



## CHAPTER 3

### DIVINATION AND THE DIVINE ORDER

The illustrious parentage of the itinerant, even vagrant, chthonicity - and much-abused in Classical times - deserves to be traced, as a necessary complement to our correct understanding of its higher Mystic and Orphico-theosophic forms. Divination, official and unofficial, provides a vantage point.

Melampus was reputed to be the first major *μάντις*, soothsayer, of high antiquity, whose exploits and feats are related or referred to more than once already by Homer (v. *Odyssey* λ, 290 sqq.; ο, 223 sqq.). The prophetic spirit and talent was preserved in his family<sup>1</sup>: thus in the latter of the above-mentioned passages, Homer credits Theoclymenus (himself a diviner) with a glorious ancestry going back to Melampus and including renowned soothsayers like Mantius, Amphiaraus, Polyphideus (cf. 252-3: *αὐτὰρ ὑπέρθυμον Πολυφείδεα μάντιν Ἀπόλλων / θῆκε βροτῶν ὄχ' ἄριστον, ἐπεὶ θάνειν Ἀμφιάροσ*). Melampus' importance in ancient tradition is reflected in the fact that Hesiod<sup>2</sup> composed an entire epos on him: Pausanias IX, 31, 5; Athenaus XI, 498 AB; II, 40F; XIII 609E; Clemens Stromat. VI, 2, 26.

Apollodorus relates how Melampus acquired all three main kinds of divination<sup>3</sup>: (I, §§96-97) *Ἀμυθῶν μὲν οὖν οἰκῶν Πύλον, Εἰδομένην γαμεί τῆν Φέρητος, καὶ γίνονται παῖδες αὐτῷ Βίας καὶ Μελάμπος. ὃς ἐπὶ τῶν χωρίων διατελῶν, οὔσης πρὸ τῆς οἰκήσεως αὐτοῦ δρυὸς ἐν ἧ φωλεὸς ὄφρων ὑπῆρχεν, ἀποκτεινάντων τῶν θεραπόντων τοὺς ὄφεις, τὰ μὲν ἔρπετὰ ξύλα συμφορήσας ἔκαυσε, τοὺς δὲ τῶν ὄφρων νεοσσούς ἔθρεψεν. οἱ δὲ γενόμενοι τέλειοι (i.e. when they assumed the fully developed form and essence of their nature; so *ἀνῆρ τέλειος, γυνή τελεία*) παραστάντες αὐτῷ κοιμωμένῳ τῶν ὤμων ἐξ ἑκατέρου τὰς ἀκοὰς ταῖς γλώσσαις ἐξεκάθαιρον*

(notice the purgative effect of the deleterious virus)<sup>4</sup>. ὁ δὲ ἀναστὰς καὶ γενόμενος περιδεής, τῶν ὑπερπετομένων ὀρνέων τὰς φωνὰς συνίει, καὶ παρ' ἐκείνων μανθάνων προὔλεγε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ μέλλοντα (augural divination). προσέλαβε δὲ καὶ τὴν διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν μαντικὴν (sc. ἱεροσκοπία, sacrificial divination). περὶ δὲ τὸν Ἀλφειὸν συντυχῶν Ἀπόλλωνι τὸ λοιπὸν ἄριστος ἦν μάντις (he gained inspirational divination, and also the perfection accruing to all kinds of μαντικὴ by reason of the encounter with the God of Divination himself).<sup>5</sup>

It is ungenerous to treat of matters superfluous, but the darkness of the previous age leaving us now, often necessitates the light of redundant labour. Naturally, all important species of divination are to be found explicitly mentioned by Homer. (The subject had been exhaustively studied of course in antiquity; for example, the long Scholium B ad B, 305 refer to οἱ τὰ περὶ οἰωνιστικῆς τῆς καθ' Ὀμηρον γράψαντες). In fact, the eminent part that the νεκυομαντεία plays in *Odyssey* Λ, contrasts significantly with the marked avoidance of this crucially chthonic type of divination in classical authors. (Characteristically it is Aeschylus who openly incorporates it in his *Persae*). The theme emerges again in post-classical literature, from Hellenistic times onwards the thing was, of course, practised all along.

In Homer, the traffic of Gods among men is continuous. Gods advise, direct, command, warn, lure, deceive, disclose, cover, prohibit, spurn human beings as a matter of course. Divine supervision, control and direction in human life and actions is not some extraordinary, miraculous, supernatural intervention, but the ordinary, normal and natural course of things. Divination is to be seen in this context of divine ever-presence and perpetual influence. Gods can and do disclose (truly or deceitfully) the future whenever they like, to whom they like, directly or by means of some transformation of theirs. But suitable persons, endowed with heightened sensitivity, blessed with the divine gift of a finer tuning apparatus, open to a wider spectrum of cosmic frequencies, can cultivate an unerring direct feeling for divine communications or develop an art of diagnosing and interpreting divine significations.

As to the specific kinds of divination to be found in Homer, I shall not here refer to the multitude of examples of sign-interpretation (including in particular the observation of birds, but also omens from

natural phenomena and miscellaneous accidents). Those adept in this difficult art are called *οἰωνισταί*, *οἰωνοπόλοι* (with particular reference to bird-omens); these are also the *μάντις* in general, covering the entire field of type (2) divination, whose ability to read through the signs, i.e. their *μαντοσύνη*, was the gift of Apollo. The most eminent such *μάντις* was Calchas himself. Notice how he is introduced for the first time in the Iliad, A, 68 sqq.:

----- τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη  
*Κάλχας Θεστορίδης οἰωνοπόλων ὄχ' ἄριστος,*  
*ὃς ἤδη τά τ' ἔοντα, τά τ' ἔσόμενα, πρό τ' ἔοντα,*  
*καὶ νήεσσ' ἠγήσατ' Ἀχαιῶν Ἴλιον εἴσω*  
 (hence called *στρατομάντις* by Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 122)  
*ἦν διὰ μαντοσύνην, τὴν οἱ πόρε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.*

He led the army because of his power to guess the most profitable course, his ability to hear the will of Gods and to foreknow what will happen in the future. As Cicero says, *De Divinatione* I, 40 (87) with reference to this very passage: Calchantem augurem scribit Homerus longe optimum eumque ducem classium fuisse ad Ilium, auspiciorum credo scientia, non locorum. We ought not, of course, to press the last point, otherwise we become ensared, all the same, in the shallow traps of enlightened «rationalising». As the least practitioners of the craft know even today, well-grounded experience in the field with reference to which the diviner is called upon to prognosticate is an invaluable asset to be wished for, for the accuracy of the divination. The opposition between intuition and experience is entirely artificial, as will be observed in a moment, and again and again. *Μαντεία* always connoted some form of divine presence, working or direct gift in man, for there was never a mere question of mechanical adroitness in the cosmic sign-language: no true knowledge for the ancients can be mechanically handled, it always presupposes a supervening, or rather in-existing, spiritual organicity profoundly recalcitrant to mechanically formalised treatment. This factor accounts for the divine and inspirational element in divination; and this aspect made possible the later appropriation of the word *μαντεία* to direct prophetic in-blowing of the divine spirit, a kind of ecstatic in-halation - as we have seen from Plato's passage for example, above quoted.

Naturally, on the other hand, we must not make an opposition out of a distinction: this is the supremest rule in classical scholarship. Heightened sensibility, intrinsic talent, acute observation, accumulated personal and collective experience, extraordinary coincidences (like snake-purification) and divine favour - all collaborate in the making of a great diviner, and converge in constituting and creating his divine art.

An appropriate illustration is provided by the very passage we are considering. The Grecian camp has been visited by a cursed pestilence. Achilles assumes as common knowledge that this is the work of the divinity whose deadly darts reach far and wide; universal death, not at the hands of Mars in combat and war, must proceed from Phoebus, the Pure. Apollo has been enraged with the Greeks. And Achilles would ask some holy man to diagnose the cause of the divine anger, and thus provide the possibility of removing the evil by making amends to the God for the wrong act that instigated his wrath. After the introduction of the chief diviner of the Greek Army in the passage above quoted, Homer makes Calchas ask for Achilles' protection; for he indeed knows the reason for the divine displeasure, but it implicates the most powerful leader, and he fears his ire. Then (84 sq.):

*τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς·  
θαρήσας μάλα εἶπε θεοπρόπιον, ὅ,τι οἶσθα,  
οὐ μὰ γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνα Διὶ φίλον, ᾧ τε σύ, Κάλχαν,  
εὐχόμενος Δαναοῖσι θεοπροπίας ἀναφαίνεις, etc.*

The *μάντις* here is called to assume higher offices. It is not merely a question of reading the signs in order to determine some action: the diviner will speak the mind of the God. There is not in the entire passage any direct mention or even allusion or assumption of any particular way by which Calchas was enabled to decipher the root of the trouble; no sign, no sacrifice, no casting of lots, no dream either, is presupposed to have occasioned the revelation that Calchas is about to make. He himself when he speaks next does not support his momentous claim by any proof from artful divination; he nakedly pronounces the will of God. People may believe or not believe him depending on his prestige and the profound obviousness of what he declares to be the hidden fact; they may act as they please - but at their

own risk: the diviner divined the divine mind. From the *οἰωνοσκόπος*, through *μάντις*, we have reached the *θεοπρόπος*.

This «heavier» signification of *θεοπρόπιον* is reflected in the remarks of the ancient grammarians. The Scholia D have: *θεοπρόπιον· τὸ ἐκ θεῶν μάντευμα* [not that the signs and other divinational procedures are not ultimately from the Gods, but this is a direct illumination flashed on to the diviner' s mind who sees accordingly through to the God' s mind, so to speak] *ἢ τὸ τοῖς θεοῖς ἀρέσκον· οὗτοι γὰρ* (sc. *οἱ θεοπρόποι μάντιες*) *τὰ τοῖς θεοῖς ἀρέσκοντα λέγουσιν*. And infra: *θεοπροπίας· τὰς τῶν θεῶν μαντείας*. The Scholia B: *θεοπρόπιον δὲ τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ προειρημένον - θεοπρόπιον δὲ τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ μάντευμα, ἢ τὸ τοῖς θεοῖς πρέπον· οὗτοι γὰρ* (sc. *οἱ θεοπρόποι*) *οἱ πάντα ἐπιστάμενοι λέγουσι τὰ τοῖς θεοῖς ἀρέσκοντα*. Apollonius Sophista, *Lexicon Hom.*: *θεοπρόπιον μάντευμα τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ προλεγόμενον*. Hesychius *θεοπρόπιον· μαντεῖον ἐκ θεοῦ*. And: *θειοπρόποι· προφηῆται, μάντιες ἐκ θεοῦ προλέγοντες*. Similarly in *Etym. M.*, where we find a significant etymology from *ἔπω* (= say) and *πρό*, i.e. *θεός + πρό + ἔπω = θεοπρόπος*, *ὁ τὰ ἐκ θεοῦ προλέγων* (v. s.v. *θεοπρόπος* and *πρέπω*); the same in *Etym. Gud.* s.vv. *θεοπρεπέων* and *θεοπρόπιον*. We can very appositely compare these formations with *θεοκλυτέω*, call on, invoke gods. A *θεοπροπία* is a message of gods to a privileged man, something which he can also proclaim as from the mouth of the Gods. Thus Patroclus says to Achilles (*Iliad* Λ, 794-5):

*εἰ δέ τινα φρεσὶν ἦσι θεοπροπίην ἀλεείνει,  
καὶ τινά οἱ παρ Ζηνὸς ἐπέφραδε πότνια μήτηρ* etc.

(cf. Π, 36-7 and 50-1). If anything, a *θεοπρόπος* is one who has such access, so to speak, to the divine mind that he can also ask and answer questions of his own or put to him, as well as simply interpret given signs; as it were, he is able to look out more actively for marks without or within which would enable him to answer a query, rather than merely wait passively for omens to occur. Such a dimension is suggested by *Odyssey* α, 415-6:

(Telemachus speaks): *οὔτε θεοπροπίης ἐμπάζομαι, ἢν τινα  
μήτηρ  
ἐς μέγαρον καλέσασα θεοπρόπον ἐξέρεται*.

But we ought not to press this too far. Although the demand for experimental divination naturally arose and caused the development of types (4) and (5) (even sacrificial divination partakes of the nature of this inquisitive attitude, putting questions to gods instead of only interpreting their signs as they may happen to occur), in Homer the emphasis lies on the more passive, less aggressive, more spontaneous categories of sign-reading or, alternatively, of direct divine enlightenment in enthusiastic inspiration.

Again, and further, we should not fall victims to the modern type of conceptual factuality and turn organic distinctions into fossilised mechanical segregations: distinctions are not of fact but of meaning in fact. Thus *θεοπροπία* is the making explicit of what is there in all divination - namely, divine touch. But in a solemn *θεοπροπία* that touch is raised to a pronouncement revealing god's mind and will, with the halo of divinity made visible in divination, so to speak. Thus, from the point of view of spiritual distinctness it is even immaterial whether signs small and ordinary or great and extraordinary (*σημεία καὶ τέρατα*) or any other means of guessing at the hidden have accompanied the diviner's reading of god's mind; they may or may not - it is irrelevant. Hence the «ambiguity», so noxious to the modern mind, of expressions like *θεοπρόπος οἰωνιστής* (Iliad N 70), or passages like this from Apollonius' *Argonautica*, A, 144-5:

----- αὐτὸς δὲ (sc. Apollo) *θεοπροπίας* ἐδίδαξεν (sc. Idmon),  
οἰωνούς τ' ἀλέγειν ἢ δ' ἔμπυρα σήματ' ἰδέσθαι.

Do the *θεοπροπίαι* include *οἰωνισμούς* and *ἐμπυρομαντείας*, or do they constitute a third function distinct from the other two? Neither alternative is in itself satisfactory. From what has been briefly said above, the answer to a wrong question is evident.

Of divinational and other dreams and their importance in Homer I need not speak extensively here, but for observing that *ὄνειροπόλος* must, on the analogy of *οἰωνοπόλος*, *θυηπόλος* etc., mean the person who is involved, occupied with, tends or attends and observes dreams, one who «verses» himself in them. As this is very well noted by the *Etym. Magnum* and, in a more complete form, by the *Etym. Gud* s.v.: *ὄνειροπόλος· ὡσπερ γὰρ οἰωνοπόλος λέγεται ὁ μάντις ὁ περὶ τοῦς οἰωνοῦς ἀναστρεφόμενος, καὶ αἰγοπόλος ὁ περὶ τὰς αἰγας (καὶ*

συγκοπῆ αἰπόλος), καὶ θυηπόλος ὁ περὶ τὰς θυσίας ἀναστρεφόμενος, οὕτω καὶ ὁ περὶ τοὺς ὄνειρους πολῶν καὶ ἀναστρεφόμενος ὄνειροπόλος. With regard to this basic sense it is in principle immaterial whether the dreams are one's own or somebody else's: experience of and in them is required for valid insight as to their message and veracity. We thus have in Homer also ὄνειροκριτικὴν, interpretation of dreams, as can be seen in Iliad E, 149-50 where τοῖς οὐκ ἔρχομένοις ὁ γέρων, who is there called ὄνειροπόλος, ἐκρίνατ' ὄνειρους. Very properly the scholia D have: ὄνειροπόλοιο· ὄνειροκρίτου, περὶ τὴν ὄνειράτων κρίσιν ἀναστρεφόμενου. Also Suda and Photius have simpliciter: ὄνειροπόλος· ὄνειροκρίτης.

But some ancient scholars wanted the dreams meant to be exclusively one's own; so the Sch. A. ad loc.: ὅτι ὄνειροπόλος ὁ διὰ τῶν ἰδίων ὄνειρων μαντευόμενος, οὐχ ὁ ὄνειροκρίτης. And so explicitly Apollonius Sophista in his Lexicon s.v.: ὄνειροπόλος· ὁ περὶ τοὺς ἰδίους ὄνειρους πολούμενος. More elaborately Sch. B ad Iliad A, 63: τὸ δὲ «ὄνειροπόλον» οὐ σημαίνει τὸν ὄνειροκρίτην, ὡς τινες ἐδέξαντο, τὸν περὶ τοὺς ὄνειρους διατρίβοντα - οὐδὲν γὰρ ὄναρ ὤφθη· ἀλλὰ σημαίνει τὸν ὄνειροπολούμενον, τὸν κάτοχον ὄνειροις καὶ θεατὴν ὄνειρου εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλθόντος γεγονότα. The particular point with reference to A, 63 is a good one: no dream has been seen in the Iliadic context so that the call could be on an expert dream interpreter to decipher its meaning. Instead, the appeal is to anybody sensitive to this kind of divine inspiration (significantly the scholiast uses the word κάτοχος ὄνειροις, a kind of mediumistic receptacle in trances for such transmission of cosmic frequencies), to anyone given to dream-possession, to come forward and disclose whether he had received any significant messages in this way, and what their meaning was. A very apt illustration of this type of situation is given in extenso by Dionysius Halicarnasseus, Antiquit. Rom. VII, chs. 68-9<sup>6</sup>.

It is indeed natural to expect ὄνειροπόλον in A, 63 to mean a sleep-visionary, so to speak, whose increased sensitivity and proclivity to somnolistic experiences may have captured something unperceived by the ordinary powers of observation, or may have been appraised of the divine attitudes by direct inspiration concerning the matter at hand; though nothing excludes the possibility of someone adept in dream interpretation coming forward with the explanation of a sign given to him, or to somebody else, in sleep. For whether the πολεῖν περὶ τοὺς

*ὄνειρους* (= *ὄνειρο-πολεῖν*) has to be restricted to one's own dreams (as the grammarians above quoted insist) or not, it is consistent with *κρίνειν ὄνειρους*, judging and interpreting them, as is evident from E, 149-50, where the context by itself does not determine whether there was an intended restriction to Eurydamas' own dreams or not<sup>7</sup>.

The grammarians' problem can be resolved so as to reconcile their divergent opinions, and is summarised concisely as usual in Hesychius' lemma: *ὄνειροπόλος· ὄνειροκρίτης· ἢ ὁ περὶ τοὺς ἰδίους ὄνειρους πολούμενος καὶ διὰ τούτων τοῖς (προ τοὺς) πέλας μαντευόμενος· ἢ ὁ κρίνων αὐτούς*. We begin from Hesychius' evident gloss: *ὄνειροπολῶν· δι' ὄνειρων μαντευόμενος*; and the equally evident basic sense given by the Etymologica and quoted above. And we search for the full content of these valid delineations of contours. They present persons whose perceptive apparatus includes especially sensitive somnolent feelers in tune with the cosmic and divine power-field. Such people are visited by dreams of singular vivacity, veracity and meaningfulness. They become soon aware of this constitutional factor and, naturally, begin to pay increased attention to their gift and its operations. We thus move from an inspirational dreamer to someone constantly alert to, and regularly observant of, dreams, one who is occupied and preoccupied with, studious of, tending and haunted by, dreams; in short to a confirmed and affirmed *ὄνειροπόλος*. The gift of significant somnolent visions and the attention to dreams coupled in the person concerned with appropriately acute powers of observation and penetrating judgement, and accompanied by long and cumulative experience, will gradually develop a deeper insight into the meaning-field of dreams and its correlation with the hidden, «occult» operations of the cosmic forces on the one hand, and the visible and manifest course of human life on the other; such insight constitutes then the spiritual art of dream-interpretation, the superior *ὄνειροκριτική*. The final stage, as with all arts, is incompetent posture and sham pretence at adeptness in that art; for all science and knowledge has its associated charlatanism. And this degenerate pseudo-art, so very significantly prominent especially in enlightened times, provides the target for the attacks by superficial intellectualism on the entire illustrious line of descent indicated just now. In classical times the full development of the *ὄνειροκριτική*, superior and inferior, had been achieved, and poor people were making a living by



interpreting other people's dreams, v. for an example Plutarch, *Aristeides*, 27: ὁ δὲ Φαληρεὺς (sc. ὁ Δημήτριος) ἐν τῷ Σωκράτει φησὶ μνημονεύειν Ἀριστείδου θυγατριδοῦν εἶ μάλα πένητα Λυσίμαχον, ὃς ἑαυτὸν ἐκ πινακίου τινὸς ὄνειροκριτικοῦ παρὰ τὸ Ἰακχείον λεγόμενον καθεζόμενος ἔβασκε.

But the task was already required in Homeric times; and so the thing and the service must of necessity have been available then. We saw Eurydamas, the ὄνειροπόλος, being expected to have «judged» dreams (κρίνειν ὄνειρους) as to the fate of his sons in the war. Possession of the sense and art required to disentangle the true from the deceptive in dreams were necessitated by the elaborate conception of the two kinds of dreams in *Odyssey* τ, 560 sqq. And we possess an example of a dream interpretation given within the very same dream, *ibid.* 535 sqq. Penelope there calls on the still unidentified Odysseus to «subjudge» the dream (μοὶ τὸν ὄνειρον ὑπόκριναι) since a κρίσις and interpretation has been already pronounced within the dream. It is important to notice that what Penelope sees as she wakes up after the dream she had, is mentioned as relevant evidence in the dream's interpretation and evaluation. This shows how divine in-flation and technical reading of signs are intimately connected; how there is no separation or contrast between inspirational and scientific divination.

The erroneous emphasis on the distinction between, on the one hand, a «dreamer» - ὄνειροπόλος - as somebody who enjoys the divine grace of somnolent visions and significant dream-visitations and, accordingly, divines inspirationally; and, on the other hand, the interpreter of dreams - ὄνειροκρίτης - who predicts knowledgeably and methodically according to his art. This and all such distinctions are surely the work of Alexandrian grammarians: it well accords with their often superficial and artificial criticism. Zenodotus, we know, athetised A 63; very likely because he took ὄνειροπόλος there to mean ὄνειροκρίτης and would deny that this thing was known to Homer - a type of consideration very frequent with Alexandrian critiques esp. of the earlier age, afflicted as they regularly were by Alexandrian hypercriticism. So Sch. A ad A63 have: Ζηνόδοτος δὲ ἠθέτηκεν αὐτόν· μήποτε δὲ ὄνειροκρίτην ὑπέιληφεν, οὐκ ὀρθῶς. The later Alexandrian scholar remarks here that one need not interpret the word in the offensive meaning. Hence there may have emerged all those above-quoted protestations and warnings that ὄνειροπόλος is one who divines by the dreams he himself sees.

We rediscover here the fundamental two tendencies in ancient Greek scholarship, the Alexandrian and the post-Alexandrian (ultimately Pergamene) one. The juxtaposition of the two senses in Hesychius, and the coming back to the basic meaning by the Etymologica, represent in this case the (dis)solution of the misleading Alexandrian question. We provided above for its complete annihilation.

