

Ethnicity and Identity in Herodotus

Edited by
**Thomas Figueira
and Carmen Soares**

First published 2020

ISBN: 978-1-138-63111-3 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-20908-1 (ebk)

8 A goddess for the Greeks

Demeter as identity factor
in Herodotus

Nuno Simões Rodrigues

(CC-BY 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781315209081-11

The Open Access version of this chapter was funded by the FCT –
Foundation for Science and Technology.

This work is financed by national funds through FCT – Foundation for
Science and Technology, I.P, in the scope of the projects UIDB/04311/2020
and UIDP/04311/2020.

8 A goddess for the Greeks

Demeter as identity factor in Herodotus

Nuno Simões Rodrigues

Introduction – Herodotus and the role of the Gods

Although the formulations by which Herodotus refers to the gods of the Greeks do not coincide with what we read in Homeric poems – the *Histories* contribute little material about what we might call Olympian mythology – divine entities are present in the historian’s narrative. Most often, we find circumstantial and casual references, which serve for instance to contextualize divine entities in their identifications and religious functions (ritual and cultural), while generally juxtaposing them with ‘theological’ discourses and formulations that are then attributed to other peoples. In this sense, Book II of the *Histories* might be considered characteristic, if not paradigmatic. Yet at other times, gods appear with specific functions that, even if not exactly mythological, seem to contribute toward the construction of the Herodotean text and the ‘ideology’ that the historian seems to adopt and intends to present.

Thus, in the end of his report on the Battle of Salamis, in Book VIII of the *Histories*, Herodotus credits Themistocles with the following statement (Hdt. 8.109.2–3):

ἡμεῖς δέ, εὖρημα γὰρ εὐρήκαμεν ἡμέας τε αὐτοὺς καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, νέφος τοσοῦτο ἀνθρώπων ἀνωσάμενοι, μὴ διώκωμεν ἄνδρας φεύγοντας. ἴταδε γὰρ οὐκ ἡμεῖς κατεργασάμεθα, ἀλλὰ θεοὶ τε καὶ ἥρωες, οἱ ἐφθόνησαν ἄνδρα ἓνα τῆς τε Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης βασιλεῦσαι ἐόντα ἀνόσιόν τε καὶ ἀτάσθαλον: ὃς τὰ τε ἱρὰ καὶ τὰ ἴδια ἐν ὁμοίῳ ἐποιέετο, ἐμπιπράς τε καὶ καταβάλλων τῶν θεῶν τὰ ἀγάλματα: ὃς καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ἀπεμαστίγωσε πέδας τε κατῆκε.

Now, we Athenians and the whole of Greece have already benefited from our luck in repelling such an immense swarm of men; they have already taken to their heels, so why should we go after them? In any case, it was not we who accomplished this, but the gods and heroes, who did not want to see a single man ruling both Asia and Europe – and a man who commits terrible atrocities too.¹

This passage does not necessarily present Herodotus’ opinion on religion and its manifestations,² but rather offers a practical example of the methodology for the

presentation of *ta legomena*, that is, it offers “what [supposedly or by means of an account] has been said”. I say this without prejudice concerning the possibility that some of such presented information seems little, or not at all, likely to belong to Herodotus himself. Nonetheless, acting like an investigator (*histōr*) and as a conduit for transmitting information, Herodotus has credited Themistocles with an idea, which would surely have been shared by many Greeks of his time: that the gods were responsible for the Persians’ expulsion from the Hellenic territory south and west of the Hellespont. This is a conception shared, for example, by Aeschylus. In the *Persians*, the messenger reporting the battle of Salamis to the Persian queen says, “No, it was some divine power that tipped the scale of fortune with unequal weight and thus destroyed our host. The gods preserve the city of the goddess Pallas” (*Pers.* 345–7, transl. H. Weir Smyth).³

Two perspectives on Demeter in Herodotus: from the goddess and her *timē* to the intervener deity

Prominent among the gods who appear in relevant roles in the Herodotean narrative on the invasion of Xerxes is Demeter, a deity associated with the earth, agriculture, and, particularly, cereal production (as in fact Herodotus himself explains in a metonymic manner at various points in the *Histories* 1.193.2–3; 4.198.2; 7.141.4). These are surely, however, not the historian’s most significant references to the goddess. In point of fact, in Book VIII, another passage, charged with oracular and metaphysical overtones, effectively establishes a relation between Demeter and the Greeks’ victory at Salamis. The Herodotean narrative revolves around two Greek renegades who had joined the Persian forces. Shortly before the confrontation at Salamis, when Xerxes had pillaged Attica, this pair faced a situation in the Thriasian Plain (near Eleusis in Attica) that they deemed strange. The renegades were Dikaios, an Athenian exile, and Demaratos, a former Spartan king from the house of the Eurypontids, who had defected to the Persian side and had thereby achieved high political status. According to the account, whose source Herodotus identifies as Dikaios, the two men witnessed in Eleusis such a dust cloud as might have been caused by a throng of 30,000 people. A sound emanated from the crowd that seemed like the hymn of the initiates, normally chanted to Iakkhos at the occasion of the Eleusinian mysteries celebrated in honour of Demeter and her daughter Persephone (Hdt. 8.65.1).⁴

The Eleusinian aspect of Herodotus’ report is immediately apparent. Nevertheless, the Greek historian wishes to assign Demaratos an inconceivable ignorance as to what was going on at Eleusis, so that Dikaios has the expository opportunity not only to explain the episode, but also to add his opinion – which, in itself constitutes a prophetic reading of the manifestation concerning the imminent confrontation in Salamis. So, Dikaios asserts that the “divine chant”, associated with the festival, annually celebrated in honour of the Mother and Daughter, and during which any Athenian or other Greek could be initiated, originated from Eleusis and had come in aid of the “Athenians and their allies” (Hdt. 8.65.2).

The reference to Mother and Daughter (*Mētēr kai Korē*) was easily understood by Herodotus' audience as an allusion to Demeter and Persephone (the Eleusinian deities). In fact, the place of the supposed event, Eleusis, leaves no doubt about that interpretation. However, as indicated earlier, this incident is not the first time that the historian has cause to mention Demeter. Apart from the metonymic references just noted, in Book II we find the first specific allusions to the goddess. As also happens with other deities, within the ambit of the Egyptian *logos* Herodotus presents an Egyptian origin of Demeter that, far from being an original in the overall framework of his writings, is one more confirmation of his idea that the Greeks would have inherited almost all divine *onomata* 'names' from the Egyptians (2.50).⁵ This derivation conforms to the organizing principle evident in the *Histories*, that the systematic belief in the gods is a common macro-structure for all peoples.⁶ Thus, when Herodotus presents the religious festivals of the people of the Nile, he mentions several Egyptian gods, listing them, however, not only with the name of the Greek deity he deems to be the same, but also with a different Egyptian name, because, as Scullion notes: "Herodotus is manifestly aware that nations identify the same gods by different vocables."⁷ Also for this reason the historian claims that "Isis in the Greek language is Demeter" (2.59.2) or even that "Demeter is Isis" (Δήμητηρ δὲ Ἴσις: 2.156.5). It is in that sense that, when reporting episodes of Egyptian mythology, Herodotus uses the names Isis and Demeter interchangeably. Rhampsinitos, for example, when descending into the Netherworld, played dice with Demeter, here used naturally as an equivalent of Isis (2.122). This is curious because, in the Greek tradition, it must be Persephone, the daughter, and not Demeter, the mother, who would be playing dice in the hellish underworld with whomsoever. Identifying Demeter, the goddess of crops, as the one present and not her daughter, endorses the intentionality of comparing deities in a mutual interpretive system.⁸ Along the same analytic line, Demeter's sanctuary and the ritual associated with it, mentioned in the same chapter, operate as a narrative hook to allow Herodotus to expand on conceptions of soul and death among the Egyptians. In this way he can offer *interpretationes graecae* of Isiac rituals, for which Demeter (and also Dionysos, here understood as the Greek counterpart of Osiris) is mostly an aid in decoding (2.123).

