Appius Claudius Pulcher's character, biography, and political activities, see Syme 1939; Gruen 1974, pp. 331-37 for the case of Scaurus, and pp. 352-55 for a general discussion of his family and political events.

with influential people through marriage and switched political alliances. Pulcher was ultimately victorious in his political ambitions when he became censor in 50 B.C.

It is noteworthy that the inscription is in Latin, which, as Clinton noted, is the only Latin inscription extant at Eleusis, and one that stands in sharp distinction to the initiation requirement that required knowledge of Greek.⁵⁴⁶ The Lesser Propylaia proclaimed Roman identity and power, because even if the Greek-speaking prospective initiates could not read the Latin inscription, they could recognize the script and alphabet of the foreign regime. To the prospective initiates who knew Latin, however, the message in the inscription would be understandable. Perhaps the inscription was intended to counteract Appius's less-than-honorable reputation, achieved by switching political alliances and involvement in scandals, by reinforcing notions of the dedicator's piety, thus overwriting his wrongdoings in perpetuity.

The Latin used in the Lesser Propylaia inscription points to strong ties to Rome. It was typical of inscriptions on public works in the East to use Latin, as a way of honoring the dedicator and his Roman heritage.⁵⁴⁷ In the case of the Lesser Propylaia, the building may have been given to commemorate events in Rome. As Clinton has suggested, the vow referred to in the inscription might not have been made with specific reference to Eleusis at all, but was rather offered to Ceres more broadly as goddess of grain.⁵⁴⁸ In 54 B.C., while Appius Claudius Pulcher was consul, the area around the Tiber suffered a flood that caused the loss of human and animal life and property, and destroyed much of the city's grain supply.⁵⁴⁹ As Pompey struggled to find new sources

⁵⁴⁶ Clinton 1997, p. 164.

⁵⁴⁷ Kaimio 1979, pp. 82-83.

⁵⁴⁸ Clinton 1997, pp. 164-65.

⁵⁴⁹ Cassius Dio 39.61, 63.

of grain, Appius Claudius Pulcher may have made a bargain with Ceres to come to the aid of Rome. Not long after, perhaps, Appius Claudius Pulcher found Eleusis an appropriate place to fulfill his vow. In this way, as Clinton noted, he connected a metropolitan Roman tragedy to Ceres of Eleusis. This reconstruction of events is only hypothetical, and even if not the impetus to build the Lesser Propylaia, the inscription alone would invite the viewer to make an immediate connection with Rome.

The Latin inscription also allowed Pulcher to position himself within an era of competition through architectural patronage, since it was meant to be understood by Pulcher's contemporaries from Rome, where, during the 1st century B.C., architectural competition reached intense proportions.⁵⁵⁰ As Elsner has shown, such an inscription made it clear to viewers how they should understand the building, in this case a propylon given to the goddesses by a prominent, if rather unethical, politician from Rome.⁵⁵¹ Perhaps following the example set by a handful of inscribed Late Classical and Hellenistic propyla, such as those at Samothrace, Pergamon, and Labraunda, Appius Claudius Pulcher recognized that a propylon was one of the most prominent types of monuments to dedicate because of its position as the first building encountered as one approached a sanctuary. In this spirit, about the time that Appius Claudius Pulcher was building the Lesser Propylaia at Eleusis, Cicero, too, considered dedicating a propylon. Rather than at a sanctuary, however, Cicero selected a site with particular personal

⁵⁵⁰ This fever pitch was later overtaken by the emperors. In fact, buildings came to be an important aspect of an emperor's biography, as demonstrated in the *Res Gestae*, an autobiographical account of Augustus' building projects in Rome, said in the text to have been written before the emperor's death in 14 A.D. See Elsner 1996, p. 41. For a discussion of architectural patronage in Rome during the 1st century B.C., see Favro 1996, pp. 53-60.

⁵⁵¹ Elsner 1996, p. 35.

resonance, the Academy in Athens.⁵⁵² In the case of Appius Claudius Pulcher, the Lesser Propylaia was built as he was moving ever higher on the political ladder in Rome. His death prevented further political achievements, so the Lesser Propylaia stands as a monument to his highest position; his nephews ride on the coattails of his success.

Experiential Analysis

The design of the Lesser Propylaia brought the participants in the procession and the propylon itself into a kinetic dialogue. Arrival at the sanctuary would have occurred at dusk, after several hours of walking from Athens. Despite the length of the journey, the members of the procession would have been alert to all that was around them. On the evening of their arrival, the prospective initiates may have danced at the Kallichoron Well next to the outer gateway, but they were not permitted to enter the sanctuary until the evening of the next day.

The procession's first approach to the Lesser Propylaia included two low steps up to the entrance court, where the space created by the parastade walls invited the visitors to pause before the doorwall. The plain parastade walls acted as blinders, leaving nothing to distract their gaze as the walls channeled the prospective initiates toward the central doorway; this effect drew their attention from the path they just crossed toward the façade of the north porch and the doorwall. If the doors were opened, the pilgrims were granted a limited view into the heart of the sanctuary; if they were closed, the only subject presented to the visitors was the north porch. Perhaps the pilgrims only had a moment in this space; perhaps they were allowed to linger here. In either case, the sudden burst of

⁵⁵² Letter to Atticus 6.1.26. Cicero reported that his great fondness for Athens prompted his idea, and that it would be a fitting place to leave a memorial of himself.

decoration and the inscription provided a startling amount of information, concerning both the dedicator and the Mysteries.

As the viewers neared the north porch and the door into the sanctuary the pavement began to slope up, so that the procession began to ascend the sacred way even while still inside the propylon. At the doorwall, a low step put each visitor on the threshold into the sanctuary, and at this moment presented to him/her a vista into the sanctuary. The view included the sacred way, now rising steeply toward the Telesterion, with a few scattered monuments and a stepped viewing area along the line of sight. The pilgrims may have had a glimpse of the roof of the Telesterion, their ultimate destination. Each pilgrim had only a moment in the doorway on the narrow threshold, before continuing into the south porch. Although the doorway itself was nearly three meters wide, the effect may still have felt like tunneling, as the visitors were at first framed by the columns of the north porch and then by the spur walls and kistephoroi on the southern porch. The effect of tunneling was also utilized at the sanctuary during the Republican period at the southern entrance, where the gateway next to tower K6 also led into a narrow passage framed by the two stoas (Figure 108).⁵⁵³ On both sides of the sanctuary, then, this design at the entrance could have increased the level of anticipation for those entering the sanctuary, by creating a line of sight toward the Telesterion.

The total distance of the passage through the Lesser Propylaia would have been c. 8.50m. On either side of the passage through the south porch, a tall podium with a

⁵⁵³ The sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (Palestrina), dating to the first half of the 1st century B.C. also utilized the effect of processing through a tunneled space to heighten the impact of reaching one's final destination, in this case the temple and theater on the upper terrace. See Stamper 2005, p. 87 for a summary of the features of the sanctuary at Praeneste, which he described as "one of the most impressive sanctuaries for processional rituals in the Roman world." The hypaethral temple of Apollo at Didyma, built beginning in the later 4th century B.C., is an earlier example of a sacred building that employed tunneled passages, in this case from the pronaos to the cella.

kistephoros situated above the viewer's head flanked the procession. Each had her back to the participants, just as the priestesses at the head of the procession. The pilgrims, unless they looked back, would only have seen their general form, without a detailed look at their dress or the *kistai*. After only a few steps, the procession passed through the south porch and stepped down on to the sacred way.

Immediately after traversing the Lesser Propylaia, the procession passed alongside the wall of the Mirthless Rock and soon they encountered the entrance to the precinct on their right. The Lesser Propylaia was built against the earlier precinct wall, either a structural short-cut or perhaps to reinforce the connection between the propylon and the place where Demeter sat lamenting her lost daughter.⁵⁵⁴

To the members of the procession exiting the sanctuary and beginning their journey back to Athens, the kistephoroi of the south porch took on a second layer of meaning. At this point, instead of taking an active role in the procession, they presented with their *kistai* a summary and reminder of the instruments used in initiation, the *kistai* and the *bacchoi*, and more importantly, the things revealed, including the wheat. Now, the participants knew the identity of the *hiera* held inside the *kistai*.

Lesser Propylaia Conclusion

After a re-investigation of the remains of the Lesser Propylaia, certain issues of reconstruction have been resolved. Ionic columns did not line the parastade walls of the entrance court and the Lesser Propylaia had only one major modification, the addition of two side doorways. The questions of when or for what reason the side doors were added are difficult to answer. Ziro suggested that the new doors were added when the Greater

⁵⁵⁴ For Clinton's reconstruction of the sacred drama that took place within the Mirthless Rock, see Clinton 1992, pp. 84-91.

Propylaia was built, to accommodate the worshippers who passed first through the five doors of the Greater Propylaia, intimating that larger numbers of participants were attending the festival.⁵⁵⁵ The number of doors of the Greater Propylaia, however, was not related to an increased number of participants, but was instead due to the choice of the Mnesiklean Propylaia of the Athenian Acropolis as its prototype. Further, there is no indication that the number of doorways in a propylon correspond strictly to the number of people using the entrance. Multiple doorways in a sanctuary propylon became popular in the 4th century B.C. and Hellenistic period, even at sanctuaries where a large procession might not be expected, such as the sanctuary of Asklepios at Troizen or the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion. Certainly the Lesser Propylaia, originally built with a single door, could accommodate the large annual procession of the Mysteries, as could the previous gateways to the sanctuary, all presumably with a single doorway. The increase in the number of doors at the Lesser Propylaia, therefore, suggests a change in the pattern of entrance, specifically that the new side doors suggest the non-accessibility of the central door. Perhaps the side doors were introduced to be used on non-festival occasions, with the central door available only for the procession of the Mysteries.

The mixing of orders on the Lesser Propylaia followed the trend begun with the Mnesiklean Propylaia on the Athenian Acropolis, which mixed, for the first time in a propylon, the Doric and Ionic orders.⁵⁵⁶ After this first example, the mixing of orders became common, especially by the Hellenistic period. The propylon at Epidauros (early

⁵⁵⁵ Ziro 1991, p. 114.

⁵⁵⁶ Carpenter 1971, p. 180; Ridgway 2002, pp. 4-5. The contrasted colors of the two different marbles used in the Lesser Propylaia (the Hymettian lower parts of the building, in the paving, stylobates for the north and south porch, central threshold, and wall socles, and the Pentelic marble superstructure) is reminiscent of the use of dark grayish blue Eleusinian limestone below the steps of the otherwise Pentelic marble Mnesiklean Propylaia of the Athenian Acropolis, used to create a visual ground line for the building.

3rd century B.C.), used Ionic hexastyle façades with an interior Corinthian colonnade, and the propylon of Ptolemy II on Samothrace (285-281 B.C.) contrasted Ionic columns on its exterior facade and Corinthian columns on the façade facing into the sanctuary.⁵⁵⁷ The propylon to the sanctuary of Athena at Pergamon of the mid-2nd century B.C. included a lower story of Doric columns with a Doric entablature above, but its second story was Ionic.⁵⁵⁸ The Lesser Propylaia went one step beyond this type of order-mixing, in which the orders are kept separate, and, despite Vitruvius' complaint that it is a violation of propriety, combined Doric and Ionic elements in the same entablature.⁵⁵⁹

In addition, some features of the Lesser Propylaia proved particularly potent because they specifically addressed the pilgrims and demanded their attention. The inscription on the architrave of the north porch proclaimed, in Latin, that Appius Claudius Pulcher began the propylon. The inscription placed the Lesser Propylaia into the small group of sanctuary propyla with dedicatory inscriptions.⁵⁶⁰ At Eleusis, the inscription is written in the language of the dedicator, Latin, rather than in Greek and is, remarkably, the only extant Latin inscription at Eleusis. The language of the inscription places an extra linguistic demand on the viewer, since a requisite for initiation into the Mysteries was knowledge of Greek; the dedication, then seems at odds with the religious requirement. The Latin used in the inscription was connected to the Pulcher's desire to promote Roman identity and power, which was probably made all the more potent

⁵⁵⁷ Epidauros: Roux 1961, pp. 253-74; *Samothrace X*, pp. 218-26.

⁵⁵⁸ Carpenter 1971, pp. 156-160.

⁵⁵⁹ Vitruvius I.2.6, IV.2.5. From about a century earlier, the so-called Temple of Peace at Paestum also combined Doric and Ionic elements in its entablature, including triglyphs, sculpted metopes, and dentils. For other examples of buildings in the Corinthian order with mixed entablatures, see Wilson Jones 2000, pp. 112-113.

⁵⁶⁰ Dedicatory inscriptions are also found on the South and East Propylaia at Labraunda (351-44 B.C.), the propylon at the sanctuary of Athena Polias Nikephoros at Pergamon (197-159 B.C.), the propylon at the sanctuary of Demeter at Pergamon (early 2nd century B.C.), and the propylon of Ptolemy II at the sanctuary of the Great Gods on Samothrace (280-79 B.C.).

because many of the participants in the procession would not know Latin, but would only be able to recognize the foreign language on the architrave, and immediately perceive a connection to Rome.

The Lesser Propylaia currently stands alone as the only propylon known to have been built during the mid-1st century B.C. at a Greek sanctuary. General sanctuary construction took place at some non-Athenian sanctuaries, such as the temple of Hekate at Lagina or the theater at the Letoon in Lycia, but to my knowledge nowhere was a propylon built.⁵⁶¹ Later, in Athens, during the Augustan period, propyla were built as part of the Roman Agora, but these were not sanctuary entrances.⁵⁶² Because the Lesser Propylaia was the latest addition to the corpus of Hellenistic propyla, it seems to stand alone. Perhaps the reason the Lesser Propylaia is so unusual is that it was a dedication offered by a Roman, but it was part of the same trend as the buildings and monuments given during the Hellenistic period by the Attalids on the Acropolis and its south slope or the work by Antiochus on the temple of Olympian Zeus, and the numerous propyla dedicated at Greek sanctuaries. As much as the Lesser Propylaia was among the first indications of Roman interest in the sanctuary at Eleusis, it was also a continuation of the spirit of the Hellenistic period, in which non-Athenians sought to connect themselves with Athens through architectural patronage. In the case of dedications made at Athenian sanctuaries, the desire may have been to link the patron and his city with the prestigious gods of Athens, as indicated by the inscription of the Lesser Propylaia, where Appius Claudius Pulcher noted his relationship with the Eleusinian goddesses.

⁵⁶¹ For these examples, see Webb 1996, pp. 108-20, 123-24.

⁵⁶² The Roman Agora included two propyla, with the western propylon, facing toward the Greek Agora of the Doric order, and the eastern propylon built in the Ionic order. For discussion of the Roman Agora and its architecture, see Hoff 1988.

Conclusion

No certain architectural activity at the City Eleusinion can be assigned to the Republican period, while at Eleusis some construction took place near the southern entrance to the sanctuary, with a modification to the gateway next to tower K6 and stoas built to either side of the gateway. Architectural attention during this period was devoted to creating a lavish new propylon at the inner northern entrance to the sanctuary at Eleusis. When it was first constructed, the Lesser Propylaia was a single-door propylon, a highly decorated version of the earlier gateways and propyla to the sanctuary. The elaborate character of the Lesser Propylaia communicated that the sanctuary at Eleusis, the home of the Mysteries and the source of Demeter's gifts, even after Sulla's widespread destruction of Athens and encampment at Eleusis (outside of the sanctuary), was still thriving. The Lesser Propylaia was the first building to demonstrate Roman interest in Eleusis. After this dedication, and beginning with Augustus, Romans showed their enthusiasm for Eleusis and the Mysteries by participating in initiation and offering dedications to the goddesses. The dedication of the Lesser Propylaia by a prominent Roman is indicative of the growing Roman interest in the Mysteries and its sanctuaries, which rapidly developed during the Imperial period.

Within the heart of Athens, a single building project can be dated as roughly contemporary with the Lesser Propylaia, the rebuilding of the Odeion of Perikles by Ariobarzanes II of Cappadocia c. 63-51 B.C., which had been destroyed in anticipation of Sulla's arrival.⁵⁶³ Like the dedication of the Lesser Propylaia by Appius Claudius Pulcher, the reconstruction of the Odeion of Perikles was sponsored by a foreigner, a

⁵⁶³ Camp 2001, p. 185. Ancient references to Ariobarzanes and the Odeion of Perikles at Vitruvius 5.9.1 and *IG II²* 3426. Habicht 1997b, pp. 335-36 noted that the Athens set up a statue of Ariobarzanes next to the Odeion, in thanks for his gift.

non-Athenian. Both dedications demonstrate foreign interest in the major Athenian festivals of the Panathenaia and the Mysteries. After its sack by Sulla, and subsequent poorly chosen alliances with other Romans, Athens and its citizens in the mid-1st century B.C. were not in an economic position to finance such projects themselves, so the city was the perfect setting for Republican patronage, similar to the rise in foreign patronage in Athens during the 2nd century B.C. It was not until the time of Augustus that Athens saw significant monumental construction, such as the reconstruction work on the Erechtheion and the construction of the temple of Roma and Augustus, both on the Acropolis.⁵⁶⁴ Both these projects, however, were also financed by a non-Athenian, by Augustus himself. It is clear that in the mid-1st century B.C. Athenian cults generated interest on the part of Roman and other foreign patrons, but only in the 2nd century A.D. did a new sense of classicism inspire numerous dedications from Romans.

⁵⁶⁴ Hurwit 1999, pp. 279-80.

Chapter 10: The 2nd Century A.D.

Introduction

Roman interest in the Mysteries and the sanctuaries at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion, which had begun in the Late Republic, continued during the Roman Imperial period. It increased particularly under the influence of the emperors Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius, and the Panhellenion, a group of wealthy Greeks who supported the traditional cults of Athens and the imperial cult.⁵⁶⁵ Hadrian attended the Mysteries three times during his reign, in A.D. 124, 128, and 131, but was probably initiated much earlier.⁵⁶⁶ He built a bridge over the Eleusinian Kephisos River on the sacred way between Athens and Eleusis, statues of him were dedicated in the forecourt at Eleusis, and he may have been responsible for the first phase of the forecourt's construction. Following him, Marcus Aurelius was the next emperor to be initiated into the Mysteries, along with his son Commodus, in A.D. 176. Marcus Aurelius was responsible for repairs to the Telesterion and, as argued below, is the most likely patron for the Greater Propylaia.

The architectural manifestation of Roman interest in the Mysteries and its sanctuaries occurred during the 2nd century A.D. At the sanctuary at Eleusis, this attention can be seen in the construction of a series of structures in the forecourt before the sanctuary, with its new entrance, the Greater Propylaia, as the focal point. The Greater Propylaia drew a direct connection to the Acropolis of Classical Athens by modeling the central building of the Mnesiklean Propylaia. At the City Eleusinion, an Inner Propylon to the heart of the sanctuary may have been built, perhaps by the Panhellenion, as an architectural reference to the Lesser Propylaia at the sanctuary at

⁵⁶⁵ For the Panhellenion, which was founded under Hadrian (A.D. 131/32) see *Agora XXXI*, p. 88; Spawforth and Walker 1985; Clinton 1989b; Jones 1996; Romeo 2002; Riccardi 2007.

⁵⁶⁶ Clinton 1989b, p. 1516 suggested that Hadrian may have been initiated as early as A.D. 112/13.

Eleusis. By mid-century, the sacred way between the sanctuaries at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion, which had been unpaved until now, was elaborated with stone paving on either end. Most of the architecture built at the sanctuaries during this period has been attributed to the patronage of Hadrian, who had a deep interest and commitment to the Mysteries and its sanctuaries. However, Marcus Aurelius, other elite Romans, and the Panhellenion also were connected with the Mysteries and these sanctuaries. Re-investigation of the architecture, and consideration of the structures within the intellectual and political milieu of the 2nd century A.D., suggests additional possibilities for patronage.

In this chapter, I first consider the Inner Propylon at the City Eleusinion, and propose the Panhellenion as its patron. Second, at Eleusis, I discuss the forecourt to the sanctuary. The paving for the forecourt and most of its structures were built in the 2nd century A.D., with these buildings reflecting contemporary developments at Athens. Third, I consider the Greater Propylaia, the processional entrance into the sanctuary at Eleusis, which I argue may have been built in one phase, and that its patron may have been Marcus Aurelius. Next, I discuss the significance of using the Mnesiklean Propylaia of the Classical Acropolis as the prototype for the Greater Propylaia, as an example of the classicism that occurred in the 2nd century A.D. Finally, I offer an experiential and topographical analysis of the starting and ending points of the processional route for the Mysteries, which traveled from the City Eleusinion to the sanctuary at Eleusis, and back again. This chapter demonstrates that with the new propylaia at the City Eleusinion and at Eleusis, the architectural relationship between the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis and Athens reached a culmination. The

architecture at the entrances reached back and forth across the sacred way to close the gap visually and experientially between the sanctuaries.

Athens

Development along the processional route at the City Eleusinion reflects Roman Imperial interest in the Mysteries during the 2nd century A.D. (Figure 143).⁵⁶⁷ Since the 2nd century B.C., the propylon to the sanctuary had been oriented toward the Panathenaic Way, and earlier during the Roman period (1st century A.D.), this path had been partly elaborated with paving.⁵⁶⁸ During the 2nd century A.D., some of the Panathenaic Way received additional paving; only the part of the path in front of the propylon to the City Eleusinion, where it traversed the steep slope from the Agora to the Acropolis, received this treatment. This concentration of paving stones in the area of the City Eleusinion drew visual attention to the sanctuary when viewed from the heart of the Agora because it was located at the point where the Panathenaic Way rose steeply up toward the Acropolis. Emphasis on the processional route continued inside the sanctuary proper, where several monument bases lined the way from the propylon into the sanctuary (Figure 144).⁵⁶⁹

⁵⁶⁷ Elsewhere to the north and south of the sanctuary, buildings of a utilitarian nature were constructed. A storage complex of four rooms was built adjacent to the northern side of the northern sanctuary wall; given its proximity to the sanctuary wall and the two monument bases found to the east of the storeroom, Miles in *Agora XXXI*, pp. 87-88 has plausibly suggested that this was an auxiliary area for the sanctuary. The complex has been dated to the Roman period on the basis of its walls and by fills inside the rooms dating to the late Hellenistic and early Roman period. On the southern side of the sanctuary, a Hadrianic or Antonine aqueduct was built behind the stoa. In addition, the Circular Building was reconstructed during the late 1st or early 2nd century A.D. For the stoa and the aqueduct, see *Agora XXXI*, p. 88.

⁵⁶⁸ *Agora XXXI*, p. 88, n. 6. The paving of the Panathenaic Way occurred in two stages, in the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D., but the section immediately beside the sanctuary was paved first. Miles in *Agora XXXI*, p. 72 noted that when the bedrock was cut down to receive the paving, the western foundations of the propylon were exposed to view.

⁵⁶⁹ *Agora XXXI*, p. 88. Miles noted that the bases were “built variously of conglomerate, poros, or rubble and concrete, and probably supported statuary or altars.” No further information, including information on date, is provided.

