



## CHAPTER 1

### *ΜΙΑΣΜΑ AND ΚΑΘΑΡΣΙΣ*

#### PURIFYING IMPURITY AND POLLUTED PURIFICATION

*καθαίρονται δ' ἄλλω αἵματι μαινόμενοι*  
(Heracleitus DK 22B5)

*Καθαίρονται δ' ἄλλω αἵματι μαινόμενοι οἷον εἴ τις εἰς πηλὸν ἐμβὰς πηλῶ ἀπονίζοιτο. μαίνεσθαι δ' ἂν δοκοίη, εἴ τις αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιφράσαιτο οὕτω ποιέοντα. καὶ τοῖς ἀγάλμασι δὲ τουτέοισι εὐχόνται, ὁκοῖον εἴ τις δόμοισι λεσχηνεύοιτο, οὐ τι γινώσκων θεοὺς οὐδ' ἥρωας οἵτινές εἰσι.*

In a number of extant fragments (B5, 14, 15, 96) Heracleitus refers to facts of Positive Religion, important sacramental practices, in what appears to be downright condemnation in the manner of, say, Xenophanes. But on deeper examination the appearance is proven to be illusory and it is of the utmost importance to expose the true meaning of his dark sayings, particularly in these cases.

Heracleitus' general attitude to religion is far from negative. The existence of Gods as supreme cosmic potencies is attested and explained; B53. The ultimate reality, ever-living fire involving the law of its self-transformation (B30) is the essence of universal common reason, the reason which is the common essence of all reality (B1; 2), the one, single, wise being (ἐν τὸ σοφὸν μόνον) which is and is not appropriately called Zeus (*Ζηνὸς ὄνομα*, with a Pherecydean reference to the life (ζῆν) signification residing in this divine name); B32: ἐν τὸ

σοφὸν μόνον λέγεσθαι οὐκ ἐθέλει καὶ ἐθέλει Ζητὸς ὄνομα. (cf. B50: οὐκ ἐμοῦ, ἀλλὰ τοῦ λόγου ἀκούσαντας ὁμολογεῖν σοφὸν ἔστιν ἐν πάντα εἶναι, the very ever-living fire which underlies all reality, v. B67). The complementary impropriety of the appellation resides in the fact that such ultimate reality is also Death; for death is the common human experience of awakening, while sleep is man's private imagination; B21: θάνατος ἔστιν ὁκόσα ἐγερθέντες ὀρέομεν, ὁκόσα δὲ εὐδόντες ὕπνος (cf. B89: τοῖς ἐγρηγορόσιν ἕνα καὶ κοινὸν κόσμον εἶναι, τῶν δὲ κοιμωμένων ἕκαστον εἰς ἴδιον ἀποστρέφεσθαι; v. B1). Zeus (no doubt) Thunderbolt is the steering principle of the cosmic Whole; B64: τὰ δὲ πάντα οἰακίζει Κεραυνός. This governing principle coimplicating all existence is the divine effective thought (γνώμη); B41: εἶναι γὰρ ἐν τὸ σοφόν, ἐπίστασθαι γνώμην, ὅτι ἐκυβέρνησε πάντα διὰ πάντων. Such γνώμη, directive-implementing thought, is the prerogative of the Gods; B78: ἦθος γὰρ ἀνθρώπειον μὲν οὐκ ἔχει γνώμας, θεῖον δὲ ἔχει.

In B102 we possess a precious piece of radical theodicy: τῷ μὲν θεῷ καλὰ πάντα καὶ ἀγαθὰ καὶ δίκαια, ἄνθρωποι δὲ ἃ μὲν ἄδικα ὑπειλήφασιν ἃ δὲ δίκαια. (Obviously, common reason reflects or rather constitutes that divine attitude as it consists in the universal harmony of the cosmic whole; it is so far as this common reason is refracted and privatised in a singular understanding that an opinioned (ὑπειλήφασιν) division into things just and unjust takes place). The Delphic Oracle is accepted as a divine institution where the God neither manifests nor hides but signifies the real; B93: ὁ ἄναξ, οὐ τὸ μαντεῖόν ἐστι τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, οὔτε λέγει οὔτε κρύπτει ἀλλὰ σημαίνει.

Together with the Olympian dimension of ancient religiosity, its chthonic aspect is also fully endorsed, particularly in one of its most characteristic modes of operation: the Eriniac *Lex Talionis*, of pollution and retribution, as the essence of a self-regulated, ineluctable lawfulness of cosmic justice; B94: Ἥλιος γὰρ οὐχ ὑπερβήσεται μέτρα· εἰ δὲ μή, Ἐρινύες μιν Δίκης ἐπίκουροι ἐξευρήσουσιν (v. the Essay on self-sustainable natural order). Hades and life after death are highly significant and potent realities; B98; B27: ἀνθρώπους μένει ἀποθανόντας ἄσσα οὐκ ἔλπονται οὐδὲ δοκεῖουσιν. Cf. B98: αἱ ψυχαὶ ὁσμῶνται καθ' Ἄϊδη; which entails a ghostly, smoky existence of souls in Hades (in tune with common religious perceptions), v. B7; εἰ

πάντα τὰ ὄντα καπνὸς γένοιτο, ρῖνες ἄν διαγνοίεν. This further implies the appropriateness of fire-sacrifices in the rites to the dead (just as to Gods and Daemons): the transmutation of the offering into smoke and odours is the proper way to reach, affect and, aboriginally, feed the Powerful (the κρείττους).

Deciphering the exact Heraclitean view of Sibylline prophecies depends only partly on the precise extent of the Heraclitean quotation in B92. In this passage Plutarch (de Pyth. orac. 6, 397A) contrasts the artistic magic attraction (κηλοῦντα καὶ καταθέλγοντα) exercised by the Sapphic stanzas to the immensely long-ranging influence of the Sibylline Prophecies, unsmiling and uncouth and unscented as they are in point of style, issued from a raving mouth (μαινομένῳ στόματι): οὐχ ὄρα... ὄσσην χάριν ἔχει τὰ Σαπφικὰ μέλη, κηλοῦντα καὶ καταθέλγοντα τοὺς ἀκροωμένους; Σίβυλλα δὲ μαινομένῳ στόματι καθ' Ἡράκλειτον ἀγέλαστα καὶ ἀκαλλώπιστα καὶ ἀμύριστα φθεγγομένη χιλίων ἐτῶν ἐξικνεῖται τῇ φωνῇ διὰ τὸν θεόν. From the last clause, «μαινομένῳ στόματι» at last is surely Heraclitean (the minimalist ascription, as with H. Fränkel). On the other side «χιλίων ἐτῶν ἐξικνεῖται τῇ φωνῇ» should also be considered safely Plutarchean. We can speculate about the point of the Heraclitean reference to Sibyll' s «raging mouth». Most likely, the truth issuing from such a frenzied mouth was contrasted with the falsehood of circumspect, yet separated and dispersed, private understanding (ἰδία φρόνησις) immersed, as this is, unaware in its dreamlike stupor. In the former, but not in the latter, truly operated the divine γνώμη and common reason: the god was speaking. Thus «διὰ τὸν θεόν» was explicitly or implicitly a crucial part of the Heraclitean point. It is probable (but by no means certain) that the stylistic description («ἀγέλαστα καὶ ἀκαλλώπιστα καὶ ἀμύριστα φθεγγομένη»), as well as the contrast to a highly elaborate artistic performance, are Plutarch's own. In any case, the adoption of the notion of divine frenzy revelatory of reality is sufficient to characterise positively Heraclitus' attitude in the present question.

Against this background of positive appreciation of Positive Religion, Heraclitus' famed Frs. B5, 14, 15, 96, appear in their apparent sense as anomalies. But the key for the resolution of the seeming discrepancy of attitude is not far to be sought: it lies in the very kernel of Heraclitean philosophy, the doctrine of the unio oppositorum.

In B15 the point is clearest: the sacred Bacchic procession and hymnology would have been a shameless parading, if it were not devoted to Dionysus; or, in the terminology of the unity of opposites, the rites are both sacred and shameless, the one pole intensifying the other. Just as the object of worship in these observances is both Dionysus and Hades, or the two opposites projected onto their underlying unity. *Εἰ μὴ γὰρ Διονύσω πομπὴν ἐποιούντο καὶ ὕμνεον ἄσμα αἰδοίοισιν* (pudenda; the awesome thing - αἰδοῖος, pudendus - is the sexual organ), *ἀναιδέστατα εἴργαστ' ἄν* (the hypothesis is expressed in the modality of the unreal); *ὡντὸς δὲ Ἄϊδης καὶ Διόνυσος, ὅτεω μαίνονται καὶ ληναίζουσιν*.

The same sense is elicited without real difficulty from B14: *τίσι δὴ μαντεύεται Ἡράκλειτος ὁ Ἐφέσιος; νυκτιπόλοις, μάγοις, βάρκχοις, λήναις, μύσταις· τούτοις ἀπειλεῖ τὰ μετὰ θάνατον, τούτοις μαντεύεται τὸ πῦρ· τὰ γὰρ νομιζόμενα κατ' ἀνθρώπους μυστήρια ἀνιερωσὶ μνεῦνται*. The «*βάρκχοις, λήναις*» in this passage corresponds exactly to the «*μαίνονται καὶ ληναίζουσιν*» of B15; thus the reference in the former must be meant in the same way as in the latter; i.e. as a case of the unio oppositorum. All mysteries and mysteric rites (of official or vagrant chthonicity, practices and observances by the entire band of wizardry and possessedness, night-wanderers, magicians, bacchants, lenaists or mysts) are both eminently sacred and thoroughly profane: this mutually reinforced complementarity of holiness and profanation corresponds to the fundamental unifying tension between hiddenness and revelation, between what is occult in the order of reality and what is manifest in it. The intense unhallowedness of many mysteric rituals, if seen in unipolar abstraction from their deeply rooted consecration, makes them similar in character to medicinal cures. Healing operations inflict on the patient pain and distress just like, and similar to, the workings on the organism of the malady under which the individual suffers. The remedies are torturing (burnings and cuttings and multiple torments), just as the afflictions of sickness. B58: *οἱ γοῦν ἰατροί, φησὶν ὁ Ἡράκλειτος, τέμνοντες, καίοντες, πάντη βασανίζοντες* (this is probably part of the quotation as well) *κακῶς τοὺς ἀρρωστούντας, ἐπαιτέονται μηδὲν ἄξιοι μισθὸν λαμβάνειν παρὰ τῶν ἀρρωστούντων, ταῦτ' ἐργαζόμενοι τὰ καὶ αἱ νοῦσοι* (τὰ καὶ αἱ νοῦσοι is Wilamowitz' correction of the obviously erroneous τὰ ἀγαθὰ καὶ τὰς

νόσους in the ms. ). Heracleitus' idea must have gone deeper than noticing the similarity of the patient' s sufferings under malady and therapy alike: the further point is that what the physician does is simply to help at the proper time the processes under which the organism passes as the illness evolves and expends itself (e.g. as the tumor of an inflammation is ulcerated, then cut by itself as in a wound, and finally healed). Both because they rack their patients, and by reason of their essentially simple abetting of Nature' s operations which cure within sickness on their own, doctors are not really entitled to their fees ( *ἐπαιτέονται μηδὲν ἄξιοι μισθὸν λαμβάνειν* ), a typically Heracleitean striking formulation with the purpose of drawing attention to the root-identity of what is beneficial with what is harmful: the very same organic process is simultaneously the development of the malady and the automatic restoration of health in the suffering living being. The path is indeed the same whereby an erupting sickness is spent out, and the organism is healed. *Ὅδος ἄνω καὶ κάτω μία καὶ ὡυτή* (B60). The point is once again the unio oppositorum, as indeed the very context of B58 makes clear: the medicinal extract is subsumed as illustration under the general observation that good and bad is the same: *καὶ ἀγαθὸν καὶ κακὸν* (sc. *ἐν ἔστυν*).

The analogy between sacred, mystieric rites of intense profanity and painful cures of maladial afflictions is explicitly invoked by Heracleitus himself, when he referred to the ribaldry of foul talk and indecent action in connexion with august, saving mysteries, as remedial. B68: *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰκότως αὐτὰ* (there has been mention of *στάσις τῶν φαλλῶν* and *αἰσχρολογίαί*) *ἄκεα Ἡράκλειτος προσεῖπεν ὡς ἐξακεσόμενα τὰ δεινὰ καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἐξάντεις ἀπεργαζόμενα τῶν ἐν τῇ γενέσει συμφορῶν*. The formulation of the interpretation is indeed Iamblichan (*de mysteriis* I, 11); but there cannot be any reasonable doubt that both the word (*ἄκεα*) and its intended meaning are veritably Heracleitean. Sacred obscenity in rites of heightened efficacy as a highly puissant tool in establishing direct access to the divine power-structure of the World, is a vast and mighty subject in the context of ancient Greek (and in fact of any natural) religiosity. For Heracleitus, it is one cardinal example of the universal cosmic Law, the unity of the opposites: the highest tension in one direction generates mightiest momentum toward the opposite one.

Existence is in general in a state of dynamic equilibrium, as in a pendulum. Thus acute shamelessness can become curative: sacred obscenity is a remedy (*ἄκος*); intensified passion can best heal immoderation in passion by sublimating it and endowing it with pregnant meaning (as in Aristotle's theory of tragic catharsis; *δι' ἑλέου καὶ φόβου περαίνουσα τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν*); dirt can cleanse and purify.

And this provides the key for the Heraclitean understanding of B5: *καθαίρονται* (sc. men) *δ' ἄλλω αἵματι μαινόμενοι οἶον εἴ τις εἰς πηλὸν ἐμβὰς πηλῶ ἀπονίξοιτο. μαινέσθαι δ' ἂν δοκοίη, εἴ τις αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιφράσαιτο οὕτω ποιέοντα. καὶ τοῖς ἀγάλμασι δὲ τουτέοισιν εὐχόνται, ὅκοῖον εἴ τις δόμοισι λεσχηνεύοιτο, οὐ τι γινώσκων θεοὺς οὐδ' ἤρωας οἵτινές εἰσί.* The practice occasioning the Heraclitean analysis is the potent purificatory rite in which blood-guilt is cleansed by ceremonial washing in the blood of a sacrificial animal, especially swine. In the Eleusinian Mysteries the first and purificatory stage of initiation involved purgation through pig-blood as a general cathartic operation eliminating all stains of guilt and rendering the individual fit to receive the august Mysteries. That blood shed can be cleansed by still more blood, that purification from sanguinary defilement can be effected through further blood-pollution (*καθαίρονται ... μαινόμενοι*), is like believing that one soiled in mud can be washed up by mud: somebody doing this would be thought mad, as well as still dirty (*μαινόμενος* as well as *μαινόμενος*, Kranz). Raving (*μαινόμενος*) connects to the Sibylline «frenzied mouth» (*μαιομένῳ στόματι* in B92), and also to the dark, mystic and maenadic cohorts of B14 (*νυκτιπόλοις, μάγοις, βάκχοις, λήναις, μύσταις*; cf. supra). The madness is effective: it relies on the working of the supreme law (*unio oppositorum*). Blood does cleanse blood, when raised to high tension ritually; Pollution does purify when sweeping the ground clear through accumulated enormity.