The etiology that the historian later provides for the Thesmophoria is not exactly of the same type as the instances mentioned earlier (2.171). In this passage, which is concerned with the rituals surrounding Osiris, Herodotus refers to practices that he calls *musteria* and that he deems to be the origin of the Athenian festival known as the Thesmophoria. For that reason, the historian restrains himself from providing further details, because he considers that, just as with the parallel Greek ceremonies and rituals, the several procedures associated with the ritual at issue, being mysteries, should remain as such while avoiding disclosure or exposure. Herodotus here reveals his scruples and respect for the sacred, which does not mean, however, that he necessarily shared the beliefs associated with the ritual.⁹ Along the same lines, since he held that part of the Greeks' rituals and beliefs were rooted in Egypt, the historian suggests that it must have been the Danaids who took these *teletai* to Hellas (Hdt. 2.171). Therefore, it is not merely a Greek

reading of Egyptian religious phenomena at issue, but an Egyptian etiology for the Greek ritual.

In another passage in Book V, Herodotus presents a complementary version of the origin of Demeter's mysteries, where the goddess is classified under the epithet of *Akhaia* ('the painful'), as she was known in the Peloponnese (see Arist. *Ach.* 709; Plut. *Is. et Os.* 69 [Mor. 378E]). Here we read that the Gephyraeans, the clan to which the tyrannicides Harmodios and Aristogeiton belonged, were of Phoenician origin, that their ancestors taught the alphabet to the Greeks, and that their descendants built temples with restricted access at Athens for the cult of Demeter and for the respective celebration of the mysteries (Hdt. 5.58, 61). With these references, Herodotus signals his conviction that these rituals were of oriental origin, although this is a controversial issue among historians still to this day.¹⁰ Nevertheless, it should be recognized that the Herodotean understanding of Demeter as an important transcultural deity influenced his receptivity toward a report such as that provided by Dikaaios.

In these passages, Herodotus also marks a process of differentiation of motifs in the references he makes to Demeter. In some parts of his work he refers to the goddess of crops (as well as other Greek deities) as only a Hellenic expression of what was ultimately an Egyptian religious category (that is, the name, the origin, or the essential mythological contexts of the goddess). In other settings, the historian introduces Demeter into the narrative not because of the inherent mythical-religious nature of the deity, but essentially on account of political circumstances, in which the role of the goddess or her domain of action or influence are pertinent to the context of the narrative process to which he is dedicated at the moment in question. It is precisely in this second subject or category that Demeter becomes more interesting to our investigation, because she assumes a unique cultural and primarily socio-political importance that can be summarized in a single inquiry: 'What was the importance of Demeter and her cult to Herodotus and for the Greeks of his time?'

An example of this second perspective on the goddess of cereals and crops is in Book VI. In the context of a digression on the Spartan royal families, Herodotus reports that one of the Eurypontids, Demaratos – precisely the same man who would become one of the protagonists of the aforementioned episode on the Thriasian Plain (Hdt. 8.65) – was accused of illegitimacy by the other Spartan king, the Agiad Kleomenes. This was so that Demaratos would be considered ineligible for the kingship, and thus be removed from power (Hdt. 6.64–69). Herodotus claims that the hostility between the pair dated back to the invasion of Attica by the Spartans; Demaratos had abandoned the campaign at Eleusis, owing to a disagreement over policy, and this had ended the invasion (Hdt. 5.74–76). Following this difference between the two kings, according to Herodotus, the Spartans would establish a rule never to authorize the simultaneous departure of the two kings for war. The hostility between both would intensify when Kleomenes decided to intervene against the Aiginetans because they had become supporters of the Persians (Hdt. 6.64). Thereupon, the Kleomenes decided to conspire against Demaratos, convincing another member of the Eurypontid family, Leotykhidas, to support him in his disputing his

opponent's legitimacy, achieving this by means of offering him the possibility of occupying the position of the eventually deposed Demaratos in the dyarchy (Hdt. 6.65). Within a context of intensified political hostility, Leotykhidas accepted the offer and accused Demaratos of being the illegitimate son of the previous king. Aiming to know the truth about Demaratos' origin, the Spartans decided to consult the Delphic oracle, but Kleomenes bribed the Pythia to declare publicly the illegitimacy of the Demaratos' succession to the throne (Hdt. 6.65–66).

Following this conspiracy, Demaratos was deposed, eventually abandoned Sparta, and joined the Persians and King Darius by whom he was particularly welcomed (Hdt. 6.67–70). Leotykhidas took Demaratos' place on the Spartan throne and, together with Kleomenes, in 491 BC, intervened on Aigina to punish the Aiginetans for having supported the Persians (Hdt. 6.73). At this time, the two Spartan kings took ten prominent Aiginetans hostages, handing them over to the Athenians. Meanwhile, the conspiracy against Demaratos had been discovered, and Kleomenes fled from Sparta to Arkadia, where he conceived a plan to seek revenge from the Spartans. Fearing the consequences, they decided to accept Kleomenes home again. The king, however, went insane and ended up committing suicide (Hdt. 6.75).¹¹

Herodotus presents three then current opinions among the Hellenes about the causes for Kleomenes' fate. For many Greeks, the king's madness and suicide arose from the fact that he had bribed the Pythia when Demaratos had been deposed. For the Argives, however, the cause of the Spartan king's fate was Kleomenes' ambush and murder of the Argive soldiers who had sought refuge as supplicants in a sacred wood, thus disrespecting that those harbouring there had been placed under a deity's protection, as well as his polluting the sanctity of the location itself, which he subsequently ordered to be set on fire (cf. Hdt. 6.76–84).¹² Still for the Athenians, Kleomenes' madness and cruel death derived from the invasion of Eleusis and the defiling of the sanctuary of the two goddesses (Hdt. 6.75; cf. 5.74–76).

Herodotus does not choose any explanation immediately, presenting all three to his audience. However, common in all of them is the quality of *hybris*, of excessive behaviour toward the established order, in this case a religious dispensation, which is defied and transgressed, leading to the destruction of the transgressor. However, it is not accidental that the historian presents still a fourth reason for the Spartan king's madness, far more pragmatic and physiological, and less mystical (thus relevant for Herodotus' perception of religious influences) than the preceding ones: Kleomenes became insane not through a divine force, but because, by influence of the Scythians, he had become addicted to drinking pure wine (not diluted in water, as it was customary for the Greeks to drink). Therefore, for the Spartans Kleomenes would have become an alcoholic, leading him to mental imbalance and eventual suicide (Hdt. 6.84). Still, the historian makes sure to point out the case of Demaratos and how his treatment explains Kleomenes' punishment (Hdt. 6.84.3). In any event, it seems relevant to us that the Athenians preferred the idea that Kleomenes' transgression was related to Eleusis and the profanation of the sanctuary of Demeter and Persephone.