A new propylon may have been built at the sanctuary during the 2nd century A.D., as argued by Miles, on the basis of several fragments of korai and a sculpted Doric frieze. Two karyatids have been restored from two korai heads found in the area of the City Eleusinion, body fragments in the National Museum, and more recently with an additional fragment identified by Kevin Glowacki in the Stoa of Attalos (Figures 145 and 146).⁵⁷⁰ The findspots of the heads and the presence of a dowel cutting on the better preserved head indicate that these are certainly architectural sculptures that should be assigned to the City Eleusinion. The korai heads provide the 2nd century A.D. date for the propylon.⁵⁷¹ A sculpted Doric frieze that is now built into the Little Metropolitan Church in Athens has also been assigned to the Inner Propylon. Although not currently located near the City Eleusinion, the frieze can be associated with the sanctuary on the basis of its iconography, which is unmistakably connected to Demeter and to the Mysteries (Figure 147).⁵⁷² The frieze is 0.60m. tall, its preserved length is 1.65m., and it contains two sculpted metopes and two sculpted triglyphs.⁵⁷³

Because these preserved elements are iconographically similar to the sculptural decoration of the Lesser Propylaia at Eleusis and because foundations that could support a propylon have not been found in the excavated part of the sanctuary, Miles restored a decorated propylon for the City Eleusinian located in the unexcavated area of the

⁵⁷⁰ M. Miles (pers. comm.).

⁵⁷¹ *Agora XXXI*, pp. 89-90, in which Miles included a summary of the various dates that have been assigned to the Cherchel/Tralleis type of karyatid, which these heads closely resemble. Miles has accepted Raftopoulou 1985, p. 364 who first connected the korai heads to this type and proposed the 2nd century A.D. date for them. Palagia 1997, pp. 90-91 argued that these heads are 2nd century A.D. copies of originals of the Tralles type. Ridgway 2002, p. 6, n. 10 noted hesitation with accepting this date, and proposed that further study may prove that the type belongs to the 1st century B.C. If so, this would make the proposed Inner Propylon at the City Eleusinion and the Lesser Propylaia at Eleusis roughly contemporary.

⁵⁷² *Agora XXXI*, pp. 89-91. For earlier discussions of the frieze, see Lenormant 1862, pp. 397-41; Steiner 1906.

⁵⁷³ Dimensions from Steiner 1906, pp. 338-40.

sanctuary, as an entranceway into the inner part of the sanctuary. In this position, the Inner Propylon would mimic the situation of the Lesser Propylaia at Eleusis, marking a temenos within a temenos, as well as the nature of its sculptural decoration.

If this restoration is correct, the Lesser Propylaia and the Inner Propylon would have corresponded to one another as the inner gateways into the sanctuaries, and their sculptural decoration may have been designed to relate visually across the sacred way. Thus, the karyatids of the City Eleusinion could represent the priestesses before they set out on the procession, because they wear only simple *poloi* on their heads; they have not yet taken up the *kistai*. On the other end of the sacred way, the kistephoroi of the Lesser Propylaia are the priestesses in the role of leaders during the procession toward the Telesterion, carrying the *kistai*, the containers for the *hiera*, which were decorated with *plemochoai*, ears of corn, and myrtle leaves.

The Doric frieze of the Inner Propylon could have provided the prospective initiates a preview of the benefits Demeter offered them through the Mysteries. The two metopes assigned to the Inner Propylon are decorated with generic religious imagery, with one metope including a phiale and the other a boukranion.⁵⁷⁴ The two triglyphs contain iconography more specifically related to the Eleusinian Mysteries and to Demeter; one triglyph shows a *plemochoe*, a vessel used for pouring libations to the dead on the last day of the festival, and the other has two crossed *bacchoi*, the bunches of myrtle carried by prospective initiates, overlaying a stalk with three pomegranate offshoots. Therefore, before they set out on their journey, the prospective initiates saw general images related to sacrifice, the boukranion and phiale, as well as objects that were

⁵⁷⁴ The phiale on this frieze bears some resemblance to the phiale included on the propylon to the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros, which Riethmüller 1996, pp. 91-108 considered as containers for eggs connected with the divine.

publicly known to be associated with the Mysteries. The *bacchoi* on the frieze were just like the *bacchoi* that the prospective initiates probably held in their hands as they looked at the propylon, and the *plemochoai*, which were used on the last day of the festival of the Mysteries, were also associated in general with offerings for the dead. The *plemochoai* went a step further and also encouraged the prospective initiates as they set out on their journey to Eleusis by referring to one of the goals sought by initiation, the promise of a better afterlife. Other images of Demeter's gifts, however, such as wheat or the *kistai* are not preserved, indicating that perhaps certain aspects of the Mysteries were not revealed to the prospective initiates too soon. Although the wheat was generally associated with Demeter and the *kistai* were carried in the procession, and thus were publicly associated with the Mysteries, both may have been excluded because they also had particular resonance with the central acts of initiation performed at Eleusis.

The patron for the Inner Propylon remains unknown. Miles suggested that the Inner Propylon was dedicated by Hadrian, but this proposal was primarily based on the association of Hadrian with nearly all of the 2nd century A.D. construction at Eleusis, a correlation which was then applied to the City Eleusinion.⁵⁷⁵ However, Hadrian is not the only patron who supported construction at Eleusis. As argued below, many of the structures built at Eleusis can be better attributed to the Panhellenion or to Marcus Aurelius. The Panhellenion, founded by Hadrian, was a group of elites who concerned themselves with aspects of cult administration.⁵⁷⁶ This group is worthy of consideration as the patron for the Inner Propylon because it dedicated monumental architecture at the sanctuary at Eleusis, in the form of two arches in the forecourt, perhaps built c. A.D. 169-

⁵⁷⁵ *Agora XXXI*, p. 91.

⁵⁷⁶ For useful discussion of the Panhellenion, see Riccardi 2007, pp. 383-86.

176. Also, on at least two occasions, one of which was during the Antonine period, the Panhellenion performed a dedication at Eleusis that replicated the first fruit offering of the Classical period.⁵⁷⁷ The Panhellenion's close connection with the City Eleusinion and its interest in the sanctuary are demonstrated by a letter sent to the group by a Roman official, which they inscribed and set up immediately to the south of the outer face of the sanctuary's Hellenistic propylon (Figure 144).⁵⁷⁸ Furthermore, it is possible that the Panhellenion met in the City Eleusinion so that they would often have a physical presence in the sanctuary as well.⁵⁷⁹ The dedication of a propylon at the City Eleusinion would be the logical architectural articulation of the group's interest in the Eleusinian cult.

For the Inner Propylon, the architects at the City Eleusinion chose as their model the Lesser Propylaia, nearly two centuries older. This is the first and only example of the City Eleusinion taking an architectural cue from the sanctuary at Eleusis. Despite its age, the Lesser Propylaia was an important landmark at the sanctuary at Eleusis. In contrast to the less conspicuous Early Classical gateway that marked the outer entrance and, later, the austere Greater Propylaia, the Lesser Propylaia stood out as being the most highly decorated propylon at Eleusis. It marked the passage into the heart of the sanctuary with iconography that referred to Demeter and the Mysteries and reminded the prospective

⁵⁷⁷ Two inscriptions that describe First Fruit dedications offered by the Panhellenes to Demeter and Kore, one of which can be dated to between A.D. 177 and 189, show this connection (Spawforth and Walker 1985, p. 100). The First-Fruits decree was a famous Athenian decree of c. 435 B.C. or the 420s B.C. (*IG I³* 78) which called for Athens and its allies to make first fruit offerings for Demeter and Kore. The regulations were a demonstration of Athens' leadership of the cult at Eleusis in the 5th century B.C. Clinton 1989b, pp. 1520-21 suggested that the performance of this ritual, which in the Classical period was performed by state financial officials, may indicate that the Panhellenion had financial control of the sanctuary at Eleusis.

⁵⁷⁸ *Agora XXXI*, p. 88; Oliver 1941, pp. 78-82. The letter was sent by a Roman official to the Panhellenion, regarding an investigation of someone who had promised to perform a task for a synhedrion, but who had failed to do so. The synhedrion in question, according to Oliver, is the Panhellenion.

⁵⁷⁹ Riccardi 2007, p. 338.

initiates of the gifts of the cult. The architects of the Inner Propylon may have deliberately emulated the iconography of Lesser Propylaia in order to achieve a similar effect. Given the Panhellenion's interest in the Mysteries, it was fitting for the group to have sought a monumental signifier of their dedication to the cult. Adding a new, Roman, propylon at the inner entrance to the sanctuary as a pendant to the older, Greek, outer entrance created a parallel arrangement at the entrances to both sanctuaries.

The architects were aware of the impact their structure could have on participants in the procession. They considered the duality of the two propylaia on either end of the sacred way, matching the decorated Inner Propylon to the undecorated Hellenistic outer propylon much like the Lesser Propylaia at Eleusis was matched to the undecorated Early Classical gateway. They hoped that, upon reaching Eleusis, prospective initiates would remember how the procession began and compare it to how their procession was ending. In conceptualizing the Inner Propylon in this way, its architects contributed further to the unity of the procession of the Mysteries, as well as to the connection between the City Eleusinion and the Eleusinian sanctuary.

Eleusis

Architectural development at the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis during the 2nd century A.D. was concentrated in the forecourt in front of the sanctuary's northern entrance, including the construction of the Greater Propylaia, with additional construction at the Telesterion (Figure 140).⁵⁸⁰ Several questions surrounding the reconstruction and

⁵⁸⁰ Of the other building projects at the sanctuary considered to belong to the Roman Imperial period, none can be securely dated to the 2nd century A.D. One example of a building of unknown date, but often included on plans of the Roman Imperial sanctuary, is the so-called Bouleterion, which was built at the southern end of the sanctuary along the 4th century B.C. wall, above the eastern stoa of the 1st century B.C. It included two semi-circular back walls. For discussion of the so-called Bouleterion, see Mylonas 1961, pp. 181-82. Mylonas 1961, pp. 141-43 suggested that the temple and terrace above the Telesterion, as well as temple F, dated to the 2nd century A.D. (Figure 140). Mylonas also dated a passage of 30 steps between

chronology of the buildings of the forecourt and the Greater Propylaia remain unsatisfactorily answered, such as their dates and patrons and, in the case of the Greater Propylaia, the number of its building phases. In addition, although specific studies of the Greater Propylaia, the forecourt, and the Telesterion have been produced, none considers the constructions collectively with reference to their location along the processional route into the sanctuary. Because together they framed the pilgrim's path into and through the sanctuary, it is essential to evaluate these building projects as a cohesive group.

In this section, I aim to sharpen our understanding of the dates, building phases, and patrons for the Greater Propylaia and the structures of the forecourt. I demonstrate that the entrance to the sanctuary at Eleusis, including the forecourt and Greater Propylaia, put an Athenian façade on this end of the sacred way during the 2nd century A.D. This appearance was created with reference to the Classical Propylaia in Athens, but was also cast through the lens of Roman Athens, as many of the monuments of the forecourt reflected Hadrianic structures there. First, I discuss the forecourt, which, as the first area approached by the procession from Athens, set the tone for arrival at the sanctuary. It included one of the more ancient monuments at the sanctuary, the Kallichoron Well, as well as a series of new Roman monuments that referred at once to Classical and Roman Athens. The long history of the sanctuary was thus presented to the prospective initiates at the same time as the first explicit architectural references to Athens. Second, I present an analysis of the Greater Propylaia. In addressing the questions concerning the date, reconstruction, and patron of the Greater Propylaia, I

the northern wall of the Telesterion and the rocky acropolis to the north and northwest of the Telesterion to the Roman period. At the top of the steps, the passage became narrower and turned to avoid direct confrontation with the steps of the Roman temple L10 in the upper terrace. For further description of the temple, see Mylonas 1961, pp. 177-78.

argue for the likelihood that this propylaia was built in a single phase, and more probably by Marcus Aurelius than by Hadrian. Furthermore, I consider the architectural relationship between the Greater Propylaia and its prototype, the Mnesiklean Propylaia of the Classical Acropolis, which intimately connected the sanctuary at Eleusis to the heart of Classical Athens by specific architectural reference. Third, I consider buildings constructed along the sacred way inside the sanctuary in order to present the topography of the processional route inside the sanctuary at Eleusis.

The Forecourt

The forecourt was the gathering place before the procession's entrance to the sanctuary through the Greater Propylaia, and also the place of public sacrifice (Figure 148).⁵⁸¹ Consideration of the forecourt and its structures, including a fountain, two arches, a temple, the paving, and several altars, is vital to realizing how a visitor in the 2nd century A.D. would perceive the Greater Propylaia. All of the forecourt's structures but one, the Kallichoron Well of the 5th century B.C., were built in the 2nd century A.D., and most visually refer to Athenian monuments. The arches and the fountain of the forecourt were similar in design and detail to Hadrianic monuments in Athens, which meant that the visitor was confronted with the image of Hadrianic Athens upon arrival to the sanctuary at Eleusis. The Greater Propylaia directly imitated the central section of the Mnesiklean Propylaia of the Athenian Acropolis, but within the setting of the forecourt, its Classical past was transformed into a Roman present. During the first few days of the festival, all the prospective initiates were in Athens, in and around the Agora and Acropolis. Therefore, the architectural references to Athens would have been

⁵⁸¹ At its widest extent, the forecourt is c. 65m. wide. For discussions of sacrifice in the forecourt, see Clinton 1988 and Evans 2002.

recognizable not only to Athenians, but also to non-Athenian Greeks, and even the Roman visitors to Greece.

The first phase of Roman construction in the forecourt included the fountain, the temple of Artemis, the L-shaped stoa, the stoa on the eastern side of the forecourt, the eschara, and the forecourt paving. It is clear that these structures were all part of the same project because they are aligned with one another, with no overlap or trimmed back surfaces. The accepted terminus ante quem for these constructions is A.D. 160, because Pausanias described seeing the temple of Artemis and the Kallichoron Well during his visit to the sanctuary.⁵⁸²

The pi-shaped fountain was built on the eastern side of the route into the sanctuary (Figure 149). It is 11.40m. wide, with six columns framing an eight-spout reservoir. In his study of the fountain, Orlandos determined that it shared formal similarities to the northern half of the west façade of the library of Hadrian.⁵⁸³ In particular, the double-fascia epistyle of the fountain and the projecting sidewalls are similar to those in Athens.⁵⁸⁴ Also like the library in Athens, the fountain included free-standing columns with an engaged entablature. Although the capitals of the fountain are not preserved, Orlandos plausibly reconstructed them as Corinthian, like those of the library in Athens.

The temple of Artemis is located near the center of the forecourt. A Doric tetrastyle amphiprostyle temple, it is built on a foundation of concrete covered by poros slabs with a Pentelic marble five-step krepidoma above (Figures 150 and 151). The

⁵⁸² Pausanias 1.38.6.

⁵⁸³ Orlandos 1936, pp. 289-294.

⁵⁸⁴ For a brief review of the formal characteristics of the library of Hadrian in Athens, see Boatwright 1997, pp. 197-99.

temple is 16.03m. long and 10.10m. wide at the base of its podium.⁵⁸⁵ Ziro noted that the temple was similar in proportion and plan to the temple of Athena Nike, although differing in its use of the Doric rather than the Ionic order.⁵⁸⁶ The spatial relationship of the temple of Artemis to the Greater Propylaia also recalls that between the temple of Athena Nike and the Mnesiklean Propylaia on the Athenian Acropolis. To the visitor approaching the Mnesiklean Propylaia, the Athena Nike temple is on the right side before the sanctuary entrance, just as the temple of Artemis is on the right side as the visitor walks from the sacred way toward the Greater Propylaia. In addition, the spatial relationship between the temple and the Greater Propylaia is reminiscent of that between the temple of Triptolemos, another tetrastyle amphiprostyle temple, and the proposed location of the Inner Propylon at the City Eleusinion, with the temple in front of the propylon (Figure 143).

Near the temple of Artemis, an L-shaped stoa, an eschara, or a ground altar for burnt offerings, and other altars were also constructed as part of the first phase of the forecourt (Figure 150). The L-shaped stoa is comprised of a simple colonnade on its northern wing, but its western wing included a series of rooms behind the colonnade.⁵⁸⁷ The preserved plan of the building indicates that the complex included two dining rooms, each with an antechamber before it, on either side of a larger central room that apparently

⁵⁸⁵ Dimensions from Mylonas 1961, p. 168. Mylonas recorded the restored height of its monolithic columns as 4.53m. The temple is also similar to the temple of the Athenians on Delos, dating to the later 5th century B.C., which, although hexastyle, was Doric and amphiprostyle, measuring c. 17 x 11m. Built of Pentelic marble, this temple included an interior apsidal base of Eleusinian limestone. For the temple, see Bruneau and Ducat 1983, pp. 129-30.

⁵⁸⁶ Ziro 1991, p. 126. The temple of Artemis is nearly double the size of the temple of Athena Nike. The temple of Athena Nike is 8.17 by 5.40m. measured on its stylobate. Dimensions from Mark 1993, p. 72.

⁵⁸⁷ Travlos 1949, p. 143 suggested that this complex of rooms could have been a shrine for the hero Dolichos, based on a reference to a shrine dedicated to him in the building inscription *IG II² 1672*, lines 23-25. However, because connections between the topography of Eleusis and monuments described in the various building inscriptions remain problematic, Travlos' suggestion cannot be accepted without hesitation, however. Dolichos is a legendary Eleusinian figure, named in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 155. For this reference, see Richardson 1974, pp. 198-99.

had a central entrance. An additional room is located to the north of the northern dining room. These dining rooms may have been used for the feast of the sacrificial animals offered on the altars of the forecourt. The eschara, located in front of the northern wing of the stoa, is framed by stone walls that create a slightly trapezoidal area for the eschara itself, which is built with brick walls and is 1.75m. deep.⁵⁸⁸ Projections to support an iron grill are located nearly at the halfway point of each wall. Near the eschara, two monument bases to the east and northeast of the temple of Artemis may have supported altars.⁵⁸⁹ The base directly to the east of the temple, which is 3.10 by 2.48m., is built of small stones in lime, and may have been an altar primarily associated with the temple. The second base, to the northeast of the temple, is poorly preserved, and is indicated by an opening in the paving stones and a single fragment. To the north of the temple, a third base, larger and with more substantial remains, may have supported an altar or another type of monument.⁵⁹⁰

The paving of the forecourt was also installed during the first phase (Figures 148 and 152). In the northern section, the paving is oriented with the sacred way, and aligned with the L-shaped stoa, the eschara, the temple of Artemis, and the fountain. Just beyond the southeastern corner of the Temple of Artemis, the orientation of the paving stones was shifted to align with the sanctuary wall, the Early Classical gateway, and the Kallichoron Well. Later, when the Greater Propylaia was built, it shared the same alignment with the paving as the Early Classical gateway. The line where the two orientations meet is irregular, formed by paving stones of various lengths and shapes.

⁵⁸⁸ The eschara is described by Mylonas 1961, pp. 169-70. The northern and southern walls are each 8.50m. and 8.28m. long, respectively, while the western and eastern walls are 6m. and 7.15m. long.

⁵⁸⁹ Ziro 1991, p. 117; Mylonas 1961, pp. 168-70. Dimensions from Mylonas.

⁵⁹⁰ Ziro 1991, p. 126 suggested that its size and remains could indicate that this was a base for a statue of Poseidon, who, according to Pausanias 1.38.6, shared the temple with Artemis.

Although the paving was laid with different orientations, both must belong to a single phase because there is no recognizable difference in material or finishing between the two sets of paving stones. The difference in orientation was not due to a time gap in construction, or to different sets of masons working in different directions, but to adapting the new paving to fit the older monuments. The shift in orientation comes in the middle of the forecourt, within the gathering area for the procession, after it had arrived from the sacred way, but before it approached the gateway into the sanctuary. Thus, while the forecourt was outfitted in the Roman period with several new structures designed to frame the experience of entering and exiting the sanctuary in a decidedly Roman way, the challenges observed in paving the forecourt show that the Roman designers also respected the Greek past of this area of the sanctuary.

After the first phase, the Greater Propylaia and the arches were built. The Greater Propylaia was certainly built after the paving was installed, because its northern steps overlap the paving stones (Figure 153).⁵⁹¹ The arches are also later than the first phase, because the eastern arch was built over the outflow drain for the fountain (Figure 154).⁵⁹² The chronological relationship between the Greater Propylaia and the arches cannot be established by the physical relationships among the structures in the forecourt, however. It can only be determined with certainty that they are later than the structures of the first phase.

The two arches were located at the eastern and western sides of the southern end of the forecourt. The eastern arch marked the roads to Athens and the sea, and the

⁵⁹¹ Willers 1996, p. 183 offered the same observation.

⁵⁹² Also noted by Clinton 1989a, p. 63 and Willers 1996, p. 185. Orlandos 1936, p. 294 argued that the arches were built earlier than the fountain.

western the road to Megara (Figure 148).⁵⁹³ Careful consideration of these structures highlights several key issues connected with their date and patronage, information that in turn elucidates the wider issues of the building phases of the forecourt and the date of the Greater Propylaea. Because they quoted aspects of the Arch of Hadrian in Athens they become another instance where structures at Eleusis directly referenced structures in Athens.

The western arch was free-standing, but the eastern arch was wedged between the fountain house and the sanctuary wall at its southwestern corner.⁵⁹⁴ Built of Pentelic marble, both structures consisted of a lower story with a single arch topped by an upper story with three bays between Corinthian columns (Figure 155). Each bore an inscription in the architrave immediately above the lower arch that read, “To the goddesses and the emperor, the Philhellenes.”⁵⁹⁵ The sculpted decoration of the arches included torches on the pedestals and acanthus decoration on the geison and raking sima (Figure 157); both these subjects had particular resonance at Eleusis. The torches were like those carried by Demeter as she searched for her daughter, and the acanthus referred to death and rebirth, a concern of those seeking a better afterlife through their initiation into the Mysteries.

Discovery of five statue bases in the area of the eastern arch and one near the western arch reveals that each arch contained several statues in the upper story, set with the bases back to back (Figure 156). The statue bases near the eastern arch are inscribed respectively Marcus Aurelius as Theos Antoninus (*IG II² 3397*), Faustina, his wife, as

⁵⁹³ Kourouniotes 1936, pp. 38-39 suggested that the eastern arch led to “recreation centers” and the western to the city of Eleusis, “the main gate of which was to the right of the Large Propylaea, at a distance of about 100 meters toward the northwest.”

⁵⁹⁴ Willers 1996, fig. 14 presented a drawing of the eastern arch with one pi-clamp exposed. A fragment of the raking sima for the eastern arch visible on site today also includes a pi-clamp.

⁵⁹⁵ *IG II² 2958*. Clinton 2005a, pp. 364-66, cat. 448.