This is then the true story of the reality and meaning of dream-divination. That the origin is enthusiastic, an inspirational «possession», is reflected in the fact that philosophical distinctions would associate this type of divination with prophetic, ecstatic, oracular prescience of the future and of the will of Gods, and further contrast such inspirational, ἔνθεον divination to the «technical», scientific one - erroneously, as I have explained briefly above, and as one can readily see from the analysis of dream-divination just chartered.

Incubation and dreaming in sacred precincts is another result of the said connexion. The absence of any singular constitutional advantage in the individual concerned, is counterbalanced by holy rites and the sanctity of the place: a revelatory dream-visitation is thus hoped for and expected.

The second moment in the analysis of dream-divination is reflected in the later derivative meaning of *δνειροπολῶ* as «to dream» or be dreamy, being given to dreams, like being caught up in a world of one's own (cf. Heracleitus), out of touch with objective reality in general, or, with regard to a particular matter, fascinated with something, unable to keep one's mind out of it, deluded about something, entertaining false advantageous beliefs or expectations etc. Cf. Aristophanes *Nubes*, 16, 27 where the sense is neutral, really and simply to dream; but in an active sense and with the derivative meaning = to deceive, make one «dream», v. *Equites* 809; Demosthenes, *Contra Philippum* A, 49; Plato *Respublica* Z, 534C; *Timaeus* 52B. (Cf. also, e.g. Lucianus *Dial. Mort.* V, 2; *De Mercede Conductis*, 20; *Heromotimus*, 71; *Somnium*, 32; *Epist. Saturn.* 21; Longus *Pastor.* III, 32; IV, 5, 27 etc.)-

Once we have gained a true overview of the nature and organic development of dream-divination, the problems raised above in connexion with the Homeric usage of *δνειροπόλος*, are solved by themselves. Dreams are of «spiritual» substance, true or deceptive as

the case may be (this, we have seen, is explicitly elaborated by Homer) and can be sent by the direct agency of Gods (ἐκ Διὸς τῶναρ as Achilles says; and cf. the famous Lying Dream sent by Zeus to Agamemnon, Iliad B sub in.; and Penelope's relieving dream sent by Athena at *Odyssey* δ, 795 sqq.). They can be seen by anybody. But those people especially receptive of them, and also particularly attentive to that field of experience, and further able to judge (κρίνειν) about the veracity and import of dreams not as clear and unambiguous as those described in the passages already quoted - these are the *ὄνειροπόλοι*. Mostly they attend and interpret their own dreams; but they can also explain those of others who, to the extent that they possess less well tuned instruments for the reception of cosmic transmissions, stand in more need of expert advice for the interpretation of the confused messages that have passed through their thicker apparatus. This then is the true unified picture of the situation.

Emphasis on dreams is a chthonic feature. Sleep and Death are twin brothers, who on Apollo's behests will carry Sarpedon's dead body to his Lycian fatherland to be buried there with all proper rites and ceremonies (Iliad, Π, 667 sqq.). In *Odyssey* ν, 79-80 we read ὕπνος... θανάτῳ ἄγχιστα εἰκίως. The dreams, here envisioned as ghostly entities (cf. e.g. Iliad, B, sub. in.; *Odyssey*, δ, 796, ζ 22) people a country (δῆμος ὀνείρων) by the Asphodel Plain ἔνθα τε ναίουσι ψυχαί, εἴδωλα καμόντων (*Odyssey*, ω, 12-4). There are two gates there, one elephantine, one of horn: the latter is an exit for deceitful Dreams, the former for truthful ones (*Odyssey*, τ, 560 sqq.). Ghosts and dreams behave in exactly the same way: compare the ὄνειρος in Iliad B, 16-22 with the dead Patroclus in Ψ, 65-8. The adjective ἀμνητός signifies the Homeric idea of an attenuation of power in ghostly existences as compared to the full-bodied and blooded life as physical existences on earth and applies both to dreams and the souls of dead. Faithfully Aeschylus reproduces the identity: when Cassandra, moved by the divine spirit in presentiment of what is going to happen to Agamemnon, has the ghastly vision described in Agamemnon, 1217-22, the butchered ghosts appear προσφερείς μορφώμασιν ὀνείρων. Hesiod most aptly mentions ὕπνος and θάνατος amongst the grim progeny of Νύξ (Theogonia 21 sqq.); cf. also 756-66. Virgil very powerfully and chthonically calls Sopor consanguineus Leti (Aen. VI, 522). Euripides ascribes the parentage of dreams to Earth herself,

Hecuba 71: ὦ πότνια Χθών, / μελανοπτερύγων μάτερ ὀνείρων.  
 And in Iph. in Tauris, 1235 sqq. we have a very explicit testimony to the aboriginal tradition respecting the Delphic oracle and the highly significant Earth - Apollo antagonism there. After she gave birth to Apollo in Delos, Leto brought the divine child to Delphi (through Athens, say the Attic traditions; through Chalcis, the Euboeo-Boeotic ones) where the Serpent of Earth guarded a chthonic oracle<sup>8</sup>. 1246 (ed. Markland) = 1245 (Di):

ὄθι ποικιλόνωτος οἰνωπὸς δράκων  
 σκιερᾶ κατάχαλκος (better κατάφαρκτος with Hartung)  
 εὐφύλλω δάφνα,  
 γᾶς πελώριον τέρας  
 ἄμφεπε μαντεῖον χθόνιον.

Apollo, still a βρέφος, killed the Dragon (for which act he was subsequently purified in Tempe) and assumed possession of the revelatory tripod. But expelling Themis, the daughter of Earth, who before him was in charge of the place and its oracle, angered Earth: 1260 (M): 1259 (Di):

Θέμιν δ' ἐπεὶ γᾶς ἰὼν  
 παῖδ' ἀπενάσσατ' ἀπὸ (or perhaps Ἀπόλλων>with Seidler)  
 ζαθέων  
 χρηστηρίων, νύχια  
 χθὼν ἔτεκνώσατο φάσματ' ὀνείρων,  
 οἱ πόλεσιν μερόπων τά τε πρῶτα  
 τά τ' ἔπειθ' ἅ τ' ἔμελλε τυχεῖν  
 ὕπνου (better ὕπνω if we keep γᾶς in next line) κατὰ δνοφερὰς  
 γᾶς εὐνὰς ἔφραζον. Γαῖα δὲ  
 μαντεῖον ἀφείλετο τιμᾶν  
 Φοῖβον φθόνῳ θυγατρὸς.

Mother Earth responded to Apollo's violence and usurpation by directly informing men through her offspring of divinatory dreams and by robbing the oracular honour from Apollo. By containing inside her bosom the inspirational exhalations she rendered Apollo's high tripod service both unneeded and impossible. Apollo had recourse to Zeus, desiring:

1272 M = 1271 Di: *Πυθίων δόμων*  
*χθονίαν ἀφελεῖν*  
*θεᾶς μῆνιν, νυχίους τ' ἐνοπίας*

...

And indeed Zeus: *ἐπὶ δ' ἔσεισεν κόμαν,*  
*παῦσε τ' ὀνείρους νυχίους*  
*ἀπὸ δὲ μαντοσύναν*  
*νυκτωπὸν ἐξείλεν βροτῶν,*  
*καὶ τιμὰς πάλιν θῆκε Λοξία.*

He removed the ban of Earth on the place thus restoring full divinatory honours to his Son and he prevented direct dream-divination from taking place there<sup>9</sup>.

The chthonic nature of Sleep is very clearly illustrated by Homer himself. When Zeus follows Sleep in hot pursuit to punish him for his role in the deception practised on him, Sleep is saved only by taking refuge into Night, who is significantly called «Subduer of Gods and Men»; overawed, Zeus stopped chasing him despite his anger and against his will: for he feared to do something displeasing to Night's august majesty. The passage is extremely characteristic, *Iliad* Ξ, 257 sqq.:

----- ἐμὲ (Sleep is speaking) δ' ἔζοχα πάντων  
*ζῆτει (sc. Zeus), καὶ κέ μ' αἴστον ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἔμβαλε πόντω,*  
*εἰ μὴ Νύξ δμητέρα θεῶν ἐσάωσε καὶ ἀνδρῶν,*  
*τὴν ἰκόμην φεύγων· ὁ δ' ἐπαύσατο χωόμενός περ·*  
*ἄζετο γὰρ μὴ Νυκτὶ θοῆ ἀποθύμια ἔρδοι.*

The use of *ἄζομαι*, with its central religious signification of reverential awe, is highly significant when used of Zeus's attitude towards Night. Equally significant is the fact that when in that context Hera asks Sleep for further help, the latter calls on her to swear that she will fulfil what she promised in return for his help - and the oath to be taken is in the name of the Titans and the Styx, purely chthonic divinities, the former with their honours taken away in the new Olympian Order, the latter belonging to the group of powerful chthonic deities whose privileges and authority were affirmed by Zeus when he established the new order of things; (*ibid.* 270 sqq.):

Ὡς φάτο· χήρατο δ' Ὑπνος, ἀμειβόμενος δὲ προσήυδα·  
 ἄγρει νῦν μοι ὄμοσσον ἀάατον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ,  
 χειρὶ δὲ τῆ ἑτέρῃ μὲν ἔλε χθόνα πολυβότειραν,  
 τῆ δ' ἑτέρῃ ἄλλα μαρμαρέην· ἵνα νῶϊν ἅπαντες  
 μάρτυροι ὦσ' οἱ ἔνερθε θεοὶ Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἑόντες· etc.

And *ibid.* 277 sqq.:

Ὡς ἔφατ'· οὐδ' ἀπίθησε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη,  
 ὠμνυε δ', ὡς ἐκέλευε, θεοὺς δ' ὀνόμηνεν ἅπαντας  
 τοὺς ὑποταρταρίους, οἳ Τιτῆνες καλέονται.

The Scholia B on Iliad Π, 672 where the twin-brotherhood of Death and Sleep is maintained, have: *τελευτώντων γὰρ ἐκλείπει παντελῶς ἡ ψυχὴ, καθευδόντων δὲ ἡ δύναμις αὐτῆς συστέλλεται*. Evidently an Alexandrian enlightened platitude, which leaves inexplicable why then we can have, through dreams as ghosts, stores of knowledge opened to us that are normally inaccessible in our ordinary state of life and wakefulness. Pindar, in one of his Threnoi, gave the true answer (Fr. 96 Böckh = Fr. 131a + 131b Mühler):

ὄλβια δ' ἅπαντες (sc. the initiated) αἴσα λυσιπνον <μετανίσ-  
 σονται> τελευτᾶν.  
 καὶ σῶμα μὲν πάντων ἔπεται θανάτῳ περισθενεῖ,  
 ζῶν δ' ἔτι λείπεται αἰῶνος εἶδωλον· τὸ γὰρ ἔστι μόνον  
 ἐκ θεῶν· εὔδει δὲ πρᾶσσόντων μελέων, ἀτὰρ εὐδόντεσσιν ἐν  
 πολλοῖς ὀνείροις  
 δείκνυσι τερπνῶν ἐφέρποισαν χαλεπῶν τε κρίσιν.

(The text of the first verse is Böckh's. But perhaps we should with Wilamowitz separate it from the rest of the fragment, and read: *ὄλβιοι δ' ἅπαντες αἴσα λυσιπόνων τελευτᾶν*).

The *εἶδωλον αἰῶνος* which survives our death being of godly origin, sleeps when we are belabouring in our wakeful ordinary lives, and comes into action when the disturbances of our afflicted condition are minimised during sleep. They disappear at death, and so this idea also accounts for the intimate relationship of sleep and death. Even Aristotle, as an «Academician», adopted this view. Sextus Empir.

adv. dogm. III, 20-22: Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἀπὸ δυοῖν ἀρχῶν ἔννοιαν θεῶν ἔλεγε γεγονέναι ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀπὸ τε τῶν περὶ ψυχὴν συμβαινόντων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν μετεώρων. (An unfortunate and exceedingly miserable and inadequate, Kantian «rationalising» diagnosis). Ἄλλ' ἀπὸ μὲν τῶν περὶ τὴν ψυχὴν συμβαινόντων διὰ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις γινομένους ταύτης ἐνθουσιασμοὺς καὶ τὰς μαντείας. Ὅταν γάρ, φησιν, ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ καθ' ἑαυτὴν γένηται ἡ ψυχὴ, τότε τὴν ἴδιον ἀπολαβοῦσα φύσιν προμαντεύεται τε καὶ προαγορεύει τὰ μέλλοντα. Τοιαύτη δ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἐν τῷ κατὰ τὸν θάνατον χωρίζεσθαι τῶν σωμάτων. Ἀποδέχεται γοῦν καὶ τὸν ποιητὴν Ὅμηρον ὡς τοῦτο παρατηρήσαντα· πεποίηκε γὰρ τὸν μὲν Πάτροκλον ἐν τῷ ἀναιρεῖσθαι προαγορεύοντα περὶ τῆς Ἑκτορος ἀναιρέσεως, τὸν δ' Ἑκτορα περὶ τῆς Ἀχιλλέως τελευτῆς (= Fr. 10 Rose). I quoted this characteristically Aristotelian, exasperating mixture of acuteness and lack of penetration because of the very correct association of dream-divination, prophetic insight at the moments of death and, as he should have added, νεκρομαντεία. For the second element of this triple connection, v. Plato, *Apologia Socr.* 39e: καὶ γὰρ εἰμι ἤδη ἐνταῦθα, ἐν ᾧ μάλιστα ἄνθρωποι χρησμοδοῦσιν (notice the word used with its oracular, as distinct from divinational, potency), ὅταν μέλλωσιν ἀποθανεῖσθαι. The Homeric examples given by Aristotle are *Iliad* II, 851-4 and X, 356-60; they are standardly referred to by authors treating the subject of the prescience of a soul in articulo mortis. V. Xenophon *Apol.* 30; Servius ad *Aen.* IV, 613. Cf. Virgil's examples *Aen.* IV, 614 sqq. and X, 739-41; cf. Lucan VII, 610-5. For prophesy in death v. Diodorus XVIII, 1, 1 ascribing the doctrine to Pythagoras καὶ τινες ἕτεροι τῶν παλαιῶν φυσικῶν; cf. Photius, *Bibliotheca* p. 439 Bekker (= *Suda* s.v. ἄνθρωπος); Tertullianus, *de Anima* 53 sub fin.; Lactantius ad Statii *Theb.* VII, 701; Servius ad *Aen.* II, 775; Cicero, *de Sen.* 77. V. Plutarch, *De Defectu Orac.* 40. And notice the very expressive formulation of the idea in Schol. B to *Iliad* II, 854: δόγμα ἐστὶ τοῦτο τῷ ποιητῇ, ὅτι ὅταν ἀθροισθῇ ἡ ψυχὴ ἐξ ὅλου τοῦ σώματος πρὸς τὸ ἐκκριθῆναι, μαντικωτάτη γίνεται· θείας γὰρ ἐστὶ μέρος φύσεως, καὶ θειότερα γίνεται χωρισθεῖσα τῆς ὕλης τοῦ σώματος καὶ πρὸς τὸ οἰκεῖον ἀναδραμοῦσα. I cannot but quote here an excellent, apposite passage from Aretaeus, *De Causis et Signis Acutorum Morborum*, II, 4 sub fin. He speaks of terminal intensifications of acute, feverish illnesses: καὶ ἀπὸ

πάντων (sc. τῶν μορίων τοῦ σώματος) ὡς ἐν ποταμῷ εἰς τὰ ἔξω ἢ φορή. Ψυχῆς κατάστασις, αἰσθησις σύμπασα καθαρῆ, διάνοια λεπτῆ, γνώμη μαντική. Προγινώσκουσι μὲν οὖν πρῶτιστα μὲν ὠντέοισι τοῦ βίου τὴν μεταλλαγὴν· ἔπειτα τοῖσι παρεούσι προλέγουσι τὰ αἰθις ἐσόμενα. Οἱ δὲ αὐτέους μὲν ἔσθ' ὅτε καὶ ἄλλο φασὶ δοκέουσι. Τῇ ἀποβάσει (i.e. the realisation) δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων θωυμάζουσι ὠνθρωποι. Μετεξέτεροι δὲ καὶ προσλαλέουσι τῶν κατοικομένων τισί, τάχα μὲν παρεόντας ὀρεῦντες αὐτοὶ μῦνοι, ὑπὸ λεπτῆς καὶ καθαρῆς αἰσθήσιος, τάχα δ' αὐτοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς προγινώσκουσας, καὶ διηγυμένης τοὺς ἄνδρας οἷσι ξυνέσονται. Πρόσθεν μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἰλύϊ τοῖσιν ὑγροῖσιν ἔην καὶ ζόφῳ (this life being convoluted in mud and darkness according to the Orphic traditions)· ἐπεὶ δὲ τάδε ἐξήντησε ἡ νοῦσος (the disease has consumed all our «envelopes» of thick impurities) καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τὴν ἀχλὺν ἔλε (a most apt Homeric reminiscence, to be noted in a moment), ἐρέουσι τά τε ἐν τῷ ἥερι καὶ γυμνῇ τῇ ψυχῇ γίγνονται μάντιες ἀτρεκέες. Οἱ δὲ ἐς τοσόνδε λεπτότητος ὑγρῶν καὶ τῆς γνώμης ἀφιγμένοι οὐ μάλα τοι περιγίγονται, ἐξηερωμένης ἤδη τῆς ζωτικῆς δυνάμιος - they reach such degrees of rarification and distillation that the vital force can no longer support the full bodily existence - and thus they die. Taking away from the eyes the haze under which we labour in this earthly life is a Homeric idea and expression; in *Iliad*, E, 127 Athena lifts up the opaque veils that restrict and obstruct human vision from Diomedes' eyes so that he can clearly discern men and gods (Cf. the Virgilian equivalent, with Aphrodite and Aeneas, *Aeneid* II, 604-6)<sup>10</sup>.

The chthonic nature of dreams is abundantly testified above. That Achilles would proclaim «A dream, too, comes from Zeus» (*Iliad* A, 63) does not signify a divergence from the essential chthonic character of sleeping and dreaming. Zeus, as the *deus optimus maximus*, commands the general supervision of the world's affairs and nothing happens without his sanction. But his sanction is often prescribed and determined for him - by Fate for instance. And in any case, Achilles' Zeus is the ἀναξ Δωδωναῖος Πελασγικός, something that will be fully analysed elsewhere.

To cast lots in order to determine any event is to presuppose uncertainty and the inability to reach a legitimate conclusion as to the right decision. Human means of deciding a case having been



exhausted without convincing success - or the inadequacy is recognised from the start and man resorts to the verdict of «chance». This «chance» is the work of the wonderful never-ending interplay of the cosmic forces - too complex and too subtle to be analysed, and so considered «accidental» in its observable effects. It is in fact as fortuitous as the minute adjustments automatically effected within an organism for any given change to which it is subjected. To cast lots is to provide a stimulus to the organism of Nature, and to observe its reaction. Thus, it is the will of Gods, guardians and personifications of the cosmic order that we learn by the casting of lots; hence this type of divination. And it is fully exemplified by Homer, v. Iliad H, 175 sqq.; Γ, 315 sqq.; cf. Ω, 400; Ψ, 352 sqq.; Odyssey β, 331. The particular domain of lot-casting is in determining who among various available persons will do or suffer a given action.

Pure, «enthusiastic», ecstatic prophesy we meet in the case of Theoclymenus' vision. He is, significantly, a Melampodian by descent, a *μάντις* (Odyssey, ο, 225); he is to begin with an *οἰωνιστής*, as he can read the signs of birds (ο, 524-33). But at the height of the suitors' impious insolence in excessive festivity and overflowing happiness (which significantly is intensified by Athena herself in her determination to render them the attracting point for all divine envy and fury), Theoclymenus sees their imminent, miserable fate (υ, 351 sqq.), describing in striking terms what exactly will happen that very night:

*Ἄ δειλοί, τί κακὸν τόδε πάσχετε; νυκτὶ μὲν ὑμέων  
εἰλύαται κεφαλαί τε, πρόσωπά τε, νέρθε τε γούνα·  
οἴμωγῇ δὲ δέδηγε, δεδάκρυνται δὲ παρειαί·  
αἶματι δ' ἔρράδαται τοῖχοι, καλαί τε μεσόδμοι·  
εἰδώλων δὲ πλεόν πρόθυρον, πλείη δὲ καὶ αὐλή,  
ἰεμένων ἐρεβόσδε ὑπὸ ζόφον· ἥελιος δὲ  
οὐρανοῦ ἔξαπόλωλε, κακῇ δ' ἐπιδέδρομεν ἀχλὺς.*

His vivid vision of what is only hours away is laughed at as a «loss of mind» - which it is indeed in the pregnant sense of *ἔκ-στασις*, of *θεία μανία* and *κατοχή*. And he, declaring his sanity and general «wholeness» of body and soul, leaves them in the fatal chamber, abandoned to their ill-starred destiny:

364 *Εὐρύμαχ', οὔτι σ' ἄνωγα ἐμοὶ πομπῆας ὀπάζειν·  
 εἰσί μοι ὀφθαλμοὶ τε καὶ οὐατα καὶ πόδες ἄμφω,  
 καὶ νόος ἐν στήθεσσι τετυγμένος οὐδὲν ἀεικίης·  
 τοῖς ἔξεμι θύραζε, ἐπεὶ νοέω κακὸν ἕμμιν  
 ἐρχόμενον, τό κεν οὔτις ὑπεκφύγοι, οὐδ' ἀλέαιτο,  
 μνηστῆρων, οἳ δῶμα κατ' ἀντιθέου Ὀδυσῆος  
 ἀνέρας ὑβρίζοντες ἀτάσθαλα μηχανάασθε.*

The Scholiast fitly describes his talk as *ὑπό τινος ἐνθουσιασμοῦ μαντευόμενος*.

There is thus only one major species of divination whose existence in Homer we have to deduce rather than verify by direct and explicit testimony. No wonder that foolish critics would deny its occurrence in the Homeric world. I mean sacrificial divination. Now it is demonstrable that this could not have been unknown to Homer, nor, much less, nonexistent in his time. For a major religious practice cannot be grafted into the organism of «national», chorocentric religion without significant alien cultural (and tribal) transfusion from a different space. Even minor modifications in existing cults presuppose and reflect some shifting of emphasis in the national, or rather spatial (localised), cultural synthesis of the constituent tribal-blood factors as carriers, at some appropriate time, of space - culture parameters. The «new» in religion is either the next stage of the organic evolution which develops and perfects the inherent, pre-existing seeds by manifesting in complete actuality the fullness of their potency; or the result of an interaction between variant forces «cultured» in different soils and nurtured by different blood-saps «chorocentrically» constituted. Which second possibility can assume various divergent forms: from the «biological grafting» indicated above; to the adoption «verbatim» of a foreign cult whose sacred symbolism is deep enough, and congenial enough to the space-constants in the framework of which it is transplanted, so as to reverberate even in national souls which did not manage to bring it into the surface on their own; through, in between, the assumption and assimilation of a foreign sacral idea by its incrustation into the natural forms of the indigenous religious feeling and its consequent transformation so that it can reflect and answer the demands of the autochthonous, space-determined, religiosity.