In the same Book VI, another passage refers to a similar situation in formal terms. As in the previous case, it is not related to Demeter's mythology, but to the relevance of her cult. Herodotus tells us that, after Kleomenes' death, the Aiginetans tried to achieve the release of the hostages, who had been delivered to the Athenians, by demanding Leotykhidas' cooperation (Hdt. 6.85). The Athenians, however, were reluctant to deliver up the hostages. The Aiginetans reacted by capturing an Athenian ship near Cape Sounion with some important persons on board, trying to acquire assets for an exchange of captives. The Athenians, nonetheless, responded by cooperating with a revolt led by Nikodromos, an elite Aiginetan dissatisfied with the island's oligarchy. Yet, the uprising of Nikodromos and his allies was suppressed by the Aiginetan regime. The Aiginetans took the rebels out of the city for the purpose of killing them. This event tarnished the Aiginetans with a sacrilege that, according to Herodotus, would lead to their expulsion from their Aigina by the Athenians in 431 BC (Hdt. 6.91):

What happened was that they were in the process of taking seven hundred prisoners out of the town for execution when one of them broke free of his chains and took refuge at the porch of the temple of Demeter the Lawgiver, where he seized the door handles and hung on to them. They could not get him to let go by pulling him away from the door, so they chopped off his hands and took him away for execution like that – while his hands remained gripping the handles.

As in the previous case, the excessive act (*hybris*) is here defined also by disrespect to what was deemed sacred, namely the idea that an individual could place himself under the protection of a sanctuary, choosing to hand his life over to it and to its guardian deity, and that act would be respected by his fellow citizens.¹³ The Aiginetans had not respected the idea of sanctuary, and were thus punished.¹⁴ It is also significant that Herodotus mentions the term *thesmophoros* as epithet of Demeter on Aigina. This name emphasizes the goddess' attribute as 'legislator' or 'law, norm, or custom enforcer', focussing on the social ordinances of an agrarian society.

Herodotus also refers to Demeter Thesmophoros in the context of his narrative on Miltiades – one of the Athenian generals in the Battle of Marathon in 490 BC. The historian tells that, because of this military success, Miltiades gained special prominence in Athens. Taking advantage of that situation, he decided to conduct an expedition against the Parians and, to this end, requested human and material commitments from his Athenian compatriots without, however, revealing to them the whole project, only brandishing the possibility of returning from the enterprise enriched with gold. Herodotus mentions that Miltiades was actually moved by a desire to feed his resentment and satisfy personal revenge. When the Athenians reached Paros, however, the Parians decided to resist, and were besieged. It is in this context that, according to Herodotus (basing himself on Parian sources), a war prisoner named Timo appears, who was also the priestess for Demeter and Persephone, mentioned in the text as "chthonic goddesses" (*khthoniōn theōn*: Hdt.

6.134.1). Timo's advice to Miltiades was that if his intention was to take Paros, then he should act as she told him.

Following the meeting, Miltiades went to the hill located in front of the city and tried to enter the sanctuary of Demeter Thesmophoros. As he could not open the temple's doors, Miltiades decided to jump over the wall and enter the temple's *megaron* 'chamber', possibly steal some sacred object. However, as he approached the doors, Miltiades was struck by a negative feeling that made him return along the path by which he had come. Then, when leaping over the wall again, Miltiades injured his hip, according to some, or his knee, according to others. At any rate, unsuccessful, Miltiades withdrew back to Athens where the Athenians accused him of *apatē* 'deception'. In the end, the general ended up dying of gangrene, stemming from the injury sustained when leaving the temple of Demeter.

In turn, the Parians decided to punish the priestess of the two goddesses, for allegedly having aided Miltiades to conquer Paros and revealing the "sacred mysteries prohibited to men" (Hdt. 6.135.2). After having consulted the Delphic oracle, however, the Pythia stated that Timo was innocent, because what appeared before Miltiades would have been a spectre of the priestess and not herself. However, the general was fated to end poorly, and the apparition bearing Timo's image would only have been the triggering element of that process, leading him to a predefined end (Hdt. 6.134–6).

The proffered explanation for the appearance of Timo's 'clone' (or *eidōlon*) reminds us, naturally, of the discussion not only by Herodotus himself, in a long section in Book II, commenting on the journey of Helen to Egypt (2.112–20) where she was separated from Paris,¹⁵ but also by the lyric poet Stesichorus who had Helen replaced in the company of Paris by an *eidōlon* (frs. 15–16, *PMG* 192–3). Effectively, as D. Leão notes following other researchers, the possibility must be taken into account that the oracle mentioned by Herodotus was spurious and simply created, possibly even by the Parians, perhaps on the basis of the traditions around figures such as Aeneas and Helen. Yet, as the same scholar appropriately notes, for Herodotus, Miltiades' marked fate also functions to lessen the impact caused by an inglorious end for one who had been and should have continued to be one of Athens' heroes in the fight against the Persians.¹⁶ Besides, lest we forget, there is the Herodotean practice of invoking divine intervention in order to absolve an individual from responsibility.¹⁷

The references to Demeter in Book VI are, thus, essentially circumstantial, even if not necessarily without a wider sense in the work's general scope. In these sections, the goddess is revealed under several aspects, but mostly as avenger and patron of multiple spaces disseminated throughout Hellas, from Athens and Eleusis to Aigina, continuing to Paros. Another aspect of these references is their occasional tendency to allude to the issue of gender segregation in the scope of Demeter's cult.¹⁸

The panhellenic identity-function of Demeter in Herodotus

Another noteworthy reference to Demeter within this essentially political circumstantial framework, is the one in Book IX, which was mentioned at the beginning

of this study (Hdt. 9.65) and with which we must relate three other references made in *Histories*. Effectively, it seems to us that it is within this context that we may defend the idea that Herodotus, on his own initiative or motivated by the political circumstances experienced during his inquiries, has either reflected a tradition on Demeter or transformed her into an emblem of identity intended to serve the idea of panhellenism.¹⁹

As we have noted, the section that contains the Thriasian ‘miracle’ appears within the narration of the events involving the Battle of Salamis of 480 BC (Hdt. 9.65). Along with the battles of Marathon (490 BC), Plataia (479 BC), and Mykale (479 BC), this confrontation has been recognized since antiquity as one of the key moments in Hellas’ struggle with the Persian enemy.²⁰ Boedeker even claims that these were events that shaped the identity of the Hellenes.²¹ In this sense, we may call the battles Greece’s foundational struggles. Recently, Whitmarsh has described them as part of a collective Greek mythology, especially one that is filtered by an Athenian perspective.²² Therefore, we deem it relevant that in the Herodotean treatment of three of these battles, there are repeatedly references to Demeter and her respective cults.

In effect, what we read in Book VIII corresponds to a type of miracle, translating an idea of divine intervention, on the one hand apparently strange to Herodotus’ religious thought, given that in *Histories* we never find gods intervening in a Homeric manner, but on the other hand, perfectly consistent with what we read in other parts of the *Histories*. Besides, it is possible to uncover within the text, what we may call an ideological agenda that, as we will try to demonstrate, seems to feature the idea of panhellenism and of a “pan-Hellas” defeating Persian barbarity.

Let us resume our discussion at the moment in which two Greek renegades (an Athenian and a Spartan) see on Eleusis’ horizon what appears to be a group of 30,000 people shouting Iakkhos’ invocation (Hdt. 8.65). This episode, which Boedeker calls the “phantom Eleusinian procession”,²³ evidently referred to the ceremony consisting of the procession that was made in autumn, along the known Via Sacra or Sacred Way, and in which the so-called ‘holy things’ associated with Demeter and Persephone were transported (cf. *Ar. Ran.* 398–413). The manner in which the episode – later referenced by Plutarch in *Themistocles* (*Them.* 15) in a clear reference to Herodotus – is narrated suggests a marked symbolic-metaphorical charge that must not be ignored.