Thea Faustina (*IG II² 3400*), and his daughters Faustina (*IG II² 3398*) and Vibia Aurelia Sabina (*IG II² 3401*).⁵⁹⁶ A third daughter, Lucilla, also seems to have been listed, however, her name has been erased (*IG II² 3402*).⁵⁹⁷ A base inscribed to Theos Adrianos Panhellenios was also found near the eastern arch (*IG II² 3386*).⁵⁹⁸ A base located near the western arch repeated the name Thea Faustina, which could suggest a duplicate set of statues for each arch.⁵⁹⁹ Alternatively, this base could name her mother Faustina the Elder, suggesting that Antoninus Pius is also among these statues, which would mean that all three emperors would be represented on the arches.⁶⁰⁰ All of the bases are of white marble, with heights ranging from 1.10m. to 1.225m.⁶⁰¹ The bases have a crown that includes an apophyge, then a cavetto with an ovolo molding above, surmounted by a cavetto and finally the upper plinth, and a base molding with the plinth surmounted by a diagonal fillet, followed by a cyma recta and apophyge. The base inscribed with Hadrian's name has a base molding with a cyma recta with a more projecting upper, convex curve.

These bases and their inscriptions, as well as the architrave inscription, provide information that can help establish the date of the arches. There has been a lack of

⁵⁹⁶ *IG II² 3398* likely refers to Marcus Aurelius' daughter Annia Aurelia Galeria Faustina, rather than Domitia Faustina because she was his eldest daughter, she lived to adulthood, and she married Gnaeus Claudius Severus who would be consul later in the 2nd century A.D.

⁵⁹⁷ For the inscriptions on each base, see Clinton 2005a, pp. 406-409, cat. 505-507, 509-510; Clinton 1989a, pp. 58-59. Kourouniotes 1936, p. 40 identified the bases as representing Antoninus Pius's family, leading him to conclude that the arch was built by Antoninus Pius.

⁵⁹⁸ Clinton 2005a, pp. 368-69, cat. 453.

⁵⁹⁹ No *IG* number. Clinton 2005a, p. 408, cat. 508.

⁶⁰⁰ Antoninus Pius was never initiated into the Mysteries at Eleusis, but a statue of him may have been dedicated at the sanctuary, statues of other members of his family were erected at the sanctuary (*IG II² 3399*), and he performed investiture for a hierophant in Rome. See Clinton 1989b, pp. 1525-28 for a discussion of Antoninus Pius' relationship with the sanctuary at Eleusis and the Mysteries.

⁶⁰¹ Heights for the bases from Clinton 2005a, pp. 368-69, 406-409, cat. 453, 505-510. The heights for the bases that are well-preserved are as follows. The base for Hadrian is 1.21m., the base for Marcus Aurelius is 1.225m., the base for Lucilla is 1.17m., the base for Sabina is 1.24m., and the base for Faustina, the daughter of Marcus Aurelius is 1.10m.

consensus in past scholarship regarding their date, however, because most of this evidence can be read in different ways, with one exception. The single piece of evidence that remains indisputable is that at least one statue base was dedicated before the *damnatio* of Lucilla in A.D. 182, as her name was originally included, but subsequently erased.⁶⁰² It is less clear how the other preserved bases relate to this one, and which emperor is referred to in the architrave inscription.

Regarding the statue bases, Clinton suggested that Lucilla's base was part of a group with all the other bases except that inscribed with Theos Adrianos Panhellenios.⁶⁰³ He argued that Hadrian's base was earlier than the others because of differences in the finish and molding of this base, as well as its naming of an earlier emperor. This base, however, is of the same material as the other bases and also shares similar dimensions with them. There are a few differences in formal details among the statue bases, including the cyma recta on the base molding of Hadrian's base, a rounded, highly pronounced ovolo on the crown molding of the base of Thea Faustina found near the eastern arch, and a taller diagonal fillet on the base molding of the base of Faustina, the daughter of Marcus Aurelius, compared to the others. Because these differences are not limited only to Hadrian's base, they do not necessarily exclude it from the others as a group. In my opinion, it is possible that the bases could all be relatively contemporary.

The terminus ante quem for the statue bases, therefore, would be A.D. 182, but it remains uncertain when the group of statue bases was dedicated. The bases of Marcus Aurelius and Hadrian include the title of *theos*, or deified, which does not necessarily

⁶⁰² For the practice of *damnatio memoriae*, see Varner 2004, pp. 1-12. For the *damnatio* of Lucilla in particular, see Varner 2004, pp. 148-51.

⁶⁰³ Clinton 1989a, p. 61. Højte 2005, p. 439, cat. Hadrian 247 and p. 558, cat. Marcus Aurelius 191, followed Clinton's conclusion that the base of Hadrian should be disassociated from the other statue bases assigned to the arches.

refer to a deceased emperor.⁶⁰⁴ If the bases were all dedicated at the same time as I have suggested, they certainly would date to after Hadrian's death, but not necessarily after that of Marcus Aurelius in A.D. 180.

The architrave inscription presents a similar problem. The inscription indicates that the arches were dedicated to the goddesses and an unnamed emperor, who is not referred to as *theos*, by the Panhellenes. Clinton suggested it would be most appropriate for the inscription to refer to Hadrian, since, as the founder of the Panhellenion he could receive this great gift from the group.⁶⁰⁵ Moreover, he argued that it would make sense for a copy of his arch in Athens to be given to him at Eleusis. However, it is possible that the Panhellenion was not closely connected with Eleusis until the Antonine period, as suggested by one of the recorded first fruits offerings given by them. If the arches demonstrated the Panhellenion's affection for Eleusis during the Antonine period, then Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, or Commodus could be the emperor named in the inscription.⁶⁰⁶ Only Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, however, were initiated into the Mysteries, making each more likely as honoree. Because Marcus Aurelius had a closer relationship with the Panhellenion, he would emerge as the most likely emperor to have been honored by the Panhellenion in this way.⁶⁰⁷ Since only one emperor is referred to in the architrave inscription, if my suggestion is correct, then the arches would therefore date to c. 169-176, when Marcus Aurelius was the sole emperor. In leaving the emperor in the inscription unnamed, the Panhellenion also could share this honor with all future emperors.

⁶⁰⁴ For the uses of this title, see Price 1984, pp. 82-85.

⁶⁰⁵ Clinton 1989a, pp. 61-62; Clinton 1997, pp. 175-76.

⁶⁰⁶ Spawforth and Walker 1985, p. 102 also suggested Marcus Aurelius or Commodus as the emperor.

⁶⁰⁷ Willers 1996, pp. 188-89 also argued that the arches were Antonine.

Unfortunately, the style of the sculpted decoration of the capitals cannot confirm an Antonine date for the arches. In her study of Corinthian capitals from the 2nd century A.D., Walker proposed that the style of the capitals of the arches suggests a date in the middle of that century.⁶⁰⁸ This conclusion was based primarily on the lower relief of the acanthus leaves compared to earlier examples, such as the arch of Hadrian in Athens, and the use of the drill to create deep ringed voids in the foliage leaves. The capitals are most similar to examples from the mid-2nd century A.D., such as those from the Nymphaeum in the Athenian Agora. Because Walker's corpus of examples is small and from monuments whose dates are often contested, however, further conclusions cannot be drawn from the evidence of the capitals.

Thus, the information provided by the architrave inscription and the statue bases arches may indicate that the arches were built and dedicated to Marcus Aurelius by the Panhellenes during his lifetime, while he was the sole emperor. The statue bases would have been added sometime before the *damnatio* of Lucilla.

The arches at Eleusis are similar in form to the arch of Hadrian in Athens, but they differ in their decoration and in the letter forms of their inscriptions.⁶⁰⁹ All three examples have two stories, with an arched opening framed by two piers below and a triple-bay attic above, and all span a road. The arch in Athens was not embellished with any sculpted decoration, however, while the sima of the arches at Eleusis contained palmette decoration and the pedestals in Eleusis were decorated with torches (Figures 157

⁶⁰⁸ Walker 1979, pp. 122-25.

⁶⁰⁹ These arches are unusual examples of honorary arches because the attic is composed of three bays within a colonnade. As Adams 1989, p. 13 noted, the closest parallel for this arrangement is the arch of Trajan at Ephesus.

and 158).⁶¹⁰ The letter forms of the inscriptions were also different, with the bars of the sigma on the arches at Eleusis much longer than those at Athens, and the bar of the alpha broken at Eleusis, but straight in Athens. These differences between the Eleusinian and Athenian arches would not have prevented a 2nd century A.D. visitor from recognizing the arches as near copies.

The arch of Hadrian, located on the main road leading to the Olympieion, was one of the most important monuments of Roman Athens.⁶¹¹ Its appearance and position recalled an honorary arch, but the inscription indicated that it was used to lay claim to the entire city of Athens as a refoundation by Hadrian.⁶¹² The inscription naming Hadrian could have been placed on the side facing the Olympieion specifically with the goal of highlighting his gift of this sanctuary to the city of Athens.⁶¹³

The arches of the sanctuary at Eleusis may have been used to achieve a similar objective, to mark the sanctuary within the territory of the emperor and the Panhellenes. More specifically, if, as Willers has argued, the Olympieion was the home of the Panhellenion, their choice of this arch as a model, which honored Hadrian, the founder of the Panhellenion, is even more striking.⁶¹⁴ The Panhellenion could have used the arches in Eleusis to mark their great interest in the sanctuary there, putting the Eleusinian sanctuary within the same spatial relationship with the arches as is the Olympieion in Athens with the arch of Hadrian. In both places, the arches were built along roads into the sanctuaries. At Eleusis, however, the arches were not along the processional route to

⁶¹⁰ Relationship to arch of Hadrian first noted by Orlandos 1921, p. 291. For stylistic differences between Athenian and Eleusinian arches, see Willers 1996, p. 185.

⁶¹¹ Adams 1989, pp. 14-15.

⁶¹² Adams 1989, p. 11, n. 10.

⁶¹³ Adams 1989, p. 14.

⁶¹⁴ Willers 1996, pp. 54-67.

the sanctuary, which was instead framed by stoas in the 2nd century A.D. The arches were built at the ends of the roads from Megara and the sea, where they approached the forecourt. The procession would not have passed through the arches, but prospective initiates would have seen the arches, with their dedicatory inscriptions and statues, to their right and left as they approached the entrance to the sanctuary. The inscriptions on the Eleusinian arches, oriented to the inside of the forecourt, connected the Panhellenes and the emperor to the sanctuary at Eleusis in the most prominent public area of the sanctuary, where they would flank the sides of the procession as it entered the forecourt from the sacred way and be visible to the largest possible audience, including prospective initiates and non-initiates. These arches would have communicated to the prospective initiates that the sanctuary and the Mysteries were under the beneficence of the Panhellenes. Also facing into the forecourt was the façade of the Greater Propylaia, including the pedimental portrait of the emperor.

To return to consideration of the forecourt as a whole, the Greater Propylaia and the arches may have been designed to work together to communicate explicitly the imperial presence at the sanctuary, while the monuments of the first stage indicated a more indirect imperial reference. The fountain used some features that were employed at the library of Hadrian in Athens, such as the engaged capitals, but it was not a direct evocation, in the way the arches at Eleusis were to Hadrian's arch in Athens.

Resemblances between the structures of the forecourt and Hadrianic monuments in Athens may or may not indicate a Hadrianic date for the Eleusinian structures; they may simply reflect the fame and influence of Hadrianic monuments, and Hadrian himself, in later reigns. Therefore, Hadrian may have been responsible for the first of the forecourt,

especially given the earlier date for this phase and Hadrian's interest in the Mysteries, but there is no evidence to confirm this association. The first stage was complete by Pausanias' visit of c. A.D. 160, and the second may have been complete by the time of Marcus Aurelius' initiation in A.D. 176.

The forecourt at Eleusis created a hybrid character for the sanctuary that fused Classical and Roman Athens.⁶¹⁵ The most ancient monument in the forecourt, the Kallichoron Well, was one of the oldest preserved Greek monuments at the sanctuary during the Roman period (Figure 148). The Roman forecourt, its paving, and the Greater Propylaia were all built with respect to this ancient feature, highlighting the feature and leaving it accessible for continued use. Similarly, the Greater Propylaia, with its high podium and Pentelic marble superstructure, presented a striking contrast to the older Greek fortification walls of the sanctuary. The approach to the sanctuary at Eleusis was unmistakably visually and experientially aligned with Roman Athens in general, and, through the Greater Propylaia, also specifically to the entrance of the Athenian Acropolis.

The Greater Propylaia

The Greater Propylaia, the most prominent structure in the forecourt, concretized the visual relationship between Eleusinian and Athenian monuments. However, instead of using a Roman structure in Athens, the architect(s) looked to Periklean Athens for a model, and quoted the central portion of the Mnesiklean Propylaia of the Classical Acropolis. This choice highlighted the Greater Propylaia's status as the processional entrance and transformed the act of entering the sanctuary. Its position and monumentality established the Greater Propylaia as the keystone of the entire forecourt,

⁶¹⁵ On the concept of hybridity and its application to the contrast of Greek and Roman identities, see Alcock 2002, pp. 88-96.

and its architectural reference equated the sanctuary with the prestigious religious heart of the city of Athens.

Excavation and Interpretation

The Society of Dilettanti first investigated the Greater Propylaia in 1811.⁶¹⁶ They concluded that it was so similar to the Mnesiklean Propylaia that the two must be contemporary, considering them both to be Classical, with the Eleusinian version modeled on the Athenian Propylaia. In 1860, Lenormant found three fragments of an epistyle inscription that he reconstructed as belonging to the façade of the Greater Propylaia.⁶¹⁷ He also re-dated the Greater Propylaia to the Antonine period on the basis of these fragments, and suggested that it was one of the projects of Marcus Aurelius at Eleusis cited by the scholium to Aelius Aristides.⁶¹⁸ Several decades later, Philios excavated the Greater Propylaia, and was the first to bring together the surviving blocks of the structure from where they had been scattered when the building collapsed.⁶¹⁹ Kourouniotes exposed several pieces of the Greater Propylaia between it and the Lesser Propylaia while he was investigating the course of the Second Archaic Phase wall.⁶²⁰

In the last century, with excavations completed, scholars have focused on the architectural comparison between the Greater Propylaia and the Athenian Propylaia, the portrait sculpture of the pediment, the epistyle inscription, and on the gateway as an expression of Roman Imperial interest in the sanctuary at Eleusis. In his 1910 study of the pediments of the Mnesiklean Propylaia, Dinsmoor compared the Athenian example

⁶¹⁶ Society of Dilettanti 1817, pp. 9-18.

⁶¹⁷ Lenormant 1862, pp. 46-48; Giraud 1989, p. 70, n. 7. Lenormant also believed that the Greater Propylaia must date to after Pausanias' visit to the sanctuary of A.D. 160 because Pausanias did not mention the Greater Propylaia. If it had existed, according to Lenormant, Pausanias surely would have noted it.

⁶¹⁸ Scholium to Aelius Aristides *Panathenaikos* 18.3.

⁶¹⁹ Giraud 1989, p. 69; Philios 1888, pp. 51-54.

⁶²⁰ Kourouniotes 1932, p. 202; Ziro 1991, p. 130.

with its Eleusinian successor, making note of a construction technique that was particular to these two gateways. Both pediments used tenons on either side of the central tympanon block to connect it to the adjacent orthostate blocks.⁶²¹ The extant pedimental portrait was identified as Marcus Aurelius by Deubner in 1937, which has been supported most recently and convincingly by Fittschen.⁶²² Concerning the inscription, Clinton has suggested that its fragments can be restored to include the names of Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius in two separate lines, perhaps one on each façade of the Greater Propylaia.⁶²³ The Greater Propylaia has become the focal point in recent discussions of Roman Imperial, and especially Hadrianic, interest in ancient Greek cults and architecture.⁶²⁴

Most recently, Ziro pursued a detailed architectural study of the Greater Propylaia, concerned with both formal and technical aspects, including construction techniques.⁶²⁵ His thorough work has identified, measured, and discussed all the extant blocks for the building, resulting in a reliable reconstruction of the Greater Propylaia. Ziro argued that the Greater Propylaia was built in two phases, the first by Hadrian, and the second by Marcus Aurelius, with its final completion and dedication by Commodus. Not all scholars have accepted Ziro's conclusions.⁶²⁶ Indeed, this conclusion leaves several critical aspects unresolved, such as the number of building phases, the date for the Greater Propylaia, and the patron responsible for its construction.

⁶²¹ Dinsmoor 1910. Dinsmoor also restored the three epistyle inscription fragments published by Lenormant as bearing the name of Marcus Aurelius.

⁶²² Deubner 1937, pp. 73-81; Fittschen 1989, p. 76.

⁶²³ Clinton 2005a, pp. 401-402, cat. 499; Clinton 1989, pp. 64-66.

⁶²⁴ Clinton 1989a, 1989b, 1997; Spawforth and Walker 1985; Willers 1990, 1996.

⁶²⁵ Ziro 1991.

⁶²⁶ Clinton 1989a, pp. 64-68; Clinton 1997, p. 189, n. 89 found Commodus' role in the construction unlikely. Willers 1996, pp. 183-84 doubted that there were two phases to the Greater Propylaia, since any damage caused by the Costobocis should have left a record.

This section demonstrates that a broader re-consideration of certain building features of the Greater Propylaia, especially clamp usage and comparison to classicizing construction techniques elsewhere, allows for the possibility that the Greater Propylaia was more likely built in a single phase. Evidence provided by the portrait and the inscription, as well as comparisons between the Greater Propylaia and contemporary work undertaken at the Telesterion, suggests that Marcus Aurelius may have been its patron.

Description and Reconstruction

The Greater Propylaia is oriented northeast-southwest, with the entrance on the northeastern side (Figures 140 and 159).⁶²⁷ It has Doric hexastyle prostyle façades on both porches, with two rows of three Ionic columns in the northern porch, and a doorwall pierced by five doorways. Fragments from nearly every part of the Greater Propylaia are preserved, including the foundations, stylobate, Ionic bases, and thresholds, which remain in situ, as well as pieces of the Doric and Ionic columns and entablatures, the doorwall, sidewalls, the coffered ceiling, pediment, and roof tiles.⁶²⁸

The foundations of the Greater Propylaia are composed of a high podium of *opus caementicium* faced with poros ashlar, some 1.85m. above the paving of the forecourt on the northern side of the building.⁶²⁹ Other than the northwestern corner, where the steps and stylobate are missing, the foundations are well-preserved. Because the Greater Propylaia is built on ground sloping down to the north, the northern side of the foundations rises above the forecourt paving and five courses of limestone blocks were needed to create a level euthynteria. The euthynteria itself is composed of large poros

⁶²⁷ I use north and south as more concise ways of describing the two sides of the building.

⁶²⁸ For a list of all the preserved fragments, see Ziro 1991, p. 137.

⁶²⁹ Ziro 1991, p. 140.

blocks joined with double-T clamps and doveled to a course of marble paving above. On the northern side, some of the limestone blocks below the paving are attached with double-T clamps to the marble steps of the krepis (Figure 160). This is visible especially on the northeast corner where the marble slabs of the stylobate are missing.

The krepis of the northern porch is composed of six Pentelic marble steps (1.844m. high) that return around the front of the building to terminate at the sanctuary wall, except at the northeastern corner, where the lowest step terminates at the Kallichoron Well. The length of the krepis on the northern side is 27.375m. wide and 8.10m. long.⁶³⁰ On the southern side, the stylobate sits directly on the euthynteria. The stylobate is 23.785m. long and 21.205m. wide.⁶³¹ The paving stones and stylobate are poorly preserved around the perimeter of the podium, with all of the eastern and western edges and most of the northern and southern missing. The paving stones are approximately 0.35m. tall.⁶³² Ziro believed that the paving stones were not completely finished, as is evident on those that act as stylobate with their shallow depressed ring around the lowest Doric column drum.⁶³³

The shallow southern porch (7.160m. deep) has a hexastyle Doric façade set before the doorwall, while the deeper Doric hexastyle northern porch (15.075m. deep) also includes two rows of three Ionic columns in line behind the two central Doric columns.⁶³⁴ The space between the two rows of Ionic columns is the same as that of the widened intercolumniation between the two central Doric columns of the façade,

⁶³⁰ Ziro 1991, fig. 55 (Figure 159 here).

⁶³¹ Dimensions from Ziro 1991, p. 147.

⁶³² Ziro 1991, p. 145.

⁶³³ Ziro 1991, p. 170.

⁶³⁴ The porch dimensions are provided in Ziro 1991, fig. 61.

5.412m.⁶³⁵ The lowest Doric column drums were doveled into a shallow depression cut into the stylobate.⁶³⁶ The lowest drum of the southwestern Doric column remains in situ, and preserves a lower column diameter of 1.555m. on the arris.⁶³⁷ Ziro noted that the Doric columns of the Greater Propylaia did not lean in toward the interior of the building, but they did have entasis.⁶³⁸ Three complete Doric capitals, as well as a few other capital fragments, are preserved in the area around the Greater Propylaia (Figure 161). The capitals, which have a steep echinus, range in height from 0.668-0.704m., with an abacus height of 0.272-0.290m., and an abacus width of 1.641-1.672m. Two capitals preserve their lower surface diameters, 1.185m. and 1.193m. on the arris.⁶³⁹ Two of the extant Doric capitals have a relieving surface around their underside that protected the flutes of the neck while the capital was set in place on the column (Figure 162). The other two extant Doric capitals do not preserve this relieving surface (Figure 163).⁶⁴⁰

The height of the Doric columns can be reconstructed on comparison with the Doric columns of Athenian Propylaia because the lower column diameters for the two buildings are nearly the same, with the lower column diameter of the Athenian Propylaia 1.556m.⁶⁴¹ Each façade of the Athenian Propylaia has a different height, however, due to the higher ground level on the eastern side of the building, so that the eastern façade is shorter, with a mean column height of 8.528m., while the western façade has a mean

⁶³⁵ Ziro 1991, p. 175.

⁶³⁶ Ziro 1991, p. 170. Ziro measured this depression as 0.006m. larger in diameter than the lowest column drum.

⁶³⁷ Kourouniotes 1936, p. 42 noted that that Doric column drum is in its original position. Lower column diameter from Ziro 1991, pp. 170-72.

⁶³⁸ Ziro 1991, pp. 172-74.

⁶³⁹ Dimensions from Ziro 1991, p. 174.

⁶⁴⁰ Giraud 1989, p. 71; Ziro 1991, p. 175.

⁶⁴¹ Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor 2004, pp. 93-95.

column height of 8.8075m.⁶⁴² The shorter column height helped to reduce the great difference of the level of the superstructure across the building. The western façade of the Athenian Propylaia might best be used as the model for reconstructing the column height of the Greater Propylaia because the western façade was the front of the Athenian Propylaia, which in turn was the entrance to the Acropolis. This façade would therefore be the one replicated by the Greater Propylaia. Moreover, the height of the shorter columns of the Athenian Propylaia's eastern side may have been too squat for the Greater Propylaia.⁶⁴³ If the eastern columns were used as a model for the columns of the Greater Propylaia, the column height would have been 8.5268m., or about 5.48 LD. Using the height of the western columns of the Athenian Propylaia as a model, however, the columns of the Greater Propylaia, including the capital, could be 8.8075m., or about 5.66 LD.⁶⁴⁴

The bases of the Ionic columns and the beddings that support each base are carved from a single block of stone, with all six bases remaining in situ (Figure 164). The bases are not of a uniform height, with slight discrepancies from one base to another, as well as from one side of one base to another side of the same base (Figure 159).⁶⁴⁵ The bases are Attic-Ionic, set on a raised (c. 0.09m. high) concave bedding, with a lower torus (c. 0.125m. high), scotia (c. 0.107m. high), and an upper torus carved with three horizontal

⁶⁴² Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor 2004, pp. 93-95.