Within this necessary framework we can once and for all expose the folly and unreality of all those views which would delude people into imagining that they are solving problems of ancient religion by the postulation of an almost continuous influx of «novelties» in the living system of religious beliefs and practices. The notion is transparently impossible, esp. in the case under investigation, namely the formation of Hellenism. As for external influences, no invasion brought foreign blood to Greece (carrier of alien space-determinations) after Homer's time; and no major contact was established after him with estranged nations unknown or unaligned before. Ancient Greek traditions carefully observe: (a) the primeval existence of Thracians on the eastern coast of mainland Greece down to Attica; and (b) channels of communication and influence from Asia Minor, Egypt and Phoenicia (as represented by the Pelopidae, the Danaidae and the Cadmeians respectively). These are the only external contributory factors into the biological and cultural make-up of the population inhabiting the geographical space of Greece. And indeed, in view of the generic affiliation of the peoples (and of the commonness of the generic space-parameters) around the Eastern Mediterranean basin, and especially of the north-eastern section of that basin, and in particular of the Aegean Sea - these «exogenous» influential factors can to a large extent be reduced to internal interaction among perhaps scions of the same phyletic stock, or, at any rate, of stocks operating within a unified geo-cultural space - a situation eminently evident, though immensely complex, in the autochthonous ethnological configuration of Greece itself.

Whatever the complete analysis of the ethno-spatial infrastructure of Greek culture, both spiritual and physical, may reveal with regard to its true composition, one thing is certain: the building-up of that infrastructure, the distillation of the Hellenic blood enlivening the organic body of Hellenic space and the making of the Greek Soul was achieved before Homer. There we discover the amazing beauty of the product, the first actual great work manifestating the new culture. If anything is not yet fully settled in the Homeric corpus of Graecitas, it is the exact balance between the strictly «Greek» and the other major ethnic factors operating on Graecian soil. The preponderance, especially in the Iliad, of the more purely «Hellenic» spirit manifests the pride over recent glorious national successes in Greece and Asia

Minor wrought by the Hellenes in the narrow sense as the dominant races and betrays an incomplete fusion of the older and the new strata in the emerging comprehensive soul of the nation. For this, if not for any other reason, Homeric poetry must belong to the period immediately following the age of the Doric conquest of Peloponnesus and the large scale colonization of the western coast of Asia Minor - feats consolidating and affirming the emerging self-consciousness of Grecian identity. As always in history, the conditions, constraints, and all the necessary material apparatus of temporal force and supporting strength - a system invincibly affirmative with adamantine hardness from without, exquisitely malleable from within - this was provided by the strictest self-imposed discipline, the rugged heroism and luminous barbarity of the master-race; while the spiritual leaven, the contentual seed, the sperm of high culture was the responsibility of the freest, nature-imposed order, the secretive, passive profundity and the darksome dreaded wisdom of the subjected ethnic element. Hellenism needed the first in order that the second could be harnessed to fruition: the Greeks in a narrow sense had precisely that role to perform among the multifarious variety of the races inhabiting Greece: hence their inestimable contribution to the formation of the identity of Hellenic culture, simultaneous to their own relative astounding cultural barrenness, as is evinced most clearly in their purest scion, the Dorians, when they had been left uncontaminated in isolation, i.e. before their expansion and conquest of the Peloponnesus.

Geographical expansion and material aggrandisement follow the constitution and definition of a nation's identity, and precede the full blooming and perfect fruition of the national soul. This applies to clans and races, tribal or ethnic groups as well as nations at large. Space first coalesces the tribal variety into a phyletic entity which then, as a national integral, stretches out to cover and integrate the maximum space compatible with the cultural determinations of the stricter national habitat and its proper locus. Greece began its great age of enlargement with the Aeolic and Ionic migrations. Of necessity she must have resolved in all its essentials the existential question concerning her natural identity before that: in Nature, only the securely rooted grows a natural and organic growth. Religion, as the first crystallization of the ineffable vital force that weaves the fabric of a

race's collective soul, reaches its final formation at the culmination of the laborious process through which the national identity is constituted and the spirit of the nation is ontologically defined. This means, in reality, when the space has been effectively imprinted on the people inhabiting it its own cultural determinations and has consequently moulded them in a form and physiognomy reflecting these intrinsic, if latent, characteristics. *The space has made its people the carriers of its own spirit, it has fashioned them so as they may bring to fruition, nourish and sustain what the space is by nature best fit to produce.* After that point, Soul and Religion are given as the spiritual essence and its closest manifestation or «solidification», respectively, of the nation's existence - i.e. of a people's habitation in a given space.

The first phase of the Life of an "*Ἔθνος*" is thus maximally constructive and synthetic; it is the making of an orderly organism out of the chaotic rush, flow and interplay of the overflowing, living, spermatic fluids which unceasingly impregnate the cosmic Womb procreating the children of Night and Earth - awesome Magnificences, dreaded Beauties, Powers and Dominions of transcendent force, and horrid Abominations and hideous Monstrosities and ghastly Abortions. The harnessing of the generative faculties of infinite potency which exist in the blood, in the life-sap, of a race so as to give natural birth to a perfect entity capable of relative self-existence -- as against the continuous emergence and immersion of momentary individuations from the fertile foam of the living Cosmic Stream; the naturally determined ordering of the all-fecund and even-pregnant dis-order;- takes place at the embryonic stage of the nation's existence.

With a felicitous birth, the processes of Life are fundamentally reversed, the result of the radical change in the offspring's mode of existence. Before, it existed in direct dependence on Mother Nature as an organic part in her universal Womb. When its shaping is completed, it is ripe to exist in its own; it abandons the protective darkness of Motherhood, emerges to the luminous vision of an unknown Father, severs the sustaining tie of the omphalian lore and begins its existence in the Light, still in the bosom of his Mother, as Nature's faithful or rebellious Son. Being in Light entails some degree of isolation, as a consequence of individuation. (Thus the spectres in Hades drink of the Waters of *Λήθη*, and become forgetful of all

particular connexions and attachments; and in the magnificent but one-sided Platonizing translumination of chthonicity, in the higher spheres of Celestial Light things merge into one another and interfuse - albeit in a luminous, crystalline way). In individual Man, this isolation is extremest on the Nature's scale. And as all cutting-off reverses the processes of synthesis, dissolution sets in the very moment that direct constitution in the hands of Nature stops. Thus it is that the work of death begins in Birth: for the un-making of an organism starts exactly when its making is completed. Once relatively independant, the individual entity sustains, preserves and develops itself (in continuous interaction with the rest of the World whose quasi-detached part it is henceforth) by means of the Vital Force imparted to it by Nature - a power created by her during the long process of pregnancy and delegated to it at the moment of birth. This potency of Life is perfect at the very transition point from Darkness to Light. Set free to work in the World at large on its own, loosened from the direct existential attachment to Nature's Womb, it can only function in independence for just a given time, defined by the internal Periodic Law of its nature. For individuation is an unbearable burden for the fiery Seed that activates it, conferring and constituting life for the individual. This living spermatic force gets tired of its delegated functions in care for the separate entity; it can concentrate less and less on its appointed task; it longs to re-unite itself with its absolute root and source, in full Communion with the Glorified Essence of Fertility, the only Omnipotent, the supreme maternal Father of All, the quientessential Foam of Procreation, the boiling Semen in the hemaphroditic crater of the world. And so the individuated Vital Force will not do what in any case it cannot do: it does not want to keep on attending its prison, to restrict itself within the walls of separate existence, to enslave itself to meagre and miserable independence, to exchange the natural, self-constituted right of participating in the eternal weaving of the entire World for the positive, delegated, though full, authority over a minimal and insignificant momentary bubble within the unending universal fermentation; but also it is unable, severed as it is from the channels of direct maternal succour, to perform in its infinitesimal region of segregation what is unceasingly, everpresently and eternally fulfilled for the whole World by its undifferentiated Self. Against the combined

Will and Capability of its enlivening Spark, the individual lasts for a while, in accordance with its appointed Periodicity and the prevailing circumstances; then Death comes, the Liberator: and the living Fluid shoots back whence it sprang forth.

At the Birth of an individual a tumultuous reversal of processes takes place as the double-faced Janus of productivity turns away his constructive side and presents his Destructive. At the Death of the individual the reversal is reversed, the cosmic forces enslaved in segregation are freed, and they begin again to play their synthetic role. Herein lies the Mystery of the aspectual identity of Dionysus with Hades: the God of Life is Destructive, the God of Death Constructive. Death is Life enhanced and rendered full and whole.

There are different kinds of individuation, defined essentially by the degree and character of their circumscribed self-identity, of their relative isolation and independence from the Cosmic Matrix. And here it is most apposite to be reminded of the crucial otherness between individuation and ontological distinction. Gods and universal forces have their own specific natures, each possessing a very definite and precise character; but they exist in essential interconnectedness to each other and the whole to which they belong. Their specificity is defined by ontological reference to the entire Order of reality, to which they severally belong and which they collectively constitute. Thus they are substantive Aspects, elementary constituents and essential, instrumental, eternal organic parts of that order. They stand vis-à-vis the universality of the Cosmic Whole and its radical Matrix as productivity or emotionality, as blood or flesh, as heart and head stand to the entire Man. Individuals, on the other hand, exist as individuals to the extent that they imitate, rather than fully participate in, the Universal Wholeness. There is only one single true individual - and this is the entire World; and particular individuals, envious of its unique self-subsistence, endeavour to exist, as much as possible, on their own in its abortive likeness. They never cease, of course, to be parts, and indeed organic parts, of that singular Individual. But their individuality is measured by their mimicking, their imitative posture of independence. And this is the secret germ in the idea of an individual in general, and of a man in particular, as a Microcosm. In their rush and impious desire for self-glorification, the folly of the situation escapes them: for Cosmos can be a genuine individual

because it opposes Nothing; it is One, as it is not No-thing, it is the Ordered Chaos of supremely potent Non-Existence (of eminently fertile Indeterminacy) rendered, by that Ordering, perfectly activated Existence. But what the Many aspiring individuals are opposed to necessarily in their virtual self-constitution, is not the Nothing, but the eminently Something, the Only-thing - the very World in its entirety. Of course the ordering of a fertile disorder yielding a solidified image of the fierce opposition of the fecund, ever-pregnant Chaos against the Annihilation and Negativity of itself as pure Non-existence and Nothingness, is also taking place in the creation of each individual microcosm. But this indispensable opposition to Nothingness, coupled with the inevitable contrast to the Arch-Existent Individual, severely delimits the prospective being's potentialities. The whole energy of affirmation is required to preserve Something against Nothing; individuals are the mere accidents of this process of beingness as Universal Affirmation.

Just as existential distinctness without separation can be subdivided into aspectual character, ingredient elementariness and constitutive partition, so in individuation various degrees of accidentality, and therefore, in inverse proportion, of permanence, can be distinguished, ranging from practical immutability to fleeting momentariness. An Individual entity's viability and quality of existence is determined by the degree, firstly, of its conformation according to a necessary *typus* wrought in the internal fabric of the World, and, further, by the decisiveness and eminence of that archetype's distinct, but fully dependent, identity. And this holds good for geographical configurations as well as for plants and animals, for natural species and for particular beings, for nations equally as for individual men, each in its own appropriate way and manner.

To return to the immediate *propositum*. At birth the procreation of the individual is completed and there it stands naked in the World before its Mother. The subsequent growth and development is a process not of further construction, but of unfolding what Nature has put into the forged vital Force enlivening the individual. It is thus, paradoxically, the positive aspect of the same process of dissolution that carries the individual to its longed-for Death. What we count as perfection and acme of the individual is in reality, according to the chthonic religiosity of darkness, the hectic invirescence before dying.



A nascent nation, space-empowered, has, a complete Soul and Religion. The process of unfolding its spiritual worth then begins: the evolution of Culture, the development of Art and Thought, and of that organization of Life which can support and promote the fulfillment of the Nation's (as Space exponent) highest intrinsic aspirations.

In Homer the nativity of the Hellenic Nation is celebrated: the Space has given birth to its Spirit: this accounts for the supreme significance of his poetry to the Greeks through the ages. Therefore no important change in Greek Religion can occur after his time, for it would necessitate a national upheaval of major proportions in the form of either racial transmutation or spiritual uprooting; it would require natural space disfigurement on the largest scale. Nothing approximating, however remotely, such dislocations ever happened, till about the end of the Middle Ages. This is definitive and irrevocable. And it is painfully illustrated in a grandiose perspective by the existence and nature of Orthodox Christianity and Byzantinism.

The previously noted relative emphasis in Homer on strict Graecitas is both natural and innoxious to our argument. For the Bard of Hellenism would evidently concentrate on the catalyst that brought about the final fermentation leading to the emergence of the Greek Spirit. But this Spirit was not the offspring of strict Graecitas alone. Quite to the contrary, in its contentual fecundity and profundity it owed most to the un-Greek element in Greece and of Hellenism. The Space needed both the Greek and the Non-Greek parameters in its location in order to evolve and express its implicit forms of intelligibility. Therefore even if a major aspect of Greek Religion is absent from Homer, we can be sure that it was not nonexistent in his age and indeed that it preceded his times, basing this certainty on the very existence of the Homeric poetry and its significance. Paradoxically, Homer, even mute, testifies to the preexistence of all major features of Hellenic spirituality and religiosity.

The introduction of a specific, peregrine cult in itself does not constitute a major religious change in the context of ancient religiosity. For, firstly, it amounted to the addition of certain definite observances related to the worship of a specific divinity, and did not imply the alteration of existing practices and beliefs in whatever way. Even if

such addition implicated contrasting symbolism to that of particular pre existing cultic practices, it did not mean and matter much more than oppositions obtaining within the corpus of the indigenous system, say between Venereal and Artemisian sacral significance (cf. e.g. the prologue in Euripides *Hippolytus*). Provided the essential character of ancient religiosity remained intact, contradictions were not incoherences but complementarities. And, secondly, the successful transplantation of foreign cultic observance (or mythical account for that matter) satisfied a real, though previously obscurely felt, demand within the national religiosity, as its very success in being adopted would testify in a largely unprotected religious environment essentially constituted on the principle of diversity: it filled a ready place (maybe a vacuum) in the people's religious feeling, within the unalterable framework of existing worship. To the extent that it satisfied such a need, the adoption of the alien point enhances the power and efficacy of the native religious system, even at the cost of some topical rearrangement in its structure. On the other hand, and in any case, examples of such introductions of foreign cults, if numerous and significant, bespeak a defectively crystallised religion and therefore an imperfectly constituted national Soul: as the examples of Rome and Greece only amply prove by comparison for the influx of foreign cults in Rome - sanctioned, unsanctioned and even, often, opposed by the conservative aristocracy - is accompanied by and stems from the same cause as the explicit modelling of Roman culture on a non-indigenous pattern, while the virtual absence of any significant adoption of truly alien worship in Greece (after at least the formative period) goes hand in hand with the uniqueness of her essentially autochthonous culture.

The adoption of an altogether different major type of divination from the ones already practised would be more like the introduction of a new dimension of religiosity than similar to the observance of certain (partially) novel practices with restricted reference and always within the horizons of significance as determined by the national religious experience of the given space. The association of divination with the entrails of sacrificial victims is too fundamental a connexion to be simply imported and superadded after the generation of the complete religious body, as it could very well be the case if it was simply meeting an unprovided lesser demand of the fully grown

religious feeling and occupying a so-to-speak ready-made, and expectant, vacant place within the system of religion which has been developed to embody that total feeling<sup>11</sup>.

Furthermore visceral divination is chthonic in character; and therefore comes from a stratum of religiosity that precedes the emergence of the Olympian moment. Indeed sacrifice in general is chthonic in its roots: to ceremoniously and ritually kill is to commune in Life with the Realm of Death. These insights will be developed and confirmed elsewhere; I mention them here in order to complete the a priori proof of what I set out to demonstrate: namely, that sacrificial divination was practised before the Homeric times and could not therefore be unknown to the poet.

Having settled that, the next, and less important question is this: Does Homer actually mention sacrificial divination? And the answer is affirmative. When Achilles convoked the assembly of the army to determine an appropriate course of action that would rid the camp from the ravaging pest, he proposes (Iliad A, 62-3):

ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ τινα μάντιν ἐρείομεν, ἢ ἱερῆα,  
ἢ καὶ ὄνειροπόλον· -----

The opinions of the ancient grammarians and critics diverged on whether *μάντις*, *ἱερεύς* and *ὄνειροπόλος* refer here to three species of divination, or that *μάντις* means the genus and the other two signify the practitioners of two of its species. Herodianus, a weighty authority, adopted the latter view, as is testified in Sch. A (and B): *μέχρι τοῦ «ἐρείομεν» διασταλτέον, εἶτα «ἢ ἱερῆα ἢ καὶ ὄνειροπόλον», ἵνα γενικὸν μὲν ἦ τὸ «μάντιν», εἶδη δὲ τὰ ἐπιφερόμενα. οὕτως Ἡρωδιανός*. The former view was espoused by Porphyry, Sch. B: *ὁ δὲ Πορφύριος τρία ἀποδέχεται, μάντιν λέγων τὸν διὰ οἰωνῶν ἢ σημεῖων ἢ τεράτων μαντευόμενον (our category (2)), ἱερέα δὲ τὸν διὰ θυσίων, ὄνειροπόλον δὲ τὸν ὄνειροπολούμενον θεατῆν ὄνειρου γεγονότα*<sup>12</sup>. It is difficult to see how exactly Nicanor interpreted the passage in the light of the right distinction of the main kinds of divination that he made: Sch. A: *καὶ ὁ Νικάνωρ δὲ οὕτως λέγει (agreeing thus presumably with Herodianus, whose view was mentioned just before): ἔστι γένος τι ἢ μαντική, διαιρουμένη εἰς εἶδη τρία: εἰς οἰωνοσκοπίαν, εἰς ἱεροσκοπίαν* (so we should evidently read, a correction

already proposed by Wassenberg and adopted by Heyne in his *Observationes ad loc.*), *καὶ τὴν διὰ τῶν ὄνειράτων μαντείαν* (and so in Sch. D without mention of Nicanor; we should perhaps dissociate the division from Nicanor in this context). The conclusive objection to the view that *μάντις* here refers to the genus while *ἱερεὺς* and *ὄνειροπόλος* to two of its kinds, is the then inexplicable omission in that case of the other major kind of augural divination, especially as, in response to Achilles' call, Calchas comes forward *οἰωνοπόλων ὄχ' ἄριστος*.

The same problem occurs in Ω, 221: Priam is determined to go to the Greek camp and ask for the mangled body of Hector, Iris herself having appeared to him and enjoined this course of action; and when Hecuba tries to dissuade him from the desperate act, he replies:

220 εἰ μὲν γὰρ τίς μ' ἄλλος ἐπιχθονίων ἐκέλευεν,  
ἢ οἱ μάντιές εἰσί, θουσκοὶ ἢ ἱερῆες,  
ψευδὸς κεν φαίμεν, καὶ νοσφίζοίμεθα μᾶλλον·  
νῦν δ', αὐτὸς γὰρ ἄκουσα θεοῦ καὶ ἐσέδρακον ἄντην,  
εἴμι, καὶ οὐχ ἄλιον ἔπος ἔσσεται· -----

where the Sch. A tell us: *καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἀξιοῦσίν τινες διαστέλλειν μετὰ τὸ «εἰσι»*. (as I have done in the text above); *ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀραφιδία τὸ γένος, φησί* (rather *φασί*, unless the name of a grammarian has been dropped, the (main) exponent of this view, in which case we may well understand Herodianus, collating with the scholia on the former passage), *προειπὼν ἐπιφέρει τὸ εἶδος: «ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ τίνα μάντιν ἐρείομεν»* etc. The alternative view was to take *μάντιες* with *θουσκοὶ* (understanding *ἐμπυροσκοποὶ* or *λιβανομάντιες*) and distinguish from them *ἱερῆες* (as extispices), as Sch. A go on to maintain.

Problems like these disappear once recourse has been had to the essential configurations of the matter. The internal development from «dreamer» to *ὄνειροκρίτης* which I have indicated above as the natural analysis of the complex but unified meaning of dream-diviner, runs parallel to the similar evolution of *οἰωνοσκόπος*, *τερατοσκόπος* etc. from the inspired soothsayer. The word *μάντις*, *μαντεύομαι* refers to a similar necessary concatenation of these moments: (1) capacity of ecstatic possession, (2) inspirational powers to fathom the gods' mind

and pronounce their will, (3) sensitivity to divine presence, (4) enhanced receptivity to divine messages, (5) ability to discern and scrutinize indirect manifestations of divine workings and operations, (6) experience in deciphering signs of the on-going cosmic processes. Thus we chart the move from the gift to the art of divination; the emphasis on the several moments may vary, but their essential cohesion is the paramount factor of the situation.

What in the primeval society is the divine-sacred-magic man, develops gradually into two basic types: the holy man and the priest. The distinction works towards its effective establishment when the original religion of Pure Ritual becomes a religion of Gods; when the primal religiosity of the articulate Rite and of the virtually undifferentiated Divinity gives way to that of a Rite-God systematic association; when the aboriginal religion of integral numinosity is transformed into the religion of divine particularism. The transition is explicitly testified for Greece by Herodotus in the «Pelagic» stratum; but it is a necessary universal step in the development towards complete natural religiosity. (Revealed religions revert in an important sense to the initial unity of the divine by sublating the primary experience of the numen).