Heraclitus does not deny the efficacy of the rituals, here as elsewhere: he explains them by identifying the cause of their power and the mode of their operation. He is, naturally, impatient with those (the many) who lack true understanding of the processes and the realities involved, when they arrogate to themselves the faculty of comprehension, imprisoning unwittingly their own souls into the confines of dreamlike, private (i.e. idiotic) thinking (B1, 2, 17, 19, 34,

49, 56, 70, 72, 73, 89, 104, 121). The wise man will search for the cause of the appearances and for the reality of phenomena; he is like the gold-hunter who digs huge amounts of ore to find a little gold (B22: χρυσὸν γὰρ οἱ διζήμενοι γῆν πολλὴν ὀρύσσουσι καὶ εὐρίσκουσιν ὀλίγον). Heracleitus gives by implication a clear example of this attitude and procedure in discovering truth within the very fragment in question (B5). Just like the apparent (*μαίνεσθαι δ' ἂν δοκοίη*) raving of washing mire by mire and cleansing pollution through pollution is the common practice of praying to the statues of Gods (or the Icons of the Saints in a different context). But in pinpointing what this co-ordinate madness consists in, Heracleitus signifies (*σημαίνει* like Apollo in Delphi) the real cause and true explanation of the practice: for someone to pray to the statues is like conversing with buildings (*ὄκοῖον εἴ τις δόμοισι λεσχηνεύοιτο*), thereby betraying that he ignores who really are the gods and heroes (*οὐ τι γινώσκων θεοὺς οὐδ' ἥρωας οὔτινές εἰσι*). But to talk to a dwelling place while one naturally intends to speak to those dwelling within is an ignorant misfocusing of address. And similarly, to implore the statues, while naturally one wishes all along to pray to the Powerful, is an ignorant misfocusing of address: one confuses the residence with the residents; statues are the domiciles of divine, daemonic and heroic potencies. Further, by analogy, to believe that the blood as such cleanses blood-stains is indeed absurd; it is sacrificial blood that is so effective, it is blood shed as offering and in atonement which purifies blood shed as appropriation and in offence. What works the wonder is not the blood of expiation itself but that in it which constitutes the union of blood-guilt and blood-sanctification, the spirit and law of blood as wielded by the blood-powers. This fact accounts also for the possibility of a direct break-through for the few elect, of a dramatic short-cut in the normal processes of natural self-regulation. Those freed from the chains of dire Necessity (*κύκλου δ' ἐξέπταν βαρυπενθέος ἀργαλέοιο* boasts the mystic soul on her road to salvation after death in the Orphic golden testimonies), men entirely purified from the stains of creation in Becoming, worship with offerings spiritual as against the blood-sacrifices of the vast majority of humanity, fully immersed as this majority is into the mire (*βόρβορος*) of this-wordly existence (cf. B13: *μήτε βορβόρω χαίρειν*). Thus the doctrine of the two kinds of sacrifice (B69) is smoothly understood.

In the light of those natural interpretations of B5, 14 and 15, B96 is also to be construed. The pattern is the same: a practice of positive religiosity (*τὰ νομιζόμενα*, B14) is deemed absurd, indeed insane. Blood purification appears as sheer raving; in the mysteries people are initiated unhallowedly; the ribaldry of the Bacchic ritual would seem sheer shamelessness; funereal rites and worship of the dead, centered as they were round the corpse, its burial and its tomb, appear equally as mighty madness: for the dead body is more worthless and repulsive, is to be thrown away more than even the excrement of a living organism; B96: *νέκυες γὰρ κοπρίων ἐκβλητότεροι*. And yet the corruption of death is the same process as the generation of the living; one's death is another's birth (cf. B88; 77; 62). Dead bodies are the erstwhile domiciles (*δόμοι*) of potent residents who had died in them and now live again as spiritual powers in elemental vehicles; the dead as such are also in themselves the stuff of new origins. The connexion of the inhabitants with their dwellings was always to varying degrees internal and organic; on the one end of the spectrum of interrelationship and co-binding lies the view that will combine archaic Hylozoism with the doctrine of the transmigration of souls and of Eternal Rebirth. The connexion of the soul with its body is maximal at each incarnation, and yet the mutual attachment is utterly ephemeral since the one term of the synthesis changes completely upon each return of the permanent other. At the other end and End, Christianity endorses the absolute co-belonging of the two factors, the self-same body being resurrected (and, if saved, thereby transfigured) to be animated by the same soul. The common ancient Greek experience emphasised implicitly the attachment of the psychic essence to its particular corporeal envelop by mortuary practices and observances concentrating on the dead body and its place of burial; nonetheless, the connexion of the two factors is severed irrevocably at death and man (its bloodless soul) exists as an enfeebled ghost in the world of Shades. Yet the destiny of the Heroes of old, superior men whose colossal feats and awesome death signaled their daemonic nature (the mightier, *οἱ κρείττονες*), was believed (as the world-view developed and was increasingly articulated) to be realisable not only in the mythical (however real) past, but also in the present. This is Heraclitus' standpoint (yet see *infra* for Hippolytus' identification of his position with the doctrine of bodily resurrection); in primis, B25:



μόροι γὰρ μέζονες μέζοντας μοίρας λαγχάνουσι: greater fate is sorted out for greater achievement in life and death. And so the warriors fallen after marvellous martial exploits in battle are honoured by Gods and men; B24: ἀρηιφάτους θεοὶ τιμῶσι καὶ ἄνθρωποι. In the case of these select few, death enhances their power, instead of unnerving them as is the common lot. This strengthening discloses their daemonic nature: they were fallen angels, mightier beings who had died in human mortality and are now, through the death of the man, reborn in their previous condition. B62: ἀθάνατοι θνητοί, θνητοὶ ἀθάνατοι, ζῶντες τὸν ἐκείνων θάνατον, τὸν δὲ ἐκείνων βίον τεθνεῶτες (cf. B77). The reference is to men who are immortal dying to mortality at their birth, mortals dying to immortality at their death, who are living the death of the mightier ones (with whom they are ultimately identical), and have died their superior life by being born into this-worldly existence. The dead souls go to Hades; and when the god (ultimately, the god of fire, the fire-god, fire as god, i.e. Zeus with the regnal Thunderbolt, the Sun, Apollo; in Hades the god is Hades, who is also the same as Dionysus) manifests himself in the horrendous place and alights there, the mighty dead are quickened and resurrected, they are enlivened and empowered, they become guardians of the quick and the dead. This is the lot of those who have proven their loftier descent in the cycle of their fallen (human) life and through their (second) death - those who have earned it not as recompense but as right by reason of their nature, being thus restituted to the order to which they essentially belong. Such is the Heracleitean Eschatology of B63: ἔνθα δ' ἔόντι ἐπανίστασθαι καὶ φύλακας γίνεσθαι ἐγερτὶ ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν. Ἐόντι refers to the god while the subject of ἐπανίστασθαι καὶ γίνεσθαι are the dead men. Hippolytus, by whom the fragment is preserved (Ref. Omn. Haer. IX, 10), interprets it correctly by emphasising the divine causality in the resurrection of the dead, although it errs in wishing to make Heracleitus a precursor of the Christian doctrine of corporeal revivification, of the resurrection of the identical body in which the mightier substance had died and from which it is now relieved; (ibid) λέγει δὲ (sc. Heracleitus) καὶ σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν ταύτης <τῆς> φανεράς, ἐν ἧι γεγενήμεθα, καὶ τὸν θεὸν οἶδε ταύτης τῆς ἀναστάσεως αἴτιον, οὕτως λέγων· ἔνθα δ' ἔόντι etc. Diels (ad loc.) rightly conceived that the main point in the incomplete fragment is the effect

on the dead of the appearance of god: «Der Gott erscheint. Die in der Finsternis des Todes Liegenden, etc.». We need not *ἴοντι* to bear the full weight of divine Epiphany; *ἔνθα δ' ἔόντι* means when (god) is there, when he is present, or by his being there. The idea of movement is anyway conveyed by the interchanges between the identical opposites: Dionysus (the productive Power) is the same with Hades (the destructive Might), while Helios and Apollo are still the same fundamental reality, the «logical, reasonable, everliving fire».

For Heraclitus, the living and the dead is one and the same, just as the woken and the sleeping, or the young and the old. The opposites change into one another; the very fact of such continual transmutation whereby every opposite changes first into its particular opposite and then again into itself manifests the underlying identity. B88: *ταὐτό τ' ἐνὶ ζῶν καὶ τεθνηκὸς καὶ [τὸ] ἐγρηγορὸς καὶ καθεύδων καὶ νέον καὶ γηραιόν· τάδε γὰρ μεταπεσόντα ἐκείνά ἐστι κάκεινα πάλιν μεταπεσόντα ταῦτα.*

Existence is pendulum like. Being is constituted as a tension; tension is intrinsically bipolar; intensification in one sense accumulates momentum toward its opposite. Opposites are complementary aspects of the same reality, the poles of the tension of being. Existence is dynamic. A single, simple entity cannot normally exist in tension. Yet there is one substance which is inherently tensional, which involves a rhythm of living and dying, of presence and absence, of activation and de-activation. This is fire; it is in its own nature endowed with a principle of change: it implicates its own kindling and extinguishing. This is the core of Heraclitus' resolution of Dualism into Monism; historically and systematically speaking, this is in effect his answer to Pythagoreanism.

To say in this context that corpses are more execrable than dung is similar to and has the same point as saying that they are mad who pray to the statues of Gods, that it is sheer frenzy to purify blood by blood, that the mysteries are unhallowed the way they are operated, that it is utter shamelessness to enact Bacchic rites. There is of course validity in these claims. But the point of making them is in fact to draw attention to the efficacy of the unspeakable rites of sacred obscenity if they are properly «embedded»; to the sanctity of significant profanity; to the extraordinary cathartic value of appropriate abominations; and to the exact identification of the living with the dead and of the sought for

with the cast away. The Bacchanalian pomp with its Phallus-celebrations would be a shameless affair if it were not enacted in the worship of Dionysus, the selfsame Dionysus who is identical with Hades. But infernal obscenity is too powerful a reality, pregnant with portentous symbols, capable of transforming shamelessness to awfulness.

The object of the following analysis will be purification through defilement, with the focus on the archetypal case where blood-stains and blood-guilt are cleansed by sacrificial pig's blood. In the next Essay the general theory of Pollution and Purgation will be given, providing a perfect example of a self-regulated system of permanent long-term equilibrium (or in other words, of necessary justice).

Aristophanes in *Acharnenses* 747 speaks of χοιρία μυστηρικά to which the Scholiast remarks: τι ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις τῆς Δήμητρος χοῖρος θύεται· ἀνάκειται δὲ τὸ ζῶον τῇ θεῷ (sic also in Suda s.v.). ἕκαστος δὲ τῶν μνουμένων ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ ἔθνευ. ταῦτα δὲ καλεῖται μυστηρικά. Similarly in *Acharn.* 764 we have μυστικὰς χοῖρους (they are female pigs), to which again the scholiast has: Διὰ τὸ ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις τῆς Δήμητρος χοῖρους θύεσθαι. And so in *Pax* 374-5: ἐς χοιρίδιόν μοι νυν δάνεισον τρεῖς δραχμᾶς· / δεῖ γὰρ μνηθῆναι με πρὶν τεθνηκέναι, where see the scholia. See also *Ranae* 337-8, where Ξανθίας on watching the sacred procession of the mystae exclaims: ὦ πότνια πολυτίμητε Δήμητρος κόρη, / ὡς ἡδύ μοι προσέπνευσε χοιρείων κρεῶν. The scholia have: θύουσι γὰρ ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ τῆς Δήμητρος (of course this Διόνυσος is Ἴακχος, the Eleusinian Dionysus) τὸν χοῖρον, διότι λυμαντικός ἐστι ἀμφοτέρων; that is, as is explained by another scholion, the pigs are destructive of these Gods' gifts (cereal and vines): ὡς λυμαντικοὶ τῶν <τοῖν> θεῶν δωρημάτων; this piece of «rationalisation» is of course to be kept at a low tone even though supported by the poetic imagination of Ovid, *Fasti*, I 349 sqq., where he proclaims that the first animal sacrifice was of pigs, and required by Demeter:

Prima Ceres avidae gavisae est sanguine porcae  
ultra suas merita caede nocentis opes etc.

That the original animal sacrifice was of pigs is also reported by Varro, *De re rust.* II, 4, 9. He also attempts an etymological derivation

of the word: sus Graece dicitur γς olim thysus (θϋς;) dicitur ab illo verbo quod dicunt θύειν, quod est immolare; thus pig is the animal appropriate κατ' ἐξοχήν for sacrifice. He further finds the trace of that primary animal sacrifice in the ritual of Eleusis, where at the initiis Cereris a pig was sacrificed. (He then goes on to mention other occasions for sacrificing pigs). - Cf. further, on the same theme, Ovid, *Metam.* XV, 111 sqq.:

----- et prima putatur  
 hostia sus meruisse mori, quia semina pando  
 eruerit rostro, spemque interceperit anni.

Cornutus explains in the same way the killing of Adonis (whom he associates with the *δημητριακὸς καρπός*) by a wild bear; *Theologia Graeca*, 28 (p. 54.21 sqq. BT): τοῦτον (sc. τὸν Ἄδωνιν) πλῆξας κάπρος ἀνελεῖν λέγεται διὰ τὸ τὰς ὕς δοκεῖν λιμβότειρας εἶναι. The same type of explanation is offered regarding the standard sacrifices of he-goats to Dionysus (op.cit., 30, p. 60.20 sqq.): τὸν δὲ τράγον αὐτῷ (sc. τῷ Διονύσῳ) θύουσι διὰ τὸ λυμαντικὸν δοκεῖν τῶν ἀμπέλων καὶ τῶν συκῶν εἶναι τοῦτο τὸ ζῷον.