First, the idea that this procession would comprise 30,000 participants certainly alludes to the *mustai* and *epoptai* that annually formed the march, which marked the beginning of the celebrations associated with the mysteries of Eleusis.²⁴ As has been noted, 30,000 is a figure that may be related to the total number of Athenian citizens at the time of Herodotus. Understood in this way, the reference to that amount of individuals surely indicates that the Athenians joined the festivities in honour of the two goddesses *en masse*, such was its importance to the city of Athens (see Plut. *Alcib.* 34), even if that may not seem materially possible.²⁵ Then, note the fact that that the two Greek renegades are actually experiencing this divine intervention. The Spartan Demaratos exhibits an inconceivable ignorance

of the phenomenon, and this provides Herodotus an opportunity to allow it to be explained by Dikaïos as a prophecy. At last, Herodotus stresses precisely this prophetic quality that the Athenian provided in his explanation: if the praise chant of Iakkhos reached the Peloponnese, then the Persian king and his army would be in danger; if, on the contrary, it reached the ships based on Salamis, then the Persian fleet would be threatened (Hdt. 9.65.3-6). As we know historically, this second possibility was the one realized, as revealed in the Greek victory.

It is relevant that the figures of Demeter and Persephone are associated with the victory at Salamis, where, unlike Plataia, there was no sanctuary dedicated to the goddesses. Thus, the anecdote about the alleged Thriasian miracle, in effect, makes the association. This relevance in the realm of cult is implicit in Herodotus' explanation of the number of individuals participating, corresponding to the celebrants (and the total number of Athenians) who in the vision participate in the procession.

Concomitantly, we must observe that Eleusis is normally associated with Attica, which grants an even more expressive symbolic load to the episode. All the details, including the explanation placed in the mouth of Dikaïos the Athenian,²⁶ converge so that Athens become the *polis* primarily associated with the episode: the staging at Eleusis, the connection to Athens through the Via Sacra and the Eleusinian procession, the number of individuals coinciding with that of the Athenian civic body, and the prophetic explanation by Dikaïos. As noted by How and Wells, not all Athenian citizens were initiated or initiates in the mysteries.²⁷ Therefore the reference can only be a sort of metonymy, almost in rhetorical exaggeration by Herodotus, where men and women or Athenians and foreign celebrants are rendered equivalent to male citizens. His purpose might be to show that the city as a whole could manifest itself at the moment of the ceremony. Thus, ultimately, the celebration of Eleusis' mysteries is conflated with Athens and, accordingly, it is Athens that becomes the prophetic entity earning victory at Salamis.

It is clear that the Greeks' victory at Salamis was the result of cooperation among a number of Hellenic cities. But Herodotus' report stresses the capital importance of Athens in this process, in a framework in which both goddesses of panhellenic significance would gain special relevance by operating in their primary Eleusinian sphere. Thus, the impact of an ideology of panhellenism, headed by Athens, appears particularly strong in Herodotus' text.

Finally, the relevance of the episode is also reflected by its arising from supernatural prompting, springing out of divine origin. It emerges from within Eleusis itself and, as such, is probably rooted in the influence of the local goddesses. Boedeker goes further, recognizing in the report in 8.84–85, where the *phasma* 'apparition' of a woman incited the Greeks to fight at Salamis, an epiphany by Demeter (and not Athena as some have thought).²⁸

In fact, this idea seems to be reinforced by other instances of the cult of Demeter in Herodotus' text. When he describes the geography of the Thermopylai, the historian clearly mentions that in the environs of that place (probably in Anthele) there was a temple dedicated to Demeter Amphictyonis (Hdt. 7.200.2).²⁹ Despite the defeat of the Spartan Leonidas and his companions in the pass along the

Malian Gulf in the spring of 480 BC, Thermopylai had become a great moment and mark of the heroic resistance of Hellas to the Persian advance. Thus, it does seem significant in our analysis that the historian explicitly mentions the proximity of Demeter's temple in the immediate region. The fact that Demeter is qualified in this passage as *amphiktyonis*, that is, protector of the Delphic confederacy of *poleis*, further draws our perspective to the horizon of panhellenism.

Herodotus also alludes to the worship of Demeter during the narration of the Battle of Plataia, located north of the Thriasian plain of Eleusis, on the border with Boiotia. There, in 479 BC with the support of a disciplined hoplite phalanx, the Spartan Pausanias and the Athenian Aristides defeated the Persians. Herodotus mentions that the most intense part of the confrontation between Hellenes and Persians happened precisely near the goddess' temple (Hdt. 9.62.2).³⁰ The battle ended with a Greek victory that, the historian emphasizes, also avenged the death of Leonidas at Thermopylai (Hdt. 9.64.1; 78). In this sense, Plataia functions as the conclusion or final stage of the battle at Thermopylai. In this framework, the references to Hera (Hdt. 9.61.3) and Demeter have particular relevance, because they appear almost subliminally as divine interventions during the course of the events. And while, in the case of Hera, Herodotus even claims that it was following prayers of Pausanias to the goddess that the results of the fight started to be favourable to the Greeks (Hdt. 9.62.1), in the case of Demeter the historian is even more assertive and suggestive: despite the fight having taken place near the goddess' sanctuary, "not a single Persian, as it turned out, either entered the precinct or died in there" (Hdt. 9.65; the same sanctuary is mentioned later in the context of the same battle: Hdt. 9.69.1). Immediately afterward, Herodotus felt the need to justify this statement in claiming: "I think the goddess herself kept them away because they had burnt her temple in Eleusis" (Hdt. 9.65).³¹

This reflection by Herodotus is significant for two reasons. The first is related to the ambivalent attitude, almost opportunistic, that the historian has adopted toward the divine, which has already been stressed by several students of Herodotus, out of whom we note Harrison.³² The second rationale draws force from my analysis earlier: Herodotus chose to exhibit Demeter as an especially protective goddess of the Hellenes in their fight against the Iranian forces. Also, Plataia meant a significant win for Hellas; therefore, by granting the goddess of agriculture the relevance we read in the text, Herodotus is, once again by association, accrediting her with a protagonist's role in the maintenance of independence and freedom for the Greeks.³³ This leading role for Demeter is reinforced when Herodotus proposes a reason for the goddess' 'behaviour' on this occasion by raising the possibility of retaliation for the Persians having set fire to Demeter's sanctuary at Eleusis. In truth, this is the historian's first and only reference to this fire. Yet it is quite possible it occurred during the looting of Attica by Xerxes in 480 BC, just as, according to Herodotus, Thespias and Plataia were set afire, and Athens itself was destroyed (Hdt. 8.50).

Nevertheless, it should seem important to us that the author of *Histories* expresses a cause and effect relation between the supposed fires and the supernatural lack of Persian casualties in Demeter's sanctuary in Plataia. The phenomenon

is understood as the rejection by the goddess of actions or factors, such as death and the dead bodies of the Persian enemies, which could pollute her territory. In fact, this association follows an idea present in other passages in the historian's work: acts of sacrilege are always punished by deities as an expression of cosmic justice.³⁴

The third reference to Demeter during the hostilities between Greeks and Persians is one that assured the definitive expulsion of the Persians from the Hellenic territory and involves the confrontation at Mykale. At this point, it must be mentioned that, according to the tradition, the battle took place on the Ionian coast, near Samos and Miletos, precisely on the same day of the clash at Plataia. It is possible, however, that the coincidence of the date is nothing more than historiographical rhetoric, taken up subsequently by learned or popular tradition, that intended to dramatize the importance of these events in the fight against the enemies of Greece. Yet it is also significant how Herodotus builds his narrative around these events and their synchronicity. In fact, apparently, the historian interprets the coincidence of the events as a sign of providential intervention in human affairs.³⁵

After the Persians' retreat to the Ionian coast, Leotykhidas takes the command of the Greek fleet which, making landfall at Mykale, attack the enemy destroying their ships. Herodotus tells the episode with some detail: once in Ionia, the Persians pass through the sanctuary that the historian identifies as being of the 'Mistresses' or 'Ladies' (τὸ τῶν Πορνείων ἱρὸν).³⁶ The reader is directed afterwards to the temple of Demeter Eleusinia which, according to the historian, would have been instituted by Philistos on the occasion of the foundation of Miletos (Hdt. 9.97). Near the temple of Demeter Eleusinia, the Persians then built a palisade of rock and wood, waiting for the Hellenes to strike (Hdt. 9.102.1). A force of mostly Athenians and Spartans had disembarked at Mykale and were preparing to attack the Persians, when they got news that, at Plataia, the Greeks had been victorious over Mardonios (Hdt. 9.100). At this point, Herodotus' reflection is particularly relevant to our inquiry (Hdt. 9.100.2):

There is plenty of convincing evidence that the divine plays a part in human affairs. Consider how, on this occasion, with the Persian defeat at Plataia and their imminent defeat at Mykale happening on the same day, a rumour of Plataia reached the Greeks at Mykale, boosting their morale and making them even more willing to face danger.