Fully grown Gods require Service, *θεραπεία*; hence priesthood, and priests as the operators of divine worship. The transformation of objective religious act into worship is the first major development of religiosity - and it is of immense significance and consequence. Part of the existing ritual is appropriated by the new moment, and crystallizes itself around more and more definitely characterized divine beings: it constitutes - together with possible, new natural growth to which it gives rise in its new setting and shifted functions - divine worship. What remains outside this circle, the more unreformed remainder of the cult of numinosity, becomes the province of the magician, the religious doctor, the sooth-sayer, the healer, the purifier, the institutor of rites purposing to do things. (At the margin, this province provides also the fertile soil for the development in after times of what I have called vagabond chthonicity, of itinerant salvation-workers, of false herbalists, of adepts in the art of deception charlatan magicians and the sort). The physiognomy and the roles of the holy man and the priest are thus distinguished, and, to a great extent, separated, out of the primeval, unified field of a worship that was part of the innermost

weaving of the fabric of the World: a due honour and service paid to the divinity of the world that ipso facto empowered the operator with the potency of the adored godhead, with a command over the cosmic powers that was the necessary result of their most supreme and absolute veneration - a divinization through unconditional prostration before natural divinity in its full, awesome integral.

The more gods preserve their chthonic root, the more significant are their aspects associated with ritual other than pure worship; hence, e.g. Zeus *Μειλίχιος* and Apollo *Ἀποτρόπαιος* and Hercules *Ἀλεξίκακος* and Zeus or Dionysus *Καθάρισιος*, Asclepius *Ἀγνίτης* etc. The purgative and protective functions of religious activity remained always markedly chthonic, even when associated with Olympian deities, whose chthonicity, in fact, they render manifest. However, the more positive and active ritual operations (the ones that more conspicuously pronounce the primal participation through ritual into the making of the world) suffered a fundamental transformation first at the emergence of a differentiated divinity and secondly, and more emphatically, at the Olympization of godhead. By causing, through divine means, the proposed result, they asked for it, their request appropriately addressed to the divinity presiding over the relevant field. Thus positive magic and prayer represent the widest segregation effected through the disintegration of the primeval unity of the religious Act; and so they bring into clearest focus the essential characteristics of the first and last moments of natural religiosity respectively: an undifferentiated numinosity permeating the world, making and breaking its structure; and a highly articulate system of Gods with more or less clearly demarcated fields of reality entrusted to their unfailing care and custody. Thus it is that the more marked «personalization» of the Olympians is objectively, and not merely «poetically», necessitated.

And with that final distinction we have the entire spectrum of complete natural religiosity unfolded before us. On the one hand we find magic, religious medicine, soothsaying, purificatory and telestic ritual, salvational cult - sacred acts of positive or negative efficacy, with either no relationship to any developed organization of godhead, or only a loose reference to presiding divinities, or, most characteristically, in intimate connexion with an absolutely and profoundly chthonic experience and differentiation of divinity. And

on the other hand we have adorative and honourific service to, i.e. worship of, fully developed Olympian gods, with negative, protective, effective ritual associated with their chthonic aspects, and Prayer conjoined to their worship as a means of securing desired positive ends by ritual entreaty.

The soothsayer belongs to the category of the holy man. Infused with divine spirit he reveals the gods' will, the ordinances of fate, and the workings of the cosmic forces. To Everyone divine messages can get through, so to speak, especially in extraordinary circumstances; and the gods can disclose the future to anyone they please. But it is a divine gift vitalizing an exceptional, appropriate receptivity which constitutes the permanently extraordinary powers of a soothsayer. This potency gradually gains also, by long experience and deep insight, the art of interpreting indirect signals and signs of divine operations and cosmic processes. And so inspirational revelation is joined by divination through signs and monstrosities - natural phenomena, movements and cries of birds, accidents and extraordinary occurrences alike from the field of *μαντική*, on which the divine gift and the cultivated technical expertise are exercised. The *ὄνειροπόλος*, we saw, belongs also to this type of holy man, with somnolistic experiences as his province.

No inspirational basis is required by contradistinction for the priest. He will perform the appointed service of a God. Knowledge of details of divine worship and of sacral traditions (ritualistic and mythological), locally or nationally associated with the Temple, are naturally demanded of him; and a calling, normally, for the holy office; but no special divine presence - enthusiastic and extraordinary - is presupposed in him, although a singular and close connexion grows between the priest and the god by virtue of the former's constant care, superintendence, involvement and performance of the worship due to the latter. Anybody with accurate knowledge of the functions incumbent on the sacred office is eligible for the task; and thus it is that priesthoods can even be obtained by sale in later times without any offence given to the dignity of Gods or the religious sensitivities of the people. Furthermore the things to be known by the priest are such as are perforce known to everybody, or to everybody relevant, i.e. the nobles. For public or temple worship does not greatly differ (and its difference is virtually nonexistent in the heroic and proto-archaic

times) from private adoration of the Gods. So there is no art or science, just as there is no special gift, to constitute a priest. Nor is public worship necessarily associated with priestly functions; for it is the business of the State and of the civil authorities to superintend and conduct (through appropriately constituted offices or bodies) the collective service to the Gods; although naturally the priest of the relevant God would actively participate in the ceremonial in his proper functions. The office of a priest consists in his offering constant and exclusive service to a particular God in a particular place. The priest is essentially of a certain God; and, equally, of a certain Temple or other sacred precinct. Priesthood takes care of a God in his House; of a given God in a given House: it is specialized and localized.

The chief functions of the early Greek priest in the service to «his» God are two: sacrifice and prayer. Divine worship consists fundamentally in the ritual killing of the primal «un-godly» stratum of religiosity, when this has been transformed into sacred offering. Sacred is what is set-aside for Gods, what, segregated from profane existence and use, belongs in a special way to the Gods. Fulfillment of our dutiful obligations regarding the «hierization» of places and buildings, living beings and artifacts, implements and lifes, entitles us to ask for God's favour and grace in our endeavours. In particular, our asking aptly accompanies special acts of «hierization», basically the «devotion» and offering of something to the God. The offering which is consummated by throwing the offered thing (or an appropriate collection of its parts) into the altar-fire, is a sacrifice, *θυσία*. And despite the strong philosophical tradition that favoured bloodless sacrifice and, misinterpreting the primeval religious horror at taking life away, would like to persuade people that killing a victim was a later development of religiosity - blood sacrifice is by far the most crucial form of sacrifice from earliest antiquity through Homer to the latest times. For as sacrifice and offering in general, is a rendering unto God of what belongs to him, a ceremonious commitment and solemn reaffirmation on the part of man of the absolute divine mastery over the world declared by a symbolic sacralization of each part and kind of nature through a token segregation of selected particulars from their natural uses and contexts; and as such segregation culminates in the destruction of the sacred thing for the use of the gods (more chthonically put, in the annihilation of its anomalous individuality



and its consequent return to the eternal matrix of all begetting); sacrificial killing must have been co-temporal with the very experience of offering; as it is the consummate sacralization of animality. Nor can we consider human sacrifices as anything but primeval: the most anxious, extreme and potent «hierarchicalization» for man must have been that of himself.

What have been distinguished here, and everywhere, are organic moments not separate mechanisms. I might even, for purposes of exposition, have sharpened the contrasting formulations. But one should never lose sight of the integrated objective unity of essence and of evolution underlying the entire field and incorporating the elements discerned in a fusion allowing diverse ontological emphasis to the various naturally emerging moments according to their necessary procession. Thus ritual killing, as a catalyst and a releaser here and now of occult forces, generates, on the level of the god-orientated religiosity, the solemn «de-votion», the ultimate consecration of life to the gods by proxy, the symbolic, supreme affirmation of the divinity in and of Nature: the two moments are unified in the sacredness of the holy rite; a divine operation brings onto the surface the divine order of the World; the occult becomes directly present and manifest. One is almost tempted to say that any difference lies chiefly in the psychology of Man as found in various stages of his development: what is presupposed in the ritual killing, is affirmed in the sacrificial offer. Similarly, the incantation indispensable for the efficacy of the aboriginal rite becomes the prayer accompanying the sacrifice: what was achieved through sacred deed and word by immediate participation in the workings of the cosmic forces, is now asked for in supplication, the appropriate channels of divine communication and connexion having been opened through sacrifice. And it is the actuality of such communication that is the paramount fact in both transactions; it is presented in all its terrible impersonality, utter naturalness and full potency in the former case; and it is coloured by the marked individuality of the Gods in the latter. And so, summarily, what is unified in the primeval sacral operation becomes dispersed in the triple development of magic handling, mystery rite, and cult of the Gods.

In Homer, the essential features of the man devoted to the service of the God in his Temple, and his special vocational connexion to the

God himself, are manifest right at the opening of the Iliad. Chryses, the priest of Apollo, comes to the Greek camp and implores the hosts to give him back his daughter, captured and made slave-concubine of Agamemnon. Chryses is called ἀρητήρ (A, 11) and ἱερεύς (A, 23): ἀρητήρ παρὰ τὸ ἀρᾶσθαι, ἔστιν εὐχεσθαι (Sch. D), invoking the God in prayer or malediction (καταρῶμαι); in fact we soon find Chryses imprecating against the Greeks (A, 37-42). Ἱερεύς is the priest especially as the sacrificer, as the signification of the triple form: ἱερεὺς - ἱερεύω - ἱερεῖον makes evident. Thus we have the two main priestly functions providing for the Homeric names of the man entrusted with the service of the God. And in the only other example of ἀρητήρ in Homer, Dolopion is called ἀρητήρ Σκαμάνδρου (Iliad E, 77-8); he is the perpetual invoker of Scamandrus, so to speak. The association of priesthood with a particular God is obvious.

Chryses came to the camp holding the insignia of his sacred office: the golden sceptre to signify priesthood; and the characteristic Apollonian fillet to indicate the God to whose service he was devoted (A, 14-5; 28); this fillet was not worn on the head but put on the sceptre to signalize supplication. He implores all the Greeks, and in particular the two Atreidean leaders, to accept rich ransom as ample recompense for the release of his daughter; he even wishes them good success in their enterprise and safe return to their country. He finally calls upon their reverential fear of Apollo (awe, fear and reverence are the constituent elements, variously emphasised in various usages, of ἀζόμενος, as in A 21: ἀζόμενοι Διὸς ἐκηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα), which presupposes his intimate connexion with the God as his priest. All Achaeans noisily assented, and vociferated:

23 αἰδεῖσθαι θ' ἱερῆα καὶ ἀγλαὰ δέχθαι ἄποινα.

But Agamemnon, displeased at the idea of loosing Briseis, sternly refused the supplication, coarsely rebutting, shamelessly insulting and directly threatening the venerable priest. He angrily warns him not to rely on his reverend office and its sacred emblems for his safety:

28 μὴ νύ τοι οὐ χραίσμη σκῆπτρον καὶ στέμμα θεεῖο.

Chryses, terrified, submits and leaves the camp. In grief he goes to the coast and there he invokes Apollo cursing the Greeks:

35 πολλὰ δ' ἔπειτ' ἀπάνευθε κίων ἡρᾶθ' ὁ γεραῖος  
 Ἀπόλλωνι ἀνακτι, τὸν ἡύκομος τέκε Λητώ:  
 κλυθί μευ, Ἀργυρότοξ', ὃς Χρῦσῃν ἀμφιβέβηκας  
 Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην, Τενέδοιό τε ἴφι ἀνάσσεις,  
 Σμινθεῦ· εἴ ποτέ τοι χαριέντ' ἐπὶ νηὸν ἔρειψα,  
 ἢ εἰ δὴ ποτέ τοι κατὰ πύονα μηρὶ ἔκηρα  
 ταύρων ἢδ' αἰγῶν, τόδε μοι κρήνηνον ἐέλδωρ·  
 τίσειαν Δαναοὶ ἐμὰ δάκρυα σοῖσι βέλεσσιν.  
 Ὡς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος· τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.

And there follows the shuddering description of the enraged God of Light descending upon the Greeks like Night (47: ---- ὁ δ' ἦϊε νυκτὶ ἐοικώς) set on darkest vengeance. (Chryses goes to the sea because he will invoke Apollo as the tutelary deity of the region worshipped in the island Tenedos and at various places on the coastline of Troas, as *Κίλλα*, *Χρῦση* and *Σμίνθος* (for the important connexion of Apollo with the mentioned places cf. Sch. A (Sch. D)). The priest reminds Apollo in this critical moment of two functions that he has honourably discharged; they must therefore be the two chief duties of his priesthood. And they are animal sacrifices and decoration of the Temple. Thus the attachment of the priest to a temple as a curator and operator of the divine service there; his sacrificial function; and his role as an invoker and communicator with God, are all vividly manifest in this short passage. Essential description is as necessary for high poetry as it is for true philosophy. Ἐρέφω and ἐπὶ-ἐρέφω (παρέλκει ἢ «ἐπί» says Sch. A; but Sch. D takes it as part of the verb, ἐπέρεψα) from a basic meaning cover, overlay, spread over, can mean on the one hand protect, especially a place, a cavity, a house, thus shelter, roof; and on the other decorate, put ornaments on something, like wreathes, branches of plants, fillets, ribands etc.). The word kept only its former sense in ordinary language; but poetic usage utilized the latter signification as well. Thus e.g. Euripides, Bacchae 318-9:

Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν καὶ Κάδμος, ὃν σὺ διαγελαῶς  
 κισσῶ τ' ἐρεψόμεσθα, καὶ χορεύσομεν etc.

In submission to Bacchus we will put on us a dress of ivy, we will crown ourselves with wreaths of ivy; for as ἐρέφω is particularly put on on top, and wreaths and garlands are the main festive decoration in antiquity<sup>13</sup>, spread everywhere on every elevation and worn on the head by the people, crown is a very appropriate signification for the ἐρέφω. Cf. also Apollonius *Argonautica* B, 159:

ξανθὰ δ' ἐρεψάμενοι δάφνη καθύπερθε μέτωπα etc.

Here they crown themselves with laurel, the plant sacred to Apollo, as before with ivy in honour of Dionysus. Cf. further Pindar *Olympion*. XIII, 31-3: δύο δ' αὐτὸν ἔρεψαν / πλόκοι σελίνων ἐν Ἴσθμιάδεσσιν / φανέντα; for crowning of craters v. Sophocles, *Oedipus Coloneus* 473; on the Pindaric theme, v. Bacchylides, *Erinicia* VIII, 23-4: οἷ τριέτει στεφάνω / ξανθὰν ἐρέψωνται κόμαν; and XII 69-70: πανθαλέων στεφάνοισιν / ἀνθέων χαίταν ἐρεφθείς. The scholia ad Apollonium correctly (and inescapably) note: δάφνη ἐστέφαντο δι' Ἀπόλλωνα and στεψάμενοι δὲ ὑπεράνω τῶν μετώπων δάφνη etc. And similarly the Pindaric scholia.

But there was unnecessary divergence in the interpretation of the Homeric passage by the grammarians. Thus sch. D have (appropriately hinting on the correct associations): ἐπέρεψα· ὠρόφωσα (from ὀροφή, roof), ἐστεφάνωσα. And Sch. A: ἔρεψα· παρὰ τὸ ἐρέφω. "Ὅθεν καὶ εἰραφιώτης ὁ Διόνυσος λέγεται· ἐστέφετο γὰρ κισσῶ (they go on to give alternative interpretations of the epitheton Bacchi). But Apollonius, *Lexicon*, peremptorily s.v. ἔρεψα· ἐστέγασα· ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ὀροφή, ἢ στέγη. κακῶς δ' ἀπέδωκαν τινὲς τὸ ἐστεφάνωσα. And it seems that this view was held in classical times; certainly Plato assumes it as a matter of course in giving the narrational equivalent of the dramatic portrayal of the affair in Homer: v. *Respublica* Γ, 394a: ὁ δὲ πρεσβύτης ἀκούσας ἔδεισέν τε καὶ ἀπήεισιγγή, ἀποχωρήσας δὲ ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου πολλὰ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ἠῦχετο, τὰς τε ἐπωνυμίας τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνακαλῶν (significantly signaled by Plato, as the true and potent divine names were a crucial part of every invocation) καὶ ὑπομιμνήσκων καὶ ἀπαιτῶν, εἴ τι πώποτε ἦ ἐν ναῶν οἰκοδομήσει ἢ ἐν ἱερῶν θυσίαις κεχαρισμένον δωρήσαιο etc. Misled from such accounts Leaf's fervent imagination constructed the idea of Chryses' referring to the most primitive form of temple, «a

mere roof to protect the image of a god standing in a grove! One can illustrate the existence of such shelters for rustic divinities, whose images are meant to be in the countryside and in the open; but to imagine that these primitive structures can be called a *νηός* by Homer - and indeed a *χαρίεις νηός* and in the singular (obviously the temple where Chryses was the officiating minister in the service of God) - is high phantasy. Hesychius s. v. *ἔρεψα* gives both interpretations: *ἔστεφάνωσα, ἔστειψα. ἔστέγασα, ὠκοδόμησα, ὠρόφησα*. While sub *ἐπέρεψα* has: *ἐπεσκεύασα. ἐπεκόσμησα. ἐπεστέγασα. Ἐπεκόσμησα* would be all right if taken as festive decoration; but here positioned between *ἐπεσκεύασα* and *ἐπεστέγασα* it must mean permanent building improvements: which makes it an unlikely fit for the repetitive sacrifices mentioned in the same breath in our passage. Although again one could stress the imperfect of *ἔκηα* as against the aorist of *ἔρεψα*; but erroneously. That Suda refers to an unascribed fragment «*νεῶν τε ἐρέψεις πρόφερρον*» and explains: *ἐρέψεις· καλύψεις*, is not to the point, as «cover» is undeniably part of the meaning field of the word, rather its root-sense. The crucial point is, in the end, the solid poetic tradition behind *ἐρέφω* as crown. Coupled with the natural fit of taking Chryses as referring to his festive decoration of the God's Temple on all appropriate occasions as well as his duly sacrificing to the God's satisfaction, makes it virtually certain that this is the Homeric sense here. And so the Etymol. Magnum and Gudanium, without the alternative interpretation.

The invocation of Apollo and the imprecation against the Greeks is signified by *ἄρῶμαι* (A, 35). In fact *ἄρά* and not *εὐχή* is the original word for what we would call prayer. But «pray» is very misleading both for *ἄρῶμαι* and for *εὐχόμεαι*, especially in these words' archaic, and therefore fundamental, signification. For the meaning of modern prayer comprises two essential elements which are differently distributed in the corresponding ancient expressions: virtually always the meaning-field is «cut», dissected, very dissimilarly in the ancient and modern conceptual structures; and invariably the ancient way is by far superior as more essential and natural. The two essential moments in prayer in its modern usage are (a) calling on God and (b) begging of him. Now (b) is expressed in ancient religiosity by *ἱκετεύω*, *λίσσομαι*, *λιτανεύω*, and pertains to the dimension of religious purification. When contaminated, defiled, ceremonially unclean,

polluted, one cannot call on the Gods, one has lost the right and the possibility of any connexion and communication with the Pure Ones. His defilement renders him of excrement, a hateful sight in the eyes of the Gods, a rejected part of the cosmic organism. To reconstitute one's position as an ontologically acceptable member of the world one must be purified; meanwhile he can only supplicate the Gods. Constituent (a), contrariwise, refers to the ordinary, normal state of affairs where man is not considered to be burdened with any ἄγος. The question of religious cleanliness is crucial in ancient religiosity. This is why impure persons cannot be present in sacred places or at sacred ceremonies: the juxtaposition of defilement and purity is explosive, quintessentially sacrilegious. The polluted cannot be made wholesome by holy rites meant for the sound, but by special sanctificatory operations of controlled defilement, thoroughly chthonic in character. Defilement is not sin, which the sinner beseeches in normal worship the Almighty to forgive, but an objective, contagious, pestiferous and pestiferous disorder which the sufferer endeavours to heal by expiation, atoning for its original cause, propitiating the provoked, presiding daemonic divinities, supplicating the Lords of Chthonic Self-ordering and the appropriate chthonic aspects of the Olympians. This complex of expiatory placation has nothing to do with the proper service of the celestial Gods. The Olympians as such know nothing about this dimension, want to know nothing and can do nothing. Only sanctified impurity can really heal impurity; only self-ordered disorder can thoroughly and «persuasively» remove chaotic disorder.

Ἄρα and εὐχῆ refer to calling upon the Gods without any known religious incapacitation and therefore do not emphatically include the notion of begging, of devout supplication, inherent in ἱκεσία or λιτανεία. And this is why «prayer» is inadequate as a rendering of either of them. It must be henceforth borne in mind that when I use the word, I employ it in a «neutral» usage, as a calling on or invocation of the Gods.

Having cleared this noxious nuisance of modernism from our ground, let it be observed that the root meaning of εὐχόμεαι is to declare, solemnly and openly pronounce, ceremoniously affirm in the face of the world, to «say» in that potent, pregnant archaico-heroic sense that connotes impossibility to renege on one's «word», absolute determination to stand by it come what may: the hero speaks the truth

and braves all, what he announces cannot but be reality. Out of this fundamental proclamatory meaning are derived the senses of vowing, boasting, vaunting (what in the standard language was expressed by the cognate forms *αὔχω*, *καυχῶμαι*) and then of bragging, braggarting, finally of addressing oneself to the Gods, calling on them clearly and loudly for all the world to hear. *Εὔχομαι* and *αὔχῶμαι* are «originally» the same word; its religious connotations keeps the former apart. But the «lay», braggardly sense of it in Homer provides the clue to the root identity of both (interchange of *α* and *ε* is common enough both within a dialect and on an interdialectal level).

Precisely because of its associations, *εὔχομαι* or *εὐχή*, when used in connexion with an invocation or «prayer», signify rather the outward circumstances of the act - its proclamation so to speak; thus we understand the special appropriateness of the adverb in *μεγάλ' εὐχετόωντο* (Iliad, O, 369); they called on all Gods loud and clear. *Ἄρωμαι* and *ἄρά* on the other hand mean the invocation itself with its definite content - be it in benedictory or maledictory contexts; and this is why the priest is called by Homer *ἄρητήρ* and not, say, *εὐχητήρ*.

*Ἄρωμαι* and its cognates are exclusively religious words; and indeed of a very definite and evidently chthonic origin and character.

(a) They are particularly apt to express malediction, curses, imprecations - a usage very frequent in tragedy with its deep chthonic roots, but of course prominently present in the epic diction as well. In standard non-poetic language those significations tend to monopolize the employment of the lexical root. The locality where Theseus laid curses on the Athenians was called *Ἄρατήριον* or *Ἄρητήριον*, a place of curses; v. Plutarch, *Theseus* XXXV; Hesychius s.v.; Et.M. s.v. *ἄρητήσιον* (to be corrected to *ἄρητήριον*): The source was *Φιλόχορος*. The magico-chthonic character of *ἄρά* in its imprecatory signification is well illustrated by Plutarch's relation of the famous incident as Crassus was leaving Rome for his ill-starred expedition against the Parthians. Ateius, wishing to abort Crassus' endeavours, when he failed (despite his own tribunician potestas) to prevent him (accompanied with the full authority of Pompeius) from leaving, resorted to the religious means of maleficatory condemnation, and performing by the very gateway at the pomerium and at the moment of Crassus' exit old and dreaded rites, he uttered his execrations. V.