On the other hand, the objectivistic and profoundly naturalistic spirit of the Greeks, together with their fundamental and innate (despite misleading appearances) traditionalism in all spiritual matters, should make us cautious about dismissing even what appears as easy, shallow rationalization on the part of latter ages. Thus, in our particular case, a passage of Plutarch helps us to understand the power that a Greek could feel behind such seeming rationalisations, a power which could facilitate if not his acceptance, at least his serious consideration of it. We know from innumerable testimonies and from Porphyry's *De Abstinencia* most elaborately (utilising Theophrastus' lost *De pietate*) how strong in Greece was also the feeling that killing and eating a living being, even the least significant and most noxious animal, is a kind of sacrilegious act, an impiety, a violation of the divine order; it is a thing φύσει, naturally, wrong in a deep religious sense. The sacredness of life and the awe and fear man feels towards it even in his most abject or materialistic condition, is at the core of this experience. Faced on the one hand with this deep-lying ineradicable consciousness of the sacredness and inviolability of life and every living

being, and on the other with the practice of killing animals and eating flesh, they, being what they were, ought to find a reason for this discrepancy, an objective, religiously sanctioned cause for the divergence of act from feeling. So they connected the annihilation of life and the eating of dead bodies with the cardinal religious ceremonial act: the sacrifice; and also thought of such practices as a necessary way of disposing of dangerous and harmful animals - in fact they claimed a divine oracle in support of even this elementary extension of the fundamental law of self-defence. It is of no consequence whether the oracle was afterwards invented or the «reasons» mentioned were figured out subsequently. For what is later is, as always in such cases, the elaboration, the formulation, the analysis, if you like even the explicit consciousness, of the already existing and powerfully operating unthought-out reasons and unpurposed motives. The point of real importance remains unassailed: deep awareness of the sacredness of life and of the horror of taking it away and eating the dead body goes seamlessly together with the «dedication» (cf. the Latin «devotio») of such heinous acts to the godhead as the sole adequate reason for their commitment, divinity itself commanding their performance in the presence of some kind of felt necessity, the bounds of which are not to be transcended. So, for instance - and in order to return to the Plutarchean passage, the mention of which prompted this basic analysis - fish is especially prohibited to be eaten according to the above logic, in so far as it lives in almost a different world from us and cannot be conceived in any way as being harmful to us and our pious interests: *Quaestionum Convivialium* VIII, 8, 730 A-B: τὸ δὲ τῶν θαλαττίων γένος οὐτ' ἀέρα τὸν αὐτὸν οὐθ' ὕδωρ ἀναλίσκον ἡμῖν οὐδὲ καρποῖς προσίον, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐτέρῳ κόσμῳ περιεχόμενον καὶ χρώμενον ὄροις ἰδίους, οὓς ὑπερβαίνουσιν αὐτοῖς ἐπίκειται δίκη ὁ θάνατος, οὔτε μικρὰν οὔτε μεγάλην τῇ γαστρὶ πρόφασιν κατ' αὐτῶν δίδωσιν· ἀλλὰ παντὸς ἰχθύος ἄγρα καὶ σαγηνεῖα λαιμαργίας καὶ φιλοψίας περιφανῶς ἔργον ἐστίν, ἐπ' οὐδενὶ δικαίῳ ταραπτούσης τὰ πελάγη καὶ καταδυομένης εἰς τὸν βυθόν.

But before this passage, Plutarch gives in a few phrases the gist of the ancient feeling regarding animal killing and eating; *ibid.* 729, E-F: ...ὡς τᾶλλα (sc. ζῶα) μὲν αἰτίαν ἀμωσγέπως παρέχοντα τοῦ κακῶς πάσχειν τὰνθρώπων, τοὺς δ' ἰχθύς οὐδὲν ἀδικούντας ἡμᾶς, οὐδ', εἰ

πάνυ πεφύκασιν, δυναμένους. πάρεστι δὲ τῶν τε λόγων καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν εἰκάζειν τοῖς παλαιοῖς, ὡς οὐ μόνον ἔδωδῆν, ἀλλὰ καὶ φόνον ζῴου μὴ βλάπτοντος ἔργον ἔναγες καὶ ἄθεσμον ἐποιοῦντο· πλήθει δ' ἐπιχειομένῳ (sc. ζῴων) καθειργόμενοι, καὶ χρησιμοῦ τινος, ὡς φάσιν, ἐκ Δελφῶν ἐπικελευσαμένου τοῖς καρποῖς ἀρήγειν φθειρομένοις, ἤρξαντο μὲν καθιερεύειν, ἔτι δ' ὅμως ταραττόμενοι καὶ δειμαίνοντες «ἔρδειν» μὲν ἐκάλουν καὶ «ρέζειν», ὡς τι μέγα δρώντες τὸ θύειν ἔμψυχον· ἄχρι δὲ νῦν παραφυλάττουσιν ἰσχυρῶς τὸ μὴ σφάττειν πρὶν ἐπινεῦσαι κατασπενδόμενον. οὕτως εὐλαβεῖς πρὸς ἅπασαν ἀδικίαν ἦσαν. - The suggestion about ἔρδειν and ρέζειν is excellent. Notice the Delphic injunction ἀρήγειν τοῖς καρποῖς φθειρομένοις; and consider it in the context of an agricultural society, with the produce of earth being the paramount symbol of an orderly, peaceful and civilized human communion; and you will understand the force behind such statements as that pigs are sacrificed to Demeter because they harm her fruit, and he-goats to Dionysus because they harm his fruit. A certain tendency in some quarters nowadays to consider such claims as childish, betrays naivety: for we manifestly prove that we have lost the awareness of the meaning and power of symbol.

By another scholion to the above quoted passage from Aristophanes, *Ranae*, 337-8, we learn of the custom of sacrificing (and eating?) pigs at the Thesmophoria; the pig sacrifices are now said to be devoted to Demeter and Persephone (τι Δήμητρι καὶ Κόρη θύουσι τὸ ζῶον). The invocation of Persephone in conjunction with the χοίρεια κρέα in our passage should not be taken as an indication that such sacrifices were especially offered to Persephone: the Scholiast's interpretation of the reason for the invocation is correct: εἰκότως δ' ἐν Ἐίδου ὦν ἐπιβοᾶται τὴν Περσεφόνην. It is the place, not necessarily or primarily the practice, that makes Persephone apposite recipient of the sacrifice here. The sacrifice of pigs was (we should have assumed in any case), incorporated in a purgative, purificational, cathartic ritual - though the exact significance of this will be clear when we shall return to the point later. Clement *Strom.* V, 70, 7 sqq. (p. 689 Potter): οὐκ ἀπεικότως ἄρα καὶ τῶν μυστηρίων τῶν παρ' Ἑλλήσιν ἄρχει μὲν τὰ καθάρσια, καθάπερ καὶ τοῖς βαρβάροις τὸ λουτρόν, μετὰ ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶ τὰ μικρὰ μυστήρια διδασκαλίας τινα ὑπόθεσιν ἔχοντα καὶ προπαρασκευῆς τῶν μελλόντων, τὰ δὲ μεγάλα περὶ τῶν συμπά-

ντων, οὐ μανθάνειν ἔτι ὑπολείπεται (male Stählin οὐ μ. <οὐκ> ἔτι ὑπ.), ἐποπτεύειν δὲ καὶ περινοεῖν τήν τε φύσιν καὶ τὰ πράγματα. Clement refers to the Eleusinian mysteries, the *mysteria par excellence* (cf. Aristotle, *Ars Rhetorica* 1401a14: ...ἀφ' οὗ γ' ἐστὶν ἡ τιμιωτάτη πασῶν τελετή: τὰ γὰρ μυστήρια πασῶν τιμιωτάτη τελετή). And he distinguishes three moments in them, corresponding to the well-known triple division in *καθαρμός*, *μύησις* and *ἐποπτεία*. Herméias, *Comm. in Platonis Phaedrum* 250B-C (p. 178 ed. Couvreur) distinguishes *τελετή*, *μύησις*, *ἐποπτεία*, allocating the first to *καθαρμός* καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. He ingeniously interprets the distinction between *μύησις* and *ἐποπτεία* as one between psychic understanding and noetic vision. He furthermore makes it clear that the reference both by Plato and himself is to the Eleusinian mysteries: τὸ δὲ «μνούμενοι» καὶ «ἐποπτεύοντες» ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν τελετῶν τῶν ἐν Ἐλευσίῃ λέγει (p. 178.26)<sup>1</sup>. For the distinction between *μύησις* and *ἐποπτεία*, apart from the *loci classici* of the Platonic corpus, cf. *Suda* s.v. *ἐπόπται* and *ἐποπτεύειν* (and cf. *Scholia ad Aristoph. Ranae* 745).

The purificational rites must have been indispensable as much to the *μύησις* as to the *ἐποπτεία*, occurring both in the *μικρὰ μυστήρια* (the *κατ' Ἄγραν*) and in the Great Eleusinia in Boedromion. (Thus when the Scholiast on *Plutus* 845 speaks of the *μικρὰ* as *προκάθαρσις* and *προάγνευσις τῶν μεγάλων*, we must understand this as an analogical relationship only: as *προάγνευσις* is to the *καθαρμός* proper, so the *μικρὰ μυστήρια* stand to the *μεγάλα*). Plutarch, *Phocion*, ch. XXVIII, confirms the use of pigs in Eleusinia, indeed on the most important day of the Great Mysteries (20th of Boedromion, ἡ εἰκάς); speaking of the ominous happenings, presaging the occupation of Mounychia by a Macedonian garrison, (an event occurring on the *ἀγιώτατον τοῦ χρόνου*, the day of the ceremonial procession in the conduct of the mystic Iacchus from Athens to Eleusis), happenings which took place in the preceding few days, he says: *Μύστην δὲ λούοντα χοιρίδιον ἐν Κανθάρῳ λιμένι<sup>2</sup> κῆτος συνέλαβε* etc.; that is, a *μύστης* (a person already having been initiated in the Lesser Mysteries) was washing a piglet (perhaps for the cathartic sacrifice before becoming *ἐπόπτης*). Such lavation, especially in the sea, is clearly purgative and cathartic<sup>3</sup>; it probably took place on the second day of the Mysteries (16th of Boedromion), a day called Ἄλαδε *Μῦσται* (To the sea, ye Mystics)<sup>4</sup>.

The close association of the purificatory pig with the Eleusinian ritual in general is, thus, certain<sup>5</sup>. There remains the further important point of elucidating the pig's purgatory and expiatory function. But, before understanding this, we must gain a higher standpoint.

Ancient Greek religion and morality was fundamentally naturalistic in the most profound sense of the word (nothing of course having to do with modern naturalism). Irreverence, sacrilege, wrong - and evil - doing and crime sealed the unfortunate perpetrator with literal, metaphysical stain; all wrong-doing was a form of sacrilege proceeding from, and in its turn causing, real pollution manifesting itself in various types of physical taint and defilement. From such condition there was no escape other than one religiously effected, a ritual purification. One form that such purification could assume, or one element in the complex ritual achieving the desired purification (a ritual varying in its details from place to place and from time to time, but identical in its essence) consisted in the use of a *κάθαρμα*. A *κάθαρμα* is something purgatory which by attracting and absorbing the *μίασμα*, the pollution, frees the defiled place or man from its or his stain by becoming itself tainted, stained, polluted. It is thus that by disposing finally of the *κάθαρμα* in a religiously appropriate manner, one effects complete cleansing: one is free from metaphysical guilt.

This is in a few words the essence of the matter. But it is highly instructive to notice the details of the evidence supporting the account.

*Κάθαρμα* could be a man<sup>6</sup>. But here we are concerned with pig-purgation. Pollux in treating of the various magistracies of the Athenian Republic, mentions the *Περιστίαρχος* and adds (VIII, 104): *Ἐκάθαιρον χοιριδίους μικροῖς οὗτοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὸ θέατρον. καθάρσιον δὲ τοῦτο τὸ (pro καὶ) χοιρίδιον ἐκαλείτο*. Cf. Sch. in Aristoph. *Ecclesiaz.* 128: *Περιστίαρχος: ὁ τῶν καθαρσίων προηγούμενος ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις* - a lemma taken over by Suda in one of its entries on *Περιστίαρχος*. Small pigs<sup>7</sup> were used as piacular, or, more correctly, purgatory vehicles, wiping off (as it were) all pollution and evil influence from the Assembly and the Theatre. As to the Assembly of the People, we know that before any business could be transacted there, this *lustration* and purification had to be performed by priestly magistrates whose special function this was<sup>8</sup>. So Aeschines, *Contra Timarchum* p. 19 (ed. Reiske) mentions a law according to which, the



following was the order in the proceedings when the Assembly was convoked upon the beginning of a session: *ἐπειδὴν τὸ καθάρσιον περιενεχθῆ καὶ ὁ κήρυξ τὰς πατρίους εὐχὰς εὔξεται*, etc. The ancient scholia to this passage are very informative and revealing, but before quoting them, I shall enlarge on other corroborative evidence.