⁶⁴³ Ziro 1991, p. 172 also preferred to use the column height of the western façade of the Athenian Propylaia as a model for his reconstruction.

⁶⁴⁴ Ziro 1991, p. 172 proposed a Doric column height for the Greater Propylaia to be 8.824m., taken from Dinsmoor 1950, p. 339. Ziro used the earlier work of Bohn 1882, Bundgaard 1957, and Dinsmoor 1950 on the Athenian Propylaia to determine his reconstruction of the Greater Propylaia, based on an LD of 1.558m. The new study by Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor 2004 offers revised measurements and calculations.

⁶⁴⁵ Ziro 1991, p. 179 suggested that this irregularity was not due to a desire to create column inclination or another refinement, since the upper columns were cut to compensate and correct these irregularities, but instead was a mark of low skill among the masons. The differences range between 0.001m. to 0.005m.

flutes (c. 0.110m. high), with an average total height of 0.432m.⁶⁴⁶ Three Ionic column drums remain in place on these bases, while over 20 other large and small fragments also survive.⁶⁴⁷ The columns were composed of large drums, ranging in height from 1.23-1.40m., each with 24 flutes.⁶⁴⁸ The upper surfaces of some drums have an anathyrosis band 0.19m. wide, but it is wider and less regular in others.

The Ionic capitals are of the Attic-Ionic type (Figure 165). Several large fragments have been repositioned on the remains of the Greater Propylaia, and a few smaller fragments also survive, for a total of 11. The capitals consist of an egg and dart echinus with six visible eggs, partly covered by the corner palmettes at the ends, under a concave volute cushion surmounted by an abacus with an uncarved cavetto. The volute spirals widely away from the cushion, with astragals around their border, and small convex eyes at the center. The neck is carved as part of the capital. The height of the capital is 0.556m.⁶⁴⁹ The height of the Ionic column including its base and capital can be reconstructed as 10.4375m. This height is determined by adding the height of the Doric column (8.8075m.) to the epistyle height (1.15m.) and the height of the frieze backer (0.48m.) (Figure 166).⁶⁵⁰

The sidewalls of the Doric porch terminated in rectangular antae on both porches.⁶⁵¹ One orthostate, some 15 fragments of wall blocks, and five anta blocks survive, all of which have double-T clamps. The wall blocks vary in height between 0.46

⁶⁴⁶ Dimensions from Ziro 1991, p. 181, fig. 79.

⁶⁴⁷ Ziro 1991, p. 137.

⁶⁴⁸ Ziro 1991, p. 182.

⁶⁴⁹ Ziro 1991, p. 187.

⁶⁵⁰ Ziro 1991, p. 188 determined the height of the Ionic columns to be 10.454m. His reconstruction was based on a Doric column height of 8.824m.

⁶⁵¹ Ziro 1991, p. 156 called these antae “equilateral” because “the two sides are equal and smaller than its width.” By contrast, Bedford reconstructed the anta with different terminations: on the northern side, the two sides of the anta were not equal, with one longer than the other, while on the southern side the two sides were equal.

and 0.525m.⁶⁵² The nearly isodomic courses were composed of wall blocks and backers of equal dimensions with their joints aligned, and connected by double-T clamps to each other and to the other blocks of the same course. Three preserved wall blocks, which each have a finished front and back face, preserve widths of 1.32-1.329m. These blocks have been reconstructed by Ziro as wall courses without backers, which alternate with the other courses that are composed of wall blocks and backers.⁶⁵³

The sidewalls were topped by an epikranitis, which was used along the entire length of the sidewalls, on both the interior and exterior faces and continued the line of the anta capitals.⁶⁵⁴ One of the four surviving epikranitis blocks is slightly wider (1.336m.) than the preserved sidewall blocks and contains the molded profile on both the interior and exterior faces, while the other blocks are half as wide, and were joined together by double-T clamps. The inner and outer faces of the epikranitis did not share the same profile. The exterior face included a taenia surmounted by a cyma recta, while the interior face included a taenia surmounted by a hawksbeak with another taenia and finally a cyma recta above.

The Doric entablature extends around all four sides of the Greater Propylaea.⁶⁵⁵ From the epistyle, six preserved blocks indicate that they were connected to each other and to their backers by pi-clamps.⁶⁵⁶ Three fragments of the epistyle are inscribed with Greek letters.⁶⁵⁷ Above the epistyle, the frieze is composed of separate triglyphs and metopes, with 26 fragments of triglyphs and nine fragments of metopes preserved on site

⁶⁵² Ziro 1991, pp. 151-53.

⁶⁵³ Ziro 1991, pp. 151-53. Ziro noted no slope or taper to the sidewalls.

⁶⁵⁴ For discussion of the epikranitis, see Ziro 1991, pp. 160-162.

⁶⁵⁵ Ziro 1991, pp. 194-205.

⁶⁵⁶ Ziro 1991, p. 189.

⁶⁵⁷ Inscription is discussed more full below.

today. The triglyphs are crowned by a taenia surmounted by a squared ovolo molding that continues across the unsculpted metopes, which were inserted into vertical slots cut into the sides of the triglyphs and connected to the triglyphs by pi-clamps. In addition, the triglyphs and metopes were joined by pi-clamps to the Ionic epistyle above the thranos (Figure 167), the lower backer of the frieze, which had a hawksbeak crown molding.⁶⁵⁸ The thranos was connected to the epistyle above by means of dowels, while pi-clamps joined the thranos blocks to each other. On the sidewalls, the interior Ionic epistyle sits above the thranos, and also acts as a frieze backer and partial support for the geison. Surmounting the two rows of Ionic columns, the triple-fasciae Ionic epistyle was a single, wide block with an ovolo crown molding.⁶⁵⁹

The horizontal geison sat atop the triglyph and metopes, as well as partially on the Ionic epistyle above the thranos. Of the horizontal geison, only a few large pieces survive, but 30 smaller horizontal geison fragments have been identified.⁶⁶⁰ The geison blocks were joined with two pi-clamps on either side. Its front surface projected from the face of the Doric entablature by 0.747m., and the width of the geison varies between 1.86 and 1.977m.⁶⁶¹ All of the geison blocks that were set in front of the interior Ionic epistyle had an L-shaped back end (approximately 0.25-0.31m. lower than the geison top surface), cut to meet the upper surface of the Ionic epistyle behind it and to accommodate the ceiling beams supporting the coffers. The geison and the epistyle were then joined by a pi-clamp.⁶⁶²

⁶⁵⁸ Ziro 1991, p. 191; Giraud 1989, p. 72.

⁶⁵⁹ Ziro 1991, pp. 216-20.

⁶⁶⁰ Ziro 1991, p. 137. Discussion of the horizontal geison in Ziro 1991, pp. 207-12.

⁶⁶¹ Ziro 1991, p. 207.

⁶⁶² Ziro 1991, p. 212.

The ceiling of the Greater Propylaia included Pentelic coffers and beams. Of the ceiling beams, 37 fragments are preserved. The soffit width of the preserved ceiling beams is c. 0.845m. and the beams are 0.63m. tall, with ovolo crown moldings on both sides. The maximum preserved length of any ceiling beam is 5.47m., although this example does not include its ends. Another ceiling beam survives to a length of 4.245m.⁶⁶³ In addition, 17 fragments of wall beams are preserved. Of the coffers, over 50 fragments are preserved, of three different types (Figure 168).⁶⁶⁴ The first type (Type I) includes two square coffers (0.295m. on each side) on the same slab, with only a few centimeters between them. The second type (Type II) also contains two square coffers that share the same slab, but the coffers themselves are larger (0.318m. on each side) and they are divided by a 0.207m. space. The third type (Type III) includes only one rectangular coffer per slab (0.295 x 0.355m.). All three types are outlined by a narrow undecorated astragal, but contained painted decoration on the coffers themselves.⁶⁶⁵

According to Ziro's reconstruction, the ceiling beams were arranged across the north porch so that each beam traversed the porch at the center of each Ionic column and at the center of each intercolumniation between the Ionic columns, across the side and central aisles (Figure 169).⁶⁶⁶ In the north porch, the ceiling beams support three different types of coffers, arranged with 13 coffer slabs (Type I) between the sidewalls and each row of Ionic columns, and 10 coffer slabs (Type I) between the two rows of Ionic columns (Figure 169). Nearest to the doorwall, Ziro reconstructed a wide single coffer (this type is conjectural), as well as a single row of coffers behind the façade (Type III).

⁶⁶³ Dimension from Ziro 1991, p. 221, fig. 103.

⁶⁶⁴ The nomenclature for the types is my own.

⁶⁶⁵ The painted decoration was observed by the Society of Dilettanti 1817, p. 15, pl. 10.

⁶⁶⁶ For Ziro's reconstruction of the ceiling, see Ziro 1991, pp. 220-232.

In the southern porch, the ceiling beams were arranged perpendicularly to those of the northern porch, extending from the doorwall out to the façade, parallel to the sidewalls. Two beams are located above the central intercolumniation, with three ceiling beams to either side, set above the outer edge of the Doric capitals. At the ends, wall beams are set above the antae. On the sides of the porch next to the sidewalls, triple coffers (this type is conjectural) span the first interval between the ceiling beams, while the rest of the ceiling uses seven rows of Type II coffers. Ziro's reconstruction is based on comparison with the ceiling of the Athenian Propylaia, and requires a total of five coffer types (the number of types preserved from the Athenian Propylaia).⁶⁶⁷ Since so much of the Greater Propylaia can be compared to its Classical prototype, Ziro's reconstruction of the ceiling is highly likely, despite the preservation of only three types of coffers at Eleusis.

The north and south façades of the Greater Propylaia include a pediment, of which eleven marble orthostates of the tympanon are preserved.⁶⁶⁸ Most of the tympanon blocks were joined by pi-clamps, and pi-clamps also connected the blocks to backers, but two of the tympanon blocks include T-clamps (Figure 170). The pentagonal central tympanon block, which contained an *imago clipeata*, or framed portrait, is thinner than the other tympanon blocks, 0.46m.; it did not have a backer. The central block was connected to the others on either side by means of a triangular tenon that is flush with the side of the block at the front and then slopes up to several centimeters from the surface (Figure 171). This tenon on either side of the block slid into sloping channels on the side blocks to create a secure hold. Ziro determined the slope of the pediment as 14°. ⁶⁶⁹

⁶⁶⁷ For the reconstruction of the ceiling of the Athenian Propylaia, see Tanoulas 2002, plan 6.

⁶⁶⁸ Ziro 1991, p. 137.

⁶⁶⁹ Ziro 1991, p. 233.

Above the tympanon, the blocks of the raking geison were joined together by pi-clamps two on each side, and doveled to the tympanon blocks below (Figure 172).⁶⁷⁰

The sima had a false decorative lion head at each corner, and the corner sima block, which was carved with the end block of the raking geison, provided a base for corner akroteria, set just behind the lions' manes.⁶⁷¹ Along the sides of the building, rather than the sima, plain cover tiles alternated with palmette antefixes. The surviving apex sima block includes an akroterion base. The roof of the Greater Propylaia was composed of Corinthian pan and cover roof tiles of marble.⁶⁷²

The doorwall is pierced by five doorways, with the doorways in axial alignment with the intercolumnial spaces of the façades (Figure 159). The central doorway is the widest, 4.00m., while the doorways to either side of the central one are 2.55m. wide, and the two smallest doorways at the eastern and western end are 1.190 and 1.195m. wide, respectively.⁶⁷³ The threshold of the small easternmost doorway has the most wear, which indicates that it was the door most often accessible, likely for everyday use.⁶⁷⁴

The toichobate of the doorwall, which remains in situ, is a single step that stretched across the width of the Greater Propylaia between the cella walls. The step has a rise of 0.34m. and consists of five blocks, each corresponding in length to the doorway it supported. It is 1.55m. wide.⁶⁷⁵ The blocks on either side of the central threshold block are connected with double-T clamps to the central block, but the two outermost threshold blocks are not joined to their neighbors with clamps. Above the toichobate, the

⁶⁷⁰ Ziro 1991, p. 237.

⁶⁷¹ Ziro 1991, pp. 240-43.

⁶⁷² Ziro 1991, pp. 245-60.

⁶⁷³ All doorway measurements are provided by Ziro 1991, p. 165.

⁶⁷⁴ This possibility was also noted by Mylonas 1961, p. 164 and Ziro 1991, p. 164, n. 467.

⁶⁷⁵ Ziro 1991, p. 163.

doorwall began with an orthostate course equal in height to that of the sidewalls.⁶⁷⁶ Eight upper blocks from the doorwall are preserved. These stretchers indicate that the wall was a single block thick. The preserved blocks vary slightly in thickness, from 1.141-1.174m.⁶⁷⁷ These blocks suffered much damage to their surfaces and corners, but it seems that originally both sides of the blocks may have been finely finished. The blocks indicate that the doorwall was narrower than the toichobate by approximately 0.40m. In addition, the heights of the various courses of the wall were not equal, with the preserved heights varying between 0.507m. and 0.53m. The blocks are joined vertically by dowels and horizontally by pi-clamps, not the double-T clamps that were used on the toichobate.⁶⁷⁸ An epikranitis crowns both sides of the doorwall. No fragments of doorframes are preserved.

The Date and Patron of the Greater Propylaia, and the Question of Building Phases

Nearly all the 2nd century A.D. emperors have been identified at one time or another as the patron of the building, often with a theory that one emperor initiated construction, while another finished it. Hadrian is most often cited as the sponsor of construction, with either Antoninus Pius or Marcus Aurelius identified as the emperor responsible for the Greater Propylaia's completion and dedication. Alternatively, either of the latter emperors is credited as patron, with the building finished and dedicated by the same emperor, or with that emperor's successor completing the task. Even the other

⁶⁷⁶ Ziro 1991, p. 167.

⁶⁷⁷ This difference may indicate tapering in the doorwall.

⁶⁷⁸ Giraud 1989, p. 70.

Antonine emperors, Commodus or Lucius Verus, have been cited as responsible for the Greater Propylaia.⁶⁷⁹

The most recently proposed view, offered by Ziro and accepted in part by Clinton, argued that Hadrian initiated construction of the Greater Propylaia, but the building was repaired and completed by Marcus Aurelius and finally dedicated by Commodus.⁶⁸⁰ Ziro posited two building phases on the basis of technical features, especially the presence of different types of clamps and inconsistency in the finishing of the Doric capitals.

According to Ziro, the long interruption began at Hadrian's death, at which time interest in providing for Athenian cults waned, and was prolonged by the Costoboc invasion of A.D. 170.⁶⁸¹ He postulated that the Costobocs gained entrance into the sanctuary at Eleusis because the Greater Propylaia was not an adequate form of defense in its unfinished state (in Ziro's first phase) and that, moreover, the fortification walls had been weakened in order to facilitate the construction of the Propylaia. Marcus Aurelius took on the project of rebuilding the Telesterion and the Greater Propylaia after the damage caused by the Costobocs, but Ziro suggested that his son Commodus repaired and completed the Greater Propylaia, including the repair of the doorwall and the addition of a roof.

⁶⁷⁹ Previous scholarship has included the following suggestions for the patron of the Greater Propylaia. Completely constructed by Hadrian: Philios 1906, p. 82, Frazer [1898] 1965, p. 506; begun by Hadrian but finished by Antoninus Pius: Philios 1896, p. 59; begun by Hadrian but finished or repaired by Marcus Aurelius: Clinton 1989, 1997; begun by Hadrian but finished by Marcus Aurelius and dedicated by Commodus: Ziro 1991; begun by Antoninus Pius but finished by Marcus Aurelius: Dinsmoor 1910, p. 155, n. 1, Kourounoites 1934, p. 31; completely built or at least completed by Marcus Aurelius: Mylonas 1961, p. 162; entirely Antonine: Willers 1996, pp. 183-91.

⁶⁸⁰ Ziro 1991, p. 269 noted that Antoninus Pius cut back on expenses and reduced funding for imperial building projects. Moreover, Ziro suggested that the epistatai must not have been greatly concerned by the threat of invasion, and were therefore willing to leave the Greater Propylaia unfinished.

⁶⁸¹ Giraud 1989, p. 74. Giraud also suggested that the damage caused by the Costobocs might not be as extensive as previously thought, and that some other factor such as an earthquake added to the destruction of the Telesterion and the Greater Propylaia.

Clinton accepted Ziro's architectural conclusions that there were two building phases for the Greater Propylaia, but diverged from his hypothesis on the emperors responsible. Clinton omitted Commodus altogether on the grounds that, although all three emperors were initiated, only Marcus Aurelius and Hadrian are epigraphically attested in the statue bases of arches in the forecourt, and that only these two emperors had a particularly close connection to the Mysteries.⁶⁸² According to Clinton, these are the two emperors represented in the pedimental portraits of the Greater Propylaia, with their names included in corresponding architrave inscriptions beneath each portrait.⁶⁸³

I argue that reconsideration of the evidence from the inscription, portrait, and technical details of the building's construction, particularly with comparison to 2nd century A.D. work on the Telesterion, indicates a single phase of building and points to either Hadrian or Marcus Aurelius as the patron, with the weight of the evidence favoring Marcus Aurelius. To begin, the technical features of the Greater Propylaia do not exclude the possibility that it was built in one phase. Ziro noted that two of the four Doric capitals used a relieving surface on its underside, while it was not preserved on the other two.⁶⁸⁴ The capitals with the relieving surface were assigned to a first phase, and the second type, without the relieving surface, to a second phase. Ziro argued that the relieving surface was evidence of close attention paid to copying the construction techniques of the Athenian Propylaia, and so had to be associated with his earlier phase. Second, Ziro noted that T- and pi-clamps were used throughout the Greater Propylaia, and he argued that the pattern of their distribution indicated two building phases.⁶⁸⁵ T-

⁶⁸² Clinton 1989a, p. 67; Clinton 1989b, p. 1527, n. 147.

⁶⁸³ Clinton 1989a, pp. 64-68.

⁶⁸⁴ Giraud 1989, p. 71; Ziro 1991, p. 175.

⁶⁸⁵ Ziro 1991, pp. 268-72.

clamps were primarily used in the lower parts of the building, in the foundations, paving, sidewalls up to the epikranitis, the threshold of the doorwall.⁶⁸⁶ By contrast, pi-clamps were primarily used in the upper parts of the building. According to his reconstruction, the first building phase, represented by the classicizing T-clamps and including the Doric colonnade, took place during the time of Hadrian, and the second phase, represented by the pi-clamps, did not occur until several decades later. Features he associated with the second phase included the Ionic colonnade, the southern Doric façade, the remainder of the doorwall, and the roof.

The appearance of two different types of clamps in the construction of the Greater Propylaia does not necessarily imply two significantly separate phases, however. In a few instances on the Greater Propylaia, pi- and T-clamps are used in the same block, as on a thranos block (Figure 173), an interior Ionic epistyle block (Figure 167), and a tympanon block (Figure 170). These blocks belong to the superstructure of the Doric façades, which in Ziro's reconstruction would belong to the second phase of construction. Second, although Ziro cited the T-clamp as specific to Hadrianic masons, they did not use T-clamps exclusively. In the bridge over the Eleusinian Kephisos River, likely built by Hadrian, pi-clamps were used.⁶⁸⁷ Also, the fountain in the forecourt at Eleusis, perhaps built during the time of Hadrian, employed pi-clamps.⁶⁸⁸ Third, T-clamps are not exclusive to Hadrianic or classicizing buildings, but are found in Roman buildings from

⁶⁸⁶ Ziro 1991, pp. 269 added that the doorwall must have been completed in the first construction phase, in order to prevent "prying" eyes from being able to see inside.

⁶⁸⁷ I have only observed pi-clamps on the bridge, along the top preserved course and on the semi-circular cutwaters. For descriptions of the bridge, see Bougia 1996, pp. 149-55; Travlos 1951a, p. 150; Travlos 1951b, pp. 122-27.

⁶⁸⁸ Orlandos 1936, fig. 4.

other periods, including the Antonine.⁶⁸⁹ For example, T-clamps were used in the Storage Building built over the Pompeion in the Kerameikos during the reign of Antoninus Pius.⁶⁹⁰ They were used in the replacement blocks for the east end of the temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous about A.D. 45/6.⁶⁹¹ T-clamps were also used in Roman additions to the Athenian Propylaia, for example in the paving through the central passage.⁶⁹² Fourth, there are examples of Roman buildings in Athens which use a combination of pi- and T-clamps contemporaneously. The Odeion of Agrippa used pi-clamps in the euthynteria and T-clamps in the first course above the floor level.⁶⁹³ At least one T-clamp was noted in the lower step of the east propylon to the Roman Market, while a pi-clamp was noted in an epistyle block.⁶⁹⁴ From Corinth, Temple H, built by Commodus in A.D. 190, used both T- and pi-clamps in its construction.⁶⁹⁵ Finally, at Eleusis, the reconstruction of the Telesterion after the Costoboc destruction employed both pi- and T-clamps.⁶⁹⁶ Therefore, the presence of multiple clamp types does not necessarily indicate two phases, nor are T-clamps exclusively associated with Hadrianic architecture.

⁶⁸⁹ Ziro noted some of these examples, but considered them “rare” and did not further discuss them.

Giraud 1989 73, n. 23.

⁶⁹⁰ *Kerameikos* X, p. 166. T-clamps were also used in the classical Pompeion (*Kerameikos* X, p. 100).

⁶⁹¹ Miles 1989, pp. 236-239 noted that the T-clamps were used with the purpose of imitating the techniques of the 5th century B.C. temple. Miles identified Roman replacement blocks with the T-clamps in the east frieze, horizontal geison, raking geison, and ceiling coffers. The date of the temple is based on the epistyle inscription which indicates the dedication of the temple to the goddess Livia.

⁶⁹² Dinsmoor 2004, pp. 85, 91, n. 127, fig. 10.6. Dinsmoor dated the paving as contemporary with the Claudian steps. Ziro 1991, p. 143, n. 436 noted that double-T clamps are also found in the SE corner of the southern wing of the Athenian Propylaia, and the Roman staircase. In these cases, Ziro argued that the clamps are re-used classical clamps, rather than related to classicizing building techniques.

⁶⁹³ Thompson 1950, p. 83. Thompson noted that the use of T-clamps was unusual, and perhaps is due to a revival of 5th century B.C. architectural techniques inspired in part by the transplantation of the Temple of Ares.

⁶⁹⁴ Hoff 1988, p. 156 noted the T-clamp in the east propylon; Hoff 1988, p. 169 noted a pi-clamp in block E6 of the epistyle-frieze block.