Plutarch, *Crassus* XVI: ὁ δ' Ἀτήϊος προδραμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην ἔθηκεν ἐσχαρίδα καιομένην καὶ τοῦ Κράσσου γενομένου κατ' αὐτὴν ἐπιθυμιῶν καὶ κατασπένδων ἀρὰς ἐπηρᾶτο δεινὰς μὲν αὐτὰς καὶ φρικώδεις, δεινοὺς δέ τινες θεοὺς καὶ ἀλλοκότους ἐπ' αὐταῖς καλῶν καὶ ὀνομάζων. Ταύτας φασὶ Ρωμαῖοι τὰς ἀρὰς ἀποθέτους καὶ παλαιὰς τοιαύτην ἔχειν δύναμιν, ὡς περιφυγεῖν μηδένα τῶν ἐνσχεθέντων αὐταῖς, κακῶς δὲ πράσσειν καὶ τὸν χρησάμενον· Ὅθεν οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖς τυχοῦσιν αὐτὰς οὐδ' ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἀρᾶσθαι. The curses were so extraordinarily potent that not only there is no means of aversion on the part of him against whom they are directed, but the powers and energy released by their efficacy will afflict badly even the operator who cannot protect himself from the cosmic activity that he instigates, cannot immune himself from the deadly virus that he releases against his opponent. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* XXVIII, 3: quoties ipsae dirae obstrepentes nocuerint etc.<sup>14</sup>.

(b) Ἀρή means also βλάβη, harm done, especially killing, violent death; as Hesychius has s.v. ἀρά: εὐχή· κατάρα· βλάβη. And also s.v. ἀρή (together with the meanings εὐχή and κατάρα) βλάβη ἢ ἐν τῷ Ἄρει, τουτέστιν, ἐν πολέμῳ: not necessarily in war, but still in armed conflict will do generally. Hesychius correctly wishes to bring into focus the connexion of ἀρή with Ἄρης, as calamity, destruction and the God of killing and destruction. (Large scale destruction occurring in war, Mars is especially the God of War; more generally he is the God of armed violence, the monstrous God of Harm, of hideous personal injury inflicted).

(c) Ἀραί are even personified chthonic divinities, and indeed of the destructive type which presides over the redress of aberrations and disorders. Thus the Furies reply to Athena's inquiry about their singular aspect and identity, unlike anything known to (Olympian) Gods or men (v. Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, 410-2):

415 πύση τὰ πάντα συντόμῳς, Διὸς κόρη:  
ἡμεῖς γάρ ἐσμεν Νυκτὸς αἰανῆς τέκνα,  
Ἄραι δ' ἐν οἴκοις γῆς ὑπαὶ κεκλήμεθα.

They are the dreadful children of awesome Night; cf. also *ibid.* 321 sqq., and repeated emphatically, e.g. 745; 792; 822; 844; 876; 1034 etc. The Primal Fates are their aunts, 961 sqq. Their true name in



Hades is Ἀραί; and their function is concisely set out in the following rapid exchange with typical chthonic contempt for elaborate reasoning: they unremmitingly, unpitifully pursue and terrorise to death the killer, most ferociously and implacably, of course, the taker of cosanguineous life, the one who sheds kindred blood, with the gradation of horror reaching to the hideous heights of parricide up to the ultimate climax of sacrilegious abomination - metroctony. And so Oedipus' curse is an Ἐριννύς in *Septem adv. Th.* 69-70:

᾿Ω Ζεῦ τε καὶ Γῆ καὶ πολισσοῦχοι θεοί,  
Ἄρά τ' Ἐριννὺς πατρὸς ἡμεγασθενής, etc.

Here the Erinys is particularized as the curse of Oedipus, as in vv. 695-6, where read τελεῖ Ἄρά, curse which is complete and perfect without remission and without possibility of leaving anything relevant outside the gambit of its fearful, inexorable operation - as in the next reference; and cf. *ibid.* 655; 766-7; while the exact meaning of τέλειος in these contexts is eloquently portrayed in 786-91; v. also 832-3. In the same sense in 945-6 we hear of ἀρὰν πατρῶαν ἀλαθῆ, i.e. ἐκβαίνουσαν, τελειομένην and τελουμένην; v. also *ibid.* 885-6. Cf. also τέλειον... Δίκην, Ἄτην, Ἐρινύν θ', i.e. completed avenging punishment and retribution, in Agamemnon 1432-3; the guilty person on whom revenge was wrought is there said to be slaughtered and sacrificed to these particularised, personified manifestations of the universal law of cosmic absolute justice. Erinys as curse appears also in vv. 832-3. And similarly the specific Ἄρά molesting with her nefarious exhalations the House of Atreus presents herself in *Choephoroi*, 693; similarly with even the curse of Saturn himself, Prometheus Vincetus 910-12. (Of course, the personified Ἄρά can be also spoken of in the plural as Ἀραί - for the Oedipodian curse see the already referred to passages). Violent death arouses the monstrous powers of Revenge; an outrage asks for its terrible punishment, for retribution. With the blood he sheds, the killed one lets loose the ghastly Spirits of exemplary Justice - and they hound down the culprit with relentless horror: they are the ἔγκοτοι κύνες τῆς Μητρός, in Clytaemnestra's case (v. *Choephoroi*, 924). Again the mutual slaughter of the two Theban brothers releases the corresponding Ἀραί: *Septem adv. Thebas*, 894; cf. 954. The terrible process is expressly described by Aeschylus, *Choephoroi*. 400 sqq.:

- XOP. ἀλλὰ νόμος μὲν φονίας σταγόνας  
 χυμένας ἐς πέδον ἄλλο προσαιτεῖν  
 αἶμα· βοᾷ γὰρ λοιγὸς Ἐρινὺν  
 παρὰ τῶν πρότερον φθιμένων ἄτην  
 ἑτέραν ἐπάγουσαν ἐπ' ἄτη.  
 OP. πόποι δᾶ νερτέρων τυραννίδες·  
 πολυκρατεῖς ἴδεσθε φθιμένων ἀραί, etc.

Cf. Apollonius, *Argonautica*, Γ, 703-5:

----- ἦ σοὶ γε φίλοις σὺν παισὶ θανοῦσα  
 εἶην ἐξ Ἀΐδέω στυγερῇ μετόπισθεν Ἐριννύς -

a revenging Fury who is associated in 711-2 with Ἀρά:

Δαιμονίη, τί νύ τοι ρέξω ἄκος, οἷ' ἀγορεύεις  
 Ἀράς τε στυγεράς καὶ Ἐριννύας;

The Curse, when operable, its potency being released, becomes an avenging Fury.

There may be a general Revenge - Curse hanging over a family, the result of an original outrage perpetrated, and then the particularised execrations (ἀραί) follow necessarily that emerge from the criminal abominations which are committed in the process of fulfillment of the primal Ἀρά. There is thus a certain lineal transmission of pollution, and a corresponding transmission of the curse that goes with it, ever bloodthirsty, ever instigating new atrocities, ever accumulating profanities upon profanities, with the end of destroying the anomaly by the ultimate collapse of the putrified, terminally diseased member. As Euripides put it with lapidary succinctness, through the mouth of Oedipus in *Phoenissae* 1611: ἀράς παραλαβὼν Λαΐου καὶ παισὶ δούς.

A transgression of the divine Law of Nature releases the power and energy, and activates the heavy hand of Absolute Cosmic Justice, an outrage unchains the horrible Hounds of inexorable just and full revenge. Particular atrocities and abominations can be inscribed into the framework of older and more potent and far-reaching filth; then the new violations, necessary as they may be for the punishment of the previous aberrations, create further «disturbances» of the Natural

Order in their vicinity and thus intensify the severity of chastisement and the rage of Justice's Hounds. For we should never forget that the Furies are intimately connected with Justice, *Δίκη*: they repeatedly and emphatically make the point in the Aeschylean tragedy that bears their euphemized name: e.g. vv. 508 sqq.; 521 sqq.; 538 sqq.; 563 sqq. - in fact the whole of the chorus 480 sqq. is fused with the chthonic ideal of absolute justice. Cf. also v. 785; 815, elsewhere.

This natural process of inherent self-correctibility in case of any violation of the divine Law of the World is inscribed in the primeval decrees of Fate; these ordinances become applicable at the moment of each transgression; their executive powers, so to speak, are invested, especially for blood-guilt, in the daemonic divinity of righteous, revengeful Fury - whose relentless pursuit of her victim, the offender, is prompted and insisted upon by the ghost of the dead; and so it is the ghost of Clytaemnestra that direly complains of the Furies' relaxation of their horrendous vigilance: *Eumenides* 94 sqq. The blood sacrilegiously shed in open effrontery to the world's divine Order, demands the blood of the culprit; this law is satisfied through the operations of the bloodthirsty Furies.

We clearly see the three levels, or rather dimensions, of the situation clearly indicated by Aeschylus in *Septem contra Th.* 975 sqq.; the chorus exclaims in a repeated *ἔφύμνιον*, when the brothers have killed each other in single combat:

βαρυδότειρα μογερά, ἰὼ Μοῖρα  
 πόντια τ' Οἰδίπου σκιά,  
 μέλαινά τ'  
 Ἐρινός, ἧ μεγασθενής τις εἶ.

(We must keep the second τ' against Porson's *μέλαινα* [ἀτ'] *Ἐρινός* adopted unthinkingly as the vulgate since his time; the triplicity of the description is best thus emphasised). *Οἰδίπου σκιά* is his Ghost, as he is, according to Aeschylus, already dead; (cf. v. 914 and 1002-4. Sophocles also in *Oed. Col.* makes the death of Oedipus precede the events at Thebes; contra Euripides in his *Phoenissae*). This fact and significance some of the Scholia did not take into account and so offer weak (and in view of *πόντια* positively impossible) interpretations. Thus the «latter» scholia have: *σκιὰν Οἰδίποδος αὐτὸν*

καλεῖ τὸν Οἰδίποδα· τυφλωθεὶς γὰρ εἶδωλον εἶναι δοκεῖ, καὶ οὐ τέλειος ἄνθρωπος. (Appositely Blomfield refers to Euripides *Phoenissae*, 1559 where Oedipus calls himself αἰθέρος ἀφανὲς εἶδωλον. But as I said, Euripides predates the Theban affair to the death of Oedipus, whereas Aeschylus postdates it). The Scholia of the Mediceus have: Οἰδίπου σκιά: ὁ ἀσθενὴς Οἰδίπους· τι δοκεῖ νῦν οὐδὲν ὑπάρχειν. This last phrase is ambiguous; it can mean that Oedipus is now as good as nothing, which is consistent with his continuing physical existence on the earth; or it may refer to the Homeric impuissance of the shades of dead. Which latter, although less likely, I accept as truer, as the Medicean Scholia are aware of the presupposed existence of Oedipus' tomb, v. ad 1004 sqq.

To resume: what Fate represents positively regarding the cosmic order, the Furies safeguard negatively (the *Μοῖρα* and the *Ἐρινύς* respectively in the above quoted Aeschylean passage, by the side of the dead man's ghost); they are the two aspects of the same divine coin. And so Servius on Virgilius, *Eclog. IV 47*: *Parcae: quae et Furiae infernales, dictae Parcae, κατ' ἀντίφρασιν, quia nulli parcunt.*

The daemonic and thoroughly chthonic divinities presiding over blood guilt and revenge in Justice are also called *Κῆρες Ἐρινύες* (Aeschylus, *Septem contra Thebas* 1054-6) as well as *Ἀραί*. As *Ἐρινύς* refers to the fury at a committed outrage<sup>15</sup>; and *Ἀρά* to the curse implicit in it; so *Κῆρ* relates to the bloodthirsty fatality of death. *Κῆρ* is Fate in so far as it specifically concerns death; as aptly the Etym. M. notes s.v.: σημαίνει τὴν θανατηφόρον μοῖραν; and so Hesychius s.v. Artemidorus *Oneirokriticon*. I,79 confirms by implication the poetic faithfulness to positive religion in ancient times: καὶ τὸν θάνατον *Κῆρα* καλοῦσιν οἱ ποιηταί! It is in the spirit of this paramount faithfulness that we can accept Herodotus' dictum that the Greeks owe to Homer and Hesiod their theology.

This time I shall exemplify the underlying connexions here from the systematic, architectural Hesiod instead of the freer, «graphical» Homer. The progeny of Night, brought forth by self-fecundation without intercourse (*Theogonia*, 213), comprises in the first place Death (*Μόρος*, *Κῆρ μέλαινα*, *Θάνατος* - the fatal event, the dark rapacious bloodthirstiness, the cessation of earthly life, respectively), Sleep (v. supra for the association) and Dreams; then follow *Μῶμος*, *Ἄϊζός* and *Ἐσπερίδες*; and then:

217 καὶ Μοίρας καὶ Κήρας ἐγένετο νηλεσποίνους,  
 Κλωθῶ τε Λάχεσιν τε καὶ Ἄτροπον, αἶ τε βροτοῖσι  
 γεινομένοισι διδοῦσιν ἔχειν ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε,  
 αἶ τ' ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε παραιβασίας ἐφέπουσι,  
 οὐδέ ποτε λήγουσι θεαὶ δεινοῖο χόλοιο  
 πρὶν γ' ἀπὸ τῶ δώωσι, κακὴν ὄπιν ὅστις ἀμάρτη.

The *Κήρες*, relentlessly punishing in retributive justice, watch over for transgressions of the divine law and their terrible rage does not cease until the guilty has reaped in full the evil growth of his own wretched seed. The modern vulgate athetises 218-9 because: (a) it allegedly interrupts the flow of the period; and (b) it is repeated in 905-6. Now (a) rests on a complete misunderstanding of Hesiod's meaning. *Μοῖραι* and *Κήρες* are intimately connected and aspectually identified (we must have already noticed the close association of the Fate that pertains to the Labdacidan House with Oedipus' unquiet ghost and the Erinys representing his ill-treatment and curse in Aeschylus' Sept. contra Theb. 975 sqq. - a passage above quoted). The threads of existence are in the hands of *Μοῖραι*, who weave (*Κλωθῶ*) all things and apportion them (*Λάχεσις*) in inexorable determination (*Ἄτροπος*). These three divinities constitute the highest summit and profoundest root of fatality: the fabric of the world and the ultimate laws of its processes rest with them; both form and content of reality are due to them. The retribution, therefore, for a violation of the cosmic order, and the restitution of the absolute chthonic harmony which they safeguard, is another function of themselves in their negative aspect. And this negative aspect of an enraged fatality, multiplied in order to correspond to the various degrees of particularization according to a fundamental law of the realm of Spirits, is the *νηλεόποιοι Κήρες*.

Of course, there is in reality no violation of, and no possibility of violating, the eternal laws of Nature, the constitutive factors of reality. The transgressor merely disobeys the divine decrees which are founded on, and presuppose, those natural laws; and is unavoidably punished for his crime through the operation of the self-same inviolable laws. These natural laws express the workings of cosmic existence - whether ordered or disordered; they reflect the inner constitution and free growth of the real forces that make and unmake the world and

everything in it. The divine decrees on the other hand represent the conditions for the World-order, the natural rules of self-created, self-imposed discipline through which the extraneously uncontrollable infinity (*ἀπειρία*) of radical energy, the unshackled illimitability of irresistible power, is mastered by itself and from within itself, harnessed according to its eternal laws and put into the glorious task of creating out of the awesome and majestic irregular omnipotence of chaos, a work of resplendent beauty: the harmonious ordering of a *κόσμος* - large or small as the case may be. It is these divine decrees, these safeguards of natural order, which can be violated by arbitrary order or recalcitrant disorder; and such is the infinite wisdom of the divine World-arrangement that in the longest run these two anomalies cancel each other: while in the shorter run, the one kind is used as a corrective of the other. Such is the harsh medicine of divine Nature: what she wills, she will have.

What I have briefly but essentially described applies to what we call the physical world, and to society and man individually as well. Just as a physical law cannot be violated but only disregarded in impious self-assertion (*ὑβρις*) that goes beyond the natural limits of what is due to which capacity-of-being; so the laws of objective order for Man are really inviolable: what the transgressor does in his sacrilegious folly is to ignore them by violating the decrees (*θεσμούςς*) founded on them. But the culprits pay dearly for their imaginary self-importance and real self-deception; not by any extrinsic supporting mechanism, but by the natural consequences of their transgression, brought about by potencies released through their very act of insubordination to Mother Nature and her divine existential core.

Thus, in the Hesiodic passage above quoted, *Κλωθώ*, *Λάχεσις* and *Ἄτροπος* are at the very source of Fatality, the supreme divinities of Fate; the *αἶ τε ... αἶ τ'* ... that follow in the text present the positive and negative aspects of that fatality, and to that extent may be considered as specifically relating to *Μοῖραι* and *Κῆρες* respectively. We can now appreciate how it is that in the Orphic Hymn 69 addressed to Erinyes, these divinities are invoked at the end as *Μοῖραι*:

v. 16 ἀλλὰ θεαὶ Μοῖραι, ὄφιοπλόκαμοι, πολύμορφοι,  
πραῖνοον μετάρθεσθε βίον μαλακόφρονα δόξαν.

And for a resounding confirmation of this evident interpretation of the former passage, compare another Hesiodic extract from *Scutum*, 248-63. A scene of sheer horror is there portrayed: *Κῆρες*, the black monsters gnashing their teeth, wait at a battle like vultures to drink blood; as soon as a warrior falls, they throw their long nails into his body and greedily gulp down his warm blood. When they take their fill, they throw the emptied body behind and turn their insatiable thirst to new victims, each of these daemonic guardians of sublime order zealously contending for the greatest share of the carnage:

- 248 ----- τοὶ δ' αὖτε μάχην ἔχον· αἰ δὲ μετ' αὐτοὺς  
*Κῆρες* κῶνάει, λευκοὺς ἀραβεῦσαι δδόντας,  
 δεινωποί, βλοσυροί τε δαφουνοί τ' ἄπλητοί τε  
 δῆριν ἔχον περὶ πιπτόντων· πᾶσαι δ' ἄρ' ἔεντο  
 αἶμα μέλαν πῖειν· ὃν δὲ πρῶτον μεμάποιεν  
 κείμενον ἢ πίπτοντα νεύτατον, ἀμφὶ μὲν αὐτῶ  
 βάλλ' ὄνυχας μεγάλους (βάλλε, each one for βάλλον, all),  
 ψυχῇ  
 δ' Ἀϊδόσδε κατῆεν  
*Τάρταρον* ἐς κρυόενθ'. αἰ δὲ φρένας εὖτ' ἀρέσαντο  
 perhaps, as Diaconus suggests, ἄρ' ἔσαντο from ἔω = πληρῶ)  
 αἶματος ἀνδρομέου, τὸν μὲν ρίπτασκον ὀπίσσω,  
 ἄψ δ' ὄμαδον καὶ μῶλον ἐθύνεον ἀθις ἰοῦσαι.

Here are the *Κῆρες* as the horrible Snatchers, the Harpies (*Ἄρπυιαι* from *ἀρπάζω*), the ghastly ministers and attendants of Death. Presiding over them are two of the supreme substantiations of fatality: *Κλωθῶ* and *Λάχεσις*. *Ἄτροπος*, the third standard representation of Fate, is separated for a contrasting description of pre-eminence and seniority, *προφερέης* and *πρεσβυτάτη* (as Graevius, *Lectiones Hesiodaeae*, ad loc. observed: «*προφερέης* enim est excellens, praestans. *Προφερέης τῶν ἄλλων*, prae aliis excellens. Concise dicitur pro ἐκ aut περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ut *διὰ γυναικῶν*, nigrae lanarum apud Plinium et mille alia». The superlative in the comparison is implicit).

- 258 *Κλωθῶ* καὶ *Λάχεσις* σφιν ἐφέστασαν· ἦ μὲν ὑφήσσαν·  
*Ἄτροπος* αὖ τι πέλεν, μεγάλη θεός· ἀλλ' ἄρα ἦ γε  
 τῶν γε μὲν ἀλλάων προφερέης τ' ἦν, πρεσβυτάτη τε.  
*Πᾶσαι* δ' ἀμφ' ἐνὶ φωτὶ etc.

This is how I read and punctuate the curiously difficult passage, optimizing thereby the sense and maximizing the smoothness. "Ἡ μὲν ὑφ' ἧσσων (parenthetical in nature) refers to Lachesis. The great Goddess must be Ἄτροπος noematically associated with Ἀνάγκη and Ἀδράστεια - which in itself elevates her to an uniquely supreme station. In 259 perhaps we should read ἧ δε for increased nicety. Τῶν γε μὲν ἀλλάων contrasts with πᾶσαι δ', its sense bordering on the idea that although she was of an alterior eminence, she nonetheless was participating in the atrocious work of her equally inexorable sisters<sup>16</sup>. The general idea is of a gradation in authority, exaltedness and seniority among the three Fates; a gradation which has been preserved, according to Sittle ad loc., at least with regard to a difference in age, in Epirotic peoples, both Greek (Ἑλλην. Φιλόλ. Συλλ. vol. ΙΔ p. 255) and Albanian (Hahn, *Griechische und Albanesische Märchen*, B, p. 315).

The Three Fates are clearly the presiding divinities over the religious field of *Κῆρες*, in intimate connexion with them, mentioned here as the chief *Κῆρες* themselves. Which is exactly what one should predict according to the view of the whole matter above indicated. Want of insight into the broader issue makes a puzzle of this passage; hence vv. 258-60 are often athetized or considered as belonging to a different recension of the work. This is foolish, as even the most superficial perusal of Homer will convince any knowledgeable person that in the relevant notion of *Κήρ* the two elements of ugly death and inexorable destiny are harmoniously and congruously blended.

But the precise manner and sense of the evidently intended disparity among the three Fates in this passage requires special investigation; which in turn necessitates elucidation within the perspective of the major problem of divine Numerology. We meet an apparently close analogue to the Ἄραι - Ἐρινύες in Virgilius, *Aenead* XII 845 sqq.;

Dicuntur geminae pestes, cognomine Dirae,  
 quas et Tartaream Nox intempesta Megaeram  
 uno eodemque tulit partu, paribusque revinxit  
 serpentum spiris, ventosasque addidit alas: etc.