Following this note, Herodotus reinforces the judgment that divine providence is present in history, without this concept absolutely coinciding with the figuration of the Homeric gods. The historian then points out two other coincidences between the battles that occurred at Plataia and Mykale: both of them had taken place on sacred spaces dedicated to Demeter (Hdt. 9.101.1) and both of them resulted in victories for the Hellenes (Hdt. 9.106). The relation between the two factors is, naturally, created from the Herodotean report. In fact, the goddess' protection had already been implied chapters before, when, apropos of the imminence of

Mardonios' attack, the historian reports that the Spartans – who according to the text wished the best for Hellas (Hdt. 9.19.1) – and Athenians united and organized themselves to face the Persian threat. When passing through Eleusis, the confederate armies would have made sacrifices, supposedly to Demeter and Persephone, having obtained favourable omens for the common enterprise (Hdt. 9.19.2).

Conclusion

Following Boedeker, we must conclude that the great battles in which the Greeks defeated the Persians – Salamis, Plataia, and Mykale – are described by Herodotus in clear association with Eleusis and Demeter.³⁷ To those conflicts we add Thermopylai, which, despite not being a canonical victory, is the founding battle of 'Greek liberty' and a central step in the process of resistance to the eastern invader. In this sense, the Thermopylai is a kind of foundational defeat that, nonetheless, in Herodotus is also related to Demeter. This seems to us another important issue since the heroes of the Thermopylai are essentially Spartans, who have thus become closer to the agriculture goddess, particularly in her Eleusinian expression, which was essentially Attic.³⁸

So, it seems to us likely that, regardless of Herodotus' belief or disbelief in deities such as Demeter, there is in the historian's text an intentionality that coincides with his historiographical material and with the value judgments expressed by the *personae* of the *Histories*. That intentionality was based on the idea that the agriculture goddess was a deity of panhellenic character who became fundamental for the victory of the Greeks over the Persians. It is not unlikely that this proposition was grounded in a trans-Herodotean tradition that made Demeter, and Eleusinian Demeter in particular, the protective goddess of the Hellenes in the Greek–Persian clash. This perspective would be parallel to the Delphic tradition, which alternatively presented Apollo (a deity with particular manifestations in the Spartan context³⁹) as the protective god of the Greeks in the confrontation against the Persians, an interpretation that is also present in the historian's work (Hdt. 8.121–122; 9.81.1).⁴⁰ Moreover, it also seems to us unquestionable that Herodotus utilizes disparate traditions that existed in service of an ideology that sought to uncover the identity of the Greeks through mytho-religious elements that linked them. Eleusis' Demeter provided one of them. Just as Delphi, Eleusis was an appropriate space for the disclosure of panhellenic attitudes.⁴¹

Then what explains this dependence on Demeter, who is not even a martial goddess?⁴² Why not reinforce what militant capacity was acknowledged in Apollo? Possibly because Apollo was too Spartan⁴³ and would not be Athenian enough, and Herodotus on Demeter seems to operate mainly so that the focus could be placed on Athens. This being so, then why not Athena, who besides all else was a war goddess? Certainly, this was because Athena was too Athenian,⁴⁴ with a risk of, for that reason, not being accepted in a panhellenic perspective by the remaining *poleis*, especially in the Peloponnese, as a supra-*polis* deity for the Hellenes and thus serving as a factor for establishing the Hellenic identity. On the other hand, Demeter, particularly Demeter Eleusinia, albeit still associated to Attica,

would be ideal to perform this function in a more consensual manner; that is, an Athenian emphasis without an Athens too exposed or obvious; almost subliminal. Effectively, Demeter seems to take a more or less tacit, more or less explicit, panhellenic character as an ethnic identifier. Hence also derives Herodotus' interest in explaining the involvement by both Athenians and Spartans in the aforementioned sections, and in mentioning the goddess' sanctuaries, scattered throughout the Greek world, regardless of the epithet associated with her locally.

We must not forget that Eleusis and the cult of Demeter had assumed the role both of a legitimizer of territorial control and of a signifier of Greekness, as is shown by the number of cults and sanctuaries dedicated to the goddess spread throughout Hellas (even if the epithet 'Eleusinia' was not always used to characterize the goddess locally).⁴⁵ In fact, the common practice often was that a deity assumed for itself characteristics, and, therefore, epithets, that translated or imitated the historic or physical, political, or social idiosyncrasies of each location. This fact favoured, naturally, a general acceptance of Demeter as a goddess of identity for the Greeks, surely far more than Athena, a goddess especially associated with Athens in the fifth century and, therefore, a possible generator of conflicts of interest among the other *poleis*.⁴⁶

Furthermore, the efforts from Athens aiming to boost the political character of Eleusis would have also favoured this process. Eleusis' association with Athens was old. As we have already noted, the location of the sanctuary must have been integrated with the Athenian *polis* relatively soon, dating back, at least to the eighth century BC or even to a previous period (some suggest the thirteenth century BC or the Mycenaean period⁴⁷). However, the augmentation and development of the mystery rituals must be deeply associated with the Athenian domination.⁴⁸ Note that, according to *Athenaion Politeia*, the organization of the Eleusinian festivals depended on Athens' archon *basileus* ([Aris.] *Ath. Pol.* 57.1). In addition, the procession throughout the more than 30 kilometres of the Via Sacra was intended to mark that integration of the Eleusinian cult in Athens, or even, as noted by some commentators, to compensate for a potential flaw in the definitive transfer of the cult to Athens, which discrepancy may have also be reflected in the subdivision of the ritual into the Minor Mysteries, celebrated in Athens, and the Greater Mysteries, celebrated at Eleusis, on different occasions within the year.⁴⁹ If the transfer process, however, was imperfect ritually, the continual reinforcement of the association between Eleusis and Athens did not fail.⁵⁰

Boedeker reminds us that, in 430 BC, at the same time that the Athenians invited those who were not contributing first fruits to Eleusis to do so, Athens decreed that all its allies were to annually send Demeter Eleusinia their first fruits (*IG I³ 78.24–26*).⁵¹ Simultaneously, in Athenian art, there appear representations of Triptolemos as an emissary sent by the goddess through the world to spread agriculture and her cult.⁵² This can be understood as a mechanism for the Greeks to assume the tight bond to their land, like the Athenians did with their own. Worshipping Demeter naturalized them as aboriginals. Behind these measures, there could only be a political agenda of panhellenic character that promoted the goddess of agriculture, that must be linked to what we have analyzed for Herodotus.