⁶⁹⁵ Scranton 1944, p. 346 dated the temple to A.D. 190. He also noted both types of clamps, T-clamps in the wall of Temple H (Scranton 1944, pp. 320-21, fig. 4), and pi-clamps in the inscribed epistyle (Scranton 1944, fig. 7) and in the raking cornice (Scranton 1944, fig. 12).

⁶⁹⁶ Townsend 1987, p. 105. The blocks of the arches visible on site today at Eleusis exhibit pi-clamps.

In sum, there is not a strict division between the two types of clamps used in the Greater Propylaia, and, moreover, neither clamp type is limited to a certain date. Second, T-clamps in the above examples are almost entirely found in structures built as part of or in close proximity to classical buildings undergoing repair or reconstruction.⁶⁹⁷ This observation indeed points to the clamps as indicating a sense of revival of classical techniques or at least copying the technique (without a conscious sense of classicism), but the observation does not indicate that T-clamps were solely used by Hadrian or in buildings of classical style.

In addition, the differences in the use of a relieving surface on the Doric capitals do not necessarily indicate two different building phases. Although Ziro suggested that the capitals with a relieving surface were earlier and “copied” techniques used on the Athenian Propylaia, the use of a relieving surface on Doric capitals is not limited to the Athenian Propylaia, or even to Classical buildings.⁶⁹⁸ Furthermore, the fact that only two of the capitals include this feature may indicate that different groups of masons worked on the capitals simultaneously or in close succession.

In addition, similarities between technical features of the Greater Propylaia and the 2nd century A.D. work on the porch of the Telesterion may indicate that the same set or sets of masons were working on both structures. One correspondence includes the similar dimensions of the lewis and empolion cuttings in the columns, and the placement

⁶⁹⁷ Ziro 1991, p. 235. Giraud 1989, pp. 72-3 suggested that the architect of the Greater Propylaia had direct access to the inner structure of the Athenian Propylaia during 2nd century A.D. repair and rebuilding of the Athenian coffered ceiling, but it is clear that Roman architects and builders also had access to other 5th and 4th century B.C. buildings that were under repair or reconstruction during the 2nd century A.D.

⁶⁹⁸ Examples of the use of this relieving surface include the capitals of the Parthenon (Orlandos 1977, fig. 206), the Mnesiklean Propylaia (Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor 2004, fig. 11.4), the 4th century B.C. temple of Apollo at Delphi (Courby in *Fouilles de Delphes* II, p. 81, fig. 17), and the Heiron at Samothrace (2nd century B.C.) (*Samothrace* III, fig. LXIV).

with one or two lewis cuttings flanking the central cutting.⁶⁹⁹ Another is that the finishing of some of the blocks of the two buildings is similar. On both the Greater Propylaia and the porch of the Telesterion, surfaces tend to be more finished near their edges, with the central area left roughly picked with the point chisel (Figures 174 and 175).⁷⁰⁰ Also, the Roman work on the porch used a combination of pi- and T-clamps, as is found in the Greater Propylaia.⁷⁰¹ Finally, both the Greater Propylaia and the porch of the Telesterion included a single reveal along the steps (Figure 176).⁷⁰²

Costoboc damage (A.D. 170 or 171) to the Telesterion was extensive, particularly on the 4th century B.C. porch of Philo. Townsend has shown that repairs to the porch reused some of the original 4th century B.C. materials, but also added 2nd century A.D. materials and techniques.⁷⁰³ As Townsend noted, the copying of classical techniques, which the masons could have learned as they worked through the surviving materials, was an effort to match the rebuilt part of Philo's porch to the 4th century B.C. original. Thus, in this example from Eleusis, it is clear that the copying of classical techniques is not limited to Hadrianic structures. The rebuilding of Philo's porch was credited to Marcus Aurelius by the scholium to Aelius Aristides (183.3): "The Emperor Antoninos [Marcus Aurelius], under whom Aristides wrote, ...honored the city of Athens, and also provided many other benefactions to that city, and fitted out the temple in Eleusis in a

⁶⁹⁹ Townsend 1987, p. 105.

⁷⁰⁰ For the porch, see Townsend 1987, p. 104.

⁷⁰¹ Townsend 1987, p. 105.

⁷⁰² Townsend 1987, pp. 102-105.

⁷⁰³ For the dates of the Costoboc invasion, and the extent of damage to the Telesterion, see Clinton 1989b, pp. 1530, especially n. 160. Ziro 1991, p. 269, n. 629 suggested a re-evaluation of the theories of the Costoboc invasions. He did not support that the Costoboc invasion would have also involved the destruction of the Telesterion and the Greater Propylaia, a building he referred to as "of no interest" to invaders.

well-crafted way.”⁷⁰⁴ It is therefore possible that the Greater Propylaia was executed at the same time, or in close succession, with the work on the Telesterion, with Marcus Aurelius as its patron. Further, because there are no signs of damage to the Greater Propylaia, it is possible that the entrance had not even been begun by the time of the invasion.

The second piece of evidence to consider in establishing the date of the Greater Propylaia is the epistyle inscription, reconstructed on the basis of three inscribed fragments containing parts of five letters (Figure 177), which may refer to Marcus Aurelius.⁷⁰⁵ Unfortunately, the poor state of its preservation prevents it from being securely placed on the building and makes restoration of its text tenuous, which hinders its role as evidence for the patron. The inscription was first published by Lenormant, who mentioned that the fragments are Pentelic marble, that they all belong to the same inscription, that they belong to the southern epistyle, and that they are too damaged to suggest a certain reading, although he dated the omega to the 2nd century A.D.⁷⁰⁶ Dinsmoor restored the fragments as a two-line inscription, of which the second line is preserved, naming Marcus Aurelius: M A [ύρήλιος Άντ]ω[νει]νος [---].⁷⁰⁷

The preserved epistyle blocks are consistent in material, letter style, and letter size, yet Clinton questioned whether these fragments all belong to the same inscription on

⁷⁰⁴ Dindorf 1829, pp. 308-55. Scholium of Sopater to Aelius Aristides *Panathenaikos* (4th century A.D.).

⁷⁰⁵ For drawings of the extant inscription fragments see Ziro 1991, fig. 87, plates 85B and 96. For the blocks drawn by Lenormant, see Lenormant 1862, pp. 46-48. The block containing the *mu* and *alpha* contains a clamp cutting just to the right of the *alpha*. The block with the *omega* contains what seems to be an extremely long clamp to the left of the *omega*. It seems most likely that these are evidence of a later use of the fragments, or perhaps that there were re-secured in their positions later.

⁷⁰⁶ Lenormant 1862, pp. 46-48, cat. 18.

⁷⁰⁷ Dinsmoor 1910, p. 155, n. 1. Dinsmoor noted that he had only seen the fragment with the omega on it, and that the other two used in his reconstruction (MA and NOS) were not mentioned by Lenormant.

epigraphical grounds.⁷⁰⁸ That is, it is not clear which of the fragments belong to the inner or outer architrave, despite Lenormant's suggestion. Clinton noted that the leaf between the *mu* and *alpha* signified the separation of names, so that the *mu* marked a *praenomen*. Therefore, it is likely that M. Aurelius was part of the inscription. In addition, Clinton argued that the NOS could be part of M. Aurelius Antoninus, spelled in Greek Antoninos, or that it could also be restored as part of Hadrianos. Because Clinton agreed with Ziro's argument that the Greater Propylaia included a first phase under Hadrian, and a second phase under Marcus Aurelius, Clinton restored two inscriptions to the Greater Propylaia, one inscription to each architrave, the outer naming Marcus Aurelius and the inner naming Hadrian (using the NOS). If, as I argue, the Greater Propylaia was built in one phase by Marcus Aurelius, then all the fragments could be considered part of the same inscription including only his name, as they had been previously reconstructed, and restored to the north façade.⁷⁰⁹ If an inscription also appeared on the inner architrave, it may have recorded the name of Commodus, who was initiated with Marcus Aurelius in 176 A.D., but this would not have survived Commodus' condemnation.

The next piece of evidence to consider in determining the date of the Greater Propylaia is the *imago clipeata* in the tympanon (Figure 178). The sculpted portrait projects out from a shield, which is decorated with tendrils that emerge from an acanthus calyx at the center of the lower shield edge. The bearded and wreathed emperor, who turns his head slightly to the right, wears a cuirass and a paludamentum, which is

⁷⁰⁸ Clinton 1989a, pp. 64-68, Clinton 2005a, pp. 401-402, cat. 499.

⁷⁰⁹ Comparison of the fragments with the dimensions provided by Ziro 1991, fig. 87 for the two extant Doric epistyle blocks indicates that the height of each of the two epistyle blocks is 1.150m., with 0.180 m. (dimension taken from the better preserved of the two blocks) taken by the taenia, mutule, and guttae. This leaves 0.970m., then, for the inscription. Including the height of the preserved letters and the space below them, the total needed for the inscription is c. 45m. Therefore, a two-line inscription could fit on the epistyle block.

gathered at his left shoulder.⁷¹⁰ This portrait has been identified as Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Commodus, Marcus Aurelius, and even Lucius Verus, but the thick and curly hair, and the use of the drill, more strongly point to an Antonine emperor.⁷¹¹ Of these emperors, Lucius Verus can be eliminated because, although he was an initiate, this portrait lacks his signature wispy mustache, luxurious hair, and long beard.⁷¹² Antoninus Pius can probably also be eliminated because, although the preserved hairstyle shares similarities to his portrait typology, he was never an initiate and never visited Athens or Eleusis.⁷¹³ As for Commodus, it is highly unlikely that a portrait of this scale would have survived his *damnatio*. Moreover, the heavy eyelids, so prominent a feature of his portraits, are absent here. The hairstyle, tilt of the head, faraway gaze, and thick mustache point strongly to this image as a portrait of Marcus Aurelius, an initiate and supporter of the Mysteries and its sanctuary.

If the portrait does represent Marcus Aurelius, the question becomes whether it is a living or posthumous image. According to Winkes, the portrait at Eleusis, although on a propylon, adhered to the same rules as pedimental sculpture on temples.⁷¹⁴ That is to say, the portrait must represent the emperor after his death and deification. It is impossible, according to Winkes, for a pedimental sculpture to represent anything other than gods or heroes. Similarly, Ziro concluded that Marcus Aurelius must have been

⁷¹⁰ Deubner 1937, pp. 75-6 argued that the gorgoneion refers specifically to warding off evils like the Kostobocs. The giant depicted on the shoulder strap is similar to that found on another sculpted portrait of Marcus Aurelius in the Louvre, and it signifies his victory over the Makromani in A.D. 172/3. Deubner further suggested that the pediment and its sculpture were contemporary with the completion of the unfinished building, with the Greater Propylaia finished after this date.

⁷¹¹ This identification is made by Deubner 1937, pp. 73-81 and Fittschen 1989, p. 76. Previous identifications include the following. Hadrian: Philios 1906, p. 82; Antoninus Pius: Philios 1896, p. 59; Orlandos 1932, p. 223; Dinsmoor 1910, p. 155, n. 1; Noack 1927, p. 222; Kourouniotes 1936, p. 44; Marcus Aurelius: Deubner 1939, pp. 73-81; Ziro 1991, p. 233; Vermeule 1965, pp. 377-78; Winkes 1969, p. 69.

⁷¹² For Lucius Verus and his status as an initiate, see Clinton 1989b, pp. 1529-30.

⁷¹³ For Antoninus Pius, see Clinton 1989b, pp. 1525-28.

⁷¹⁴ Winkes 1969, pp. 66-69.

dead by the time the portrait was installed, because he considered the presence of the acanthus a signifier of death and deification.⁷¹⁵

Neither the acanthus nor the placement of the *imago clipeata* alone is sufficient to indicate that the portrait must be posthumous, however. First, the acanthus does not necessarily signify that a person is deceased.⁷¹⁶ The acanthus is connected to death and rebirth, and in particular, life after death.⁷¹⁷ Perhaps in the context of its use at Eleusis, the acanthus on the portrait and as used on the arches in the forecourt, referred to the very promise of initiation into the Mysteries. Second, an *imago clipeata* in a pediment could represent a living person, as at the monument of Mithridates in the sanctuary of the Great Gods on Delos, which contained a portrait of one of Mithridates' companions in the pediment. According to the dedicatory inscription on the architrave and the inscriptions for the other sculpted portraits in the monument, it was built by Helianax, the priest of the Great Gods, in 102/101 B.C., during the lifetime of the king Mithridates.⁷¹⁸ The portrait in the pediment and the other portraits along the walls inside the monument all depicted living subjects. Like the monument of Mithridates, a shrine to a ruler, the Greater Propylaia was not a temple, and thus a posthumous portrait was not required. It remains possible that the *imago clipeata* could represent a living Marcus Aurelius, perhaps set up in time for his initiation to the Mysteries with Commodus in A.D. 176.⁷¹⁹

⁷¹⁵ Ziro 1991, pp. 270-71, following Dontas 1966, p. 136, who suggested that the leaves symbolize hope for resurrection from the dead, and Jucker 1961 who first suggested the connection between acanthus leaves and death in portraiture.

⁷¹⁶ Clinton 1989a, pp. 66-67.

⁷¹⁷ Pollini 1993, pp. 210-13.

⁷¹⁸ *Delos XVI*, pp. 32-42, fig. 42 presented the inscription that identified the portrait in the pediment, which Durrbach 1977, pp. 211-23, cat. 136 reconstructed as Dorylaos, a companion of Mithridates. Discussed by Webb 1996, pp. 141-42, who stated that the pedimental portrait depicted Mithridates, and Winkes 1966, pp. 152-56, who followed the reconstruction of Chapouthier in *Delos XVI*.

⁷¹⁹ Clinton 1989b, p. 1531.

A fragment of a second *imago clipeata*, preserving the left side of the shield with floral decoration, also survives (Figure 179).⁷²⁰ This fragment is not identical to the *imago clipeata* of Marcus Aurelius, as it does not contain a bead and reel molding between the inner and outer coronas, and the floral decoration is not as detailed. As a pendant to the portrait on the façade, this second portrait must have represented another emperor. It may have depicted Commodus, who was initiated with Marcus Aurelius in A.D. 176, but later suffered a *damnatio*, the performance of which could have left little of the portrait extant.⁷²¹

In conclusion, the extant portrait and the inscription likely refer to Marcus Aurelius, but they do not prove who was responsible for the building. Comparison with work on the Telesterion makes an association with this emperor more convincing. The evidence presented in the preceding sections has shown that pi- and T-clamps could co-exist in a building of a single phase. And, since T-clamps are not only used in Hadrianic buildings or in those of a classicizing style, the use of particular clamps does not indicate a particular emperor's patronage. In addition, other patrons besides Hadrian could duplicate features of Hadrianic structures in Athens for Eleusis. Further, classicism should not be associated exclusively with Hadrian, and the philhellenism of Marcus Aurelius must be recalled. Marcus Aurelius was, in his own way, a philhellene with specific beliefs that are distinct from Hadrian's philhellenism, and perhaps more conservative. In his *Meditations*, which he wrote in Greek, Marcus Aurelius outlined his beliefs in moderation and reason. His initiation in the Eleusinian Mysteries demonstrated

⁷²⁰ Clinton 1989a, p. 65; Ziro 1991, pl. 101c.

⁷²¹ Giraud 1989, p. 75 also suggested that this second portrait could have represented Commodus, but that the *damnatio* would have destroyed the portrait. For the *damnatio* of Commodus and examples of his portraits removed from monuments, see Varner 2004, pp. 136-48.

Marcus Aurelius' concern with the venerated ancient Greek cult as well as his desire for a better afterlife, a topic much discussed in his *Meditations*.⁷²² Marcus Aurelius was an active supporter of the Panhellenion, and all that it strove to accomplish within its maintenance of earlier Greek religious and administrative traditions.⁷²³ He ruled and wrote during the period when the Second Sophistic was at a peak, with its objectives of a return to the style and concerns of rhetoric of the 5th century B.C.⁷²⁴

Finally, there is no evidence, such as with the Telesterion, that the Greater Propylaia suffered damage at the hands of the Costoboccs. This could mean that the Greater Propylaia post-dated their invasion. It may be possible that the Costoboccs were able to enter the sanctuary because the Early Classical gateway was weak or in disrepair, and destruction of this gateway caused the need for a new propylaia. Thus, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the sponsor of the Greater Propylaia could have been Marcus Aurelius. If the Greater Propylaia was completed in a single phase by Marcus Aurelius, perhaps it was dedicated at the time of his A.D. 176 initiation into the Mysteries. This year, A.D. 176, was also a politically important time for Marcus Aurelius, when he was honored with a triumph in Rome for his German victories, achieved in the previous year. This triumph in A.D. 176 marked a highpoint in Marcus Aurelius' reign, and it perhaps prompted the senate to erect a triumphal arch and a column in Rome in his honor as well.⁷²⁵

Comparison of the Greater Propylaia to the Athenian Propylaia

⁷²² Rutherford 1989, pp. 163-67; Hadot 1998, pp. 265-66; Clinton 1989b, pp. 1530-32.

⁷²³ Oliver 1970, pp. 131-37.

⁷²⁴ Rutherford 1989, pp. 80-89.

⁷²⁵ For a description of the triumph in Rome, see Birley 1987, p. 197.

One of the most striking aspects of the Greater Propylaia is the degree to which it adopted features of its prototype, the Athenian Propylaia (Figure 180). There are analogies not only in easily recognized aspects, such as in the plan and scale of the 5th century B.C. model, but also in smaller details, such as moldings and in construction techniques. Yet the Greater Propylaia has several of its own distinct features, linking it to general Roman techniques as well as to other Roman projects at Eleusis. Investigation of the similarities and differences between the two buildings show that a simple copy of the Athenian Propylaia was not intended. Rather, the form and details of the building were adapted with Roman techniques, measurements, and objectives.

The two propylaia had similar dimensions and aspects of plan. Both the Greater Propylaia and the Athenian Propylaia are Doric hexastyle amphiprostyle gateways, with two rows of three Ionic columns lining the central passage in the outer porch, and a single transverse doorwall pierced by five doorways. The central doorway of each monument is the widest, which is also reflected in a wider central intercolumniation of the façades, with two triglyphs and three metopes spanning the distance. The Greater Propylaia is only 0.043m. narrower, and 0.08m. shorter than the Athenian Propylaia.⁷²⁶ Both propylaia were built of Pentelic marble.

There are also several similarities in the moldings of the Greater Propylaia and the Athenian Propylaia. The Doric capitals for both buildings have the same echinus slope, as well as four annulets and similar dimensions (Figure 161). The Ionic bases for both buildings include horizontal fluting on the upper torus (Figure 181). The horizontal geison from both propylaia include very similar hawksbeak moldings at the top and cyma

⁷²⁶ Ziro 1991, p. 147, n. 43.

reversa moldings on the soffit (Figure 182). The moldings from Eleusis are only slightly steeper. Both buildings also included a taenia and ovolo above the Doric frieze.

Other correspondences between the two buildings include construction techniques that are hidden within the fabric of the buildings. One example is the relieving surface on the bottom of the Doric capitals, preserved on two of the capitals from Eleusis (Figures 162 and 163).⁷²⁷ The relieving surface is used fairly commonly, and not only on the Athenian Propylaia, yet some masons working on the Greater Propylaia may have adopted it from the Athenian Propylaia. Another example is the pedimental construction using the tenons on the central tympanon block to slide it into place on the side orthostate blocks flanking it (Figures 171 and 183).⁷²⁸ In each example, the central tympanon block was thinner than its counterparts.

The several differences between the buildings include discrepancies in the form and design of the propylaia. The Greater Propylaia is set on a stepped krepis, with the north and south façades on the same level, in contrast to the Athenian Propylaia that has a lower western porch, with a sloping central passage leading up to the higher eastern porch. The Greater Propylaia does not include this central ramp. The Athenian Propylaia has four steps on its front, western side, while the Greater Propylaia has five on its front, northern side. Another readily recognizable difference in design is the absence of the distinctive side wings of the Athenian Propylaia on the Greater Propylaia. In addition, the Doric entablature wraps around all four sides of the Greater Propylaia, while on the Athenian Propylaia the Doric entablature only spans the façades and part of the side walls. On the Greater Propylaia, the Doric frieze is composed of separately carved

⁷²⁷ Ziro 1991, p. 175.

⁷²⁸ Dinsmoor 1910, pp. 149-53; Ziro 1991, pp. 233-37.

triglyphs and metopes, while the frieze of the Athenian Propylaia is composed of blocks that combine the triglyphs and metopes.⁷²⁹ The Greater Propylaia includes a thranos, or lower frieze backer, while the Athenian Propylaia includes a backer for the frieze that is equal in height. Another difference is that the Ionic bases of the Greater Propylaia are carved from one block with the stylobate. On the Athenian Propylaia, the bedding and stylobate are carved together, but the molded base is separate.⁷³⁰ The central tympanon block of the Greater Propylaia is pentagonal, while the central tympanon block of the Athenian Propylaia is hexagonal.⁷³¹ The sima of the Greater Propylaia included a decorative lion's head, not a waterspout, at each corner of the roof, while the Athenian Propylaia included a sima with sets of three triple hemispherical openings cut around eggs.⁷³² Finally, the Ionic epistyle of the Greater Propylaia did not include the iron bars to help support the ceiling above, which are a distinctive feature of the Athenian Propylaia.⁷³³

Several aspects of the Greater Propylaia distinguish it as distinctively Roman. First, the bottom step of the Greater Propylaia has the highest rise (0.368m.) and the top step is shorter (0.271m.), while the Athenian Propylaia bottom steps are of about equal height, ranging in rise from 0.295-0.302m., with the stylobate step 0.321-0.323m.⁷³⁴ On the Greater Propylaia, the taenia across the metopes and triglyphs is of equal height, which is an Archaic and Roman feature not present on the Athenian Propylaia. The foot

⁷²⁹ For the Doric entablature of the Athenian Propylaia, see Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor 2004, pp. 181-87.

⁷³⁰ For the Ionic bases of the Athenian Propylaia, see Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor 2004, p. 231.

⁷³¹ For the central tympanon block of the Athenian Propylaia, see Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor 2004, pp. 266-67.

⁷³² For the sima of the Athenian Propylaia, see Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor 2004, p. 299.

⁷³³ Giraud 1989, p. 72. For the iron bars in the Athenian Propylaia, see Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor 2004, pp. 238-39.

⁷³⁴ For dimensions for Greater Propylaia, see Ziro 1991, fig. 60. For dimensions for Athenian Propylaia steps, see Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor 2004, p. 70.

unit used in the paving of the north porch of the Greater Propylaia was 0.295, which is a typically Roman foot measurement not used in the Athenian Propylaia.⁷³⁵ Instead, the Athenian Propylaia used a Doric foot unit of 0.327.⁷³⁶ In order to accommodate the different foot measurement, the paving slabs of the porch are not of the same number and arrangement as those in the Athenian Propylaia.⁷³⁷ Elsewhere in the Greater Propylaia, the use of the Roman foot unit seems not to have been used.