Harpocration s.v. *καθάρσιον* has the following explanation (repeated by Suda s.v. without the reference to the Aeschinian locus): *Αἰσχίνης κατὰ Τιμάρχου. ἔθος ἦν Ἀθήνησι καθαίρειν τὴν ἐκκλησιάν καὶ τὰ θέατρα καὶ ὄλως τὰς τοὺς δήμου συνόδους μικροῖς πάνυ χοιριδίους, ἅπερ ὠνόμαζον καθάρσια. τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίουν οἱ λεγόμενοι Περιστίαρχοι, οἵπερ ὠνομάσθησαν οὕτως ἦτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ περιστέχειν ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας*. We have here two additional pieces of information: a) This purification was taking place in all public meetings and not only in the Sovereign Assembly and theatres; b) The officiating priests were named after either their going round to execute their function or from the hearth (as if it was *περιεστίαρχος*). The connection with the hearth-altars, to take the second point first, is further illustrated and set into its proper prospective by a passage which appears in three sources: Suda s.v. *Περιστίαρχος*, Photius s.v. and in the *Corpus Paroimiogr.*, Apostolius, XIV.21. In substance the passage is as follows: *Περιστίαρχος· ὁ περικαθαίρων τὴν ἐστίαν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησιάν καὶ τὴν πόλιν* <sup>9</sup>, *ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας ἢ τοῦ περιστέχειν. Ἴστρος δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς περίστιά φησι προσαγορεύεται τὰ καθάρσια. (And so the scholiast on Aristoph. Ecclesiaz. 130: *περιστίαρχος: ὁ τῶν καθαρσίων προηγούμενος ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Περίστια γὰρ τὰ καθάρσια*). καὶ οἱ τὰ ἱερὰ καθαίροντες περιεστίαρχοι· ἔξωθεν γὰρ περιέρχονται χοιροφοροῦντες. (The Paroemiographer's mss. have *μαχαιοφοροῦντες*, but this is clearly inadmissible). *ἐκάστου τῶν ἱερῶν, οἰκίας μὴ παριέμενοι δημοσίας καὶ περίδρομον ἐχούσας*<sup>10</sup>. Thus according to Istrus the function of the Peristiarchoi was extended to the *Ἱερά*, holy places, and also public buildings in which a *περίδρομος*, a gallery, (presumably) ran round the central hearth-altar or perhaps round the building itself.*

From the evidence so far then, I conclude that the office of the Peristiarchoi was a priestly magistracy in charge of the public purifications performed at the beginning of each Assembly, in all public meetings and councils and for state buildings and places. From the fact that on most (if not all) of these occasions there was a hearth

or altar<sup>11</sup>, in connection with which the lustration was performed (e.g. there was in the first place a circumabulation, being extended afterwards to embrace the whole of the space<sup>12</sup>), the Peristiarchoi's function was thought to be connected with all hearths and altars, or they were considered responsible for the purgatory lustration of all holy places and temples (as Istros seems to maintain in the extant fragment above mentioned). But I think such enlargements of the Peristiarchoi's jurisdiction are rather unreal; they were restricted to their public function as against what happened both in the properly hieratic sphere and in the private one<sup>13</sup>. (Of course similar rites to those entrusted to their care were naturally carried on both in temples by proper priests and privately in houses and private places, or for private uses)<sup>14</sup>. There may, on the other hand, have been other priests, in properly religious function, who could have been called *Περιστίαρχοι*, or, even, all persons carrying around *καθάρματα* for the purgation of a place (especially where a hearth-altar was involved), whether in a properly priestly, public or private capacity, might have been called *περιστίαρχοι* in the performance of their function, especially in cities other than Athens, for which particular case the restriction I proposed is abundantly proven by the main bulk of our evidence<sup>15</sup>.

We have seen that the pig-purgations played a major role in both public and private lustration ceremonies. But there are still more important details to be collected from our sources on this matter. The pig used, as we have observed, was a very young one, a *χοιρίδιον*, a piglet, or even a suckling-pig, a *δελφάκιον*<sup>16</sup>; and the same custom was prevalent with the Romans in the case of the *sacres* or *sacri porci*<sup>17</sup>. It was to be without any kind of blemish, as was the case with every sacrificial victim. Cf. e.g. Aristophanes, *Acharnenses* 784-5, where the Scholiast commenting on the *κέρκον οὐκ ἔχει*, says: *τὰ γὰρ κόλουρα ἐν ταῖς ἱερουργίαις οὐ θύεται, καὶ καθόλου περ ἂν μὴ ἦ τέλειον καὶ ὑγιές οὐ θύεται τοῖς θεοῖς*. The lustral pig was sacrificed<sup>18</sup>, its blood was sprinkled around and its body was carried in a procession encircling the place to be purgated. Incense might afterwards be burnt. The carcass of the pig was probably thrown finally into the sea. So the scholiast on Aristophanes *Acharnenses* 44: *εἰώθασιν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι θύειν δέλφακα καὶ ραίνειν τὰς καθέδρας τῶ ἀίματι αὐτοῦ εἰς τιμὴν τῆς Δήμητρος, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς καρπούς αὐτῆς*

βλάπτει. The connection of this purificatory rite with Demeter is very important: the Eleusinian ritual can be seen as a large-scale purification of body and soul. On the other hand the last sentence presents again the superficial, pseudo-rationalising explanation which we disposed with above. The scholiast then interposes information on the matter in the particular case of the Assembly purification: *τι καθάιρονται οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ χοίρου σφαζομένου καὶ ὁ ῥήτωρ μαρτυρεῖ* (a reference to Aeschines 4.11 (ed. Stephanus), a passage already referred to above): *ἐπειδὴν τὸ καθάρσιον περιενεχθῆ καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ τὰς πατρίους εὐχὰς εὔξεται, τότε δὴ κελεύει δημηγορεῖν*. In the third part of the scholion, the Scholiast returns to the general point: *τὸ δὲ θυόμενον χοιρίδιον ἐπὶ καθάρσει τῶν τόπων κάθαρμα ἐκαλεῖτο, ὁ δὲ περικαθαίρων καθαρτῆς. καὶ παρὰ μὲν τοῖς κωμικοῖς κάθαρμα καλεῖται* (e.g. by Aristophanes in the very passage the Scholiast is commenting upon), *Αἰσχίνης δὲ ἐν τῷ κατὰ Τιμάρχου* (loc. cit.) *καθάρσιον καλεῖ*. No mention of *Περιστίαρχος* here, simply because he has in mind the general practice and not the specifically public one; this further confirms our restriction as to the duties of the *Περιστίαρχος* above explained.

Complementary and confirming information is provided by the Scholiast to the Aeschinean passage above-mentioned. He says: *ἐπεὶ ἔθος ἦν τοιοῦτον: εἰσήρχετό τις (ὁ λεγόμενος Περιστίαρχος) ὁ περικαθαίρων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν διὰ χοίρου ἐπεσφαγμένου καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν* (what were these other things exactly? Clearly purificatory substances, at any rate, sponges used to wipe away pollution by absorbing it), *καὶ τὰ καθάρσια λαβὼν ἔρριπτεν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. ὁ καὶ ὁ ποιητῆς εἶπεν: (Homer, A 314) οἱ δ' ἀπελυμαίνοντο καὶ εἰς ἄλλα λύματ' ἔβαλλον<sup>19</sup>. Εἶτα εἰσήρχετο ὁ κῆρυξ, ὃς θυμιατεύσας πρότερον καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν* (here we have the burning of incense), *ὑστερον ἐβόα: Τίς ἀγορεύειν βούλεται etc<sup>20</sup>*.

We do not know the exact type of sacrifice involved in these purificatory rites. If the text of Photius' Lexicon s.v. *καθάρσιον* is correctly transmitted and he was correctly informed, then the pig carried round the place to be cleansed was roasted or boiled, or at any rate parched. He says: *καθάρσιον· χοιρίδιον ἦν ὀπτὸν ᾧ ἐκάθαιρον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν οἱ λεγόμενοι περιστίαρχοι· περιστίαρχος δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ περιστεῖχειν*. I suggest that we should connect this piece of evidence with what the Scholiast to Aristophanes Thesmoph. 236 says (a

passage already referred to above): *μετὰ γὰρ τὸ τυθῆναι, τὰ δελφάκια φλογίζονται ἵνα ψιλωθῶσιν*: after the sacrifice the suckling pigs are parched so that they can be striped of all their hair. It is, then, in such a parched condition, and without any hair that they can serve as *καθάρματα*. Hair, and particularly wool, was considered unclean in mystic contexts especially.

Despite the fact that a proper sacrifice took place, the pigs were clearly not to be eaten, off-scourings (and with the plenitude of pollution upon them) as they are; in fact we are told that they were thrown into the sea; or, in other cases, thrown away at road junctions, at *trivia*<sup>21</sup>.

There remains another, and very important, point to be made, indeed the crucial issue of the matter: why were pigs considered such suitable lustrational victims? Eustathius, the vastly learned bishop, had noticed the fact: *Comment. ad Iliad. p. 1183, 17: Σημείωσαι δὲ ὅτι ἐπιτήδειος ἐδόκει πρὸς καθαρμὸν ὁ σῦς ὡς δηλοῖ Αἰσχύλος ἐν τῷ*:

*πρὶν ἂν παλαγοῖς αἵματος χοιροκτόνου  
αὐτός σε χράνῃ*<sup>22</sup> *Ζεὺς καταστάξας χεροῖν*

(Fr. 197 Hermann = 340 Dindorf = 327 Radt).

The ritual referred to by Aeschylus consisted in washing the polluted one's hands in the purificational victim's blood. We have a description of the ritual in Apollonius, *Argonautica* IV, 693 sqq. Jason and Medea go to the sorceress Circe, they fall on the hearth as wretched suppliants, silently beseeching her help: they are polluted by the murder of Medea's brother. Circe performs the purificational ritual in awe of and with reverence for *Ζεὺς Ἰκέσιος*,

701 *ὃς μέγα μὲν κοτέει, μέγα δ' ἀνδροφόνουσιν ἀρήγει.*

The invocation of him is essential: Zeus *Ἰκέσιος* hears the supplication on behalf of the murderer as well as that on behalf of the victim. Supplication is in itself sacred, irrespective of motive and context. Now the cleansing consisted of holding above the murderers (as they were laying down) a suckling pig, and sacrificing it (by the standard procedure of cutting its throat) invoking *Ζεὺς Καθάριστος*, so

that the blood (together with some other libations) should wash the pollution from the guilty hands:

704 *πρῶτα μὲν ἀτρέπτοιο λυτήριον ἧ γε φόνοιο  
τειναμένη καθύπερθε, σὺς τέκος, ἧς ἔτι μαζοὶ  
πλήμμυρον λοχίης ἐκ νηδύος, αἷματι χεῖρας  
τέγγεν, ἐπιτμήγουσα δέρην· αὐτὶς δὲ καὶ ἄλλοις  
μείλισσεν χύτλοισι, καθάρσιον ἀγκαλέουσα  
Ζῆνα, παλαμναίων τιμήρορον ἰκεσιάων.  
(retaining ἰκεσιάων instead of ἰκεσίησι).*

Then the off-scourings, the *λύματα* (cf. supra), the filth (that is, as we have seen above, mainly the lustrational victim), are removed far away by Circe's attendant Nymphs<sup>23</sup>, whereas she completes the ritual by combusting offering cakes and other *piacula* together with «sombre» (i.e. *αἰώνους*, libations without wine) votive offerings on the hearth:

710 *καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀθρόα πάντα δόμων ἐκ λύματ' ἔνεικαν  
Νηϊάδες πρόπολοι, ταὶ οἱ πόρσνον ἕκαστα.  
Ἴδ' εἴσω πελανοὺς μειλικτρά τε νηφαλίσιν  
καῖεν ἐπ' εὐχλωῆσι παρέστιος, ὄφρα χόλοιο  
σμερδαλέας παύσειεν Ἐρινύας, ἧδὲ καὶ αὐτὸς*

(sc. *Ζεὺς Μειλίχιος*, another «aspect» of *Ζεὺς Ἰκέσιος* and *Καθάρσιος*; here he is associated with the Erinyes, to whom only *ἄοινοι*, *νηφάλιοι*, non intoxicated, *θυσίαι* are suitable)

*εὐμειδῆς τε πέλοιτο καὶ ἦπιος ἀμφοτέροισι  
(i.e. to Jason and Medea)  
etc.<sup>24</sup>*

We have here nothing less than an outline of the ancient Greek purificational rite for murder. The agreement with Aeschylus<sup>25</sup> on three essential points is remarkable: a pig is involved; the washing with the victim's blood of one's own hands; the association of the ritual with Zeus (clearly *Ζεὺς Καθάρσιος*<sup>26</sup>, or *Μειλίχιος*, the «daemonic» Zeus).

Furthermore, we find here combined all the elements already noticed, but relatively dispersed in a variety of cases. Such dispersion, obviously, does not imply real separation in reality, in time or in place: we must never forget the meagreness and mutilated condition of our extant sources. (There is no systematic account of sacral antiquities available to us. What we learn of them comes from accidental notices, descriptions that serve primarily a different purpose than the adequate representation of the sacral reality in its fullness. It belongs to the objective situation of the evidence as it confronts us to be fragmentary and dispersed. We have to collect, combine and re-constitute that reality as a living whole, from the glimpses that its scattered and incomplete condition allows us to have of it). However it is a very welcome proof of the speculatively and scientifically reached conclusions, when one is able to point to evidence which, by exhibiting all the dismembered elements in their natural coordination, provides a demonstration of the orderly connectedness of the entire field.

And such a case is the one before us. We find in the Apollonius passage: the suckling pig as lustrational victim, as piaculum; the wiping out of pollution mainly by washing one's hands in the pig's blood; the existence of other concomitant cathartic libations<sup>27</sup>; the removal far away of the *καθάρματα* or *λύματα*, of the off-scouring; the connection with the hearth; the involvement in the ritual of the «daemonic» Zeus, *Ζεὺς Μειλίχιος* or *Καθάρισος*<sup>28</sup>. Furthermore, the role of *πέλανοι* and *ἄοινοι σπονδαί* in the ritual - mild offerings that were burnt on the hearth emerges clearly for the first time here.

It is worthwhile to observe how the purificational ritual could vary depending on the purpose and nature of the case, while preserving an essential identity in its fundamental pattern. Compare e.g. the purification for homicide in Apollonius, the *κάθαρσις* in the Assembly, and the lustration of Caesar's naval army in Appian, *Ἐμφυλίων* E, 96. In the last one altars are erected by the sea, absolute silence is held, sacrifices are conducted, *καὶ τρὶς ἐπὶ σκαφῶν περιφέρουσιν ἀνὰ τὸν στόλον τὰ καθάρσια* (obviously the sacrificial victims), *συμπεριπλεόντων αὐτοῖς τῶν στρατηγῶν, καὶ ἐπαρωμένων ἐς τὰδε τὰ καθάρσια, ἀντὶ τοῦ στόλου, τὰ ἀπαίσια τραπήναι. νείμαντες δὲ αὐτά, μέρος εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἀπορρίπτουσι καὶ μέρος εἰς τοὺς βωμοὺς ἐπιθέντες ἄπτουσι, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ*. Notice that

the priests imprecate that the ἀπαίσια (ill-omened and untoward things) should fall on the καθάρματα rather than on the ships and the army. Here we have the essential nature of all purification: it absorbs metaphysical filth leaving pure and sound the desired field. The off-scourings are divided (after being carried round) into two parts, one thrown into the sea (we have already observed this way of disposing of the καθάρματα), the other combusted on the altar (όλοκαύτωμα). Both methods are meant to secure the annihilation of the noxious power of the defilement while, especially with the second method of the burnt-offerings, the presiding dark powers and safeguards of cosmic order are also satisfied.