Shortly afterwards, Isocrates would state that the Mysteries and the growing of cereals were two gifts from Demeter that humankind received through Athens.⁵³ And Nilsson has already claimed that the Thesmophoria, connected with Demeter Thesmophoros, was the mostly widely disseminated festival and cult throughout the Greek world.⁵⁴

In any case, we are more particularly interested in highlighting the intrinsically Athenian character of Demeter Eleusinia, totally perceivable in the fifth century BC and precisely derived from those circumstances that we have seen illustrated in our references in Herodotus. By valuing Demeter in this context, it contributed toward the promotion of a panhellenism built on an idea of Athenocentrism, and that must be related to the association and admiration, however more or less objective we deem it, that the historian apparently had for this city.⁵⁵ Note, for example, how Herodotus accredits the Athenians with a defence of panhellenism amid assurance of their opposition to Persian autocracy (Hdt. 8.144.2):

Then again, there is the fact that we are all Greeks – one race speaking one language, with temples to the gods and religious rites in common, and with a common way of life. It would not be good for Athens to betray all this shared heritage.⁵⁶

As noted by Whitmarsh, there were formal mechanisms which enabled the establishment of a consolidated panhellenic perspective, such as the Olympic Games, the Delphic Oracle, and the common cultural investment in Homer's and Hesiod's poetry.⁵⁷ It seems to us that Eleusis and the cult to Demeter celebrated there may have fulfilled similar conditions for Greek integration, and, based on what we have analyzed in the *Histories*, Herodotus had contributed towards the promotion of yet another 'anti-imperialist' conceptualization that was grounded in Greek ethnic identity.⁵⁸

There is another aspect of Demeter that seems essential for understanding this issue. In Greek religious thought Demeter can be a chthonic goddess, Herodotus himself noting her as such (Hdt. 6.134). And this goddess of land and agriculture also takes the function of a deity that delineates borders, a characteristic in fact visible in Herodotean *logoi* (e.g., Hdt. 9.65). That role can be conflated with the idea of autochthony, so dear to the Greeks, especially the Athenians, mostly from the sixth century BC onwards.⁵⁹ As shown by Valdés Guía, it is more often Gaia who is the goddess who helps to establish the function of autochthony in Athenian thought.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, there is in Herodotus' references a series of elements which allow us to think of Demeter as a goddess focussed on defending territory, both in Attica in particular and Greece in general, in a fashion evoking autochthony or quasi-autochthony. Thus, by not allowing any dead Persian to stain her holy precinct in Plataia, Demeter symbolically expels the enemy from the Greek land, actualizing her peasant, rural, agrarian connections as a defender of her land (while encompassing common Greek territory). And if she is not exactly the chief goddess of autochthony, she is unquestionably a divinity who through her tutelage over agriculture binds the Greeks as an *ethnos* to their soil and so grants them an

invincible claim against Xerxes to their territories, as confirmed by Herodotus' text.⁶¹ By protecting her space, the goddess protects the whole of Hellas.⁶² She assists in fusing an idea of territory with ethnic identity, which in the case of the Greeks begins with language, but will eventually encompass other domains including religion in its cultural, ritual, and mythological aspects.

Herodotus himself acknowledges the central role of Athens and of the Athenians in the fight against the Persians (Hdt. 7.139).⁶³ But the fact that the historian acknowledges that importance does not ensure that contemporaries from the other Greek cities had also acknowledged it; therefore, the presentation of an ethnolinguistic-cultural identity and an integrative element such as the cult and symbolism of Demeter gains special sense and justification. As Harrison has noted, it does not seem that Demeter in Herodotus is particularly associated with revenge, while having a function in panhellenic identity and unity (as proposed by Boedeker).⁶⁴ Having Demeter in a central role in this process seems key also to Athens' being recognized as a leader in the fight against the Persians and as a mentor of Greek freedom, but not necessarily as their oppressor. Thus, themes associated with Demeter proved a significant element for Herodotus' historiographical project, which is also qualified by several remarkable political elements.⁶⁵

The interpretation of religion by Herodotus may be considered essentially providentialist and universalist, but sometimes even rationalist. By considering divine action as a logical regulation of the world and human actions,⁶⁶ the historian does not hesitate in using Demeter as a specific expression of the divine at work among Greeks. In a way, this position is linked with what Scullion called an "ambivalent attitude to custom and convention" and reflects the historian's recourse to the so-called uncertainty principle concerning religion.⁶⁷ The intervention of the divine does not work in the mode of myth-history, even if Immerwahr has defended the idea that the events portrayed in Book IX suggest that the historian "himself thought of the local gods as participating in the battle",⁶⁸ but through evoking ritualistic factors at the service of a pro-Athenian ideology, though one not yet necessarily 'imperialist'. Gods participate in the battle not in a Homeric manner with the physical presence of deities – Herodotus resists associating the divine with forms of corporeality, as noted by Scullion⁶⁹ – but in a more intelligible and providential form of divine action affecting human history.

Notes

- 1 All translations are adapted from Waterfield 2008. This research was developed under the project UID/ELT/00196/2013 of the Centre for Classical and Humanistic Studies, funded by the Portuguese FCT – Foundation for Science and Technology.
- 2 E.g., Shimron 1989: 37–9; Soares 2002: 31.
- 3 Soares 2002: 71, n. 124.
- 4 The same framework is suggested in tragic and comic theatre: see, e.g., Eur. *Ion* 1079–86; Arist. *Ran.* 316, 398–413.
- 5 On the meaning of the passage, see Scullion 2006: 198.
- 6 Whitmarsh 2016: 26.
- 7 See Scullion (2006: 197–8) who deems Herodotus a proponent of cultural dissemination.
- 8 In another passage of the same book (Hdt. 2.156.5–6), Herodotus refers to a lost tragedy by Aeschylus in which the Greek playwright presents Artemis as daughter

- of Demeter. The historian reasons that the poet would have done this because he was inspired by Egyptian tradition that considered (according to Herodotus) Apollo and Artemis as offspring of Dionysos and Isis. As Isis is identified as Demeter, Artemis, consequently, must be her daughter.
- 9 On Herodotus' relation with the religious and sacred in general, see Scullion 2006: 192–208; Harrison 2002; Mikalson 2012: 187–98.
 - 10 On this issue, see, e.g., Sourvinou-Inwood 1997: 132–64; Dietrich 1982: 445–71.
 - 11 On the character and death of Kleomenes, see Soares 2003: 448–61.
 - 12 On the offence about supplication in Herodotus, see Mikalson 2003: 73–4; on how the historian approaches the topic of sanctuaries, see Mikalson 2012: 187–98.
 - 13 Mikalson 2003: 73–4.
 - 14 On disrespect for the sacred space in Herodotus, see, e.g., Hdt. 8.129. The subject is particularly well discussed in Harrison 2002: 96–7, 169–73.
 - 15 See in this volume pp. 258–68. Also Euripides in 412 BC in the *Helen*, follows and develops that tradition, which built a justification for the less laudable actions of the Greek heroine, by stating that what had been conveyed to Troy would have been an image or *eidōlon* of the Spartan queen and not Helen herself, who had been retained in the country of the Nile (Eur. *Hel.* 30–5, 580–90; cf. Pl. *Rep.* 9.586B–C). We must not rule out the hypothesis of an intertextual process between Herodotus and Euripides' works. If the poet wrote the tragedy after the historian composed his work, the influence on the latter must be considered. Equally, the tragedy *Philoctetes* by Sophocles, presented in 409 BC, seems to contain elements from Miltiades' story, namely the gangrenous leg, despite the fact that the *Iliad* 2.716–720 already mentions the injury of Philoktetes. Perhaps we must consider, however, the possibility of the treatment in Herodotus having received earlier influences. Nor should we forget both that the subject of a malicious *eidōlon* already appeared in the *Iliad* when Apollo forges a double for Aeneas to confuse the enemy and thus save the hero (*Il.* 5.449–51), and that Helen's *eidōlon* dated back to Stesichorus at least (regarding which see, e.g., Oliveira 2015: 20–1; Pulquério 1973/1974: 265–73). Moreover, inside the universe of the *Histories*, we have another protagonist dying of gangrene, the madman Cambyses (following a wound in the corresponding place where he had wounded the sacred bull of the Egyptians, the god Apis; Hdt. 3.64–6). Consequently, both Herodotus and Euripides may have drawn on common thematic matrixes, regarding this subject. Regardless of whether the Parians were Herodotus' likely sources or not, there is an underlying literary *topos* that Herodotus reproduces (Hdt. 6.134). I thank our colleague C.L. Soares for commentary regarding this note.
 - 16 Leão & Ferreira 2000: 47.
 - 17 Harrison 2002: 228.
 - 18 See Larson 2007: 70–2.
 - 19 During the Persian Wars, a panhellenic sentiment and an ethnic consciousness increased among the Greeks, as we can read in Simonides, Pindar, and Aeschylus, but also in Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, and Thucydides. See Ferreira 1992: 299–460; Ferreira 2005: 15–42.
 - 20 Boedeker 2007: 67.
 - 21 Boedeker 2007: 65; Ferreira 2013: 275–313.
 - 22 Whitmarsh 2016: 72.
 - 23 Boedeker 2007: 69.
 - 24 On this ceremony, see Burkert 1983: 278–9; Bremmer 2014: 5–16.
 - 25 Soares 2002: 71, n. 127; also How & Wells 1928: 256–7.
 - 26 On Herodotus as narrator and how, in that quality, he approaches religion, see Scullion 2006: 197–8; Harrison 2002: 180–1.
 - 27 How & Wells 1928: 256–7.
 - 28 Boedeker 2007: 69.
 - 29 Scott 2015: 111–13, 204, 222.
 - 30 On archaeological traces of a sanctuary possibly dedicated to Demeter near Plataia, see Boedeker 2007: 67–8 and bibliography quoted there.