The Greater Propylaia so closely adopted certain features of the Athenian Propylaia that it even took on the unfinished quality of the Classical model.⁷³⁸ This is evident in the use of the setting depressions for the Doric columns on the stylobates of both buildings, and the unfinished parts of the superstructure, such the unfinished undersides of the geison blocks.⁷³⁹ In addition, the *apergas*, the smooth border around an otherwise unfinished block surface, was left visible as if before final finishing of the wall blocks. For these reasons, Ziro suggested that neither building was finished.⁷⁴⁰ As Kalpaxis has shown, often what is generally considered an unfinished feature in Greek architecture may be a deliberate decorative choice.⁷⁴¹ Therefore, I argue that it is likely that the Greater Propylaia is imitating the “unfinished” character of the Athenian Propylaia, not, as Ziro suggested, that the Greater Propylaia was also unfinished. Such an appearance on the surfaces of the Greater Propylaia connected it to the Roman taste for rustication, which could range from the highly mannered Porto Maggiore in Rome (c.

⁷³⁵ De Waele 1999, p. 148.

⁷³⁶ Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor 2004, pp. 5-6 argued for the foot unit 0.32723.

⁷³⁷ For the paving slab arrangement, compare Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor 2004, pl. II and Ziro 1991, fig. 53.

⁷³⁸ Townsend 1987, pp. 103-104 identified a similar unfinished quality between the 4th century B.C. porch of the Telesterion and the Roman rebuilding in the “unfinished” reveal on the stylobate of both, but suggested that both sets of masons left their project unfinished due to running out of time or losing interest.

⁷³⁹ Ziro 1991, p. 133.

⁷⁴⁰ Ziro 1991, p. 170.

⁷⁴¹ Kalpaxis 1986, pp. 156-66.

A.D. 52) to similarly finished Hadrianic monuments in Athens that also left the *apergas* visible, such as the wall surrounding the Olympieion.⁷⁴²

The Greater Propylaia was not alone in copying part of the landmark Propylaia of the Athenian Acropolis, which was often copied in antiquity. In the 4th century B.C., the choregic monument of Nikias quoted its façade, and that of Thrasyillos monument referred to its southern wing.⁷⁴³ During the Augustan period, the tetrastyle Doric propylon of the Roman Agora vaguely recalled the western façade of the Athenian Propylaia.⁷⁴⁴ For the choregic monuments of the 4th century B.C., Townsend has shown that the use of the Athenian Propylaia served to connect these victorious individuals to the civic ideals of the Classical period as embodied in the city's architecture on the Acropolis.⁷⁴⁵ For the Greater Propylaia in the Roman period, this quotation demonstrated the command the Romans had over all the virtues of the Classical city as embodied in the Propylaia, wealth, power, piety, and political and economic power. The adoption of the Athenian Propylaia allowed its Roman patron to take ownership of all of these accomplishments, and to demonstrate authority of the sanctuary at Eleusis which, by this gateway, was elevated to the status of the Acropolis.

The Athenian Propylaia was the gateway into the most important Athenian religious center, and it served as a signifier of the Acropolis and Classical Athens itself. For this reason, in the 2nd century A.D. the choice of this building for the prototype of the Greater Propylaia at Eleusis was a decision of great potency. Not only did it connect the sanctuary at Eleusis directly back to the heart of Classical Athens, but it also specifically

⁷⁴² For the Claudian Porto Maggiore, see Ward Perkins 1981, pp. 52-54. For the surface treatment of the Olympieion, see Spawforth and Walker 1985, pl. II, fig. 3.

⁷⁴³ Hurwit 1999, p. 259; Townsend 2004, pp. 307-309, 321-24.

⁷⁴⁴ Hoff 1988, p. 129.

⁷⁴⁵ Townsend 2004, pp. 321-24.

aligned the sanctuary of Demeter at Eleusis with the sanctuary of Athena Polias on the Athenian Acropolis. Both now had processional entrances that were formally and spatially similar. Participants in the procession, standing before the Greater Propylaia at their arrival to Eleusis, would have been reminded that the Mysteries were part of the same Classical past of Athens as the sanctuary on the Acropolis.⁷⁴⁶ Their departure point in Athens, the City Eleusinion, was located just below the Mnesiklean Propylaia, so that participants would have the memory of the Athenian Propylaia fresh in their minds. Several hours later, the appearance of the similar propylaia at Eleusis must have been immediately recognizable to participants in the procession. But with the emperor looking down on the procession from the pediment of the Greater Propylaia and the imperial family visible on the arches, the participants also felt the imperial presence at the sanctuary. As a fellow initiate, the emperor joined the ranks of the *epoptai*. But as a figure who was also ultimately divine, he was located in a position where he, too, could be venerated by the initiates.

The interest that directed the choice of using the Mnesiklean Propylaia as a model was one aspect of a general trend toward classicism during the 2nd century A.D. This classicism generated Imperial and Roman interest in the other major festival of Athens, the City Dionysia and especially the Panathenaia. Hadrian oversaw the City Dionysia of A.D. 124/5, and the frieze of the scene building, Hadrianic in date, may have been executed for this year's festival.⁷⁴⁷ Perhaps modeling himself on Hadrian's example, the

⁷⁴⁶ As Alcock 2002, pp. 69-70 noted, a popular audience became participants in maintaining a memory of the past. Townsend 2004, pp. 321-24 has recently shown that the architecture of Classical Athens manifested the polis' ideology and self-image during the middle part of the 5th century B.C. Even after the 5th century B.C., the ideals were still ascribed to these monuments, which made them desirable as models for later architecture.

⁷⁴⁷ Hurwit 1999, p. 275.

Athenian Herodes Atticus provided donations for the performance of the Panathenaia. In particular, Herodes Atticus sponsored the rebuilding of the Panathenaic stadium in lavish marble for the festival of A.D. 142/3 (perhaps also the bridge that allowed access to the stadium, built across the Ilissos River), a decorated ship to carry the peplos for Athena in the Panathenaic procession, and funds for other expenses of the festival.⁷⁴⁸ Herodes Atticus, although an Athenian, lived in Rome for many years and was a friend of Marcus Aurelius. With Roman and Imperial interest in Athens and with the rise of the Second Sophistic, admiration for Classical Athens was encouraged.⁷⁴⁹ Through different methods, both sought to draw out those characteristics of Athens' Classical past that were to be most emulated. Herodes Atticus' donations may have been due as much to a personal connection with Athens as to his interest in philosophy, following the spirit of classicism in literature and philosophy that emerged in the 2nd century A.D. For those connected with the Second Sophistic, this meant a return to Classical Attic Greek, and to the themes that had concerned philosophers and writers in the 5th and 4th century B.C. For the architects of the Greater Propylaia, classicism in the 2nd century A.D. meant looking back to the most important propylon of the 5th century B.C. in Athens, the Mnesiklean Propylaia.

Construction inside the Sanctuary

During the 2nd century A.D., the processional route within the sanctuary was redefined. After passing through the Greater Propylaia and Lesser Propylaia, the

⁷⁴⁸ See Tobin 1997, pp. 165-94 for a survey of all the structures built by Herodes Atticus in Athens. See Geagan 2004, pp. 132-38 for literary and epigraphic evidence of Herodes' architectural and monetary donations. The lavish Odeion built on the south slope, another donation of Herodes Atticus, was used as a music and lecture hall, and not connected with the Panathenaia.

⁷⁴⁹ For the Second Sophistic and its relationship with Classical Athens, see Anderson 1993, pp. 1-12, 119-26. The Second Sophistic has primarily been considered with regard to rhetoric, literature, and language. See Anderson 1993; Goldhill 2001; Swain 1996.

procession emerged onto a newly paved sacred way. The precise date for the paving eluded excavators, although it is clearly later than the Lesser Propylaia, since the paving stones covered the lowest step of the southern porch of the Lesser Propylaia (Figure 184).⁷⁵⁰

To the right of the procession as it approached the Telesterion was Temple F, a Doric tetrastyle prostyle structure built of Pentelic marble, whose front pediment included sculpture that replicated figures from the western pediment of the Parthenon (Figures 8, 185, and 186).⁷⁵¹ Among the preserved figures from Temple F's pediment, six figures based on Athenian originals have been identified as Kekrops and one of his daughters (to the left in Figure 185; the third and fourth figures from the left in Figure 186), Athena (the sixth figure from the left in Figure 186), two Eleusinian heroines or members of the Eumolpidai family (the two figures to the right in Figure 185; the second and third figures from the right in Figure 186), and a reclining figure. The subject of the western pediment of the Parthenon was the contest between Poseidon and Athena for the city, while the subject of Temple F's pediment may have been the Rape of Persephone.⁷⁵² The western pediment from the Parthenon could have been selected as a model for Temple F due to the correspondence between its position on the processional route through the Acropolis and the position of Temple F at Eleusis. The western side of the Parthenon was the first side seen when one entered the Athenian Acropolis from the Propylaia, and the front of Temple F was the side seen by the procession as it approached

⁷⁵⁰ Philios 1888, p. 50, n. 2 only called the paving "Roman."

⁷⁵¹ Mylonas 1961, pp. 175-77; Lindner 1982, pp. 303-400.

⁷⁵² Lindner 1982 proposed the rape of Persephone as the subject for the pediment, based especially on two fragments of sculpture, one identified as Persephone pushing away from Hermes (see Lindner 1982, fig. 26), and the other as Demeter (see Lindner 1982, fig. 32).

the Telesterion from the Roman propylaia.⁷⁵³ The pediment of temple F also related iconographically to the Classical pediment. Although the inclusion of Athena, Kekrops, and the Eumolpidae family does not easily correspond with the subject of the Rape of Persephone, these figures provided visual references to Athens and Eleusis and connected them with the subject. Further, just as the contest between Poseidon and Athena established Athena as the patron goddess of Athens, the rape of Persephone led to the wanderings of Demeter to Eleusis, and ultimately to her gift of grain to the Athenians.

The temple itself is not well-preserved, and therefore a firm date for the building is lacking, but the use of the Parthenon sculpture for a prototype may be analogous to the choice of the Athenian Propylaia for the Greater Propylaia, and is suggestive of a date in the 2nd century A.D., contemporary with the classicizing structures of the forecourt. Mylonas suggested that this temple was dedicated to Sabina as New Demeter.⁷⁵⁴ Clinton has shown, however, that she was not honored in this way at Eleusis.⁷⁵⁵ The honored deity remains unknown.

The final destination of the processional route, the Telesterion, had significant repairs after the damage caused by the Costoboc invasion of A.D.170/71.⁷⁵⁶ Townsend has shown that the porch was rebuilt from the steps to the superstructure, and that even the southern wall of the Telesterion was repaired. In this construction work, the original 4th century B.C. materials were re-used as much as possible, but the damage caused by

⁷⁵³ Spaeth 1991, pp. 338-44 argued that the western pediment of the Parthenon included on its right (southern) side, Eumolpos and other Eleusinian heroes prominently, in order to highlight Athens' control through Erechtheus over Eleusis, the Mysteries, and the cult's importance to the polis. Therefore, Spaeth 1991, p. 334, n. 9 argued that the subject of Temple F's pediment was selected because Eleusinian heroes were present in the western pediment of the Parthenon. As Palagia 2005, p. 248 has shown, the myth of the battle between Eumolpos and Erechtheus as presented in Spaeth's proposal reflects a version of the myth that does not date earlier than Euripides.

⁷⁵⁴ Mylonas 1961, pp. 178-80.

⁷⁵⁵ Clinton 1989b, p. 1523.

⁷⁵⁶ Mylonas 1961, pp. 160-162; Townsend 1987.

the attack was so severe that in many cases new blocks were introduced. Sometime during the Roman period, the Telesterion was extended 2.15m. to the west and the seats and entrances were sheathed in marble.⁷⁵⁷ Mylonas suggested that this was work which also took place when the porch was repaired.⁷⁵⁸ The Telesterion had to be repaired in the 2nd century A.D. in order to return it to its 4th century B.C. appearance.

Experiential Analysis and Conclusion

During the 2nd century A.D., the procession of the Mysteries departed the City Eleusinion from the area outside of the Inner Propylon. Participants could see above them the Acropolis, especially the north porch of the Erechtheion and the northern and western sections of the Athenian Propylaia. In the shadow of the Acropolis, they were standing in the heart of Athens, with two of the most important city cults, of Athena Polias and of the Eleusinian Mysteries, in visual alignment. Within the City Eleusinion, members of the processional saw the Inner Propylon, whose frieze depicted objects they may have held in their hands at that very moment, the *bacchoi* and the *plemochoai*. On the procession's way out of the sanctuary, it passed several dedications, the temple of Triptolemos, and the Rocky Outcrop. The procession left the City Eleusinion through its Hellenistic propylon along the western side of the sanctuary, and stepped onto the recently paved Panathenaic Way. It passed through the city gates and into the countryside surrounding Athens, then onward to the Rheitoi lakes and the sanctuary of Aphrodite. Along the sacred way, the procession crossed the bridge across the Eleusinian Kephisos River, which was perhaps a gift of Hadrian. As the procession neared the

⁷⁵⁷ For Roman work on the Telesterion, see Noack 1927, pp. 109-12, 275-83. For the extension of the Telesterion, see Mylonas 1961, p. 161; Townsend 1987, p. 98.

⁷⁵⁸ Townsend does not make this association, and noted that the marble sheathing was certainly Roman as evidenced by the use of mortar.

sanctuary at Eleusis, the prospective initiates walked once again on a recently completed Roman paving, similar to the paved Panathenaic Way near the City Eleusinion.

At the forecourt of the sanctuary at Eleusis, the procession stood before several lavish marble structures reminiscent of those they left behind in Athens. The fountain and arches that framed the forecourt would have reminded participants of Hadrianic monuments in Athens, and the arches told them that the Panhellenes and the Imperial family were active at the sanctuary. The Greater Propylaia, on the other hand, would have reminded them of the Acropolis in Athens, the most important topographical landmark of Classical Athens and the entrance to the sanctuary of the city's patron goddess, which loomed above the City Eleusinion. The Greater Propylaia could have reminded participants of the Classical heritage of the sanctuary at Eleusis and the Mysteries. As a monumental propylon, the Greater Propylaia made it absolutely clear that the prospective initiates were about to enter a new space, accessible only to them, where the long-awaited initiation would take place. Passage through the Greater Propylaia allowed the procession to penetrate the formidable ancient walls of the sanctuary.

Climbing up the steps of the Greater Propylaia, the participants knew they were participating in a cult under the command of the Romans as manifested by the emperor in the pediment above. Once inside the gateway, however, the experiences of entering the sanctuary at Eleusis and the Acropolis in Athens were aligned. In both places, as Rhodes has articulated for the Athenian Propylaia, the Ionic order lining the path from the outer Doric colonnade to the doorwall directed the procession into the sanctuary.⁷⁵⁹ For the moments the prospective initiates were inside the Greater Propylaia, the two most

⁷⁵⁹ Rhodes 1995, pp. 53-60.

important processions of Athens, those of the Panathenaia and Mysteries, were linked by the experience of passing into the interior of the sanctuary through gateways of nearly identical form.

As they emerged from the Greater Propylaia, participants in the procession could see on the hill in front of them the roof of the Telesterion, but immediately before them they faced the small and decorative Lesser Propylaia, one more boundary marker to be traversed before arrival into the heart of the sanctuary. The members of the procession, who had been channeled through the wide central doorway of the Greater Propylaia (about 4m. wide), were embraced by the walls of the Lesser Propylaia's entrance court and funneled through a narrower central doorway (just under 3m. wide). As the procession moved up the sacred way, paved sometime after the construction of the Lesser Propylaia, participants caught a glimpse of the Mirthless Rock through the precinct wall to their right and perhaps heard the laments of Demeter. Soon after, they passed the small and classicizing temple F up on the western slope above the sacred way. Some participants may have recognized the sculpture of this temple as similar to the west pediment of the Parthenon, another Doric temple of Pentelic marble. Finally, the procession approached the Telesterion. Although recently repaired, the imposing Telesterion betrayed little evidence of this recent work. The designers of the rebuilt porch wanted to keep this most important building at the sanctuary, the locus of initiation, as close to the original structure as possible, to maintain the appearance of a seamless continuity from its Classical appearance to its Roman one in order to erase the signs of the violation of the Telesterion. It therefore retained its classical form, preserving the sense of the ancient history of the Mysteries and the initiation that took place inside.

Members of the procession moving between the sanctuaries in the 2nd century A.D. must have felt the connection between the sanctuaries as never before. The first Roman entrance into the sanctuary, the Greater Propylaia, caused the members of the procession to recall the Athenian Propylaia, and to connect the sanctuary at Eleusis with the Classical heritage of the important sanctuary in Athens. The Athenian Propylaia had towered over the City Eleusinion as a monument to the Acropolis. Now, at Eleusis, the procession could pass through the Greater Propylaia and, in the process, the prospective initiates may have felt they were entering a sanctuary just as old and important to the city of Athens as the Acropolis itself. At the Lesser Propylaia, the procession was immediately reminded of the Inner Propylon in the City Eleusinion with its decorated frieze. The sculpted images of the Lesser Propylaia depicted the *kistai*, held by the priestesses who were leading the procession, and wheat, the gift of Demeter. While the images on the Inner Propylon referred to objects carried by the members of the procession, the images on the Lesser Propylaia referred to the objects that would be revealed during procession, the *hiera* inside the *kistai*. During the 2nd century A.D., the Roman propyla at the City Eleusinion and the sanctuary at Eleusis directed the procession into and out of the sanctuaries, but also drew connections between the two Eleusinian sanctuaries and to the Acropolis. The Roman propyla worked across the distance of the sacred way to communicate a single message, that the Eleusinian Mysteries were as old and important to the city of Athens as the cult of Athena Polias, and that the City Eleusinion and the sanctuary at Eleusis were two separated parts of the same sanctuary, physically connected by the sacred way, and conceptually linked by the form and iconography of the gateways.

Chapter 11: Conclusion

The preceding discussion has shown that the entrances to the sanctuaries of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion connected the two ends of the sacred way visually and experientially. Through the long architectural history of the two sanctuaries, the spaces around the entrances, and the gateways themselves, showed signs of being constantly reworked, and interesting and significant patterns emerge as the forms of the entrances during each of the phases are considered holistically.

To begin, significant changes in the nature of entrance can be identified during a few pivotal moments throughout the several centuries. For both sanctuaries the most fundamental change was a shift in the orientation of their processional entrances. At the City Eleusinion, the change occurred somewhat late in the sanctuary's architectural history, during the 2nd century B.C., when the sanctuary's first monumental propylon was built. The new propylon reoriented the entrance, which had been on the southern side of the sanctuary, to the western side of the sanctuary, aligned with the Panathenaic Way. For the sanctuary at Eleusis, the shift of the processional entrance took place during the 5th century B.C. At both sanctuaries, the shift in orientation was caused by desire to change the experience of entering the sanctuary, not by political concerns. In both examples, the result was a gateway or propylon with its façade immediately visible from the sacred way as it approached the sanctuaries. The motivation for the change at Eleusis seems to have been prompted by the desire for a more direct passage into the sanctuary, a change sought perhaps because of the increased number of participants in the Mysteries. With the introduction of the northern processional entrance, the experience of circling the eastern side of the sanctuary and moving through a narrow passage to reach the

Telesterion was eliminated and emphasis was given to the area in front of the northern entrance, where the Kallichoron Well and later the Roman monuments elaborated this space.

Against the backdrop of the changing forms of the entrances to the sanctuaries, some experiential touchstones emerge as elements that were maintained or recreated across different phases. At both sanctuaries, the retention of certain types of features, in particular the well, stepped viewing platforms, gathering areas, and places for the display of monuments, all located along the processional routes at the sanctuaries and usually near the gateways, indicates a desire for continuity in the experience of entering the sanctuaries. Particularly at Eleusis, it was essential to provide a place for gathering and final instructions or preliminaries before entering the sanctuary; after the long journey to Eleusis and the intervening day of rest, such spaces allowed the prospective initiates to regroup and prepare themselves for entry.

The close analysis of archaeological and architectural evidence offered in this dissertation has presented revised reconstructions for the entrances, gateways, and propyla at Eleusis. It has demonstrated that the entrances, as a vital element of the processional routes into the sanctuaries, affected the experience of prospective initiates as they moved between the sanctuaries. The form of the entrances and the processional routes demonstrate changes and continuities over time, necessarily altering the experience of these spaces with each new transformation. The architecture and topography of the entrances and processional routes presented here creates a landscape into which consideration of other questions related to the performance of cult at these sanctuaries may be integrated.

It has been shown here that link in the architecture of the entrances at the two sanctuaries visually and experientially began in the 8th and 7th century B.C. and culminated in the mid-2nd century A.D. But what happened thereafter? Although the procession and Mysteries continued until the 4th century A.D., the experience of entering the sanctuaries changed drastically in the mid-3rd century A.D.⁷⁶⁰ In Athens, the post-Herulian wall, built after the sack of Athens in A.D. 267, was built along the western peribolos wall to the City Eleusinion. Its construction included blocks reused from the propylon and the peribolos wall, and it was built over the entrance to the sanctuary (Figure 2); Miles proposed that the new entrance to the sanctuary may have been located further to the east of the Hellenistic stoa.⁷⁶¹ The form of the sanctuary inside the walls seems not to have been much altered by the addition of the post-Herulian wall, but its connection with the sacred way was broken, its propylon destroyed. On the other side of the sacred way, the outer entrance to the sanctuary at Eleusis was also blocked, probably in the mid-3rd century A.D. as well.⁷⁶² A new fortification wall was built across the Greater Propylaia's northern façade, incorporating the Doric colonnade within its fabric, as well as along the building's western side (Figures 187 and 188). The wall extended to the east, in front of the Kallichoron Well. As a result, the entire northern side of the sanctuary presented a single imposing blockade to the procession as it approached the sanctuary from the sacred way, with no reference to the well or to the monumental propylon just behind it. By the mid-3rd century A.D., therefore, the entrances to the sanctuaries no longer included an intentional visual reference to one another, and they no

⁷⁶⁰ *IG II² 1078* (A.D. 220) outlined regulations for the procession, indicating it was still an essential element of the festival in the early part of the 3rd century A.D.

⁷⁶¹ *Agora XXXI*, pp. 91-93.

⁷⁶² Ziro 1991, pp. 277-90 proposed the date of the fortification work to the 250s A.D., as reinforcement of the sanctuary during the time of Valerian.

longer communicated with the sacred way. The architectural reciprocity that united the sanctuaries so strongly in the mid-2nd century A.D. sacrificed to the demands of security. Now the connection demonstrated a parallel devolution, as both sanctuaries presented makeshift fortification walls where monumental propyla had once signaled entrance into the sacred spaces of the Eleusinian sanctuaries.