But let us revert once more to the subject of the special suitability of pigs in cathartic rituals. Pausanias, V, 16, 8 informs us that before performing the rites which fall upon them to enact, the Έλλανοδικαί and the sixteen Women are lustrated by a pig (actually with pig's blood) suitable for purification (i.e., I think, unblemished and not as yet weaned) and water: *όπόσα δέ η ταίς έκκαίδεκα γυναιξίν η τοίς έλλανοδικούσιν Ηλείων δρᾶν καθέστηκεν, ού πρότερον δρώσι πρὶν η χοίρω τε έπιτηδείω πρὸς καθαρισμόν και ύδατι άποκαθήρωνται· γίνεται δέ σφίσιν έπι κρήνη Πιέρα τὰ καθάρσια*<sup>29</sup>.

Further, the Scholiast to Apollonius IV.704:

*πρώτα μὲν άτρέπτοιου λυτήριον η γε φόνοιο*

comments on λυτήριον (i.e. that which delivers one from the power of pollution, which dissolves the bondage of defilement, which sets one free) as follows: *τὸ καθάρσιον λέγει, έστι χοιρίδιον μικρόν, όπερ οί άγνίζοντες θύσαντες* (again we find that the lustrational victim is firstly sacrificed), *τὰς χείρας τοῦ άγνιζομένου τῶ αἵματι αὐτοῦ βρέχουσι.*

Hesychius has the following entry s.v. Ἀφροδισία ἄγρα:

*Σοφοκλής Δανάη  
Γόνον τε μήλων κ' άφροδισίαν ἄγραν.*

*Οί μὲν, τοὺς πέρδικας, οἱ δὲ πρὸς τὸν καθαρισμόν άρμόζουσιν· (τῇ δέ θηλεία παλεύοντες αἰροῦσιν αὐτούς)*<sup>30</sup>. *κακῶς δέ· χοίρω γάρ καθαίρουσι και άρνίω, ἄλλ' οὐ πέρδικι. λέγει οὖν τῆν τῶν συῶν (sc.*

ἄγραν) διὰ τὸ κατωφερὲς εἶναι τὸ ζῶον πρὸς συνουσίαν. καπρᾶν γέ τοι καὶ καπραίνειν ἀπὸ τούτου (i.e. from κάπρος, the wild boar). Δύναται δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν αἰγῶν γονὴν δηλοῦν· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ζῶον λίαν ἐπτόηται πρὸς τὰ ἀφροδίσια ὥστε καὶ ἑαυτὸ ὑβρίζειν. (It can work self-arousal).

Sophocles in the quoted passage from the Danae must refer to animals suitable to purification. He mentions sheep, and then refers to some other kind indirectly, calling it ἀφροδισία ἄγρα. Hesychius mentions three views as to exactly which animal is meant. Setting aside the third as not relevant to our inquiry, we see that the first candidate is the pigeon, and this, as explained in n. 30, does answer nicely. The second view is supported by people who object that doves are not used in purifications, but sheep and pigs are, and then explain the adjective ἀφροδισία by the known fact of the latter animal's extreme sexuality<sup>31</sup>. There is, however, an unnoticed difficulty raised by ἄγρα since there is no known special connection between purifications and wild boars; but the expression could be merely poetic, though I am not happy with this solution. It is preferable to say that, without knowing the context in the drama, the supposition cannot be ruled out that some particular circumstance explained the reference to boars rather than to pigs. Unless the ἄγρα refers rather to the «chasing» of the sow by the boar. However, it is not as significant for our purpose to decide on the more probable interpretation of Sophocles' verse as it is to notice that many philologists have gone out of their way to reject a very plausible and, in all appearances, nicely fitting interpretation (I am speaking of first-order adaequatio here, of course), on the strength of the conviction that, in mentioning purificatory animals, Sophocles must have referred to pigs. Eustathius records both possibilities. In continuing the passage which gave us the Aeschylean verses on purification by means of the pig's blood (Comm. in Iliad p. 1183) he says: λέγεται δέ, φασι, καὶ Ἀφροδισία ἄγρα καθὰ πέρδιξ, οὕτω καὶ σὺς· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ὁ χοῖρος κατωφερῆς εἰς ἀφροδίσια. Ὅθεν κατὰ Αἴλιον Διονύσιον, καὶ κάπρανα γυνή, ἣ ὀργῶσα πρὸς μίξεις· καὶ καπρᾶν κυρίως τὸ ὀρέγεσθαι κάπρον τὴν ὕν.

But let us ask again our principal and crucial question: why were pigs considered so appropriate in purifications? The already referred-to scholia on Aeschines, *Contra Tim.* p. 4.10, give us the answer. After



explaining the purification at the Assembly by the Peristiarchos, it continues: Ἐκέχρητο δὲ ὁ περιστῖαρχος χοίρω καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀκαθάρτοις, διὰ τούτων τοὺς ἀκαθάρτους δῆμους καὶ τὰ πνεύματα (spirits) τὰ πολλάκις ἐνοχλοῦντα ταῖς διανοαῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὥστε πολλάκις ἄλλως βουλεύεσθαι, ἔλκων πρὸς τὰ θύματα καὶ ὡσπερ ἀποχωρίζων τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἵνα καθαρῶς βουλεύσῃται. ὁ δὲ κῆρυξ διὰ τῶν θυμιαμάτων ἐπικαλῶν τὰ θεῖα <εἶλκε> (or <συνῆγε>; there is a lacuna here in the mss.) τοῖς ὁμοίοις τὰ ὅμοια, ἵνα διὰ τῆς τούτων παρουσίας ἀγαθόν τι ἔχωσιν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι βουλεύεσθαι.

We have here the principles of homoeopathic magic; more than that, we have a particular operation of the Homoeopathic Principle in general, a principle so dominant in ancient Greek experience, appearing already, in its application to social life, in Homer, *Odyssey*, ρ 218:

*ὡς αἰεὶ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἄγει θεὸς ὡς τὸν ὁμοῖον.*

The Scholiast relates the proceedings to the particular purpose in view, i.e. the deliberations in the Assembly, but, clearly, the scope of his explanation is universal. Impure animals attract impure spirits<sup>32</sup>, pure incense releases the activity of beneficent divinities. Akin acts on akin, the similar «senses», tunes in and receives and resonates the activity of the similar. In studying the ancient, particularly the ancient Greek, mind, one meets again and again with clear, and not too clear, workings of this general principle: from the notion of knowledge being of the similar by the similar to that remarkable phenomenon, Greek homosexuality; from medical homoeotherapy to the emotional catharsis in tragedy. And so on.

But the action of the similar on the similar is normally additive or even multiplicational, it augments the weight of the manifestation of the character in question. In this way the polluted stuff, when powerful enough, attracts the pollution attached to the person who has committed a transgression of the divine, cosmic order, and thus cleans it: the substance full of abomination is then cast away, and the person is ridden from the defilement of his offence. Such Rites of Riddance, and corresponding Rituals of Aversion (luring horrendous

powers to stay away and remain unencountered), did indeed pertain preeminently to ancient religiosity. Yet Heraclitus' point is deeper and more far-reaching, like an occult harmony mightier than any exposed one. Till now the Principle of Homoeoattraction has been applied externally to the sullied person: it is a case of Purifying Impurity, defilement which cleanses by absorbing the stains of guilt. But the Principle may also operate internally: now it is the polluted person which attracts and absorbs the offered impurity thereby intensifying its condition of defilement. If properly conducted, the process effects thorough purification. In this case, it is a question of intrinsically Polluted Purification rather than of an extrinsically Purifying Pollution. Herein lies the significance of the Heraclitean doctrine.

Homoeoactivity and homoeopassivity in this stronger sense presuppose at the root the identity of opposites. For a heightened concentration (in power and energy, if not in substance) of an essence can act restrictively on a consubstantial mass only by exercising a forcefully contrary influence. Since all existence is dualistic in nature and bipolar in appearance, the intensification of a character, by moving to one extreme, approaches the common root of the opposition which it manifests the one pole of, and thus excites the contrary tendency and activates the reverse movement. By reason of the inherent tension of being, once at the extremest intensity of its particular character of existence, a thing must start changing toward its opposing complementarity, which from now on will have to make itself felt with increasingly potency. The Pendulum of Being must reverse the direction of movement precisely when it is at its maximal distance from the middle position in one direction. So that by pushing in one direction at the limit, one actually causes the beginning of the reverse movement. Such extremity is reached either by (a series of) enormities perpetrated according to the Law of Blood; or through the enormity of ritual awfulness that symbolically (and magically) reproduces the former in a controlled manner. In the first case tremendous destruction accompanies the final purification; in the second, the tremendous energy involved is channelled in a saving process. In any case, the Order of Existence remains inviolable. The Law of Blood secures absolute and necessary Cosmic Justice.

## NOTES

1. Plutarch, *Demetrius*, ch. 26, uses the *τελετή* in the general sense, in which, for instance, Aristotle, apud Synesius, *Dio*, 10 (Fr. 15, Ross), uses it when he *ἀξιοὶ τοὺς τελουμένους οὐ μαθεῖν τι δεῖν ἀλλὰ παθεῖν καὶ διατεθῆναι*; an apophthegm which Michael Psellus (v. Cat. des Man. Alchem. Grecs ed. Bidez vol. 6, 171) very pertinently relates to the Eleusinian *Τελευταί* and comments on as follows when he distinguishes between the *διδακτικόν* (teachable) and *τελεστικόν*: *τὸ δὲ δεύτερον (sc. τὸ τελεστικόν) αὐτοῦ παθόντος τοῦ νοῦ τὴν ἔλλαμψιν (sc. γίνεται)*: ὁ δὲ καὶ *μυστηριώδης Ἀριστοτέλης ὠνόμασε καὶ ἑοικὸς ταῖς Ἐλευσινίαις (ἐν ἐκείναις γὰρ τυπούμενος ὁ τελούμενος τὰς θεωρίας ἦν, ἀλλ' οὐ διδασκόμενος)*. Similarly when, for instance in Sch. Aristoph. Pax, 374 we read that *τι τοῖς μμουμένοις ἐστὶν ἔθος χοιρίδιον θύειν*, here *μούμενος* is used in the broad sense signifying any mystic or rather mysteric rite (especially one pertaining to the Eleusinian worship of Demeter, Persephone and Iacchus). We need not associate the sacrifice of the pig with the Lesser Mysteries in contrast to the greater ones.
2. One of Piraeus' harbours (cf. Sch. on Aristoph. Pax 145). A special purificatory role was played in the context of the Eleusinian mysteries by two rivulets, called *Ρειτοί* or *Ρίτοι* (the grammarians differed over the name, e.g. Horus favoured the former, Herodianus the latter, cf. Etym. M. s.v. and Scholia ad Thucyd. II, ch. 19), of salt water (*ἐπεὶ τό γε ὕδωρ θάλασσά ἐστι σφίσι*, Pausanias I, 38, 1), coming from one source (Photius s.v. *Ρειτά*: *ἐν Ἐλευσίνι δύο ναμάτια φερόμενα ἐκ μιᾶς πηγῆς καλούμενα Ρειτά*: οὕτως Σοφοκλῆς), their water disappearing into the earth, hence of chthonic significance in the chthonic Eleusinian ritual. (V. Etym. M. s.v. *Ρειτὸς ἢ Ρίτος*: ...*διὰ φάραγγος ὑπὸ γῆν ρέοντες ἐν τῷ Θριασίῳ (sc. πεδίῳ) πλησίον Ἐλευσίνος*; hence described by Hesychius s.v. as *ρωγμαί*, fractures of the earth); the one of them being especially associated with Demeter (*πρεσβυτέρα θεά*), the other with Persephone (*νεωτέρα*, v. Hesychius s.v.); in them the *θίασοι* (the associations of mystics themselves) took their purificatory bath (Hesychius: *ἴθην τοὺς λουτροὺς ἀγνίζεσθαι τοὺς θιάσους*; for a different ritual connected with the rivulets, see Pausanias I, 38, 1). It is to this cleansing, purification and expiation, rather than to the pig-*καθάρματα* that the priest named Ὑδρανός (v. Hesychius s.v., ὁ ἀγνιστῆς τῶν Μυστηρίων, cf. also *ὑδράνα* and *ὑδράνη*) was presiding over. In this context it is extremely important to notice that *ἀνύδρονος* or *ἀνύδρευτος*, according to Hesychius s.v., is the *ἄταφος*: *οὐ λελουμένος, οὐδὲ τῶν νομιζομένων τυχῶν*: the ordinary preparation of the dead is transplanted and transformed in the Eleusinian ritual as a preparation for the beatific life of the initiated.

3. V. Homer A 314 οἱ δ' ἀπελυμαίνοντο καὶ εἰς ἄλλα λύματα ἔβαλλον, very significantly before offering splendid sacrifices to Apollo. Such a purgative lavation in the sea of a sacrificed pig as *κάθαρμα* is mentioned by the Scholiast to Aeschines, *Contra Timarchum* 23, an important passage which will be discussed below.
4. Cf. Hesychius s.v. For the fixing of the day on the 16th, cf. Polyainus, *Strategemata* III, 11; Plutarch Phocion ch. VI (where an *οἰνοχόημα* is also introduced on that day by Chabrias for his victory); idem, *de Gloria Athen.* 349F. (Harrison, *Prolegomena* etc. p. 152, erroneously refers the *πανσέληνος* to that victory.
5. Numismatic evidence strikingly confirms this, too. Eleusinian coins normally bear on the one side Triptolemos in the Serpent chariot of Demeter, holding ears of corn, and on the other a pig with a torch below it and an ivy spray at the lower exergue.
6. Cf. e.g. Scholia, Aristophanes Plutus 454: *καθάρματα ἐλέγοντο οἱ ἐπὶ καθάρσει λοιμοῦ τινος ἢ τινος ἐτέρας νόσου θύομενοι τοῖς θεοῖς. τοῦτι δὲ τὸ ἔθος καὶ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἐπεκράτησε. λέγεται δὲ καὶ καθαρισμός, cleansing. We are now confronted with the great subject of *φαρμακός*. For a useful collection of relevant evidence consult Gerhard' s dissertation: «*Die pharmakoí in Ionien und die Σύβακχοι in Athen*». Cf. also Suda s.v. *κάθαρμα*, where, referring to an Aristophanian passage it says: ὑπὲρ δὲ καθαρμοῦ πόλεως ἀνήρουν ἐστολισμένον τινά, ὃν ἐκάλουν κάθαρμα. Further cf. Photius s.v. *περίψημα*: οὕτως ἐπέλεγον τῷ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐμβαλλομένῳ τῇ θαλάσῃ νεανία ἐπ' ἀπαλλαγῇ τῶν συνεχόντων κακῶν: «περίψημα ἡμῶν γενοῦ» ἦτοι σωτηρία καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις· καὶ οὕτως ἐνέβαλον τῇ θαλάσῃ, ὡσανεὶ τῷ Ποσειδῶνι θυσίαν ἀποτινύντες. One should also be reminded in this context of the Apostle's remarkable passage in I. Corinth. IV, 13.*
7. Its diminutive dimensions makes the point of Aristophanes' joke in *Eclesiaz.* 129: ὁ *Περιστίαρχος*, περιφέρειν χρῆ τὴν γαλῆν - as the Scholiast remarks: τὴν γαλῆν: εἰς τὴν λεπτότητα τοῦ δελφάκιου (sc. ἀναφέρεται οἱ something similar): *δελφάκιον* is the suckling pig, a diminutive animal jokingly referred to as a cat.
8. Naturally this purification *de rigueur* did not exclude other lustrational rituals being performed on special occasions. Thus we learn from Plutarchus, *Praecepta Gerendae* Reipubl. 814B, that the Athenians on learning the Argive *σκυταλισμόν* in which one thousand and five hundred people were killed by their compatriots, *περινευγκεῖν καθάρσιον περὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐκέλευσαν*: such monstrosity, by its very enormity was likely to spread its dire filth and contaminate places far away from its place of perpetration, as in Athens.