The names of the Furies given by the tradition are Ἀληκτώ, Τισιφόνη and Μέγαιρα (v. Sch. D. on Iliad I, 454; Orphei Hymni 69.2; Orphei Argonautica, 968; Tretzes sch. ad Lyc. 406; Harpocraton s.v. *Εὐμενίδες*; Cornutus p. 11.5 (cap. 10); and, particularly significant, Apollodorus *Bibl.* I, 1, 4. In the Orphic hymn, Megaera is particularly emphasized by having the adjective *δία* attributed to her). The two triads, the furial and the fatal one, greatly and essentially resemble each other: the meaning of the names is all too evident, the sense is written bright and large on their face. Ἀληκτώ and Ἄτροπος obviously correspond exactly<sup>17</sup>. So do, less strikingly, Κλωθώ and Μέγαιρα - as the generic root descriptions of the fatal and furial order respectively. And Λάχεσις to Τισιφόνη, representing the points of contact of the general idea with the specificity of human persons and conditions - Λάχεσις distributes lot-wise the fatal threads spun by Κλωθώ as Τισιφόνη turns into punishing concrete revenge the terrible rancour felt by Μέγαιρα at the violation of divine order.

This congruity of the two triads is but another, and relatively minor, manifestation of the essential positive - negative identity of Fatality and Revenge, of Order and Punishment (of its transgression). And so Servius, exaggeratingly, on Virgilius Eclogae IV 47: *Parcae: Quae et Furiae infernales*. And we shall see that that fundamental convergence also exhibits itself in similar relations, and even numerical variations, within the multiplicity of each one of its aspects.

Nor can one really suspect it as accidental that Virgil would so single out One of the Three in the case of the Furies; for he does the same with the Harpies, Aenead III, 210 sqq.:

----- Strophades Grajo stant nomine dictae,  
insulae Ionio in magno: quas dira Celaeno  
Harpylaeque colunt aliae, etc.

These Harpies are supposed to be identical in root with the Furies, since Celaeno speaks in 245 sqq. as *maxima Furiarum* (252). And accordingly Servius on Virgilius, Aeneas III, 209 gives an elaborate account of that aspectual identity: *Ut autem Jovis canes dicerentur* [sc. the Harpies], *haec ratio est, quia ipsae Furiae esse dicuntur* [better: they are a certain aspectual manifestation of the Erinic order. Referring to the Erinys as canine is well testified - cf. the *κυνηγέτιδες κύνες* of

Aeschylus in *Eum.* 231; *Choephoroi* 1055. This characterization relates both to their thoroughly chthonic nature in general and to the doglike tracking down and tearing apart of their victims in particular]; unde etiam epulas dicuntur abripere, quod est Furiarum, ut VI, 606: Et manibus prohibet contingere mensas [sc. the Maxima Furiarum. Dogs snatch food, just as the snatching bird-like monstrosities do, e.g. in Phineus' case; Harpies also certainly lacerate and snatch away human beings. To snatch in this context is a species of Furiosity]. ... Item has Furias esse paulo post ipse testatur, dicens infra 252: vobis Furiarum ego maxima pando. Furias autem canes dici et Lucanus docet, dicens VI 733: stygiasque canes in luce superna / destituam. [The Thessalian sorceress, for the purposes of her *νεκρομαντεία*, invokes the infernal powers, and specifically here employs the supreme magical technique of sacred threat, intimidation and blackmail directed against Tisiphone and Megaera:

730 Tisiphone, vocisquae meae secreta Megaera,  
 non agitis saevis Erebi per inane flagellis  
 infelicem animam? jam vos ego nomine vero  
 eliciam, stygiasque canes in luce superna  
 destituam: per busta sequar, per funera custos,  
 expellam tumulis, abigam vos omnibus urnis.

It is significant here to meet the duality of the Erinys; by implication Alecto is set apart]. Et in sexto Virgilius (v. 257): Visaequae canes ululare per umbram / advertante dea. [But there it is a question of real dogs or the canine manifestations who howl when the powers of Darkness are loose and imminently present; however, as Servius ad loc. says: Ululare autem et canum et Furiarum est]. Sane apud inferos Furiarum dicuntur et canes; apud superos Dirae et aves ut ipse in XII [846 sqq. v. *supra*. However, there Virgil does not intend to distinguish a tartarean Megaera from two celestial Dirae, but only to divide the triad into a duality and a single member]; in medio vero [this must comprise the aerial sphere touching from above our terrestrial surface, just as the infernal regions extend to it from below. Harpies are themselves winged entities, too. But presumably they are earth-bound in contradistinction to the celestially aetherial volatility of the Dirae] Harpyiae dicuntur.

This Servian systematization of the relevant facts, though based on acute observation of subtle differentiations, is nonetheless forced as will be shown clearly in a moment with respect to the most crucial facts. Servius repeats ad XII, 846 the specific association of Furiae with the infernal World. But ad IV, 609 he has: *Hecatem autem causa invocat ultionis; unde etiam Furias vocat, sed usurpative modo Diras dixit. Nam Dirae in coelo, ut XII, 845: Dicuntur geminae pestes cognomine / Dirae; Furiae in terris; Eumenides apud Inferos. Unde et tres esse dicuntur. Sed haec nomina confundunt poetae.* But surely the difference between Eumenides and Erinys (Furiae) refers to the distinction of the placated from the inflamed and enraged aspects of the same divine entity, adequately and aptly corresponding thereby to the division of infernal chthonicity into a beatific Cronian state and the Tartarean horrors of Hades. Both substantial aspects operate naturally on the surface of the Earth, which from Homer already is the common ground of the action of all orders of divine powers.

The implication that the triplicity of Furies corresponds one-to-one to the three successively stratified realms of reality, modelled as it is on the analogous interpretation of Hecate's triformity, is vain: for the Erinys' multiplicity must be posited on each region of the World, as it certainly exists at least, according to the religious facts, on the chthonic level. In fact it is the rigidity of the offered systematization which causes our perplexity, and not so much the poetic loose and confounded usage of which Servius reminds us. For we shall see that the poets' relations and distinctions tend to conform nicely to known facts of positive religiosity.

Aeschylus already utilizes the idea of differing appellations applicable to Erinys in different realms of the world. *Eum. 395; ἀραὶ δ' ἐν οἴκοις γῆς ὕπαι κεκλήμεθα.* Servius himself draws on the elaborate theories of «specialists» and, perhaps, as is usual, the simplified schematicity of (what we possess of) his reports fails to reproduce their elaborate analyses. What we can say is, with his own words (ad XII, 846): *Bene tartaream addidit (to Megaeram), ut ostendat esse et terrenam et aeream Megaeram. Nam ut etiam in tertio (209 and IV, 609) diximus, volunt periti, quandam potestatem triplicem esse (hence not on an one-to-one correspondence) et in terris et apud Superos, sicut est Furiarum apud Inferos. Who these periti are, on what positive facts and traditions they draw, and why their triple*

division is rather unstable as compared with a more fundamental dualistic, Pythagorean one, will become apparent in due course.

But we shall extract here Virgil's position - always of importance as he was such a meticulous observer of positive religiosity, something noticed already explicitly in antiquity, cf. Servius and Macrobius. The chief Virgilian facts are:

1) Aeneas III, 210 sqq. Harpies inhabit a place on earth (the Strophades in the Ionian sea), cruel winged monsters of horrendous appearance, significantly connected with Famine:

210 ----- Strophades Graio stant nomine dictae  
 insulae Ionio in magno; quas dira Celaeno  
 Harpyiaequae colunt aliae, Phineoa postquam  
 clausa domus, mensasque metu liquere priores.  
 Tristius haud illis monstrum, nec saevior ulla  
 pestis et ira deum Stygiis sese extulit undis.  
 Virginei volucrum voltus, foedissima ventris  
 proluvies, uncaeque manus, et pallida semper  
 ora fame.

Their apparent leader Celaeno, enraged by the Trojans' behaviour declares herself (245 sqq.), and prophesizes dire famine on them and disaster in revenge for their sacrilegious hostility. She calls their attention to her prophetic words (which, curse-like, turn the standing oracular safeguard of the Harpian rights into a concrete inexorable prediction) in this way:

250 Adcipite, ergo, animis atque haec mea figite dicta:  
 quae Phoebus pater omnipotens, mihi Phoebus Apollo  
 praedixit; vobis furiarum ego maxima pando.

(Then follows the prediction [in fact realised later on] of the famous prodigium of the Trojans, in the extremities of famine, eating the «tables»; they will eventually reach their allotted land,

255 sed non ante datum cingetis moenibus urbem,  
 quam vos dira fames nostraeque injuria caedes  
 ambesas subigat malis absumere mensas.

For this singular event, v. Heyne' s Excursus II on Aeneid Lib. VII).

2) At the entrance of the subterranean regions, and before Acheron has been reached, Virgilius locates a great number of the Hesiodic progeny of Darkness. Among them are:

VI, 273 Vestibulum ante ipsum, primisque in faucibus Orci  
Luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia Curae;  
pallentesque habitant Morbi, tristisque Senectus,  
et Metus, et malesuada Fames, ac turpis Egestas,  
terribiles visu formae, Letumque, Labosque;  
tum consanguineus Leti Sopor, et mala mentis  
gaudia, mortiferumque averso in limine Bellum,  
ferrique Eumenidum thalami, et Discordia demens,  
vipereum crinem vittis innexa cruentis.

Other infernal monstrosities follow, among which

289 Gorgones, Harpyiaequae, et forma tricorporis umbrae

(sc. Hecate).

3) Near the innermost core of Hades, at the very gates of Tartarus, sits on a high indestructible iron tower, watchful and revengeful Tisiphone:

554 ----- stat ferrea turris ad auras;  
Tisiphoneque sedens, palla succincta cruenta,  
vestibulum exsomnia servat noctesque diesque.

And immediately below, regarding those condemned by Rhadamanthus,

570 Continuo sontis ultrix accincta flagello  
Tisiphone quatit insultans, torvosque sinistra  
intentans anguis, vocat agmina saeva sororum.

4) Within Tartarus itself, the chief of the Furies effects her cruellest torture of famishing her miserable victims:

601 Quid memorem Lapithas, Ixiona, Pirithoumque?  
 Quos super atra silex iamiam lapsura, cadentique  
 imminet adsimilis; lucent genialibus altis  
 aurea fulcra toris, epulaeque ante ora paratae  
 regifico luxu. Furiarum maxima juxta  
 adcubat, et manibus prohibet contingere mensas,  
 exsurgitque facem attollens, atque intonat ore.

5) In the VIIth book the help of Alecto is invoked by Hera herself in her desire to ruin the Trojans. Here is the relation of the event:

323 Haec ubi dicta dedit, terras horrenda petivit;  
 luctificam Alecto, Dirarum ab sede sororum  
 infernisque ciet tenebris: cui tristia bella,  
 iraeque, insidiaeque, et crimina noxia cordi.  
 odit et ipse pater Pluton, odere sorores  
 tartarae monstrum: tot sese vertit in ora,  
 tam saevae facies, tot pullulat atra colubris.

Juno asks from her to perform her «*proprium*» (331) work; and this is described thus:

335 Tu potes unanimes armare in proelia fratres,  
 atque odiis versare domos; tu verbera tectis  
 funereasque inferre faces; tibi nomina mille,  
 mille nocendi artes. Fecundum concute pectus,  
 disjice compositam pacem, sere crimina belli.  
 Arma velit, poscatque simul, rapiatque juvenus.

6) Finally, there is the passage in the 12th book where Megaera is in her turn singled out, and the Dirae are considered as apparitors to the court of Zeus:

845 Dicuntur geminae pestes cognomine Dirae,  
 quas et tartaream Nox intempesta Megaeram  
 uno eodemque tulit partu, paribusque revinxit  
 serpentum spiris, ventosasque addidit alas.  
 Hae Jovis ad solium saevique in limine regis  
 apparent, acuuntque metum mortalibus aegris,  
 si quando letum horrificum morbosque deum rex

molitur, meritas aut bello territat urbis.  
 Harum unam celerem demisit ab aethere summo  
 Juppiter, inque omen Juturne occurrere iussit. etc.

Now, briefly to extricate Virgil' s own position as to the matter, let these observations be made:

a) (5) is very definite. Juno addresses herself to Alecto for succour in her insidious work; Alecto is a monstrum hated by the King of the Infernal Horrors himself, not less by her very father, and her sisters; her function is to cause death and to perpetrate atrocity generically, even without specific reference to retribution and exemplary punishment: it represents the ugly face of Darkness in itself, which is being utilized, according to the divine scheme of things, in the terrible correction of transgression, without admitting any ray of light into her substance, which an essential and constitutional intrinsic propensity to that work would normally confer on her. (After all, such relative independence of retributory chastisement is implied in the Pausanian etymological derivation of the word *Ἐρινύς* from the (significantly) Arcadic (and so old-Achaean) *ἐρινύειν*, i.e. *θυμῶ χρηθῆσθαι*, a derivation confirmed by Et.M. p. 374.2). As to Alecto's domicile, it is clearly infernal; cf. also, e.g., Georgics III, 551-2 (quoted infra); nonetheless she, and her sisters, are called Dirae, which leads to the second remark, namely, that

b) Servius' notion that in (6) Virgil wants to imply a celestial Erinycity under the nomination Dirae is forced. V. Servius ad v. 846. That he based his interpretation on (6) specifically is seen from his remark ad III, 209: sane apud inferos Furiae dicuntur et canes; apud superos Dirae et aves ut ipse in XII (846) ostendit; in medio vero (= near and on the surface of earth) Harpyiae dicuntur. And again ad IV, 610: Hecaten autem causa invocat ultionis; unde etiam Furias vocat; sed usurpative modo Diras dixit (!). Nam Dirae in coelo ut XII (845): Dicuntur geminae pestes cognomine Dirae; Furiae in terris; Eumenides apud Inferos, etc. The clause I underlined and exclamated upon is weak as a justification of a recurrent «usurpation» with no instance of observed legality. Megaera as well as the duality of her dire sisters are Tartarean by birth, habitation and function. But they are at the call of the supreme aetherial God, when he wants to utilize their proper work for his Olympian purposes: this, and no more, is

included in that apparent as Virgil makes evidently clear by the following *si* etc. Servius himself in his remark *ad apparent* (*videntur, praesto sunt ad obsequium; unde etiam apparitores constat esse nominatos*) is prudently neutral but for the insinuating *apparitores*, which in vain wants to carry over to the realm of gods the circumstances of imperial functionaries.

c) The Eumenides of (2) are, of course, in absolute aspectual identity with the Furies. Their dwelling is located, like those of the other infernal monstrosities, in the subterranean regions between the surface of the Earth and the realm of Darkness, at the very mouth of the kingdom of Shades; but their work extends everywhere, both on Earth and in Hades.

d) Harpies and Furies are certainly differentiated (e.g. in (2)), within, of course, a common field of signification. When Celaeno speaks of herself in (1) as *maxima Furiarum vobis* (addressing herself to the offensive Trojans), it is analogous to e.g. Cassandra's self-description as one of the three Erinyes in her agonized invocation to Apollo, Euripides, *Troades*, 458-9:

οὐκέτ' ἂν φθάνοις ἂν αὔραν ἰστίοις καταδοκῶν,  
ὥς μίαν τριῶν Ἐριννὺν τῆσδε μ' ἐξάξων χθονός.

And similarly the Phrygian servant in *Orestes*, 1382 sqq. calls Helen *ξεστῶν Περγάμων Ἀπολλωνίων Ἐριννύν*; where the Scholiast explains: *ἤγουν τὴν κατάραν τῶν ξεστῶν Περγάμων*. Again Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 729 refers to Helen as *νυμφόκλαυτος Ἐρινύς*. And so Virgil, *Aeneas*, II, 573 *Trojae et patriae communis Erinys*. And again the chorus in Sophocles' *Electra*, 1078-80, speaks of the noble Atreidean daughter as heedless of death, prepared to lose her sight even, provided that she lays her hands on the twin Fury (*διδύμαν ἐλούσ' Ἐριννύν*), i.e. *Ἀγισθὸν καὶ Κλυταιμνήσθραν* as the Scholiast explains (which explanation is to be surely preferred to the other two mentioned there), the pair which finally directly destroyed the ancient, famed House (cf. the modern Greek locution «εἶναι Διάβολος»). - Between the divine Erinyes and an Erinic person stands the furial power-field associated with a specific individual by reason of its being atrociously wronged, by the efficacy of a curse, by its dire infuriation instrumental to the workings of the divine order, or in whatever way



the negativity of the transgressed, irreverenced cosmic harmony concentrates its energy on a catalytic focal point. Thus the living operatory curses and furies of Oedipus will destroy Polyneices, Sophocles *Oed.Col.* 1427-9:

----- ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ μὲν (Polyneices is speaking) ἦδ' ὁδὸς  
 ἔσται μέλουσα δυσποτμός τε καὶ κακὴ  
 πρὸς τοῦδε πατρὸς τῶν τε τοῦδ' Ἐρινύων.

To the Aegidae there belonged by oracle a cult of Ἐρινύη ἢ Λαΐου καὶ Οἰδίποδος, cf. Herodotus IV, 149 - for both curses were laid relating to those heroes offspring and as a result the members of that clan, their real or putative, natural or adoptive progeny, were losing their own children. Aeschylus, Sept. contra Theb. 70, speaks of Ἐρινὺς πατρὸς (sc. Οἰδίποδος) ἢ μεγασθενῆς. Cf. Euripides, *Phoenissae* 627: Πατρὸς οὐ φεύξεσθ' Ἐριννύς; Homer, *Odyssey*, λ, 279 has μητρὸς Ἐριννύες as afflicting Oedipus. The same exact expression is used to describe corresponding divine situations, as when Athena, having brought down Ares by a stone she threw at him and after boasting of her superiority, adds:

*Iliad*, Φ, 412:

οὔτω κεν τῆς μητρὸς Ἐριννύας ἐξαποτίνοις,  
 ἦ τοι χωρόμενη κακὰ μῆδεταί, οὔνεκ' Ἀχαιοὺς  
 κάλλιπες, αὐτὰρ Τρωσὶν ὑπερφιάλοισιν ἀμύνεις.

And it is to be duly remarked that the Erinyes, as chthonic beings, are particularly sensitive and observant of the fights, duties and violations regarding all natural ties, and so especially of blood-relationships in their minute hierarchizations. Supreme among this latter is motherhood; hence the most acute pointedness of the Erinic unconditional support for Clytaemnestra's case, even irrespective of her moral character, or any other circumstance of justification. And similarly the terrible sisters follow the word of the older brother, as Iris reminds Poseidon in that crucial confrontation of divine prerogatives related in *Iliad*, O, 158 sqq.; v. O, 204: οἶσθ', ὡς πρεσβυτέροισιν Ἐριννύες αἰὲν ἔπονται. Thus we understand the frequency of the parental Erinyes; as, e.g. in Phoenix' case, *Iliad*, I, 453-7:

----- πατήρ δ' ἐμός, αὐτίκ' οἷσθεῖς,  
 πολλὰ κατηρᾶτο, στυγεράς δ' ἐπεκέκλετ' Ἐριννύς,  
 μή ποτε γούνασιν οἷσιν ἐφέσσεσθαι φίλον υἱόν,  
 ἐξ ἐμέθεν γεγαῶτα. θεοὶ δ' ἐτέλειον ἐπαράς,  
 Ζεὺς τε καταχθόνιος, καὶ ἐπαινὴ Περσεφόνηια.

Cf., also, Euripides, *Phoen.* 262; Aeschylus, *Sept.* 721 (πατρὸς εὐκταίαν Ἐριννύν); 887; etc. And for the reverse direction v. σ' Ἐριννύς ὀλέσειε τέκνων in Euripides, *Medea*, 1386. Terrible is the power of Althaea's curses on her son, Meleager, *Ilias*, I, 566 sqq.:

----- ἦ ρα θεοῖσι  
 πόλλ' ἀχέουσε' ἤρᾶτο κασιγνήτοιο φόνοιο·  
 πολλὰ δὲ καὶ γαῖαν πολυφόρβην χερσὶν ἀλοία,  
 κικλήσκουσ' Ἀΐδην καὶ ἐπαινὴν Περσεφόνηϊαν,  
 πρόχην καθεζομένην, δεύοντο δὲ δάκρυσι κόλποι,  
 παιδὶ δόμεν θάνατον· τῆς δ' ἠεροφοῖτις Ἐριννύς  
 ἐκλυεν ἐξ Ἐρέβεσφιν, ἀμείλιχον ἦτορ ἔχουσα.

Telemachus refuses to persuade or oblige his mother to marry one of the suitors and leave the house, *Odyssey* β, 134:

ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς κακὰ πείσομαι, ἄλλα δὲ δαίμων  
 δώσει· ἐπεὶ μήτηρ στυγεράς ἀρήσεται Ἐριννύς  
 οἴκου ἀπερχομένη, νέμεσις δέ μοι ἐξ ἀνθρώπων  
 ἔσσεται.-

(The Fury of the outraged mother will operate, partly, through human vengeance).

And just as the Furies stand an absolute surety for the validity and immutability of the natural relationships of humans and of the sacrosanct order created and sustained thereby; so they also keep a sleepless, all seeing, zealous eye on the inviolability of Gods' prerogatives; hence expressions like Ἄδου καὶ θεῶν Ἐριννύες (Sophocles, *Antig.* 1062).

In short: the Erinyes redress all violation of cosmic order and restore its ordained structure and course. As the Sch.B. on *Ilias*, T, 418 epigrammatically have it: ἐπίσκοποι γὰρ εἰσι τῶν παρὰ φύσιν. They cancel a monstrem: Xanthus, Achille's divine horse, speaking with

human voice. And they do not allow too much to be disclosed praeternaturally and divinatorially. (Cf. Phineus' fate in Apollonius, *Argonautica* B, 178 sqq. We have here the ever-present triplicity: three orders of divinity or, rather numinosity, concurring: Apollo is enraged at the contempt implied by the indiscriminate use of inspiration granted to Phineus; the Erinys work the corrective retribution through which the violated order is restored and reconfirmed; the Harpies perform the principal task of the chastisement. The daemonic Harpies are the actual instruments in effecting what the necessity proceeding from Erinic-Furial dark, chthonic divinity demands in order for the harmonious cosmic system of Olympian, luminous deity may be eternally uncorruptible. Cf. also Virgil, *Aeneas*, III, 379-80).