- 31 This reference contrasts with Hdt. 9.27.3, where it is mentioned that the Argive dead who had fallen in the expedition of the Seven against Thebes were buried in the sanctuary of Eleusis by the Athenians. Albeit Argives, these dead were nevertheless Hellenes (just as their Theban adversaries). In this context, it is relevant to mention, as D. Boedeker does (2007: 68), that in his *Aristeides*, Plutarch follows this tradition, alluding to Demeter Eleusinia as the deity in whose soil, according to the Delphic oracle, the Battle of Plataia must be fought (Plu. *Arist.* 11.3–7; cf. Paus. 9.4.3). In the section in question, apart from Demeter and Kore, other deities are mentioned, to whom the Greeks must pray for help for the victory over the Persians: Zeus, Hera, Pan, and the Sphragitides nymphs, apart from a series of venerable heroes. But it is regarding Demeter and her daughter, namely through the reference to the Eleusinian sanctuary, that Plutarch is emphatic. In this same chapter of the biography of Aristides (also one of the Attic generals at Marathon), Plutarch notes the Athenian hoplites, whom he led at Plataia, as well as the Spartans and remaining Hellenes, commanded by Pausanias, the overall commander.
- 32 Harrison 2002.
- 33 On the issue of freedom, see Moles 2002: 33–52.
- 34 Scullion 2006: 194; Whitmarsh 2016: 80–1; Harrison 2002: 102–7.
- 35 Niskanen 2004: 99.
- 36 Hdt. 9.97. Some editions of Herodotus (e.g., Marincola 2003: 593) identify the *Potniai* as the Eumenides; others, however (e.g., Strassler 2007: 712, n. 9.97.1a), identify them as Demeter and Persephone (see Soph. *OC* 1050, *Arist. Thesm.* 1149, and Paus. 9.8.1). It is likely that the ‘Ladies’ were in fact the Eleusinian goddesses, even if the following explicit reference to Demeter Eleusinia renders the meaning somewhat redundant.
- 37 Boedeker 2007.
- 38 Boedeker 2007: 67–9. Based on the work by Polemon, Boedeker claims that, apart from the referenced battles, Marathon (490) was also, in the Greek tradition, associated with Demeter and her daughter Persephone (Boedeker 2007: 72–4). Although this reference does not appear in Herodotus, there are reasons to think that the Greek tradition made that association.
- 39 Graf 2009: 116–20; Pettersson 1992.
- 40 See Boedeker 2007: 73–4; Mikalson 2012: 189–91, who refer to three panhellenic gods: Olympian Zeus, Isthmian Poseidon, and Delphian Apollo. In a certain manner, Plut. *Arist.* 11.3–7, by signalling that the Delphic oracle determined that the confrontation of Plataia would occur in realm of Demeter Eleusinia, implies a fusion of both traditions.
- 41 An idea already proposed by Boedeker 2007: 66.
- 42 Effectively, Nilsson already noted (1961: 24) that Demeter is a deity to whom the Homeric warriors paid little attention. She is mostly a peasants’ goddess.
- 43 Pettersson 1992.
- 44 On this aspect of Athena, see Deacy 2008: 74–91. One must recall however that, when Herodotus was writing his *logoi*, controversial cults of Athena Polias were being established by Athenian partisans among the allied cities. On this subject, see Deacy 2008: 99, 124.
- 45 Boedeker 2007: 66–8, 75–6; Clinton 1994: 161–72; Graf 1985: 273–8. Pausanias still accounts for that in the second century, as shown by the following examples: Attica: Paus. 1.1.4; 2.4; 13.7; 14.1; 22.3; 37.3–4; Corinth: 2.4.7; 11.3; 21.5; 34.8; 36.4; Lakonia: 3.20.5; 21.8; Messenia: 4.17.1; 31.9; Elis: 5.5.6; 6.21.1; Achaia: 7.21.4; 25.5; Arkadia: 8.8.1; 9.2; 25.2–4; 29.5; 35.7; 44.5; 53.7; 54.5; Boiotia: 9.24.2; Phokis: 10.33.6; 35.5.
- 46 The subject is suggested by Boedeker 2007: 76.
- 47 Padgug 1972: 148–50; Walton 1952: 108–9. Some, like Parke 1977: 57, consider that the incorporation took place c. 600 BC.
- 48 Padgug 1972: 135–50; Sourvinou-Inwood 1997: 132–64; Walton 1952: 112.

- 49 On this issue, see Padgug 1972: 145–6 and the bibliography discussed and quoted there; cf. Walton 1952: 110.
- 50 Sourvinou-Inwood 1997: 132–64.
- 51 Boedeker 2007: 75.
- 52 Through Triptolemos the goddess benefits the whole world and invites everyone to come to Eleusis and be initiated in order to obtain happiness in this life and the after-life. See Johnston 2013; Boedeker 2007: 75; Clinton 1992: 100–3; Raubitschek 1991: 229–38; Walton 1952: 106, 112.
- 53 Isoc. 4.28–31.
- 54 Nilsson 1957: 313; Nilsson 1961: 24.
- 55 Moles 2002: 49–52. This author pertinently notes that Herodotus admires Athens as defender of Greek liberty and condemns it as promoter of ‘imperialism’. In fact, Herodotus prefers a genuine panhellenism to this other option.
- 56 Identical arguments appear in 1.6.3; 7.138.1; 8.3.1.
- 57 Whitmarsh 2016: 19–20.
- 58 On account of these arguments, we stressed earlier the fact that the Athenians consider Kleomenes’ transgression toward Demeter as an assault on Athens. See Hdt. 6.84.
- 59 On this issue, see, e.g., Valdés Guía 2008.
- 60 Valdés Guía 2008: 47–88.
- 61 See Mikalson 2003: 126–7; Boedeker 2007: 78; see still Cole 1994: 199–216; Nilsson 1961: 24.
- 62 In this connection, note the relation and parallelism that Loraux established between the character of Persephone, daughter of Demeter in Athenian tradition, and Creusa, a mythological figure embodying paradigmatically the issue of Athenian autochthony. See Loraux 1990: 196–251 (esp. 245–7); see also Loraux 1996; Leão 2011: 105–22; Leão 2010: 445–64. We thank our colleague L.N. Ferreira for this helpful suggestion.
- 63 Moles 2002: 33–52.
- 64 Harrison 2002: 181; Boedeker 1988: 46.
- 65 Because of the clear mythological affinities between Demeter and Isis, namely the quest for a lost daughter/husband, perhaps it must not be overlooked that Demeter is identified with Isis, one of the more important deities of the Egyptian pantheon.
- 66 See Whitmarsh 2016: 80–1; Scullion 2006: 195; Harrison 2002: 177–81.
- 67 Scullion 2006: 192, 202; Harrison 2002: 191.
- 68 Immerwahr 1986: 295.
- 69 Scullion 2006: 202.