9. Is not here the singular *ἑστίαν* significant? Could it mean the hearth of the city, for instance, perhaps the hearth-altar in the Prytaneion? The close connection of Vesta and the *Πρυτανεῖον* as the hearth of the city is well known. Cf. a locus classicus, Pindar, Nemea, XI, 1: *Παῖ Ρέας, ἅ τε Πρυτανεῖα λέλογχας, Ἑστία, / Ζηνὸς ὑψίστου κασίγνητα* etc., where the Scholiast says: *πρυτανεῖα φησι λαχῆν τὴν Ἑστίαν, παρόσον αἱ τῶν πόλεων Ἑστίαι ἐν τοῖς Πρυτανεῖοις ἀφίδρυνται καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν λεγόμενον πῦρ ἐπὶ τούτων ἀπόκειται*. We know also that in Athens there was *ἄσβεστον πῦρ* (the inextinguishable fire), as in the Temple of Vesta in Rome: Pluarchus, Numa, ch. IX: *ἐπεὶ τοι τῆς Ἑλλάδος πῦρ ἄσβεστόν ἐστιν, ὡς Πυθοῖ καὶ Ἀθήνησιν, οὐ παρθένοι, γυναιῖκες δὲ πεπαυμένοι γάμων ἔχουσι τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν*. This last character differs from the Roman Vestals; where notice the superior wisdom of Greeks (though the matter has a more profound religious significance as well): elderly women are the guardians of the Flame, who are chaste and pure from aphrodisiac contamination by being beyond the limit of sexual intercourse with men. The paroemiographer has plural in the passage under discussion, but it is obviously a loose, if not incorrect statement: *καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι* (sc. *οἱ περιστῆραρχοι*) *περικαθάιρον τὰς ἑστίας καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τὰς πόλεις*. In any case public hearth altars must be meant: the *περιστῆραρχος* was a public priest - magistrate (cf. also Hesychius s.v. *καθάρσια*).
10. This is a locus difficilis. The text of the last sentence is mine. The paroemiographer's mss. have (ed. Leutsch) *οἰκίας περιλημμένοι* (sic) *δημοσίας καὶ περιδρομον ἔχοντες* (sc. *οἱ περιστῆραρχοι*; but what is then the *περίδρομος*? A net's rope?). Photius (ed. Naber) has: *ἐκάστου τῶν ἱερῶν οἰκίας περιειλημμένου δημοσίαις καὶ περιδρομον ἔχοντες*, the last word of which I would emend in this connection to *ἐχούσης* or better *ἔχοντος*, so that the meaning would be that they were going round those *ἱερά* which were incorporated in the midst of public offices and which had a *περίδρομος* (a portico, or something of the sort, all round): this sense I would propose, if the one indicated in the text is found to be defective. Finally Bekker in his Suidas has: *ἐκ. τῶν ἱερῶν οἰκίαις περιειλημμένον* (but this must be a typographical mistake for *περιειλημμένου*) *δημοσίαις καὶ περιδρομον ἔχοντες*, to which the same difficulties and solutions are appropriate. Palaeographically the mistake might have originated from a supra lineam addition of *μή*, like this: *μή παριέμενοι*, which *μη* was misread as *λη* and incorporated within the word instead of being prefixed to it.
11. Cf. Hesychius s.v. *ἑστία*: *βωμὸς ἢ οἰκία*, for *ἑστία* in the broader sense of the altar or even the building itself (metaphorical probably in the latter case - cf. the expression *ὑπὲρ βωμῶν καὶ ἐστιῶν*).

12. Aristophanes *Acharnenses* 43 sq. κῆρυξ: πάριτ' ἔς τὸ πρόσθεν, / πάριθ', ὡς ἂν ἐντὸς ἦτε τοῦ καθάρματος. One was safe and exempt from maleficent influences only within the circle of protection determined by the carrying round of the purificatory objects. The Mantineans wanting to cleanse their city after it has been polluted by the presence of the guilty Cynaethian καθαρόν τῆς πόλεως ἐποιήσαντο σφάγια περιαγαρόντες κύκλω τῆς χώρας ἀπάσης (Athenaus XIV 626F).
13. For the distinction between *ιερά*, *δημοσία*, *ιδία* cf. also among many other relevant passages Aristotle, *Politics* 1267b34, where it is applied to the question of the distribution of land, according to the theory of Hippodamos.
14. There is a final question to be examined, as to the extent of the jurisdiction of the Peristarchos. Hesychius s.v. *κάθαρμα* says: τὸ χοιρίδιον, ᾧ τὴν ἐστίαν ἐκάθαιρον ἐν ταῖς ἐκτροπῖαις (sic cod.). ὁ δὲ ἐπιτελῶν δημοσίως περιστίαρχος ἐλέγετο. Ἐκτροπῖαι (or rather *ἐκτροπαί*, as perhaps we should read here with Valesius) are the trivia and tetravia or fork-like junctions of or branches off a road, cf. Hesychius s.v. Ἄτραπός; Aristoph. *Ranae* 113 (with Scholia); Xenophon *Hellenica* VII, 1, 29; Euripides, *Rhesus*, 881. We need not assume that hearths or altars were erected at such junctions, even though some sacred object or other (*Ἐκάτειον*, Herma or Apollo *Ἄγχιεύς*) was to be found there. But I think that Hesychius here alludes to a significant practice incorporated in the rites of purification of houses: the *κάθαρμα*, the off-scouring, was thrown in the streets and, particularly, in road junctions or trivia. Eustathius (commenting on *Odyssey* χ 481 where purification by fire and brimstone (the magical *θειώσεις*) is being performed after the slaughter of the suitors and the hanging of the maidens, among other very important information says: καὶ ἕτεροι μὲν δηλοῦσι τρόπους καθαρῶν ἐτέρουσ' ἃ (sc. *καθάρσια*) καὶ ἐξάγοντες τῶν οἴκων (hence we have to do with a purification of a house, of an ἐστία) μετὰ τὰς ἐθίμους ἐπαιοιδὰς προσέριπτον ἀμφόδοις ἔμπαλιν τὰ πρόσωπα στρέφοντες καὶ ἐπανιόντες ἀμεταστρεπτί. Ἄμφοδοι or ἄμφοδα probably relate to a schema (something similar to a *τριόδος*) where a main road has smaller roads or lanes coming off it). We thus learn of the practice of throwing away in such places the off-scourings of the preceding *καθαρόν* without looking at them, and going back home without turning to look behind. Eustathius further mentions such disposing of *καθάρματα* in trivia during the *Πομπαῖα*, in connecting further on various forms of lustrational riddance: καὶ οἱ τὸ διοπομπεῖν (or *διοπομπεύειν*) δὲ ἐρμηνεύοντες φασὶν τι δῖον ἐκάλουν κώδιον ἱερίου τυθέντος Διὶ Μειλιχίῳ ἐν τοῖς καθαρμοῖς φθίνοντος Μαιμακτηριῶνος μηνὸς τε ἤγοντο τὰ Πομπαῖα, καὶ καθαρμῶν ἐκβολαὶ εἰς τὰς τριόδους ἐγίνοντο. This clarifies Hesychius' meaning. He further comments that the one who performed this disposal or riddance *δημοσίως*, that is as a state functionary,

on behalf and with the authority of the state and for public purposes, was called *Περιστίαρχος*. This confirms our restriction on the extent of duties laying on that magistracy.

15. My point is nicely illustrated by a lemma in that most learned and reliable from the extant grammatico-lexicographical works of antiquity - I mean of course Hesychius' Lexicon. We read there s.v. *κάθαρμα*: τὸ χοιρίδιον, ᾧ τὴν ἑστίαν ἐκάθαιρον ἐν ταῖς ἐκτροπίαῖς (sic cod.)· ὁ δὲ ἐπιτελῶν δημοσίως περιστίαρχος ἐλέγετο. The case is clear: *Κάθαρμα* was the young pig by means of which they were purifying the ἑστία ἐν ταῖς ἐκτροπίαῖς whatever this means - and we shall attend to this matter in a moment. The person who was performing these purifications δημοσίως, i.e. as a public function, was a city-official, our very *Περιστίαρχος*. He was the magistrate responsible for the public purification of public hearth-altars as distinct both from strictly priestly lustrational ceremonies (especially in strictly sacred [*ἱεροῦς*] places) and from private purgational proceedings.

But what exactly were these purifications ἐν ταῖς ἐκτροπίαῖς? And first of all what are the ἐκτροπίαῖ? Ἐκ-τροπαί were roads off a main highway, such as one meets with when travelling from a town to another, leading to some out of the way places. The verb ἐκτρέπεσθαι was also used to signify one's taking such a sideway, as we can see, very appositely, from Pausanias' periegesis; cf. e.g. II, 25, 8; 36, 2; III, 10, 6; 21, 5. The verb, in the same use, may be also found in Aristophanes Fr. 282 Blaydes = 275 Di = Fr. 293 PCG, apud Pollux X.185: οὐ μέντοι οἱ κεραμεῖς τὰς πλίνθους ἔπλαττον, πλινθεῖον καλεῖ (perhaps <τὸν>) τόπον ἐν Δράμασιν ἢ Νιόβῃ Ἀριστοφάνης, περὶ τοῦ Κυκλοβόρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ λέγων·

ὁ δ' ἐς τὸ πλινθεῖον γενόμενος ἐξέτρεψε.

But I should rather write ἐξέστρειψε here with most of the mss. and the old vulgate text; for if the meaning is supposed to be «turned off» (as Blaydes would have it) then ἐξετράπη should here have been used. Unless an object is omitted, like πλίνθους for instance, as is suggested in Meineke Fr. Com. Gr. II p. 1061, countenanced less explicitly by Dindorf and adopted by Bergk; but then the use of the verb is of course irrelevant to the present signification (other ideas for a grammatical object are <πάντα> Kock, <θῦδωρ> or <ἐαυτὸν> Kaibel). For *Κυκλοβόρος* river v. Fr. 293 PCG. Cf. also Fr. 644; with notes. Furthermore, the verb can be used, naturally, for any deflection from one's way, whether one takes or indeed follows an actual proper road: cf. Xenophon, *Anabasis*, IV, 5, 15: ἐνταῦθ' ἐκτραπόμενοι ἐκάθηντο, καὶ οὐκ ἔφασαν προεῦεσθαι, of a group of utterly exhausted soldiers, unable to follow the main body over the rugged wilderness to which their retreat led them.

For the substantive, *ἐκτροπία*, see Aristophanes *Ranae*, 113, where in the midst of a funny list of what one encounters in wanderings, we find *ἐκτροπάς*, the scholiast explaining: *ἐκτροπαὶ δὲ ἐκνεύσεις τῶν ὁδῶν, ὅπου τις ἐκτραπήναι δύναται* - though he probably means here places where one can stand by the road, rather than ways off it, as the sequel suggests more strongly: *διὰ τὸ ἐκτρέπεσθαι τῆς ὁδοῦ καὶ κρύπτεσθαι, ὅταν ταραχὴ τις γένηται τῶν νεκρῶν*. In Euripides, *Rhesus*, 879-81 we read:

*ὕμᾱς δ' ἰόντας τοῖσιν ἐν τείχει χρεῶν  
Πριάμῳ τε καὶ γέρουσι σημήνῃαι νεκροῦς  
θάπτειν κελεύειν λεωφόρους πρὸς ἐκτροπάς.*

For such tombs of eminent (heroic) persons by the side of public ways v. J. Kirchmann de *Furerib. Roman.* Lib. II, 22. If, less probably, *λεωφόρου* (with or without a change of *κελεύειν* to *κελεύθου* with Dobree) is the correct reading here, the point remains.


A most clear illustration of the desired use of *ἐκτροπή* is provided by Xenophon *Hist. Graeca* VII, 1, 29, where, in connexion with soldiers moving on the road from Midea to Sparta, we read: *ὡς δ' ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ ἐπ' Εὐτρησίους ἐκτροπῇ* etc., which means the way leading to Eutresia off the Midea-Sparta road. It is also evident that we have a junction (*συμβολή*) there, as is in fact explicitly said in loc.cit.: *ὁ δὲ (sc. Ἀρχίδημος), οὐπὲρ ἐστι χωρίον ἐπίπεδον ἐν ταῖς συμβολαῖς τῆς τε ἐπ' Εὐτρησίων καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ Μιδέας ὁδοῦ, ἐνταῦθα ἐκβάς παρετάξατο ὡς μαχοῦμενος*. I believe that the reason why such a junction is more appropriately characterised by *ἐκτροπή* rather than called straightforwardly a *τρίοδος* is firstly that the latter expression implies a fork-like junction like this: Y, rather than a diversion like this: V;

and secondly that the *ἐκτρέπεσθαι* suggests taking a lesser, in some way, road off the main traffic line, whereas all the branches off a *τρίοδος* stand more or less on the same footing. Of course just as the verb has a more general meaning, so the substantive. *Ἐκτροπαί* can be off-growths or branches or cross-phenomena of any kind, cf., e.g., Diodorus III, 14: *τὰς δὲ οἰκήσεις ἔχουσιν (sc. οἱ Ἰχθυοφάγοι) οὐκ ἄποθεν τῆς θαλάττης παρὰ τὰς ραχίας, καθ' ἃς εἰσὶν οὐ μόνον βαθεῖαι κοιλάδες, ἀλλὰ καὶ φάραγγες ἀνώμαλοι, καὶ στενοὶ παντελῶς αὐλῶνες σκολιαῖς ἐκτροπαῖς ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως διειλημμένοι. τούτων δὲ τῇ χρεῖα τῶν ἐγχωρίων πεφυκότων ἀρμοζόντως, τὰς ἐκτροπὰς καὶ διεξόδους συγκεχώκασι λίθοις μεγάλοις*, etc. These last ways out are evidently not proper roads. Cf. also idem III, 25 sub in. In fact an *ἐκτροπή* can also be a branch of a canal, v. The Flinders Petrie Papyri, Part II, p. 40. And there is of course the whole range of possibilities constituted by the very construction of the word, *ἐκ-τρέπω*.