Bibliography

- Adams, A. 1989. "The Arch of Hadrian at Athens," in *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire. Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium*. London 1986, ed. S. Walker, London, pp. 10-16.
- Agora XI* = E. Harrison, *Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture*, Princeton 1965.
- Agora XIV* = H.A. Thompson and R.E. Wycherly, *The Agora of Athens: The History, Shape, and Uses of an Ancient City Center*, Princeton 1972.
- Agora XXXI* = M. M. Miles, *The City Eleusinion*, Princeton 1998.
- Alcock, S. 2002. *Archaeologies of the Greek Past. Landscape, Monuments, and Memories*, Cambridge.
- Alderink, L. 1989. "The Eleusinian Mysteries in Roman Imperial Times," in *ANRW* (18.2), eds. W. Hasse and H. Temporini, pp. 1457-1498.
- Anderson, G. 1993. *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*, London and New York.
- Austin, R.P. 1931-1932. "Excavations at Haliartos, 1931." *BSA* 32, pp. 180-212.
- Becker, T. 2003. *Griechische Stufenanlagen. Untersuchungen zur Architektur, Entwicklungsgeschichte, Funktion und Repräsentation*, Münster.
- Bergquist, B. 1973. *Herakles on Thasos: The Archaeological, Literary and Epigraphic Evidence for his Sanctuary, Status and Cult Reconsidered* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis Boreas 5), Uppsala.
- Binder, J. 1998. "The Early History of the Demeter and Kore Sanctuary at Eleusis," in *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Archaeological Evidence. Proceedings of the Fourth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22-24 October 1993*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm, pp. 131-139.
- Birley, A. 1987. *Marcus Aurelius: A Biography*, rev. ed., New Haven and London.
- Blavette, V. 1884 "Fouilles d'Eleusis," *BCH* 8, pp. 254-64.
- Boardman, J. 1975. "Herakles, Peisistratos and Eleusis." *JHS* 95, pp. 1-12.
- . 1978. *Greek Sculpture. The Archaic Period*, London.
- Boatwright, M.T. 1994. Rev. of Willers 1990, in *JRA* 7, pp. 426-31.

- . 1997. "The Traianeum in Italica (Spain) and the Library of Hadrian in Athens," in *The Interpretation of Architectural Sculpture in Greece and Rome*, ed. D. Buitron-Oliver, Washington, pp. 192-217.
- Boersma, J. 1970. *Athenian Building Policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B.C.*, Groningen.
- Bohn, R. 1882. *Die propylaeen der Akropolis zu Athens*, Berlin.
- Bohtz, C.H. 1981. *Das Demeter-Heiligtum (Pergamon XIII)*, Berlin.
- Bougia, P. 1996. "Ancient Bridges in Greece and Coastal Asia Minor" (diss., Univ. of Pennsylvania).
- Brumfield, A.C. 1981. *The Attic Festivals of Demeter and their Relation to the Agricultural Year*, New York.
- Budde, L. and R. Nicholls. 1964. *A Catalogue of the Greek and Roman Sculpture in the Fitzwilliam Museum Cambridge*, Cambridge.
- Bundgaard, J.A. 1957. *Mnesicles, a Greek Architect at Work*, Copenhagen.
- Burkert, W. 1983. *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, trans. P. Bing, Berkeley.
- . 1985. *Greek Religion*, trans. J. Raffan, Cambridge, Mass.
- Camp, J. 2001. *The Archaeology of Athens*, New Haven and London.
- Carpenter, J.R. 1971. "The Propylon in Greek and Hellenistic Architecture" (diss, Univ. of Pennsylvania).
- Catling, R.W.V. 1994. "A Fragment of an Archaic Temple Model from Artemis Orthia," *BSA* 89, pp. 269-75.
- Cavanaugh, M. B. 1996. *Eleusis and Athens: Documents in Finance, Religion, and Politics in the Fifth Century B.C.*, Atlanta.
- Chandler, R. 1817. *Travels in Asia Minor, and Greece, or An Account of the Tour, Made at the Expense of the Society of Dilettanti*, 2 vols., London.
- Clarke, E.D. 1818. *Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa*, 8 vols., London.
- Clinton, K. 1974. *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries (TAPS 64.3)*. Philadelphia.
- . 1979. "IG I³ 5, The Eleusinia, and the Eleusinians," *AJP* 100, pp. 1-12.

- . 1980. "A Law in the City Eleusinion concerning the Mysteries," *Hesperia* 49, pp. 258-288.
- . 1984. "Eleusinian Treasures in the Late Fifth and Early Fourth Centuries," in *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on his 80th Birthday (GRBS 10)*, pp. 51-60.
- . 1987. "The Date of the Classical Telesterion at Eleusis," in *Φιλια Επη εις Γεώργιου Ε. Μυλωνώς*, Athens, pp. 257-262.
- . 1988. "Sacrifice at the Eleusinian Mysteries," in *Early Greek Cult Practice: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 26-29 June, 1986*, eds. R. Hägg, N. Marinatos, and G.C. Nordquist, Stockholm, pp. 69-79.
- . 1989a. "Hadrian's Contribution to the Renaissance of Eleusis," in *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire. Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium, (London 1986)*, ed. S. Walker, London, pp. 56-68.
- . 1989b. "The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors, Second Century B.C. to A.D. 267," in *ANRW* (18.2), eds. W. Hasse and H. Temporini, pp. 1499-1539.
- . 1992. *Myth and Cult. The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries. The Martin P. Nilsson Lectures on Greek Religion, delivered 19-21 November 1990 at the Swedish Institute at Athens*, Stockholm.
- . 1993a. "The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis," in *Greek Sanctuaries. New Approaches*, eds. R. Hägg and N. Marinatos, London and New York, pp. 110-24.
- . 1994a. "The Eleusinian Mysteries and Panhellenism in Democratic Athens," in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy. Proceedings of an International Conference Celebrating 2500 Years Since the Birth of Democracy in Greece, Held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, December 4-6, 1992*, eds. W.D.E. Coulson and O. Palagia, Oxford, pp. 161-72.
- . 1994b. "The Epidauria and the Arrival of Asclepius in Athens," in *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence. Proceedings of the Second International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22-24 November 1991*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm, pp. 17-34.
- . 1997. "Eleusis and the Romans: Late Republic to Marcus Aurelius," in *The Romanization of Athens. Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska (April 1996)*, eds. M.C. Hoff and S.I. Rotroff, Oxford, pp. 161-181.
- . 1999. "Eleusis from Augustus to the Antonines. Progress and Problems," in *XI*

Congresso internazionale di epigrafia greca e latina, Roma 18-24 settembre 1997 (Atti, 2), Rome, pp. 93-102.

---. 2003. "Stages of Initiation in the Eleusinian and Samothracian Mysteries," in *Greek Mysteries: The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults*, ed. M.B. Cosmopoulos, London and New York, pp. 50-78.

---. 2005a. *Eleusis: The Inscriptions on Stone. Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme*, Vols. 1a and 1b, Athens.

---. 2005b. "Pigs in Greek Rituals," in *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian. Proceedings of the Sixth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, organized by the Department of Classical Archaeology and Ancient History. Göteborg University, 25-27 April 1997*, eds. R. Hägg and B. Alroth, Stockholm, pp. 167-79.

---. Forthcoming. *Eleusis: The Inscriptions on Stone. Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme*, Vol. 2, Athens.

Coldstream, J.N. 2003. *Geometric Greece*, 2nd ed., London and New York.

Cole, S.G. 1994. "Demeter in the Ancient Greek City and its Countryside," in *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*, eds. S.E. Alcock and R. Osborne, Oxford, pp. 199-216.

Connelly, J.B. 2007. *Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*, Princeton.

Connor, W.R. 1990. "City Dionysia and Athenian Democracy," in *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*, eds. W.R. Connor, M.H. Hansen, K.A. Raaflaub, B.S. Strauss, Copenhagen, pp. 7-32.

Conze, A. and A. Michalis. 1860. "Scavi di Eleusi," *Bulletino dell' Instituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica* 32, pp. 177-83.

Cooper, F.A. 1996. *The Temple of Apollo Bassitas. Volume I. The Architecture*, Princeton.

Corinth VIII.3 = J.H. Kent, *The Inscriptions, 1926-1950*, Princeton 1966.

Corinth XXVIII.3 = N. Bookidis and R. Stroud, *The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: Topography and Architecture*, Princeton 1997.

Cortés Copete, J.M. 1998. "Marco Aurelio, benefactor de Eleusis," *Gerión* 16, pp. 255-270.

Cosmopoulos, M.B. 2003. "Mycenaean Religion at Eleusis: The Architecture and

Stratigraphy of Megaron B,” in *Greek Mysteries. The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults*, ed. M.B. Cosmopoulos, London, pp. 1-24.

Costaki, L. 2006. “The Intra Muros Road System of Ancient Athens” (diss., Univ. of Toronto).

Coulton, J.J. 1976. *The Architectural Development of the Greek Stoa*, Oxford.

Darque, P. 1981. “Les vestiges mycéniens découverts sous le Téléstérion d’Éleusis,” *BCH* 105, pp. 593-605.

Davis, P.H. 1931. “Some Eleusinian Building Inscriptions of the Fourth Century Before Christ.” (diss., Princeton Univ.).

Delos V = F. Courby, *Le Portique d’Antigone ou du Nord-Est et les Constructions Voisines*, Paris.

Delos XVI = F. Chapouthier, *Le sanctuaire des Dieux de Samothrace*, Paris, 1935.

Deubner, O. 1937. “Zu den grossen Propyläen,” *AthMitt* LXII, pp. 73-81.

Dillon, M. 1997. *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece*, London.

---. 2002. *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion*, London and New York.

Dindorf, W. 1829. *Aristides*, Leipzig.

Dinsmoor, W. B. 1910. “The Gables of the Propylaea,” *AJA* 14, 2, pp. 143-84.

---. 1927. *The Architecture of Ancient Greece. An Account of its Historic Development. Being the First Part of the Architecture of Greece and Rome by W.J. Anderson and R. Phené Spiers*, rev. ed., London.

---. 1950. *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, 2nd ed., London.

--- and W.B. Dinsmoor, Jr. 2004. *The Propylaia to the Athenian Akropolis. Volume II. The Classical Building*, ed. A.N. Dinsmoor, Princeton.

Dinsmoor, Jr. W.B. 1974. *Sounion*, Athens.

---. 1980. *The Propylaia to the Athenian Akropolis, Volume I. The Predecessors*, Princeton.

Dodwell, E. 1819. *A Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece, during the years 1801, 1805, and 1806*, 2 vols., London.

Dontas, G. 1966. "Appius Claudius Pulcher," in *Χαριστήριον εις Α.Κ. Ορλάνδον*, vol. 2, pp. 121-137.

Durrbach, F, ed. 1997. *Choix d'Inscriptions de Delos*, Chicago.

Dyggve, E. 1948. *Das Laphrion. Der Tempelbezirk von Kalydon*, Copenhagen.

Edmonds, R.G. III. 2006. "To Sit in Solemn Silence: *Thronosis* in Ritual, Myth, and Iconography," *AJP* 127, pp. 347-66.

Eiteljorg, H. 1973. "The Greek Architect of the Fourth Century B.C.: Master Craftsman or Master Planner" (diss., Univ. of Pennsylvania).

---. 1995. *The Entrance to the Athenian Acropolis before Mnesicles* (AIA Monographs, New Series, Number 1), Dubuque, Iowa.

---. 2005. "The Attic Foot as the Basic Unit of the Propylaea," in *Omni pede stare. Saggiarchitetonici e circumvesuviani in memoriam Jos de Waele. Studi della Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei 9*, eds. S.T.A.M. Mols and E.M. Moormann, Naples, pp. 39-44.

Ekschmitt, W. 1998. "Das Orakel von Dodona. Antike Orakelstätten, 1," *AW* 29, pp. 13-18.

Elsner, J. 1996. "Inventing Imperium: Texts and the Propaganda of Monuments in Augustan Rome," in *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, ed. J. Elsner, Cambridge, pp. 32-53).

Elsner, J. and I. Rutherford, eds. 2005. *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity. Seeing the Gods*, Oxford and New York.

Étienne, R. 2002. "The Development of the Sanctuary of Delos," in *Excavating Classical Culture. Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Greece*, eds. M. Stamatopoulou and M. Yeroulanou, Oxford, pp. 285-293.

Evans, N. 2002. "Sanctuaries, Sacrifices, and the Eleusinian Mysteries," *Numen* 49, pp. 227-54.

Favro, D. 1996. *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge.

Ferrari, G. 2002. "The Ancient Temple on the Acropolis in Athens," *AJA* 106, pp. 11-35.

Fittschen, K. 1989. "Zur Deutung der Giebel-Clipei der Grossen Propyäen von Eleusis," in *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire: Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium. (London 1986)*, eds. S. Walker and A. Cameron, London, p. 76.

- Fornara, C.W. and L.J. Samons II. 1991. *Athens from Cleisthenes to Pericles*, Berkeley.
- Fouilles de Delphes II* = M.F. Courby, *Topographie et Architecture. La Terrasse du Temple*, Paris 1927.
- Fouilles de Delphes II* = G. Daux and E. Hansen, *Topographie et Architecture. Le trésor de Siphnos*, Paris 1987.
- Frazer, J.G. [1898] 1965. *Pausanias' Description of Greece. Volume II. Commentary on Book I*, repr. New York.
- Frödin, O. and A.W. Pearson. 1938. *Asine I. Results of the Swedish Excavations 1922-1930*, Stockholm.
- Fullerton, M. 1998. "Atticism, Classicism, and the Origins of Neo-Attic Sculpture," in *Regional Schools in Hellenistic Sculpture. Proceedings of an International Conference held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, March 15-17, 1996*, eds. O. Palagia and W. Coulson, Oxford, pp. 93-99.
- Fürtwangler, A., Fiechter, E.R. and H. Thiersch 1906. *Aegina. Das Heiligtums der Aphaia*, Munich.
- Ganzert, J. and P. Herz. 1996. *Der Mars-Ulitor-Tempel auf dem Augustusforum in Rom. Mainz am Rhein*.
- Gasparri, C. 1979. *Aedes Concordia Augustae*, Rome.
- Gattinoni-Landucci, F. 1983. "Demetrio Poliocete e il santuario di Eleusis," *CISA* 9, pp. 117-124.
- Gawlinski, L. 2006. "The Sacred Law of Andania: Sanctuary and Cult." (diss., Cornell Univ.).
- . in press. "'Fashioning' Initiates: Dress at the Mysteries," in *Reading a Dynamic Canvas: Adornment in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, eds. M. Heyn and C. Colburn, Cambridge.
- Geagan, D. 2004. *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla*, Buffalo.
- Gebhard, E.R. and F.P. Hemans 1992. "University of Chicago Excavations at Isthmia, 1989: I," *Hesperia* 61, pp. 1-77.
- . 1998. "University of Chicago Excavations at Isthmia: II," *Hesperia* 67, 1, pp. 1-64.
- Gerding, H. 2006. "The Erechtheion and the Panathenaic Procession," *AJA* 110, pp. 389-

401.

Giraud, D. 1986. "The Greater Propylaia at Eleusis, a copy of Mnesikles' Propylaia," in *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire: Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium (London 1986)*, eds. S. Walker and A. Cameron, London, pp. 69-75.

Gneisz, D. 1990. *Das antike Rathaus. Das griechische Bouleuterion und die frühromische Curia*, Vienna.

Goette, H.R. 2000. *Ο αξιόλογος δήμος Σούνιον. Landeskundliche Studien in Südost-Attika*, Leidorf.

Goldhill, S. 2001. *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge.

Graf, F. 1974. *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

---. 1996. "Pompai in Greece: Some Considerations about Space and Ritual in the Greek Polis," in *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis. Proceedings of the Third International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 16-18 October 1992*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm, pp. 55-65.

Gruben 1997. "Naxos und Delos. Studien zur archaischen Architektur der Kykladen," *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 112, pp. 261-416.

Gruben, G. 1996. "Griechische Un-Ordnungen," in *Säule und Gebälk. Zu Struktur und Wandlungsprozess griechisch-römischer Architektur. Bauforschungskolloquium in Berlin vom 16. bis 18. Juni 1994*, ed. E.-L. Schwandner, Mainz, pp. 61-77.

---. 2001. *Griechische Tempel und Heiligtümer*, Munich.

Gruen, E.S. 1974. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, Berkeley.

Habicht, C. 1997a. "Roman Citizens in Athens (228-31 B.C.)," in *The Romanization of Athens. Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska (April 1996)*, eds. M.C. Hoff and S.I. Rotroff, Oxford, pp. 9-17.

---. 1997b. *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, trans. D.L. Schneider, Cambridge.

Hadot, P. 1998. *The Inner Citadel: The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius*, trans. M. Chase, Cambridge and London.

Hansen, M.H. and T.H. Nielsen. 2004. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis:*

An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation, Oxford.

Heinrich, H. 1994. "Die Chimärekapitelle," in *Das Wrack. Der antike Schiffsfund von Mahdia*, ed. G. Hellenkemper Salies, Köln, pp. 209-37.

Hellström, P. 1996. "Hecatombid Display of Power at the Labraunda Sanctuary," in *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World. Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1993 (Boreas. Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations. 24)*, eds. P. Hellström and B. Alroth, Stockholm, pp. 133-38.

Hemelrigk, E.A. 1999. *Matrona Docta. Educated Women in the Roman Elite from Cornelia to Julia Domna*, London.

Hintzen-Bohlen, B. 1997. *Die Kulturpolitik des Eubulos und des Lykurg*. Berlin.

Hoff, M. 1988. "The Roman Market at Athens," (diss., Boston Univ.).

---. 1997. "Laceratae Athenae: Sulla's Siege of Athens in 87/6 B.C. and its Aftermath," in *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska (April 1996)*, eds. M.C. Hoff and S.I. Rotroff, pp. 33-51.

Hoffelner, K. 1999. *Das Apollo-Heiligtum. Tempel. Altäre. Temenosmauer. Thearion*, Mainz.

Højte, J.M. 2005. *Roman Imperial Statue Bases. From Augustus to Commodus*, Aarhus.

Holland, L.B., F.W. Householder, and R.L. Scranton. unpub. *Sylloge of Greek Building Inscriptions*.

Hörmann, H. 1932. *Die inneren Propyläen von Eleusis*, Berlin.

Hurwit, J.M. 1999. *The Athenian Acropolis: History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present*, Cambridge.

---. 2004. *The Acropolis in the Age of Perikles*, Cambridge and New York.

Jameson, M.H. 1994. "Sacrifice and Animal Husbandry in Classical Greece," in *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity (IXth International Economic History Congress, Berne, August 1986)*, Cambridge, pp. 87-119.

Jacobson, D.M. 1986. "Hadrianic Architecture and Geometry," *AJA* 90, pp. 69-85.

---. 1958. *Paradeigmata. Three Mid-Fourth Century Main Works of Hellenic Architecture*, Aarhus.

- Jones, C.P. 1996. "The Panhellenion," *Chiron* 26, pp. 29-56.
- Jördens, A. 1999. "IG II² 1682 und die Baugeschichte des Eleusinischen Telesterion im 4. Jh. v. Chr.," *Klio* 81, 2, pp. 359-91.
- Jucker, H. 1961. *Das Bildnis im Blätterkelch: Geschichte und Bedeutung einer römischen Porträtform*, Olten.
- Julius, L. 1877. "Das Alter der kleinen Propyläen zu Eleusis," *AM* II, pp. 190-92.
- Kagan, D. 1991. *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War*, Ithaca.
- Katsikoudi, N. 2005. *Δωδώνη. Οι Τιμητικοί Ανδριαντες*, Ioannina.
- Kellum, B.A. 1990. "The City Adorned: Programmatic Display at the *Aedes Concordiae Augustae*," in *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*, eds. K.A. Raaflaub and M. Toher, Berkeley, pp. 276-96.
- Kennell, N.M. 1997. Rev. of M. Golden and P. Toohey, eds., *Inventing Ancient Culture: Historicism, Periodization, and the Ancient World*, in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 97.11.01.
- Kerameikos X = W. Hoepfner, Das Pompeion und seine Nachfolgerbauten*, Berlin 1976.
- Kienast, H. 1992. "Topographische Studien im Heraion von Samos," *AA* 107, pp. 171-213.
- . 2002. "Topography and Architecture of the Archaic Heraion at Samos," in *Excavating Classical Culture. Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Greece*, eds. M. Stamatopoulou and M. Yeroulanou, Oxford, pp. 317-326
- Knigge, U. 1991. *The Athenian Kerameikos. History-Monuments-Excavations*. Athens.
- Kokkou, A. 1970. "Αδριάνεια έργα εις τὰς Ἀθήνας," *ArchDelt* 25, A, pp. 150-73.
- Kokkou-Vyridi, K. 1999. *Ελεύσις. Πρωιμές Πυρές Θυσίων στο Τελεστήριο της Ελευσίνας*. Athens.
- Korres, M. 1997a. "Die Athena-Tempel auf der Akropolis," in *Kult und Kultbauten auf der Akropolis. Internationales Symposium vom 7. bis 9. Juli 1995 in Berlin*, ed. W. Hoepfner, Berlin, pp. 218-43.
- . 1997b. "An Early Attic Ionic Capital on the Acropolis," in *Greek Offerings. Essays on Greek Art in Honour of John Boardman*, ed. O. Palagia, Oxford, pp. 95-107.
- Kourouniotes, K. 1932. "Συγγραφή επισκευής των πυλών και του τείχους της

Ελευσίνας.” *Ελευσινιακά Α’*, Athens, pp.189-208.

---. 1933. “Αι τελευταίαι ανασκαφαί της Ελευσίνας. Ανασκαφή εν τῷ Τελεστηρίῳ,” *ArchDelt* 13 (1930-31), pp. 17-30.

---. 1934. *Ελεύσις. Οδηγός των ανασκαφῶν και του μουσείου*, Athens.

---. 1935a. “Ανασκαφή ‘Ελευσίνας κατά τό 1933.” *ArchDelt* 14 (1931-32), pp. 1-30.

---. 1935b (as Kuruniotis). “Das Eleusinische Heiligtum von den Anfängen bis zur vorperikleischen Zeit,” *ArchRW* 32, pp. 52-78.

---. 1936. *Eleusis. A Guide to the Excavations and Museum*, trans. O. Broneer, Athens.

---. 1938. “Ανασκαφή Ελευσίνας 1934.” *ArchDelt* 15 (1933-35), pp. 1-48.

Kourouniotes, K. and J. Travlos. 1938a. “Τελεστήριον καί Ναός Δήμητρος,” *ArchDelt* 15 (1933-35), pp. 54-114.

---. 1938b. “Ανασκαφαι εν Ελευσίνοι,” *Prakt* (1937), pp. 42-52.

---. 1939. “Συμβολή εις την Οικοδομικην Ιστοριαν του Ελευσινιακου Τελεστηριου,” *ArchDelt* 16 (1935-36), pp. 1-42.

Kowalzig, B. 2005. “Mapping Out *Communitas*: Performances of *Theōria* in Their Sacred and Political Context,” in *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity. Seeing the Gods*, eds. Elsner and Rutherford, Oxford and New York, pp. 41-72.

Kron, U. 1992. “Heilige Steine,” in *Kotinos. Festschrift für Erika Simon*, eds. H. Froning, T. Hölscher, and H. Mielsch, Mainz/Rhein, pp. 56-70.

Labraunda I.1 = K. Jeppesen, *The Propylaea*, Lund 1955.