The Erinic power-field emanating from the instrumental concentration at an anomalous point is appositely described as generated by that point-person, Sophocles, *Trachiniae*, 879-81:

ἔτεκεν, ἔτεκε μέγαν  
 ἅ νεόρτος ἄδε νύμφα  
 δόμοισι τοῖσδ' Ἐρινύν. -

In conclusion: Celaeno, having been insulted, prophesies with absolute determination and adamantine inviolability what will befall the Trojans; Zeus and Apollo safeguard it on the Olympian side; she herself testifies to their certain punishment with a resolve as good as that of a Fury to which she by general nature, intensity of rage and type of specific objective justification is effectively assimilated. The distance, at any rate, is never long, and is capable of continuous elimination, between intense invocation of a divine power and corresponding daemonic possession by it. Thus Celaeno is, virtually, maxima Furiarum. And it is maxima Furiarum because she will exact and inflict the extremest grandest torture: famine. We will testify to this conception further *infra*; to which evidence, add Lucan, *Pharsalia*, VII, 411-2:

Aëra pestiferum tractu, morbosque fluentes,  
 insanamque famen etc.

which Gessner in his truly erudite Thesaurus explains: insana; Maxima, vel Quae ad insaniam redigit homines. The furial nature of

fames in its utmost cruelty is brought nicely forward. Even Servius is inclined to the above interpretation, only he exaggerates a poetico-religious natural affiliation and assimilation into a full identity: v. on Aeneas VI, 605: *Furiarum Maxima; id est, saevissima, hoc est, Fames; ut: Vobis Furiarum ego maxima pando* (III, 252). *Unde et famem praenuntiat, ut hanc esse Furiarum maximam doceat.* He commits the same type of strictly inaccurate formulaic simplification in his comment ad Aen. III, 252, which see *infra*. As to *fames* being the most extreme torture and cruellest punishment, Emmenessius (comm. ad loc.) aptly refers to Quintilianus, *Declam.* 12, p. 171 (ed. Variorum, 1665): *felix pestilentia, felix praeliorum strages, denique omnis mors facilis; fames aspera vitalia haurit, praecordia carpit, animi tormentum, corporis tabes, magistra peccandi durissima necessitatum, deformissima malorum.* And, *Imo ne apud Inferos quidem ulla poena est fame gravior,* which last clause provides an exact echo of Virgil's *Furiarum maxima iuxta / accubat* etc. Furthermore, Celaeno herself is described in (1) in terms of starvation (vv. 217-8).

An analogue to the Virgilian treatment, perhaps the prototype of the idea, may be sought in the Phineus story of Apollonius, *Argonautica*, B, 178 sqq., as mentioned above. In connection with the anger of an Olympian Apollo, Olympian par excellence, an Erinys undertakes the cruel punishment of iniquity and the paradigmatic chastisement of one guilty of transgression of the universal order; Harpies perform a central part in the task of retribution, which consists precisely in starving Phineus by perpetually snatching away his food.

e) A similar train of thought I should suggest regarding (4), too. That is, basically, that the greatest of Furies is the frenzy of Famine; that «Fury» is being used in the broader sense, in which there are troops of Furies, with the madness of Fames the most exacerbating and exasperating among her sister-calamities.

However, there is indeed an inclination to associate in (2) *maxima Furiarum* with one of the supreme Furies in particular as well, and a presumption to do so here in (4): *maxima* comes too close to the normal hierarchization of the Furial triad to denote only the extremest punishment or direst necessity; and the passages require additionally the presupposition of ultimate authority, which rests with the triple capital of the Erinic order, and with the pre-eminent one among

them. Furthermore, starvation is one of the supplicia suffered in Hades by the wrongdoers; and although to represent the supreme Erinys as inflicting this severest punishment is very appropriate, yet it is eminently probable that Virgil meant by maxima Furiarum literally one of the capital Furies, rather than Fames personalized, albeit she is a Fury herself and the grandest indeed as the most atrocious. For although he acknowledges the latter's existence in Aeneas VI 276, he does so in the clearly Hesiodic passage mentioned above - cf. Hesiod, *Theogony* 227 - and leaves the matter dormant. Fames thus is rather more the divine substance of famine than its divine cause; more a passive deification of something all too monstrously potent to lack a divine counterpart, than an actively operational power in an unified but multifarious field; in effect, to use the trivial and unreliable common parlance, more an abstraction than a god.

For a further step towards a more energetic and causal personification of Fames, v. Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, VIII, 738 sqq., esp. 790 sqq. Significantly, the work of Fames here (not, of course, to be merely identified with egestas, but conceived as also involving the Greek βουλιμία or φαγέδαινα; signifying both the miserable extremity of want as well as the repulsive insatiability of the plenty; cf. Donatus on the Vergilian locus: fames; non solum quae egestatem affert victus, sed quae cupiditatem rapiendi affert) is done by Demeter herself directly in the corresponding Callimachean relation of the story of the Thessalian Erisychthon in the Hymn to Demeter. There is not much real discrepancy, as Ovid makes Ceres ask Fames to intervene. It is Demeter who causes both abundance and its polar contrast of insufficiency effected either naturally by privation or abnormally by morbid greediness. She can also grant πολυφαγία in a positive sense as capacity of devouring enormous amount of food unhurt - cf. Antoninus Liberalis, *Metamorphos.* XI p. 82.1 (Martini): Δημήτηρ διδοῖ μηδέποτε βαρυνθῆναι τὴν γαστέρα ὑπὸ σιτίων, ὁπόσον ἂν πλήθος εἰσενέγκηται.

Demeter asking Fames to do her proper job here is a markedly different affair from Juno invoking Alecto's help in Virgil: the former is a sheer poetic embellishment, indeed license bordering on inexactness; the latter presupposes careful demarcation of the divinities' propria. Naturally, these remarks have nothing to do with

the monstrous vivacity and utter realism in the poetic personification of such «abstractions», the archetype for this sort of «true-to-life» delineation of an infernal horror being given with the chilling description of Ἀγλὺς in the Hesiodic Ἀσπίς.

We can now leave the likelihood of Virgil's actual reference to maxima Furiarum as a principal Erinys as well as the indication of the extremest furial nature of Fames. Following this aspect of the problem, we should conclude with *Alecto* as the likeliest candidate. For

(A) she is unmistakably singled out preferentially for eminence in Horror as explained above in (a) and confirmed below.

(B) Tisiphone will not do. It would be defective aesthetically to connect (4) with (3) in their context; and Virgil is, of course, eminently artistic, besides also being gravely faithful with regard especially to matters religious. Servius, while having left the subject at the first level of analysis in his scholion ad loc., unfortunately opts, it appears, for the Tisiphonian alternative in his comment ad III, 252: Adeo ipsae sunt Furiarum (sc. the Harpies - another case of formulaic exaggeration as noted above), ut et unum epitheton habeant (i.e. Furiarum), et causis consentiant; nam ait de Tisiphone (VI, 605): Furiarum maxima iuxta / accubat, et manibus prohibet contingere mensas. Quod etiam hae faciant (sc. the Harpies, as their proper function) et inferentes Trojanis famen et praenuntiantes. (But note, as to the assumed «identity», the corrective sentence following: Alii dicunt ideo adumpsisse sibi Furiarum nomen Harpyiam, ut terreat. Indeed there is much more to it than the «ut terreat» would suggest by itself as has been explained above; but the point, albeit inaccurately, is being made). It is true that Τισι-φόνη, as specifically presiding over retributive chastisement connected with killing or (shedding of) blood, is a naturally probable candidate in the present instance (and it is in fact mentioned as such in (3)). But in theology, every member of a triad can appear as doing the work of the others by virtue of their co-substantiality and their action in unison. As, e.g., in Aeneas X, 761, Tisiphone, in the midst of the ferocious battle, presides her atrocious presidency of ἔρις and war and destruction - a work associated with Alecto in (5); but it is always a furial function in general that is differently allocated. And in the third occurrence of Tisiphone in the Virgilian corpus, she manifests herself as the power center of an all-

consuming pestilential outbreak (not specifically connected with any punishment), magisterially described in *Georgics* III, 478 sqq.; v. 551 sqq.:

saevit et in lucem Stygiis emissa tenebris  
 pallida Tisiphone, morbos agit ante metumque,  
 inque dies avidum surgens caput altius effert.  
 Balatu pecorum et crebris mugitibus amnes,  
 arentesque sonant ripae, collesque supini.  
 Jamque catervatim dat stragem, atque aggerat ipsis  
 in stabulis turpi dilapsa cadavera tabo;  
 donec humo tegere, ac foveis abscondere discunt. -

(C) Megaera's claim, finally, can only rest on (6); a weak foundation indeed. For the formulaic singling out of her there cannot stand even in balance with the definite, essential preeminence of Alecto in (5); far less can it be considered for the position of eminence in question in view of the extra-Virgilian evidence for the latter candidate. Virgil, I believe, mentions her honourifically there to brought forward in his *Aeneas* the remaining sister, too: Tisiphone mentioned in VI; and Alecto the real protagonist of almost the entire book VII (323-571) (a relevant passage of which is singled out for particular commendation and implicit praise by Juvenal, VI, 66 sqq.:

Magnae mentis opus nec de lodice paranda  
 adtonitae, currus et equos faciesque Deorum  
 adspicere, et qualis Rutulum confundat Erinnyis -

referring to Aeneas, VII, 415-474). Cf. also how Venus speaking in the divine conclave regards Alecto's free rein upon the upper world and her roaming around in an infuriated state as the culminating stroke against the Trojans, *Aeneas* X, 39-41:

Nunc etiam Manes (haec intentata manebat  
 sors rerum) movet, et superis immissa repente  
 Alecto, medias Italum bacchata per urbes, etc.

To conclude then: for Virgil, Alecto is the supreme Erinys - though not so by actual age seniority. Norden, like a mere grammarian,

remarks ad VI, 605: *Maxima*; sc. *natu.* (!). (When Lucan wishes to specify the oldest Etruscan soothsayer to be consulted regarding the dreadful omens of evil import preceding the eruption of the Caesaro-Pompeian civil war, he does so with *maximus* indeed, but specifically qualified, I, 585:

----- quorum qui *maximus* aevo  
 Arruns incoluit desertae moenia Lucae, etc.)

But there is no real ground for worry. In the case of twins or triplets or multiplerts, the first actually to leave the maternal womb of procreative darkness and enter the world of light and individuality is the first-born. And this is well-exemplified in the myth of Hercules' birth, for example, where the importance of this first-delivery was paramount. For the three sisters are born *uno eodemque partu* (XII, 847). As to the second place, *Megaera* appears entitled to it; for although XII, 845 sqq. is weak against *Alecto*'s claims, it is still sufficient, perhaps, to counteract *Tisiphone*'s triple mention. But ἐπέχω, and leave the matter where Virgil left it: on balance.

Then it is more important that the triad segregates itself into a monad and a dyad than that a strict, triple hierarchy is observed. And the form of XII, 845-7 is more significant than the actual division effected thereby; for the former comes from deep religious numerological facts, while the latter is probably little more than artistically required. This line of thought we shall pursue a little. Lucan (VI, 730), we saw, implies the same formal segregation, and is right in terms of content too: for he combines *Megaera* and *Tisiphone*, leaving out *Alecto*. Statius, *Thebais*, VII, 474 sqq. describes *Jocasta*'s progress with his familiar majestic, translucid pathos:

Ecce truces oculos sordentibus obsita canis  
 exsanguis *Iocasta* genas, et brachia planctu  
 nigra ferens, ramumque oleae cum velleris atri  
 nexibus, *Eumenidum* velut antiquissima, portis  
 egreditur, magna cum majestate malorum etc.

The pre-eminence implied in *Eumenidum antiquissima* must be allotted to *Alecto*, consonantly to Virgil, as the ancient commentator



Lactantius correctly saw: *Furiae addidit insaniam* (i.e. to *Jocasta's* description), *eam potissimum nominando, quam crudeliorem omnibus esse constabat. Etenim Alecto antiquissimam, quasi (N.B.) natu majorem, dixit; de qua Virgilius «odit et ipse pater Pluton, odere sorores»* - precisely the crucial passage I have already commented upon. Lactantius seems rather reserved as to whether «*antiquissima*» must here determine superiority as founded in the right of primogeniture; but unnecessarily so, if our explanations above are borne in mind.

The mention of *Tisiphone* in 466 as bacchanalizing and exulting in the slaughter, must not prejudice us as to the true reference of 477. The very relative frequency of the occurrence of *Tisiphone* in the *Statian* corpus as against the total absence of the name of *Alecto* (and the middle position *Megaera* significantly occupies in this respect) tells in favour of our acceptation. *Alecto* is next to unspeakable; while *Tisiphone* by its very essence should often operate in a tale of murderous abomination, dreadful curse and vengeful punishment par excellence.

It should be mentioned however, that what *maxima Furiarum* performs in *Virgil*, namely starving the greatest of sinners, *Megaera* differently enforces in *Status*, *Thebais*, I, 712 sqq.:

----- *ultrix tibi (sc. to Apollo) torva Megaera*  
*jejunum Phlegyam subter cava saxa jacentem*  
*aeterno premit accubitu, dapibusque profanis*  
*instimulat; sed mixta famem fastidia vincunt.*

In *Valerius Flaccus*, *Argonaut. II*, 192-5, the mode of torture is as in *Status*, but *Tisiphone* exacts it instead:

----- *inferni qualis sub nocte barathri*  
*adubat attonitum Phlegyam et Thesea juxta*  
*Tisiphone, saevasque dapes et pocula libat,*  
*tormenti genus, et nigris amplectitur hydris.*

That in *Virgil* the victims are hindered from eating at all, while in *Status* (and *Valerius Flaccus*) they have their food fouled to such an obscene degree of loathsomeness that hunger itself is vanquished, this may be drawn from *Phineus' story* in *Apollonius* - where in the

superior Greek manner both aspects are organically combined instead of being left as if mutually incompatible by an illicit mechanical concretization into autonomous entities, v. *Argonautica*, B, 223-33. The variation itself is merely poetical, and thus religiously peripheral. Central, contrariwise, are the underlying facts on which the poet draws, above all, the seniority of one of the Furies. There no doubt, are important objective aspects, governing even the fictitious creations by the imaginative activity of an ancient poet, such as the shift in emphasis when a torture proceeds from Megaera or Tisiphone, and the correspondingly, perhaps unconsciously, effected changes in the punishment itself (e.g. Valerius Flaccus does not mention whether unbearable hunger or profane repulsiveness is victorious). But it is optimum if one can, with all the wisdom of Art, go in word and meaning exactly as far as things objectively extend, and figure out reality with absolute adequation. The Greeks did this very thing, bathed in their luminous spirituality, infinitely more efficaciously than the concretizing, square-based, convention-minded and rule-bound Romans.

But to proceed. It is difficult to surmise whom Valerius Flaccus meant in I, 817 by *maxima Furiarum*: Alecto or Megaera? He only mentions Tisiphone by name among the dreaded Sisters in his poem: naturally, in order to insist on their retributory function as belonging to their essence. For this same reason he makes Poena their mother, I, 790 sqq.:

----- tu nuntia sontum  
 Virgo Jovi, terras oculis quae prospicis aequis,  
 ultrasque deae (i.e. Erinyes), Fasque, et grandaeva Furorum  
 Poena parens, etc.

It is chiefly for this reason that, although what *maxima Furiarum* does in I, 816 is very akin to Tisiphone's loathsome work in the passage already quoted (II, 192 sqq.), it is all the same unlikely that for Valerius Flaccus the greatest Fury is Tisiphone. Compare:

I, 816 Adstitit et nigro fumantia pocula tabo  
 contigit ipsa gravi Furiarum Maxima dextra.  
 Illi (Aeson and his wife Alcimede) avide exceptum pateris  
 hausere cruorem

(the blood of a bull sacrificed to the infernal divinities). Notice that there is nothing of retributive punishment in this act; in fact the pair is about to be viciously and treacherously slain on the order of murderous Pelias; and they go, when dead, to Elysium, v. 827 sqq., esp. 847 sqq. And there is no good reason why Valerius Flaccus would just once avoid naming Tisiphone while actually meaning her. Maxima Furiarum is the preeminent sister; and, given that nothing specifically obstructs us, we ought in fine to opt for Alecto.

Claudianus also confers upon Alecto the horrendous pre-eminence among the infernal Erebi pestes. Presidentially she calls and addresses their monstrous conclave, *In Rufinum*, I, 25 sqq. The nocturnal progeny (v. 30) is enumerated similarly by Virgil and - ultimately - Hesiod (vv. 30 sqq). They are sisters (v. 27), and all so many Furiae (v. 60), in the latior sense. Among them is imperiosa Fames, a Fury no doubt, but distinguished from the supreme triad of the hideous cohort - explicitly differentiated at any rate from Alecto and Megaera, the latter being the only Pest who speaks after Alecto, gives thorough advice, and carries it through into effect (vv. 74 sqq - the description of her atrocious work given in vv. 74-85). -

Euripides already acknowledges a *πρέσβειρα Ἐριννύων* - she occupied the stone of the accuser in Orestes' dreadful trial at Areius Pagus. *Iphig. in Taur.* 964. Hesychius, probably referring to this passage also, has the gloss: *πρέσβειρα· προτιμητή, ἀρχηγέτις*. The preeminence is that of a leader, of highest authority, but, especially with thoroughly Chthonic divinities, literal seniority must be involved centrally. Euripides recognizes three chief Erinys, v. *Troades*, 459:

*ὡς μίαν τριῶν Ἐριννὺν τῆσδέ μ' ἐξάξων χθονός.*

And similarly in *Orestes* 1665 sqq. we have:

*Ἐνθένδε τ' ἔλθων τῆν Ἀθηναίων πόλιν  
δίκην ὑπόσχεσ αἵματος μητροκτόνου  
Ἐὐμενίσι τρισσαῖς·*

The triplicity of the Erinic capital is no poetic elaboration. For example, it answered old Areopagitic practice. The scholia to Aeschines, *Contra Timarchum*, 188 relate that: *οἱ δὲ Ἀρεοπαγῖται*

τρεις που του μηνος ημερας τας δικας εδικαζον τας φονικας, εκαστη των θεων μιαν ημεραν απονεμοντες. Pollux, VIII, 117 gives us the days: καθ' εκαστον δε μηνα τριων ημερων εδικαζον (sc. the Αρεοπαγίται) εφεξης, τεταρτη φθινοντος, τρίτη δευτέρα - that is 27, 28, 29th in a full, and 26, 27, 28th in a leap (lunar) month. These days were called by the Athenians αποφράδες, v. Etym. M. s.v. (p. 131.12): αποφράδας ελεγον οι Αττικοι τας απηγορευμενας ημερας, ως υπελαμβάνον χειρους είναι των άλλων (ως δη και επεικάδας καλοῦσι), φθινοντος του μηνος τετράδα, τρίτην, δευτέραν. "Η (no real alternative, as those days were both the three last but one days of the lunar month and the days when the Areopagites sat in awful judgement of murder cases - and the two facts were obviously deliberately connected, cf. the Έκατήσια at the last day of the month) τας ημερας εν αις τας φονικας δικας εδικαζον (we must understand this as restricted to the Areopagus although by an extension of meaning it could apply to all φονικαι δικαι in the various courts which had jurisdiction in such cases, and so justify the η above). Δια το οιον αποφράττεσθαι το της σεληνης φως εν αυταις - then the chthonic-lunar divinities were in the highest degree frustrated and thus negatively agitated. Cf. Etym. Gudianum s.v. (p. 70.3 sqq. Sturz): αποφράδες, οὔτως ημεραι προσηγορικως (pro προσηγορικαι; v. 70.7 επιθετικως) καλούμεναι και επεικάδας καλοῦσι, φθινοντος του μηνος τετράδα, τρίτην, δευτέραν εν αις και τας φονικας (pro φορητικας) εδικαζον δικας. The αποφράδες ημεραι were impure, μη καθαράι, cf. Plato, Leges 800 D, where see the scholia.

## NOTES

1. The importance of hereditary transmission for the knowledge of Nature and the Gods in the archaic ancient world is evident. Significant knowledge always gives power; and true wisdom requires special capacities and long discipline: there were the two factors that made knowledge of the secrets of the world to be itself secretive, reserved and preserved in blood families initially, and then in the extended families also of priestly castes or closed guilds and quasi-religious associations. Thus in sacred medicine we have the Asclepiadae of Cos; in divine poetry (Homer's θειοι αιοιδοι) there were the Homeridae of Chios. Of families of soothsayers we have besides the progeny of Melampus, the Eleian Iamidae (v. Pindar, Olympion. VI, 43-72; Pausanias

VI, 2, 4-5; III, 11, 6-7; etc.); the Milesian Branchidae (V. Conon, XXXIII); the Elian Talliadae (Herodotus, IX, 37; cf. VIII, 27 and Pausanias X, 1, 8 whence we plainly see that prophetic reknown of a family can be inaugurated even in later times). A branch of a family stem can also acquire fame in divination; thus Eperastus boasts of belonging to the gens of Clytidae, an offspring from Melampodian blood (Pausanias VI, 17, 6): *εἶναι δὲ καὶ μάντις ὁ Ἐπέραστος τοῦ Κλυτιδῶν γένους φησὶν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐπιγράμματος τῇ τελευτῇ*

*τῶν δ' ἱερογλώσσων* (i.e. those of the sacred speech,  
preeminently, soothsayers)

*Κλυτιδῶν γένος εὐχομαι εἶναι  
μάντις, ἀπ' ἰσοθέων αἶμα Μελαμπαδιδᾶν.*

Pausanias gives there the full genealogy.

The hereditary transmission of all high sacred offices in the Eleusinian Mystery Ritual, is another sign of the direct link that unites Mysteries with primeval religiosity.

2. The Scholia ad Lycophr. 682 and 683 refer to the author indefinitely as *ὁ τῆς Μελαμποδίας ποιητής*. But what they report from this work is ascribed to Hesiod (though without the title of the relevant work) by Apollodorus Bibl. III, §§1-2.
3. *Μαντική* and *μάντις* have the general sense of divination, foreknowledge of the future; as Cicero says, *De Divinatione* I, 1: *vetus opinio est iam usque ab heroicis ducta temporibus, eaque et populi Romani et omnium gentium firmata consensu, versari quandam inter homines divinationem, quam Graeci μαντικὴν appellant, id est praesensionem et scientiam rerum futurarum*. But the word can have a more strict sense, meaning one species of divination, namely, foreknowledge by means of observing natural or abnormal occurrences which although apparently accidental are held to be significant. For a proper understanding of the various kinds of divination, we may begin with the ancient Stoic distinction between direct divination and divination through signs, the one being spontaneous and natural, the other presupposing experience and knowledge. To the former belong ecstatic vision or presentiment of the future in inspiration and dreams as seen and understood by the sleeper himself. Although, naturally, if it comes to interpreting the enthusiastic vision or presentiment and dreams as recollected, experience, art and wisdom are again necessarily needed - just as there must needs be priests to interpret the responses of an ecstatic Pythia. Chrysippus, in conformity with the general tendency of his School, emphasised this feature of divination; Cicero, *De Divin.* II, 129-30: *Stoici*

autem tui negant quemquam nisi sapientem divinum esse posse (just as *μόνος ὁ σοφός, πλούσιος, βασιλεύς, δυνατός, καλός* etc.). Chrysippus quidem divinationem definit his verbis: vim cognoscentem et videntem et explicantem signa quae a dis hominibus portendantur (the ability to know which signs to look for, to discern them and to interpret properly); officium autem esse eius praenoscere dei erga homines mente qua sint quidque significant, quemadmodumque ea procurentur atque expientur. And he accordingly defined *ὄνειροκριτικὴν* as art: Idemque somniorum coniectionem definit hoc modo: esse vim cernentem et explanantem quae a dis hominibus significantur in somnis.