The word is found transliterated in Latin (ectropas esse multas), Varro, Menippeae Fr. 418 Bücheler = p. 198.3 Riese; it corresponds exactly, in its entire field of meaning and specifically in connexion with roads, to the Latin diverticulum or deverticulum. In fact the correspondence is so close that we can illustrate some uses of the Greek word so very clear and explicit in their precise significance by the analogy to the Latin use and meaning. The main road and the smaller by-road leading to a country house are nicely illustrated by Terence, Eunuch, IV, 2, 7; and similarly in Suetonius, Nero, 48. Cf. also Cicero, In Pisonem, 22 §53; Frontinus, Aquad., 5: concipitur Appia via Praenestina deverticulo etc.; Curtius Rufus III, 13, 9. Such examples as Pliny's XIV, 5 (...in eodem Nomentano (sc. agro) decimi lapidis ab urbe diverticulo) or XXXI, 25 sub in (idem et Virginem adduxit ab octavi lapidis diverticulo duobus millibus pass. Praenestina via) and VI, 26 (diverticulo duum millibus), testify to the Romans practicality and efficaciousness: main roads were marked with stones as sign-posts, and side ways could thus be referred to without mentioning the places to which they were leading - as is always the case in Greece. Servius, commenting on Virgil's

Objiciunt equites sese ad divortia nota etc.

(*Aeneas* IX, 379, cf. Tacitus *Agricola*, 19), confirms my explanation of the ἐκτροπή to the letter: Ad divortia: vias in diversa tendentes, hoc est, ad diverticula viae militaris. He then refers to the already quoted passage from Terentius, Eunuchus, and concludes: Diverticula autem sunt semitae transversae, quae sunt a latere viae militaris. Via militaris being the main highway, the scheme  - picturing a smaller way (semita) leading off from the highway - is exactly what Servius has in mind.

On the other hand, Donatus in his Commentary on the above quoted Terentian passage brings attention to that other meaning of diverticulum which we suggested above for ἐκτροπή in connexion with Aristophanes, *Ranae*, 113 and the scholia *ad loc.*: a place for travellers to put up, then an inn, a lodging. Donatus explains: diverticulum est, ubi iter de via flectitur. Et proprie diverticula dicuntur in via domicilia, ad quae de itinere divertendum sit. The connexion of the two meanings is natural: such inns were likely to be found at crossroads. A further extension will cover all taverns and will give the word the implication of a place of low reputation. See for the neutral sense Livy, I, 51 sub fin., in which case the place is indeed where Turnus was staying, but still, since he was away from Aricia, that was not his home but other, perhaps hired, lodgings; for the disreputable tavern v. Tacitus *Annales* XIII, 25.

Moving out of the main road could be at times an act of hiding or of avoidance - hence *diverticulum* assumed the nuance of a refuge, a retreat or a lurking place - as indeed the Greek scholiast to the quoted Aristophanian passage has already intimated. But that was only a shade of meaning: we should not fall in the trap prepared for us by the modern practice which pays mechanical attention to the context in determining the sense of a certain usage in isolation from the semantic field to which the word employed belongs in its various applications - and maintain that the meaning of the word in the particular instance «there» (as if there is a «there» without an «everywhere») is subterfuge or retreat or whatever. For all cited examples make it clear that the sense of the word is basically way-out or off, sometimes taken, of course, metaphorically. Consider for instance Plautus, *Captivi* III, 3, 8

nec confidentiae usquam hospitium est, nec diverticulum  
dolis, etc.

He despairs of finding an «exit», an escape for his cunning schemes, just as he fails to see any refuge for his trusting; my point being highlighted by this contrast between *hospitium* and *diverticulum*. And similarly in instances like Cicero, *Partitiones oratoriae*, 39 (§136); *Oratio pro Roscio Comoedo*, 17 (§51); Quintilianus XII, 3, 11; IX, 2, 78; Pliny X, 71 (§140). Naturally such misuses of the scientific method under the pretext of rational methodology were unavailable in pre-«critical» times: no word for this feigned meaning is to be found e.g. in Gesner's *Thesaurus*.

Let us return to our main path, from which we diverted in order to clarify the terminology respecting cross- and off-roads, where purification rites were often performed in antiquity.

16. See e.g., Pollux VIII, 104; Aristophanes, *Pax* 374; Hesychius s.v. *κάθαρμα*; Photius and Harpocration and Suda s.v. *καθάρισιον*; cf. Aristophanes, *Ecclesiaz.* 129 with the Scholion, as explained above. Further, for the sacrifice of a female swine who has just given birth to Terminus v. Ovidius *Fasti* II 656: *lactens porca*. For female pigs sacrificed during the Mysteries, cf. the *μυστικὰς χοίρους* of Aristophanes, *Acharnenses* 764. The suckling pigs, after their sacrifice, were held above fire in order to be stripped bare of hair: Aristoph. *Thesmoph.* 238: *οἶμοι κακοδαίμων, δελφάκιον γενήσομαι*, where the Scholiast: *μετὰ γὰρ τὸ τυθῆναι τὰ δελφάκια φλογίζονται, ἵνα ψιλωθῶσιν*.
17. Suckling pigs, if without any blemish and fit for sacrifice, were called *sacres* or *sacri* in Latin. They were at most two months old, as we learn from Varro, *De Re Rust.* II, 1, 20: *Fere ad quatuor menses a mamma non disjunguntur agni; hoedi tres, porci duo; e quis quoniam puri sunt ad sacrificium, ut*

immolentur, olim appellati sacres; quos appellat Plautus (Menaechm. II, 2, 15) cum ait etc. And further, op. cit. II, 4, 16: cum porci depulsi sunt a mamma, a quibusdam delici appellantur, neque jam lactentes dicuntur qui a partu decimo die habentur puri; ab eo appellantur ab antiquis sacres, quod tum ad sacrificium idonei dicuntur primum, itaque apud Plautum in Menaechmis, cum insanum quem putat etc., with reference to the Plautian passage above mentioned. (If I am correctly interpreting the passage, «neque jam lactentes dicuntur» refers not to delici, where the remark would be trivially true, but rather to sacres. The gist, I presume, is this: even though really suckling, they were not however called [ordinary] sucking-pigs but sacres). According to Varro, then, the unblemished suckling pigs at least ten days old, were sacri and fit for sacrifice. Festus does not seem to impose any lower age limit, but the relevant passage is mutilated: sacrem porcum dici ait Verrius ubi jam a partu habetur purus, a qua re appellatum esse sacrem dicit (the two Plautian examples are mentioned in the sequel - the one already referred to and the other in Rudens IV.6 init. - together with some other missing illustrations). Pliny on the other hand, posits the limit at the fifth day after parturition: Suis foetus sacrificio die quinto purus est etc.

18. This must be emphasised. Sacrifice proper was involved in purifications. Thus, e.g. in the ritual (different in detail, because performed for a different purpose, but identical in the essential pattern) for the lustration of Caesar's fleet in Appianus, Ἐμφυλίων *E*, 98, proper altars (βωμοί) are erected, and θυσίαι are conducted on them (οἱ ἱερούργοι θύουσι etc.),
19. Λύματα are the καθάρματα: cf. Hesychius s.vv. λῦμα and λύματ' ἔβαλλον. (Suda explains them as excrementa). The word was used to signify generally that by which one cleanses and wipes off dirt, so it was also applied to the cleansing and purging of a woman after giving birth to a child; cf. Callimachus, *Hymn to Jupiter* 17 (where the scholiast has: λύματα· καθάρματα) and Pausanias VIII, 41, 2 (who also refers to the Homeric verse). But the general sense was the one which Spanheim, in his most elaborate commentary to Callimachus, defines (on *Hymn to Jupiter*, 17): Λύματα caeteroquin appellatae quaeris sordes, a quibus quis erat purgandus. In the most general sense cf. Callimachus *Hymn to Apollo*, 109. Λύματα as the moral and metaphysical filth or pollution which has to be wiped off, cf. Sophocles, *Ajax* 654 sqq.: Ajax speaks after his madness and his infatuated fury under the influence of which he committed the slaughter of the cattle in the belief that he was killing his enemies:

ἀλλ' εἴμι πρὸς τε λουτρά καὶ παρακτίους  
 λεμώννας, ὡς ἂν λύμαθ' ἀγνίσας ἐμὰ  
 μῆνιν βαρεῖαν ἐξαλύξωμαι (with Hesychius) θεᾶς.

Purification is the only means of placating the Goddess. We observe here the intimate connection of lustration and expiation. The Scholiast ad locum has *λύματα*: *μολυσμοὶ* (*sordes*) and gives one form of purification: *ἔθος ἦν τοῖς παλαιοῖς, ὅτε ἢ φόνον ἀνθρώπου, ἢ ἄλλας σφαγὰς ἐποίουν, ὕδατι ἀπονίπτειν τὰς χεῖρας εἰς κάθαρσιν τοῦ μιάσματος*. (Water is not however an appropriate detergent because of its purity. We need a substance in some way involving dirt, capable of attracting dirt: sea water, or better still, blood. Soap is produced from oils, even from the worst oils).

In Euripides, *Helena*, 1271: *ὡς μὴ πάλιν γῆ λύματ' ἐκβάλλη κλύδων*, the codex has *λύματα* but is impossible in this context: it is about offerings to one who perished at sea. So Hermann proposed *θύματα* (accepted by Dindorf) and Nauck *πάλιν θυλήματα*, perhaps better since the offerings included blood of animals, a laid couch, bronze weapons, fruits of the earth, all to be thrown into the sea from a ship sailing far from the land (so far that the beach-waves be barely visible). In Aeschylus, *Prometheus*, 718 sq. *πήματα, λύματα, δείματ' ἀμφήκει / κέντρω ψύχειν ψυχὰν ἐμάν* it appears difficult to interpret *λύματα* adequately; but seeing the verse in the context of the preceding narration of her fate by Io, we must refer *δείματα* to the nightmarish dreams besetting Io at the beginning of her troubles: cf. *ᾄψειν ἔννευχοι* 672, *ὀνείρασι* 682, *νυκτίφαντ' ὀνείρατα* 684; the *πήματα* refers naturally to the transformation that Io suffered, v. 700 sqq; and *λύματα* must refer to the sending away, the getting rid of as a scapegoat, the casting out of Io by her father as an abomination on the strength of a Delphic oracle: vv. 690-695. This interpretation, confirmed by the imminent destruction threatened if Io's father does not comply with the oracle, both is in tune with the central core of the meaning of *λύματα* - *καθάρματα*, and suits the context nicely. (We can see here how superficial it is to set aside lightly the text as it is transmitted in order to make it follow subjective fancies; see what Hermann did to the passage by being offended by the series of the three substantives).

20. A different scholion to the same effect is preserved in another ms.: *ὁ λεγόμενος περιστάρχος ἱερεῖον λαβὼν* (hence the pig is properly sacrificed before being used as a *καθάρσιον* as I have observed above) *τούτῳ καθαίρει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. τοῦτο λέγεται καὶ καθαρμὸς καὶ καθάρσιον*. The Scholiast, after referring to Aristophanes, *Acharnenses*, 44, continues: *ἔθος δὲ ἦν καθαίρειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὰ θέατρα* (this was also part of the duties of the *Περιστάρχος*, as we saw above) *μικροῖς χοιριδίῳις* (suckling pigs), *ἃ καθάρσια ἐκάλου, καὶ προσηγορεύοντο οἱ περικαθαίροντες περιστάρχοι* (the two *περί* - signify the going around)... *τὸ δὲ καθάρσιον ἦν χοῖρος ἐσφαγμένος* (hence we have again the element of the sacrifice), *δι' οὗ ἐκάθηραν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*.