Langdon, M. 1997. “Cult in Iron Age Attica,” in *New Light on a Dark Age. Exploring the Culture of Geometric Greece*, ed. S. Langdon, Columbia Miss, pp. 113-124.

Lawton, C. 1995. *Attic Document Reliefs: Art and Politics in Ancient Athens*, Oxford.

Lefantzis, M. 2008. “The North Wall of the Stoa of Eumenes II: The Earliest Arches in Greece” (paper, Chicago 2008).

Lehmann, K. 1998. *Samothrace. A Guide to the Excavations and Museums*, 6th ed., Thessaloniki.

Lenormant, F. 1862. *Recherches archéologiques à Eleusis, exécutées dans le cours de l'année 1860. Recueil des inscriptions*, Paris.

- Libertini, G. 1916. "I Propilai di Appio Claudio Pulcro," *Annuario* II, pp. 201-17.
- Lichtenberger, A. 2001. "Die Einweihung Mark Aurels in die Mysterien von Eleusis und der Beginn der Ära von Philadephia," *ZDPV* 117, pp. 140-148.
- Lindner, R. 1982. "Die Giebelgruppe von Eleusis mit dem Raub der Persephone," *JdI* 97, pp. 303-400.
- Lippolis, E. 2006. *Mysteria. Archeologia e culto del santuario di Demetra a Eleusi*, Milan.
- Loening, T.C. 1987. *The Reconciliation Agreement of 403/402 B.C. in Athens: Its Content and Application*, Stuttgart.
- MacMullen, R. 1959. "Roman Imperial Building Policy in the Provinces," *HSCP* 64, pp. 207-35.
- Macridy-Bey, T. and C. Picard. 1915. "Fouilles du Hiéron d'Apollon Claros," *BCH* 39, pp. 33-52
- Maier, F.G. 1959. *Griechische Mauerbauinschriften*, Heidelberg.
- Mallwitz, A. 1981. "Kritisches zur Architektur Griechenlands im 8. und 7. Jahrhundert," *AA*, pp. 599-642.
- Mark, I.S. 1993. *The Sanctuary of Athena Nike in Athens: Architectural Stages and Chronology* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 26), Princeton.
- Mattusch, C. 1994. "The Eponymous Heroes: The Idea of Sculptural Groups," in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy. Proceedings of an International Conference held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, December 4-6 1992*, eds. W.D.E. Coulson, O. Palagia, and T.L. Shear, Oxford, pp. 73-81.
- Mazarakis-Ainian, A. 1997. *From Rulers' Dwellings to Temples. Architecture, Religion and Society in Early Iron Age Greece (1100-700 B.C.)*, Jonsered.
- McCredie, J.R. 1966. *Fortified Military Camps in Attica* (*Hesperia*, suppl. XI), Princeton.
- . 1968. "Samothece. Preliminary Report on the Campaigns of 1965-1967," *Hesperia* 37, pp. 200-34.
- . 1979. "The Architects of the Parthenon," in *Studies in Classical Art and Archaeology. A Tribute to Peter Heinrich von Blanckenhagen*, eds. G. Kopcke and M.B. Moore, Locust Valley, NY, pp. 69-73.

- McDonald, W.A. 1943. *The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks*. Baltimore.
- McNicoll, A.W. 1997. *Hellenistic Fortifications from the Aegean to the Euphrates*. Oxford.
- Mertens, D. 2003. *Selinus*, Mainz.
- Michalis, A. 1889. "Das Sogenannte Dreifusskapital von Eleusis," *AM* 14, pp. 8-14.
- Mikalson, J. D. 1975. *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year*. Princeton.
- Miles, M.M. 1989. "A Reconstruction of the Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous," *Hesperia* 58, 2, pp. 133-249.
- . 1998. "The Propylon to the Sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros at Selinous," *AJA* 102, 1, pp. 35-57.
- Miller, S.G., ed. 1989. *Nemea. A Guide to the Site and Museum*, Berkeley.
- Mitchel, F.W. 1973. "Lykourgan Athens, 338-322," in *Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple. Second Series, 1966-1970*, C.G. Boulter, D.W. Bradeen, A. Cameron, et. al. eds., Cincinnati, pp. 163-214.
- Morgan, C. 1990. *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century B.C.*, Cambridge and New York.
- Mylonas, G. 1942. *The Hymn to Demeter and Her Sanctuary at Eleusis*, St. Louis.
- . 1961. *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Princeton.
- . 1987. "Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries," *ArchEphem* 126, pp. 383-96.
- Mylonas, G. and K. Kourouniotes. 1933. "Excavations at Eleusis, 1932. Preliminary Report," *AJA* 37, pp. 271-86.
- Mylonas, G. and I. Travlos. 1955. "Ανασκαφαι εν Ελευσινι," *Prakt* (1952), pp. 53-72.
- . 1981a. "Ανασκαφή Ελευσίνος," *Prakt* 137, pp. 155-56.
- . 1981a. "Ανασκαφή Ελευσίνος," *Ergon*, pp. 45-46.
- . 1983. "Ανασκαφή Ελευσίνος," *Prakt* 139, pp. 148-50.
- Nixon, L. 1995. "The Cults of Demeter and Kore," in *Women in Antiquity. New Assessments*, eds. R. Hawley and B. Levick, London and New York, pp. 75-96.

Noack, F. 1927. *Eleusis: Die Baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Heiligtums*, Berlin.

Ohnesorg, A. 2003. *Inselionische Marmordächer (Denkmäler Antiker Architektur 18.2)*, Berlin.

---. 2005. *Ionische Altäre. Formen und Varianten einer Architekturgattung aus Insel- und Ostionien*, Berlin.

Oliver, J. H. 1965. "The Athens of Hadrian," in *Les Empereurs romains d'Espagne. Actes du Colloque international sur les empereurs romains d'Espagne, Madrid-Italica 31.3.-6.4.1964*, eds. A. Piganiol, H. Terrasse, and R. Etienne, Paris, pp. 123-33.

---. 1970. *Marcus Aurelius. Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East (Hesp. Suppl. 13)*, Princeton.

Oliver, J.H. and B.D. Meritt. 1941. "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 10, 1, pp. 65-90.

Orlandos, A. 1932. "Ο εν Έλεθσίνι ναός της Προφυλαίας Άρτέμιδος," in *Ελευσινιακά Α*, Athens, pp. 209-23

---. 1936. "Η κρήνη της Έλευσινος," in *Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps on his seventieth Birthday*, Princeton, pp. 282-95.

---. 1977. *Η Αρχιτεκτονική του Παρθενόνος*, Β, Athens.

Østby, E. 1995. "Chronological Problems of Archaic Selinus," in *Acta Hyperborea 6. Ancient Sicily*, ed. T. Fischer-Hansen, Copenhagen, pp. 83-102.

Padgug, R.A. 1972. "Eleusis and the Union of Attika," *GRBS* 13, pp. 135-150.

Pakkanen, P. 1996. *Interpreting Early Hellenistic Religion: A Study Based on the Mystery Cult of Demeter and the Cult of Isis*, Helsinki.

Palagia, O. 1997. "Classical Encounters: Attic Sculpture after Sulla," in *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska (April 1996)*, eds. M.C. Hoff and S.I. Rotroff, Oxford, pp. 81-95.

Papageli, K. 2002. *Ελευσίνα. Ο Αρχαιολογικός Χώρος και το Μουσείο*, Athens.

Parke, H.W. 1977. *Festivals of the Athenians*, London.

Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion. A History*, Oxford.

Philios, D. 1883. "Εκθεσις περι των εν Ελευσινι Ανασκαφων," *Prakt* (1882-1883), pp. 84-103.

- . 1884. "Εκθεσις περι των εν Ελευσινι Ανασκαφων," *Prakt* (1883), pp. 51-67.
- . 1885a. "Εκθεσις περι των εν Ελευσινι Ανασκαφων," *Prakt* (1884), pp. 64-87.
- . 1885b. "Αρχαιολογικα Ευρηματα των εω Ελευσινι Ανασκαφων," *ArchEph*, pp. 169-183.
- . 1888. *Prakt* (1887), pp. 49-58.
- . 1906. *Ελευσίς (Μυστήρια, Ερείπια, και Μουσείον αυτής)*, Athens.
- Pickard-Cambrige, A.W. 1946. *The Theater of Dionysus in Athens*, Oxford.
- Pollini, J. 1993. "The Acanthus of the Ara Pacis as an Apolline and Dionysiac Symbol of Anamorphosis, Anakyklosis and Numen Mixtum," in *Von der Bauforschung zur Denkmalpflege. Festschrift für Alois Machatschek zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. M. Kubelík and M. Schwarz, Vienna, pp. 181-217.
- Pollitt, J.J. 1979. "Kernoi from the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 48, pp. 205-33.
- Preka-Alexandri, K. 2000. *Eleusis*, Athens.
- Price, S.R.F. 1984. "Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult," *JHS* 104, pp. 79-95.
- Raubitschek, I.K. and A.E. Raubitschek. 1982. "The Mission of Triptolemos," in *Studies in Athenian Architecture, Topography, and Sculpture. Presented to Homer A. Thompson (Hesperia Suppl. 20)*, pp. 109-117.
- Rhodes, R. 1995. *Architecture and Meaning on the Athenian Acropolis*, Cambridge.
- Riccardi, L.A. 2007. "The Bust Crown, the Panhellenion, and Eleusis," *Hesperia* 76, pp. 365-90.
- Richardson, N.J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford.
- Ridgway, B.S. 1999. *Prayers in Stone: Greek Architectural Sculpture ca. 600-100 B.C.E.*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- . 2002. *Hellenistic Sculpture III: The Styles of ca. 100-31 B.C.*, Madison.
- Riethmüller, J. W. 1996. "Die Tholos und das Ei. Zur Deutung der Thymele von Epidauros," *Nikephoros* 9, pp. 71-109.
- Robertson, N. 1996. "New Light on Demeter's Mysteries. The Festival Proerosia," *GRBS* 37, pp. 319-379.

- . 1998. "The Two Processions to Eleusis and the program of the Mysteries," *AJP* 119, 4, pp. 547-575.
- . 1999. "The Sequence of Days at the Thesmophoria and the Eleusinian Mysteries." *Echos du Monde Classique/Classical Views* XLIII, n.s. 18, pp. 1-33.
- Romeo, I. 2002. "The Panhellenion and Ethnic Identity in Hadrianic Greece," *CP* 97, pp. 21-40.
- Roux, G. 1961. *L'architecture de l'Argolide aux IVe et IIIe siècle savant J.-C.*, Paris.
- Rubensohn, O. 1962. *Das Delion von Paros*, Wiesbaden.
- Rutherford, R.B. 1989. *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius. A Study*, Oxford.
- Sakurai, M. and A. Raubitschek. 1987. "The Eleusinian Spondai (*IG I³ 6*, lines 8-47)," *Φιλια επι εις Γεώργιον Ε. Μυλωνάν Β'*, Athens, pp. 263-65.
- Samos IV* = H.P. Isler, *Samos IV. Das Archaische Nordtor und Seine Umgebung in Heraion von Samos*, Bonn 1978.
- Samothrace III* = P.W. Lehmann, *The Heiron*, Princeton 1969.
- Samothrace X* = A. Frazer, *The propylon of Ptolemy II*, 2 vols., Princeton 1990.
- Sauron, G. 2001. "Les Propylées d'Appius Claudius Pulcher à Éleusis: l'art néo-attique dans les contradictions idéologiques de la noblesse romaine à la fin de la République," in *Constructions Publiques et Programmes Édilitaires en Grèce entre le II^e siècle av. J.-C. et le I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C. Actes du Colloque Organisé par l'École Française d'Athènes 14-17 Mai 1995* (*BCH Suppl.* 39), eds. J-L Yves and J-C Moretti, Athens, pp. 267-85.
- Schmidt, E. 1982. *Geschichte der Karyatide. Funktion und Bedeutung der menschlichen Träger- und Stützfigur in der Baukunst*, Würzburg.
- Schuller, M. 1991. *Der Artemistempel im Delion auf Paros*, Berlin and New York.
- Scranton, R.L. 1941. *Greek Walls*, Cambridge.
- . 1944. "Two Temples of Commodus at Corinth," *Hesperia* 13, pp. 315-348.
- Scullion, S. 2005. "'Pilgrimage' and Greek Religion: Sacred and Secular in the Pagan Polis," in *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity. Seeing the Gods*, eds. Elsner and Rutherford, Oxford and New York, pp. 111-130.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R., ed. 1968. *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, Cambridge.

- Shapiro, H.A. 1989. *Art and Cult under the Tyrants in Athens*, Mainz am Rhein.
- Shear, I.M. 1999. "The Western Approach to the Athenian Akropolis," *JHS* 119, pp. 86-127.
- Shear, J.L. 2001. *Polis and Panathenaia: The History and Development of Athena's Festival* (diss., Univ. of Pennsylvania).
- . 2003. "Atarbos' Base and the Panathenaia," *JHS* 123, pp. 164-80.
- Shear, Jr., T.L. 1982. "The Demolished Temple at Eleusis," in *Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture, and Topography Presented to Homer A. Thompson (Hesperia Suppl. 20)*, Princeton, pp. 128-140.
- Simms, R.M. 1990. "Myesis, Telete, and Mysteria," *GRBS* 31, pp.183-95.
- Skias, A. 1895. "Περί της εν ελευσινι ανασκαφης," *Prakt* (1894), pp. 14-17.
- . 1896. "Περί της εν Ελευσινι ανασκαφης," *Prakt* (1895), pp. 159-93.
- Smith, R.R.R. 1998. "Cultural Choice and Political Identity in Honorific Portrait Statues in the Greek East in the Second Century A.D.," *JRS* 88, pp. 56-93.
- Society of Dilettanti. 1817. *The Unedited Antiquities of Attica: Comprising the Architectural Remains of Eleusis, Rhamnus, Sunium, and Thoricus*, London.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1990. "What is Polis Religion?," in *The Greek City. From Homer to Alexander*, eds. O. Murray and S. Price, Oxford and New York, pp. 295-322.
- . 1993. "Early Sanctuaries, the Eighth Century and Ritual Space: Fragments of a Discourse," *Greek Sanctuaries. New Approaches.*, N. Marinatos and R. Hägg, eds., London and New York, pp. 1-17.
- . 1997. "Reconstructing change: Ideology and ritual at Eleusis," in *Inventing Ancient Culture. Historicism, Periodization and the Ancient World*, M. Golden and P. Toohey, eds., London, pp.132-64.
- . 2003a. "Festival and Mysteries: Aspects of the Eleusinian Cult," in *Greek Mysteries: The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults*, ed. M.B. Cosmopoulos, London and New York, pp. 25-49.
- . 2003b. *Tragedy and Athenian Religion*, Lanham, Mass. and Oxford.
- Spaeth, B.S. 1991. "Athenians and Eleusinians in the West Pediment of the Parthenon," *Hesperia* 60, pp. 331-62.

Spawforth, A.J. and S. Walker. 1985. "The World of the Panhellenion. Part I. Athens and Eleusis," *JRS* 75, pp. 79-104.

Spon, J. 1683. *Voyage de Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grece, et du Levant*, 2 vols., Lyon.

Stamper, J.W. 2005. *The Architecture of Roman Temples: The Republic to the Middle Empire*, Cambridge.

Steiner, P. 1906. "Antike Skulpturen an der Panagia Gorgoepikoos," *AM* 31, pp. 325-41.

Svoronos, I. 1914. "Explication de la base de Sorrente," *Journal international d'archéologie numismatique* XVI, pp. 151-210.

Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250*, Oxford.

Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford.

Tanoulas, T. 1994. "The Propylaea and the Western Access of the Acropolis," in *Acropolis Restoration. The CCAM Interventions*, R. Economakis, ed., London, pp. 53-67.

---. 2002. *Μελέτη αποκατάστασης της ανωδομής του κεντρικού κτιρίου*, Athens.

Thieme, T. 1993. "Architectural Remains of Archaic Labraunda," *Les grands ateliers d'architecture dans le monde égéen de VI siècle av. J.-C. Actes du colloque d'Istanbul. 23-25 mai 1991.*, eds. J. des Courtils and J.-C. Moretti, Paris, pp. 47-55.

Thompson, H.A. 1950. "The Odeion in the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 19, pp. 31-141.

---. 1960. "Activities in the Athenian Agora: 1959." *Hesperia* 29, pp. 327-68.

Tobin, J. 1997. *Herodes Attikos and the City of Athens. Patronage and Conflict under the Antonines*, Amsterdam.

Tölle-Kastenbein, R. 1994. *Das Olympieion in Athen*, Köln.

Townsend, R.F. 1982. "Aspects of Athenian Architectural Activity in the Second Half of the Fourth Century B.C." (diss. The Univ. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill).

---. 1987. "The Roman Rebuilding of Philon's Porch and the Telesterion at Eleusis," *Boreas* 10, pp. 97-106.

---. 2003. "The Philippeion and fourth-century Athenian architecture," in *The Macedonians in Athens 322-229 B.C. Proceedings of an International Conference held*

at the University of Athens, May 24-26, 2001, eds. O. Palagia and S.V. Tracy, Oxford, pp. 93-101.

---. 2004. "Classical Signs and Anti-Classical Signification in 4th Century Athenian Architecture," in *XAPIΣ: Essays in Honor of Sara A. Immerwahr* (*Hesperia* suppl. 33), pp. 305-26.

Travlos, J. 1949. "The Topography of Eleusis," *Hesperia* 18, pp. 138-147.

---. 1951a. "Hadrian's Bridge on the Eleusinian Kephisos," *AJA* 55, p. 150.

---. 1951b. "Ανασκαφαί εν Ελευσίνοι," *Prakt* (1950), pp. 122-127.

---. 1971. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, London.

---. 1983. "Η Αθήνα καί η Ελευσίνα στόν 8^ο καί 7^ο π.χ. αιώνα," *ASAtene, Nuova Serie* XLV, pp. 323-338.

---. 1988. *Bildlexicon zur Topographie des antiken Attika*, Tübingen.

Vanderpool, E. 1974. "The Date of the Pre-Persian City-Wall of Athens," in *ΦΟΡΟΣ. A Tribute to Benjamin Dean Meritt*, eds. D.W. Bradeen and M.F. McGregor, Locust Valley, NY, pp. 156-160.

---. 1982. "ΕΠΙ ΠΡΟΥΧΟΝΤΙ ΚΟΛΩΝΩΙ, the Sacred Threshing Floor at Eleusis." *Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture and Topography Presented to Homer A. Thompson* (*Hesperia* suppl. 20), Princeton, pp. 172-174.

Vassilika, E. 1998. *Greek and Roman Art*, Cambridge.

Verdan, S. 2002. "Fouilles dans le sanctuaire d'Apollon Daphnéphoros," *AntK* 45, pp. 128-32.

Vermeule, C.C. III. 1965. "A Greek Theme and its Survivals: The Ruler's Shield (Tondo Image) in Tomb and Temple," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 109, 6, pp. 361-397.

---. 1968. *Roman Imperial Art in Greece and Asia Minor*, Cambridge.

Von Gerkan, A. 1934. "Hörmann, Die innere Propyläen von Eleusis," *Gnomon* X, pp. 10-15.

---. 1941. "Die Neronische scanae frons des Dionysostheaters in Athen," *JdI* 56, pp. 163-77.

Von Mercklin, E. 1962. *Antike Figuralkapitelle*, Berlin.

- Waele, J.A.K.E. de. 1999. "A Building Copy. The Greater Propylaia in Eleusis." *Classical Archaeology towards the Third Millennium. Reflections and Perspectives. Proceedings of the XVth International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Amsterdam, July 12-17, 1998.*, eds. R.F. Docter and E.M. Moorman, Amsterdam, pp. 145-149.
- Walker, S. 1979a. "The Architectural Development of Roman Nymphaea in Greece." (diss., Univ. of London).
- . 1979b. "Corinthian Capitals with Ringed Voids: The Work of Athenian Craftsmen in the Second Century A.D.," *AA* 31, pp. 103-29.
- Walter, H. 1990. *Das Griechische Heiligtum. Dargestellt am Heraion von Samos*, Stuttgart.
- Walter, H. 1993. *Ägina: die archäologische Geschichte einer griechischen Insel*. Munich.
- Ward Perkins, J.B. 1981. *Roman Imperial Architecture*. New York and Harmondsworth.
- Webb, P. 1996. *Hellenistic Architectural Sculpture: Figural Motifs in Western Anatolia and the Aegean Islands*, Madison.
- Wells, B. 1988. "Early Greek Building Sacrifices," in *Early Greek Cult Practice: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 26-29, June 1986*, eds. R. Hägg, N. Marinatos, G.C. Nordquist, Göteborg, pp. 259-66.
- Welter, G. 1941. *Troizen und Kalaureia*, Berlin.
- Wescoat, B.D. 2003. "Athens and Macedonian royalty on Samothrace: The Pentelic Connection." in *The Macedonians in Athens 322-229 B.C. Proceedings of an International Conference held at the University of Athens, May 24-26, 2001*, eds. O. Palagia and S.V. Tracy, Oxford, pp. 102-116..
- . 2006. "Recent Work on the Eastern Hill of the Sanctuary of the Great Gods, Samothrace," in *Proceedings of the XVI International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Boston, August 23-26, 2003. Common Ground: Archaeology, Art, Science, and Humanities*, eds. Mattusch, C., A. Donahue, and A. Brauer, Oxford, pp. 79-83.
- Wheler, G. 1682. *A Journey into Greece*, London.
- White, D. 1967. "The Post-Classical Cult of Malophoros at Selinus," *AJA* 71, pp. 335-52.
- Wickkiser, B. 2003. "The Appeal of Asklepios and the Politics of Healing in the Greco-Roman World." (diss., Univ. of Texas at Austin).

Willers, D. 1990. *Hadrians panhellenisches Programm: archäologische Beiträge zur Neugestaltung Athens durch Hadrian*, Basel.

---. 1996. "Der Vorplatz des Heiligtums von Eleusis. Überlegungen zur Neugestaltung im 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr.," in *Retrospektive. Konzepte von Vergangenheit in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, eds. M. Flashar, H.-J. Gehrke, E. Heinrich, Munich, pp.179-225.

Williams, D. 1987. "Aegina, Aphaia-Temple 11. The Pottery from the Second Limestone Temple and the Later History of the Sanctuary," *AA* 102, pp. 629-80.

Wilson Jones, M. 2000. *Principles of Roman Architecture*, New Haven and London.

Winkes, R. 1969. *Clipeata Imago. Studien zu einer römischen Bildnisform*, Bonn.

Winter, F. 1971. *Greek Fortifications*, Toronto.

Wrede, W. 1933. *Attische Mauern*, Athens.

Wycherly, R.E. 1964. "The Olympieion at Athens," *GRBS* 5, pp. 161-79.

Yavis, C.G. 1949. *Greek Altars, Origins and Typology*, St. Louis.

Zanker, P. 1998. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro, Ann Arbor.

Ziro, D. 1991. *Η κυρία είσοδος του ιερού της Ελευσίνας*, Athens.

Zschiezchmann, W. 1933. "Die Inneren Propyläen von Eleusis," *AA* 48, p. 336.