Bibliography

- Boedeker, D. 1988. “Protesilaos and the End of Herodotus’ ‘Histories’.” *Classical Antiquity* 7: 30–48.
- . 2007. “The View from Eleusis: Demeter in the Persian Wars.” In Bridges, E., Hall, E., & Rhodes, P.J., eds., *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium*. Oxford (Oxford University Press), 65–85.
- Bremmer, J. 2014. *Initiation into the Mysteries of the Ancient World*. Berlin (De Gruyter).
- Burkert, W. 1983. *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*. Berkeley, CA (University of California Press).
- Clinton, K. 1992. *Myth and Cult. The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Stockholm (Paul Åströms förlag).
- . 1994. “The Eleusinian Mysteries and Panhellenism in Democratic Athens.” In Coulson, W.D.E., et al., eds., *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica Under the Democracy*. Oxford (Oxford University Press), 161–72.

- Cole, S.G. 1994. "Demeter in the Ancient Greek City and Its Countryside." In Alcock, S.E., & Osborne, R., eds., *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*. Oxford (Clarendon Press), 199–216.
- Deacy, S. 2008. *Athena*. London (Routledge).
- Dietrich, B. 1982. "The Religious Prehistory of Demeter's Eleusinian Mysteries." In Bianchi, U., & Vermaseren, M.J., eds., *La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'impero Romano*. Leiden (Brill), 445–71.
- Ferreira, J.R. 1992. *Hélade e Helenos: Génese e Evolução de um Conceito*. Coimbra (Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica, Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos da Universidade de Coimbra).
- . 2005. "Hélade, Pan-Helenismo e Identidade Helénica." In Fialho, M.C., Sousa e Silva, M.F., Rocha Pereira, M.H. da, coords., eds., *Génese e Consolidação da Ideia de Europa: Vol. I: De Homero ao Fim da Época Clássica*. Coimbra (Imprensa da Universidade), 15–42.
- Ferreira, L.N. 2013. *Mobilidade poética na Grécia Antiga: Uma leitura da obra de Simónides*. Coimbra (Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra).
- Graf, F. 1985. *Nordionische Kulte: Religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulte von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia*. Zürich (Schweizerisches Institut in Rom).
- . 2009. *Apollo*. London (Routledge).
- Harrison, T. 2002. *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus*. Oxford (Oxford University Press).
- How, W.W. & Wells, J. 1928. *A Commentary on Herodotus With Introduction and Appendixes II*. Oxford (Clarendon Press).
- Immerwahr, H.R. 1986. *Form and Thought in Herodotus*. Atlanta, GA (Scholars Press).
- Johnston, S.I. 2013. "Demeter, Myths, and the Polyvalence of Festivals." *History of Religions* 52: 370–401.
- Larson, J. 2007. *Ancient Greek Cults: A Guide*. London (Routledge).
- Leão, D.F. 2010. "Cidadania, autoctonia e posse de terra na Atenas Democrática." *Cadmo* 20: 445–64.
- . 2011. "Autoctonia, filiação legítima e cidadania no 'Íon' de Eurípidés." *Humanitas* 63: 105–22.
- Leão, D.F. & Ferreira, J.R. 2000. "Introdução." In *Heródoto: Histórias, Livro 6º*. Lisboa (Edições 70).
- Loraux, N. 1990. *Les enfants d'Athéna: Idées athéniennes sur la citoyenneté et la division des sexes*. Paris (Éditions du Seuil).
- . 1996. *Né de la terre: mythe et politique à Athènes*. Paris (Éditions du Seuil).
- Marincola, J.M. 2003. "Introduction." In *Herodotus: The Histories*. Translated by A. Sélincourt. London (Penguin).
- Mikalson, J.D. 2003. *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars*. Chapel Hill, NC (North Carolina University Press).
- . 2012. "Religion in Herodotus." In Bakker, E.J., De Jong, I.J.F., & van Wees, H., eds., *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden (Brill), 187–98.
- Moles, J. 2002. "Herodotus and Athens." In Bakker, E.J., De Jong, I.J.F., & van Wees, H., eds., *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden (Brill), 33–52.
- Nilsson, M.P. 1957. *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der attischen*. Darmstadt (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).
- . 1961. *Greek Folk Religion*. Philadelphia, PA (University of Pennsylvania Press).

- Niskanen, P. 2004. *The Human and the Divine in History: Herodotus and the Book of Daniel*. London (T & T Clark International).
- Oliveira, A.C.J.N. 2015. "Estudo introdutório." In *Eurípides: Helena*. Coimbra & São Paulo (Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra/Annablume), 11–105.
- Padgug, R.A. 1972. "Eleusis and the Union of Attika." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 13: 135–50.
- Parke, H.W. 1977. *The Festivals of the Athenians*. London (Thames & Hudson).
- Pettersson, M. 1992. *Cults of Apollo at Sparta: The Hyakinthia, the Gymnopaïdai and the Karneia*. Stockholm (Paul Åströms Förlag).
- Pulquério, M.O. 1973/1974. "O problema das duas palinódias de Estesícoro." *Humanitas* 25–26: 265–73.
- Raubitschek, A.E. 1991. "The Mission of Triptolemos." In Obbink, D., & Waerdt, P.A.V., eds., *The School of Hellas: Essays on Greek History, Archaeology and Literature*. Oxford (Oxford University Press), 229–38.
- Scott, M. 2015. *Delfos. Historia del Centro del Mundo Antiguo*. Barcelona (Editorial Planeta).
- Scullion, S. 2006. "Herodotus and Greek Religion." In Dewald, C., & Marincola, J., eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*. Cambridge (Cambridge University Press), 192–208.
- Shimron, B. 1989. *Politics and Belief in Herodotus*. Stuttgart (Steiner)
- Soares, C. & Ferreira, J.R. 2002. *Heródoto: Histórias, Livro 8º*. Lisboa (Edições 70).
- Soares, C. 2003. *A morte em Heródoto: Valores universais e particularismos étnicos*. Lisboa (Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian).
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1997. "Reconstructing Change: Ideology and the Eleusinian Mysteries." In Golden, M., & Toohey, P., eds., *Inventing Ancient Culture: Historicism, Periodization, and the Ancient World*. London (Routledge), 132–64.
- Strassler, R.B., ed. 2007. *The Landmark Herodotus: The Histories*. New York, NY (Anchor Books).
- Valdés Guía, M. 2008. *El nacimiento de la autoctonía ateniense: cultos, mitos cívicos y sociedad de la Atenas del s. VI a.C.* Madrid (Universidad Complutense de Madrid).
- Walton, F.R. 1952. "Athens, Eleusis, and the Homeric Hymn to Demeter." *Harvard Theological Review* 45: 105–14.
- Waterfield, R., ed. 2008. *Herodotus: The Histories*. Oxford (Oxford University Press).
- Whitmarsh, T. 2016. *Battling the Gods: Atheism in the Ancient World*. London (Faber & Faber).