21. One might further play with the idea of connecting such sacrifices with some sacrifices to Vesta in which the sacrificed animal could not be offered to, or shared by, somebody else, nor could it be taken away: cf. e.g. Hesychius s.v. *Ἔστια θύομεναι*: ἤσαν τινες θυσίαι, ἀφ' ὧν οὐχ οἶόν τε ἦν μεταδοῦναι ἢ ἐξενεγκεῖν; Eustathius, *Odys.* 1579.43: παροιμία τὸ ἐστία θύομεν, ἀφ' ὧν οὐκ ἔστι φασὶ μεταδοῦναι οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν· ἵνα εἴη τὸ ἐστία θύομεν ταῦτόν τῳ οὐδενὶ μεταδιδόαμεν τῶν τῆς ἐορτῆς. Cf. further, Zenobius (in *Corpus Paroemiagr.*) IV, 44; Diogenianus (*ibid.*) II, 40 and IV, 68; Suda s.v. *Ἔστια θύομεν* and *ἰστία*; Photius s.v. *ἐστία θύομεναι*. Aristophanes alludes to this fact in *Plutus* 1138, where the Scholist notices that *ὡς ἐν ἐνίαις θυσίαις λεγομένου τούτου* (sc. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔκφορα or ἔκφορά - see the Scholiast), referring also to a fragment of Theopompus, probably the one which Zenobius also has in mind (cf. Fr. IV of *Καπηλίδες* with Fr. Incertum VIII, Meineke Fr. Com. Gr. Vol. II p. 801 and 818 respectively); cf. Euphro, *Ἀδελφοί*, Fragment in Meineke vol. IV p. 487 v. 20 (apud Athenaeus IX 380A). As I have said, it might appear attractive to associate these sacrifices with the pig-sacrifices for purificatory purposes which we are examining; for, if nothing else, both kinds are very closely associated with the hearth-altar that existed at the innermost, central part of houses or buildings. But the sacrificial victims of the type of sacrifices mentioned in this note seem to be only prohibited from being shared by people other than the family and their servants, that is persons resident in the house in which the sacrifice is being offered to Vesta; and the purpose seems to be rather to confirm and strengthen by religious means the unity of the household than to purge and purify it from any stain. Therefore, it is better to keep the two types separate. On the other hand we find in Latin authors cases which seem to bridge the difference. Thus, Propertius V, 1, 23 refers to lustrations in *compita* (*τριόδους*) by means of pigs; such purgations must be connected with the *Compitalia*, on the calends of May (even if they occur also outside their context). But the *Compitalia* are in honour of the *Lares*, and so unless we make too drastic a distinction between the public and the household *Lares* (a distinction which in any case should be taken very cautiously into consideration, cf. e.g. Ovid, *Fasti* V 129 sqq.), we have lustrations by pigs performed in the name and in honour of spirits presiding over the protection, safety and well-being of the household. And we should bear also in mind Plautus, *Rudens* IV, 6, *init.* where *porci sacres* are intended for sacrifice to *Lares familiares*, *cum auxerunt nostram familiam*; here it is precisely the spirit of household self-consciousness in its achievements which provides the human basis of the service to *Lares*. (For the appellation *porci sacres*, see *supra*). And similarly in Tibullus I, 10, 25 sqq., the *Lares* are

invoked as preservers and protectors, clearly the *Lares patrii* (v. 15) and a sacrifice of a pig is promised together with interesting ritual details:

at nobis aerata, Lares, depellite tela!  
 hostia erit plena mystica porcus hara:  
 hanc pura cum veste sequar, myrtoque canistra  
 vincta geram, myrto vinctus et ipse caput.

*Mystica porcus* corresponds to the *μυστικὸν* or *μυστηρικὸν χοιρίδιον* of Aristophanes as we saw above. Horatius also testifies for the close connection of pig-sacrifices to *Lares aequis*, again in connection with personal well-being and safety: Satire II, 3, 164-5: *immolet aequis / hic porcum Laribus*. In Carmen III, 23, 4, we have the offering of incense (we recall the burning of incense in the Assembly in conjunction with the pig-purification), the *primitia* of corn and a sow, in order to placate *Lares*. This last detail is also significant for our purpose, because, through expiation placation is connected with purification. - In Plautus, *Menaechm.* II, 2, 15 sqq., a *sacer porcus* is associated with the purgation and purification of somebody from his madness (which is a sort of pollution); cf. Varro, *de Re Rust.* II, 4, 16 who mentions and explains the passage. Could this purification involve an (expiatory) sacrifice to *Lares*? We know how appropriate to *Lares* pig-sacrifices were considered. And their mother being *Mania* (*Μανία* or Madness), what more suitable than that the purgation and wiping off of madness should involve piacular or expiatory sacrifice to them and their mother; for whose close connection in ritual, and for instructive information as to their nature consult Macrobius, *Saturnalia* I, 7, 34-5 (and also Arnobius, *Adversus Nationes* III, 41). In the Macrobius passage, we also observe, by the way, that the daemons of the *Compita* and *Compitalia*, and the tutelary divinities of the Household must be indistinguishable.

To conclude then: *Lares*, the household divinities, the daemons of the hearth par excellence, also the spectres of the *compita*, are particularly honoured with suckling-pig sacrifices; placation and purgation are associated with them; and, in general, offerings and sacrifices to them seem to be of the daemonic type, to which their nature is in accord (cf. e.g. the views of Nigidius Figulus and Varro in Arnobius, loc. cit.) - I mean by daemonic type of sacrifices the one which directly and essentially involves placation, expiation, purgation; and I contrast to this the Olympian type of sacrifice which is mainly and eventually honourific; this crucial distinction will be elaborated elsewhere.

On the other hand, the Greek purificatory rites involving also suckling-pig sacrifices were, as we saw, especially connected with the hearth and hearth-altars; and being explicitly purificatory rites they belong to the «daemonic»

worship, in the technical sense of the term alluded to above. Some factors, like the burning of incense (cf. also Juvenalis, XII, 89-90; IX, 137) have been found in both groups of rites; as also the connection with road-junctions.

To which divinity or divinities are then the sacrifices offered which are involved in the purificatory rites above detailed? We are not told, but we may perhaps surmise that they were hearth-divinities, to judge by analogy - confessedly, a not altogether reliable guide.

We are now, at last, in a position to locate, tentatively, in their proper context the group of *Ἑστία θύομεναι* sacrifices with which we began this note. If our hypothesis as to the nature of the divinities involved in the Greek purificatory rites above examined is correct, then *Ἑστία* would stand to these daemonic divinities as Vesta stands to Penates and Lares. If, then, the *Ἑστία θύομεναι* sacrifices were really offered to *Ἑστία*, the ritual would be the Olympian (or quasi-Olympian) analogue of the «daemonic» rites constituting the purgatory ceremonies of our subject. If, on the other hand, the «*Ἑστία*» of the proverbial expressions refers rather to the actual hearth than to the presiding Olympian deity, then the sacrifices in question could be classified as a type of Lares-ritual. Whatever the answer may be as to whether the sacrificial victim was eaten by the members of the household alone or not even by them (and it should be noticed that the Aristophanian passage referred to above - *Plutus*, 1136 sqq. - supports the former alternative, for Hermes asks to be received as *σύνουικος* (v. 1147), as cohabitant or belonging to the same household, in order presumably to have the restriction satisfied. Not to speak of the natural interpretation of what the ancient lexicographers say), however that is, that question should be answered, the result could be reconciled without too much violence with both alternatives. A decision between them is very difficult.

22. *Χράνη* pro ms. *χράναι* Porson in his note on Euripides, *Orestes* 910; Hermann defends *χράναι*: «Recte enim se habet optativus, si haec non vatis alicuius, sed alius hominis verba sunt referentis quid vel vates vel oraculum dixisset» - not without verisimilitude. *Χρᾶναι* Stallbaum.
23. Perhaps it is significant that they are *Νηϊάδες*: we know from inscriptions that *Ζεὺς Νάϊος* was worshipped at Dodona, that there was a festival in his honour (*Νάϊα*) and that the warden of the Temple of Zeus there was called *Ναίταρχος*. V. Inscr. Gr. V2, 118.21; Sylloge Inscr. Gr.3 1206.7. Or perhaps the Nymph's connection with the water of springs and rivers was meant (such water carrying further away the *λύματα*), although one would expect to find reference to the cathartic virtue of the sea instead, as we have noticed above. Interestingly, there are two complementary functions and dimensions of lustration: the one (that of the sea) takes in and neutralises, it digests the pollution; the other (pure water) carries it away.

24. In Orpheus, Argonautica the story is told differently, but the pollution and filth covering the culprits because of the murder which they committed is conveyed very vividly, as does the necessity of divine purification involving the «magic» ritual known to Orpheus. Circe says to Medea referring to her deeds with Jason:

1230 οὐδὲ γὰρ ὕμμε πάτρησιν οἶομαι ἄσσον ἰκέσθαι,  
 εἰ ἐν ἀναγνίστοισιν ἀλιτροσύναις ἀκέοντες,  
 μέσφ' ὅταν ἐκνήψησθε μύσος θείοισι καθαρμοῖς  
 Ὀρφέως ἰδμοσύνησι παρὰ κροκάλοιο Μαλείης  
 (near *Ταίναρον*, the place of the gates of

Hades).

οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμετέροιο δόμου θέμις ἔστιν ἰκέσθαι  
 προστροπίους· τοίῳ γε λύθρῳ πεπαλαγμένοι ἔστέ.

"With such filth you are defiled": we recall here the mud-ritual of the Orphic purifications. Orpheus does perform the necessary ritual, as we are told at the end of the poem:

1363 Ἄλλ' θ' ὑπ' εἰρεσίης Μαλεώτιδας ἰκόμεθ' ἄκρας,  
 Κίρκης ἐννεσίησιν ἀπορρίψεσθαι ἔμελλον  
 ἀράς Αἰήτεω καὶ ἡλιτόποινον Ἐρινύν·  
 δὴ τότε ἔγῳ Μινύαισιν ἐφ' ἱερά λύτρα καθαρμῶν  
 ρέξα, etc.

The pattern and the terms (as underlined) are the same with those of the ordinary ritual described by Apollonius and commented on in extenso above. The difference is that to the ordinary ritual, the Orphic one is meant to be substituted here: No sorceress can perform it, only Orpheus through his esoteric knowledge (gnosis) of things arcane (*ἰδμοσύνη*), in the vicinity of the entrance to the Hades. Thus the purification for a particular crime is meant to be associated with the universal catharsis necessary for the promised beatitude after death, according to Orphism. Such all-potent purifications constitute the sacred ransom (*λύτρα*), which resolves (*λύει*) the bondage of necessity that keeps the human soul in the labyrinth of incessant this-worldly ordeals. The rite involved here could be, as we have hinted, the Orphic mud-ritual.

25. This is one of the numerous agreements in details between earlier and later sources, agreements which provide the empirical support for the a-priori evident thesis that the Ritual is practically unalterable in the context of a historical phase and with reference to the appropriate space-constants; (it can



be only further augmented by the accretion of new ritual observances, or, very rarely, be diminished by the falling into disuse of others). Real changes in it presuppose change of the entire cultural environment in its most basic and essential elements, change of culture on the whole; and even then the qualifications are easily recognizable, just because of the profound change of the outlook they then involve. Such change happened once only in the history of ancient Greece: it was marked by the introduction, or elevation into dominance, of the Olympian dimension in Religion and the accompanying relative de-chthonization (i.e. en-light-ment) of beliefs, life and cultus.

26. Cf. Herodotus I, 44 ... *ἐκάλεε μὲν Δία καθάρσιον, μαρτυρόμενον τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ ξείνου πεπονθῶς εἶη, ἐκάλεε δὲ ἐπίστιόν τε καὶ ἔταιρήμιον, τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον ὀνομάζων θεόν* etc.

27. Cf. e.g. Scholia on Aeschines, *Contra Timarchum*, p. 4.10 sqq.: ...*ὁ περικαθαίρων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν διὰ χοίρου ἐπεσφαγμένου καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν.*

28. Such involvement may seem at first to invalidate forthwith my reasoning and concluding hypothesis in n. sub fin. above. But we should note that we have to do here with a ritual specifically intended for purification from homicide. The placation of the Furies and the satisfaction of Zeus *Μειλίχιος* is essential here. Such variations in the ritual depending on the type of purification at hand are probable. Thus in the catharsis before an Assembly could begin its business, (being not a purgation from any specific act of crime, but rather the precautionary cleansing and taking away of all possible focuses of pollution and contamination), there was not a washing of hands in blood but a sprinkling of the sacrificial blood onto the sitting places around, as we have seen above.

It would be inappropriate here to contend that the Erinyes have definite affinities with the Latin Mania, mother of Lares, in support of the hypothesis vis-à-vis the evidence from Apollonius. For the Furies cause *μανία* (madness, fury), in relation to a committed crime, whereas the Latin Mania seems to be closer in nature to the Greek *Ἄτη*.

On balance then, the hypothesis can stand, as nothing more than a (working) hypothesis.

29. For the use of water in purification cf. Pausanias II, 31, 8-9, regarding the purification of Orestes according to the Troizenians: *καθηῆραι δὲ φασιν Ὀρέστην καθαρσίους καὶ ἄλλοις καὶ ὕδατι τῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἴππου κρήνης*. In both passages we have a connection with a spring of fresh water. Should we relate this to the fact that it is *Νηϊάδες* (Nymphs of the Springs and the rivulets) that dispose of the offscouring in the passage by Apollonius above commented? We have noticed three ways of getting rid of the *καθάρματα*: throwing them into the sea (Scholia ad Aesch. *Contra Timarchum* p. 4.10),

into flowing fresh water or in the fire of whole-burnt sacrifices. Here we see an alternative way of disposing them, namely burying them in the earth (Pausanias, II, 31, 8).

30. Partridges and especially pigeons were hunted by catching female doves, blinding them and fixing them in a net in such a way that male pigeons (hearing her crying) would approach intending to indulge their amorous proclivities and would be caught. These female pigeons who deceived, and were instrumental in catching, the male birds were called *παλεύτραι*. V. Aristoph. Aves 1081-3 and Scholia ad 1083; Bekker Anecdota Gr. p. 59, 6; *ibid* p. 472, 22 (*Ἀφροδισία ἄγρα: οἱ πέρδικες· διὰ τὸ τοὺς θηρῶντας τῇ θηλείᾳ ἐπιβουλεύοντας αἰρεῖν αὐτούς*); Suda s.v. *παλεύσαι*; Photius s.v. *παλεύετε, παλευταί, παλεῦσαι*; cf. Aristotle, Hist. Anim. IX, 613a22-3; cf. also Hesychius s.v. *παλεύσας*.
31. V. Hesychius s.v. *κάπραινα* and *κάπρας*; Eustathius Comm. In Iliad p. 1183 (*κάπραινα* is used of the woman *ὀργῶσα πρὸς μίξεις, κατωφερῆς εἰς ἀφροδίσια*); Suda s.v. *κάπρος* (= *τὸ αἰδοῖον τοῦ ἀνδρός*) and *καπρῶντας*; Aristophanes, Plutus 1024 with the Scholia; Pollux VII, 202 (quoting a verse from Hermippus' *Ἄρτοπώλιδες* - Fr. II, Meineke II p. 384 = Fr. 9 PCG: *ᾧ σαπρὰ καὶ πασιπόρνη καὶ κάπραινα*); cf. Aristotle, Hist. Anim. VI, 571b13 sqq. and 572a15 sqq. Cf. Phryn. Fr. 33K; Pher. Fr. 17 Dem.; Aristophanes, Plut. 1024: *γραὸς καπρώσης*.
32. There is, of course, no inconsistency with the fact that the sacrificial suckling pigs must be pure, i.e. unblemished: obviously the impure spectres desire impure habitation in all its perfection. Similarly, we saw above that mystic pigs were lavated in the sea probably before, and with a view to, their serving as lustrational victims; this does not mean that they were purified in nature, and thus unfit to attract and absorb pollution, but rather that all filth is to be removed from them so that in the crucial rite they may shine in the pristine condition of their nature, they may possess and exhibit their maximum capacity to wipe off the mystic's defilement.