The art of divination comprises (1) the ability to decipher signs from the extra of the sacrificial victims (*ἱεροσκοπία*, the Latin *haruspicina* - though this Etruscan art included, together with extispicial function, knowledgeable observation of ostenta and fulgura. This was an important but historical circumstance, not accepted into the systematic division); and also from the behaviour of offerings put on the sacrificial fire (the Homeric *θυοσκοπία*; cf. the archetypal sacrifices of Cain and Abel); these two functions, examination of the extra of the victim and observation of the burning of offerings, go naturally together as sacrificial divination. (2) A second species of artful divination consists of the interpretation of occurrences, happenings and events taken as significant of the future. Such accidents may be meteorological phenomena - chiefly lightning and thunder. In particular, the movement and cries of various appropriate kinds of birds form a major field of divination (*ὀλωνιστική*, *auguralis*). Often the most insignificant normally phenomena, chancest happenings, or entirely fortuitous events and occurrences were especially observed as omens; as e.g. an accidental saying or sound, even sneezing and twinkling of the eyes (*φῆμαι, κληθδόνες, φωναί, ὄμφαί, ὄτται, σύμβολα*). Portents like earthquakes, unaccountable noises, rain of stones or blood, eclipses, all irregular, unnatural or monstrous transformations were considered singularly significant. We can list all these various kinds of divination under the heading divination by omens, by accidental or abnormal phenomena in Nature. (3) The third major species of divination is interpretation of dreams; *καὶ γὰρ τὸν ἄρ ἐκ Διὸς ἔστιν*, as Achilles says (*Ilias A, 63*). Dream-divination boasted some very high-prestige manifestations; in primis the incubation in sacred precincts for healing advice, cf. e.g. among the Persian Magi there was a group of *ὄνειροπόλοι*, v. Herodotus I, 128. (4) A miscellaneous group of divinatory methods remains involving astrological predictions, sortilegies, divinations by water, mirror, fumes etc. (5) *Νεκρομαντεία*.

A full list of all main types of divination are given by Aeschylus in *Prometheus* 484 sqq. Prometheus taught men these arts, as part of his

general endeavour to help the miserable mortals in their position vis-à-vis the cosmic forces that overwhelm them:

τρόπους τε πολλοὺς μαντικῆς ἐστοίχισα,  
 κάκρινα πρῶτος ἐξ ὄνειράτων ἄχρη  
 ὕπαρ(\*) γενέσθαι (i.e. ὄνειροκριτική), κληδόνας τε δυσκρίτους  
 ἐγνώρισ' αὐτοῖς ἐνοδίου τε συμβόλους,  
 γαμψωνύχων τε πτῆσι οἰωνῶν σκεθρῶς  
 διώρισ', οὔτινές τε δεξιοὶ φύσιν  
 εὐωνύμους τε, καὶ δίαιταν ἦντινα  
 ἔχουσ' ἕκαστος, καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τίνες  
 ἔχθραι τε καὶ στέργηθρα καὶ συνεδρίαί (sign-divination or  
 οἰωνιστική in the general sense till now)  
 σπλάγχων τε λειότητα, καὶ χροῖαν τίνα  
 ἔχουσ' ἂν εἶει δαίμοσιν πρὸς ἡδονῆν  
 χολή, λοβοῦ τε ποικίλην εὐμορφίαν (ἱεροσκοπία or θυτική).  
 κνίσῃ τε κῶλα συγκαλυπτὰ καὶ μακρὰν  
 ὄσφυν πυρώσας δυστέκμαρτον εἰς τέχνην  
 ὠδῶσα θνητούς, καὶ φλογωπὰ σήματα  
 ἐξωμμάτωσα πρόσθεν ὄντ' ἐπάργεμα (ἐμπυρομαντεία,  
 ignispicio, the Homeric *θυοσκοπία*).

\*Ὑπαρ is a vivid phantasm sharing in the reality of actual perception. V. Homer, *Odyssey* ο, 547; and cf. Blomfield's note on this Aeschylean occurrence of the word, with the references; add Pindar *OI.* XIII, 67 and Plato, *Politicus*, 278e. Against this conspiring ancient evidence we shall decline the easier way to construe this particular passage: Prometheus was the first to discriminate those of the dreams that must needs be realised in our waking life.

[For *πυροσκοπία* v. Euripides, *Phoenissae*, 1270 sqq. with the Scholia and Musgrave's note. For *ἱεροσκοπία*, extispicio, haruspicio, v. Lucan, *Pharsalia*, I, 617-629; and Seneca, *Oedipus*, 356 sqq.]

It is only natural that even on the face of, and against, the Gods, the universal benefactor of mankind, Prometheus, should also bestow on them the high art of divination; for it is chiefly through her means that man somehow relieves his impotence, ignorance and insignificance through a circumscribed revelation of future reality as this is inscribed in the womb of the past and actually worked out in the multifariously cross-linking agencies of the present.

This classification, implicit and explicit in our sources, fits perfectly well with their testimony. Minor-seeming irregularities can easily and smoothly be resolved: for instance the behaviour of the victims before their killing, as they

approach the altar, or during the initial stages of the sacrificial ritual; accidental sounds, voices or other occurrences at a sacrifice; these factors should strictly fall under (2); but can also be considered sub (1). More importantly, the above-noted variation in the meaning of *μαντική* itself should be kept in mind. It has been observed that *μάντις* and *μαντική* can signify either divination in general or divination by ordinary and extraordinary events in the natural course of life; those terms can also be appropriated to refer to direct, enthusiastic, inspirational divination (*ἐνθεος κατοχή* of strictly speaking a prophetic, sibylline type) as against all other kinds of artful observation and knowledgeable interpretation. Thus for Plato, Phaedrus etymologises *μαντική* from *μανική*. He defends the claims of high madness and ecstasy, condemning those who would deprecate and depreciate all forms of fury (244A): *εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἀπλοῦν τὸ μανίαν κακὸν εἶναι, καλῶς ἂν ἐλέγετο* (sc. that the loved one should grant his graces to the non-lover who oppertunes him, rather than to the lover, since *ὁ μὲν μαίνεται, ὁ δὲ σωφρονεῖ!*)· *νῦν δὲ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἡμῖν γίνεται διὰ μανίας, θεία μέντοι δόσει διδομένης. Ἡ τε γὰρ δὴ ἐν Δελφοῖς προφήτις αἶ τ' ἐν Δωδώνῃ ἰέρειαι μανέειναι μὲν πολλὰ δὴ καὶ καλὰ ἰδία τε καὶ δημοσία τὴν Ἑλλάδα εἰργάσαντο, σωφρονοῦσαι δὲ βραχέα ἢ οὐδέν. καὶ ἐὰν δὴ λέγωμεν Σίβυλλαν τε καὶ ἄλλους, σοὶ μαντικῆ χρώμενοι ἐνθέω πολλὰ δὴ πολλοῖς προλέγοντες εἰς τὸ μέλλον ὄρθωσαν, μηκύνοιμεν ἂν δῆλα παντὶ λέγοντες.* He adds that the *παλαιοί* wisely called this *ἐνθεος μανία μανική*, while the moderns tastelessly changed it to *μαντική*. Then: *ἐπεὶ καὶ τὴν γε τῶν ἐμφρόνων ζήτησιν τοῦ μέλλοντος διὰ τε ὀρνίθων ποιουμένων καὶ ἄλλων σημείων, ἅτ' ἐκ διανοίας ποριζομένων ἀνθρωπίνῃ οἰήσει νοῦν τε καὶ ἱστορίαν, «οἰωνοῖστικὴν» (= οἰήσις + νοῦς + ἱστορία) ἐπωνόμασαν ἦν νῦν «οἰωνοῖστικὴν» τῷ ω σεμνύνοντες οἱ νέοι καλοῦσιν.* Ὅσω δὴ οὖν τελεώτερον καὶ ἐντιμότερον *μαντικὴ οἰωνοῖστικῆς*, τό τε ὄνομα τοῦ ὀνόματος, ἔργον τ' ἔργου, τόσω κάλλιον μαρτυροῦσιν οἱ παλαιοὶ *μανίαν σωφροσύνης τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ τῆς παρ' ἀνθρώπων γιγνομένης*. From this passage it is evident first of all the currency of the more restricted signification of «*μαντική*» as divination through signs (species (2) supra) and especially birds (because of the eminence of *οἰωνοῖστικὴ* within that group); and the use of the word *μαντική* for the *ἐνθεος ἔκστασις* of a prophetic pronouncement. Though admittedly this restriction here may have been partly motivated by the desire to utilise the given etymology of *οἰωνοῖστικὴ*. Divination through birds and that by other signs of type (2) were so closely connected that *οἰωνοῖστικὴ*, *οἰωνός* came to signify broadly all portents and *σημεῖα*. Thus Aristophanes makes the Birds claim to be for men equivalent in effect to all the Oracles together and Apollo *Μαντείος* in addition - the reputed reason being that everything divinatory in category (2) is called *οἰωνός*, hence *ὄρνις*:



716 ἔσμεν δ' ἡμῖν Ἄμμων, Δελφοί, Δωδώνη, Φοῖβος  
 Ἀπόλλων·  
 ἔλθόντες γὰρ πρῶτον ἐπ' ὄρνις οὕτω πρὸς ἅπαντα  
 τρέπεσθε,  
 πρὸς τ' ἐμπορίαν καὶ πρὸς βιότου κτήσιν καὶ πρὸς  
 γάμον ἀνδρός.  
 ὄρνιν δὲ νομίζετε πάνθ' ὅσα περὶ μαντείας διακρίνει·  
 φήμη γ' ὑμῖν ὄρνις ἐστί, πταρμὸν τ' ὄρνιθα καλεῖτε,  
 ξύμβολον ὄρνι, φωνὴν ὄρνιν, θεράποντ' ὄρνιν, ὄνον  
 ὄρνιν.  
 ἀρ' οὐ φανερώς ἡμεῖς ἔσμεν μαντεῖος Ἀπόλλων;

*Μαντεία* is clearly used to signify divination of type (2). Hippocrates, *de Rat. Vict. in Morb. Ac.* p. 30 Kühn has: σχεδὸν ἂν κατὰ γε τὸ τοιόνδε τὴν τέχνην (sc. τὴν ἰατρικὴν) φαῖεν ὁμοιωσθαι μαντικῇ, ὅτι οἱ μάντιες τὸν αὐτὸν ὄρνιθα, εἰ μὲν ἀριστερὸς εἶη, ἀγαθὸν νομίζουσιν εἶναι, εἰ δὲ δεξιὸς κακόν, καὶ ἐν ἱεροσκοπίῃ τὰ τοιάδε ἄλλα ἐπ' ἄλλοισιν. ἀλλ' ἔνιοι τῶν μάντεων τὰναντία τούτων. Which is interpreted by Galen in his commentary on the Hippocratean work as referring to the distinction between sign-divination (general οἰωνιστικὴν) and sacrificial divination: μαντικὴν ὠνόμασε τὴν οἰωνιστικὴν, καὶ ἱεροσκοπίαν τὴν θυτικὴν ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν καλουμένην, ἣν ὄντως οἱ [ἄλλοι] παλαιοὶ καλοῦσιν ἱεροσκοπίαν... Τοὺς διὰ τῶν ὄρνιθων πτήσεως μαντευσόμενους μάντιες ἐκάλεσε, καίτοι τὸ τοῦ μάντεως ὄνομα καὶ ἡ μαντικὴ κατὰ πασῶν τῶν οὕτω προλεγουσῶν τεχνῶν ἐπιφέρεται· μάντιες γὰρ καλοῦνται οἱ τε ἱεροσκοποὶ καὶ οἱ οἰωνισταὶ καὶ οἱ γενεθλιακοὶ καὶ οἱ διὰ συμβόλων καὶ οἱ διὰ σημείων (? Certainly the mss. *ἱερέων* is corrupt) *προλέγοντες*, πρὸς τούτοις δὲ χρησμολόγοι (i.e. those consulting ancient bodies of oracular pronouncements and interpreting events in their light, as, for example, the Sibylline divination) καὶ θεομάντιες (directly agitated by God - analogous to the Homeric *θεοπρόποι*). ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ὄνειροπόλους ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ κληθέντας ἐν τοῖς μάντεσιν καταλέγουσιν. Ἄλλ' ὅγε Ἰπποκράτης τοὺς οἰωνιστὰς μόνους ὀνομάζει μάντιες, ὡσαύτως τῷ ποιητῇ (A, 62): Ἄλλ' ἄγε δὴ τίνα μάντιν ἐρείομεν ἢ ἱερεῖα ἢ καὶ ὄνειροπόλον, ἱερέα μὲν λέγων τὸν ἱεροσκοπόν, ὄνειροπόλον δὲ τὸν περὶ τοὺς ὄνειρους ἔχοντα, μάντιν δὲ τὸν οἰωνιστὴν· οὐ γὰρ δὴ παρέλιπεν ἂν αὐτὸν εἰς τὰ μέγιστα πολλαχόθι τῆς ποιήσεως καὶ τῇ περὶ τοὺς οἰωνοὺς τέχνην χρώμενος. Galen is right in his interpretation of the Homeric passage as will be noticed *infra*. But Hippocrates seems rather to have employed the word *μαντικὴ* in the above quoted passage as a generic term, including *ἱεροσκοπίαν*. Be that as it may, Galen's interpretation certainly reflects available classifications in the ancient conceptual field regarding divination, and thus supports my distinctions).

The Stoics preserved the distinction between inspirational and artful divination. V. the Plutarchean, *De Vita et Poesi Homeri* §212: ταύτης μέντοι (sc. τῆς μαντικῆς) τὸ μὲν τεχνικὸν φασιν εἶναι οἱ Στωϊκοί, οἶον ἱεροσκοπίαν καὶ οἰωνοὺς καὶ τὸ περὶ φήμας καὶ κληδόνας καὶ σύμβολα, ἅπερ συλλήβδην ὅταν καλοῦμεν (ὅπτεια was the collective name for this kind of divination), τὸ δ' ἄτεχνον καὶ ἀδίδακτον, τουτέστιν ἐνύπνια καὶ ἐνθουσιασμός. Cf. Cicero, *De Divinatione* I, 11-2: Duo sunt enim divinandi genera, quorum alterum artis est, alterum naturae. Quae est autem gens aut quae civitas quae non aut extispicum, aut monstra aut fulgora interpretantium, aut augurum aut astrologorum, aut sortium (ea enim fere artis sunt), aut somniorum aut vaticinationum (haec enim duo naturalia putantur) praedictione moreatur? Quarum quidem rerum eventa magis arbitror quam causas quaesi oportere. Est animi vis et natura quaedam, quae tum observatis longo tempore significationibus, tum aliquo instinctu inflatuque divino futura praenuntiat. In ancient times empirical claims in support of traditional views were challenged from the point of view of an immature rationalism; empiricism had not then, as now, degenerated into the handmaid of commonsensical shallowness.

For the distinction see further op. cit. I, 34: iis igitur adsentior qui duo genera divinationum esse dixerunt, unum quod particeps esset artis, alteris quod arte careret. Est enim ars in iis qui novas res coniectura persequuntur, veteres observatione didicerunt. Carent autem arte ii qui non ratione aut coniectura observatis ac notatis signis sed concitatione quadam animi aut soluto liberoque motu futura praesentiunt, quod et somniantibus saepe contingit et non numquam vaticinantibus per furorem, ut Bacis Boeotius, ut Epimenides Cres, ut Sibylla Erythraea. Cuius generis oracula etiam habenda sunt, non ea quae aequatis sortibus ducuntur, sed illa quae instinctu divino adflatuque funduntur; etc. Cf. also I, 89; 109-10; II, 26-7. Cf. Plutarch *De Genio Socratis* 593C-D. Also Servius ad Aen. III, 359 quoting from a non-extant Ciceronian context.

4. Serpents purifying the sensorial pores of Cassandra and Helenus when they were left very young through the night in the Temple of Apollo are mentioned by Tzetzes, Scholia ad Lyc. (Prolegomena, ed. Scheer p. 5): τῇ ἐπαύριον δὲ τῶ νὰϞ προσελθόντες β' ὄφεις ἐπηρωρημένους τοῖς παισὶν εἶρον καὶ τὰ αἰσθητήρια τούτων καθαίροντας, μηδὲν δὲ λυμαιομένους αὐτοῦς. Ἀπόλλων δὲ τις χρησμολόγος καὶ μάντις ὑπάρχων ἐν τῶ ρηθέντι ἱερῶ τοῦ Ἥλιου μαντικούς εἶπε γενέσθαι τοὺς παῖδας, ὃς καὶ λαβὼν αὔξωντας ἐδίδασκε τὴν μαντικὴν etc. (the last remarks about the diviner Apollo and the temple of the Sun are part of a rationalization of the traditional accounts of Apollo's gift to Cassandra as is clear from what Tzetzes says in the sequel. The solar nature of Apollo is however clearly indicated). The story comes from Anticleides, the author of *Ἐξήγητικά* v. Sch. A, Iliad H, 44. Cf.

Eustathius ad loc. Above all v. Pindar's account of a similar event that happened to babe Iamus, the founder of the *πολύκλειτον καθ' Ἑλλαντας γένος Ἰαμιδᾶν*: *Olympion*. VI, 74 sqq.:

ἦλθεν δ' ὑπὸ σπλάγχων ὑπ' ὠδνός τ' ἐρατᾶς Ἰαμος  
 ἐς φάος αὐτίκα. τὸν μὲν κνιζόμενα  
 λείπε χαμαί· δύο δὲ γλαυκῶπες αὐτὸν  
 δαιμόνων βουλαῖσιν ἐθρέψαντο δράκοντες ἀμμεφεῖ  
 ἰῶ μελλισᾶν καδόμενοι.

Although the *ἐθρέψαντο* relates the incident to the general group involving the significant presence of snakes with young heroes, not specifically with the purgative action of the poisonous excretion. Heroic worship was intimately connected with serpents. Here, also, notice the emphatic antithesis in the wholesome action of the blameness venom. A variant of the story concerning Melampus and the serpents, but with the theme of their licking his ears and thus imbuing him with divining powers, is given by the Schol. to Apollonius *Argonautica* A, 118. The fact is also mentioned in Sch. ad *Odys.* λ, 289; cf. Eustathius 1685. 25.

5. Thus, similarly, Pindar relates of Iamus how Apollo, on the Cronian hill in Olympia (*Olympion*. VI, 111 sqq.):

----- οἱ ὤπασε θησαυρὸν δίδυμον  
 μαντοσύνας, τόκα μὲν φωνὰν ἀκούειν  
 ψευδέων ἄγνωτον, εὖτ' ἂν  
 δὲ θρασυμάχανος ἔλθων  
 Ἡρακλῆης, σεμνὸν θάλος Ἀλκαῖδᾶν, πατρὶ  
 ἑορτάν τε κτίσῃ πλειστόμβροτον τεθμόν τε μέγιστον  
 ἀέθλων,  
 Ζητὸς ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῳ βωμῷ τότε' αὐ χρηστήριον θέσθαι  
 κέλευσεν.

The *φωνὴ ψευδέων ἄγνωτος* is the voice of Apollo; the *χρηστήριον* refers to sacrificial divination through *ἔμπυρα ἱερά* practised on the altar of Zeus in Olympia.

6. Rome towards the end of 488 BC, according to Dionysius' chronology, was afflicted by a wave of religious terror, monstrosities and dire omens presaging evil for the city, pestilence affected men and cattle. Then Titus Latinius ceremoniously divulged in the Senate the repeated visitation of Jupiter Capitolinus in his dreams, and the direct but cryptic citation of the cause of the divine displeasure which manifested itself in that calamitous way. The dream oracle was finally deciphered, and the offence given to Zeus at the

beginning of the Ludi Magni amended by a repetition of the games, i.e. the re-making of the games in a new fixed day: *ex senatus itaque consulto et Maenia lege ad propitiandum Iovem additus est illis circensibus dies*, called *instauraticius* (cf. Macrobius to be referred to *infra*); the games, *instaurativi*, given *ex instauratione*, according to the well-known (and even deliberately utilised) obligatory liturgical precision of the Romans in all religious matters esp. in what concerned ritual. (For this v. Plutarch, *Gaius Marcius Coriolanus*, 25). For the story, cf. also Livy II, 36; Cicero, *De Divinatione* I, 26 (55); Macrobius, *Saturnalia* I, 11, 3-5. (Further cf. mention of the story in Plutarch, *Coriolanus*, 24-25; Valerius Maximus I, 7, 4; Minucius Felix *Octav.* 7, 3; 27, 4; Arnobius VII, 38 sqq.; Lactantius *Inst.* II, 7, 20; Augustinu *De Civ. Dei* IV, 26; VIII, 13).

There is fundamental agreement among all the sources - in particular about what concerns us here - despite certain minor oddities in the reporting of external circumstances. Naturally Dionysius' account commands the highest respect, especially as it is confirmed by the other great historian of early Rome.

I cannot resist indicating a very significant difference in attitude as to the reason for Zeus' displeasure: the slave under punishment, naked and with his hands raised and bound on the patibulum fastened on his neck, was driven, while being flogged, around in the public places and the Circus before the beginning of the ceremonies. (This horribly fascinating scourging to death with a final throw over the Tarpeian precipice was the antique mode of punishment of criminals in Rome, later called *supplicium* *more majorum* or *antiqui moris*. V. Suetonius Nero, 49; Claudius, 34; Domitianus, 11; Eutropius, *Breviarium* VII, 15; Tacitus *Annalia* II, 32 sub fin; IV, 30; XVI, 11 sub fin.; XIV, 48; Hist. IV, 42; Aurelius Victor *Epitoma*, V, 7; Julius Caesar *De Bello Gallico* VI, 44; Hirtius VIII, 38. For the archetypal instance, v. Livy I, 26; though this may refer to some form of crucifixion - a mode of capital punishment also in ample use by the Romans). Livy mentions the fact with a haughty indifferent objectivity and correctly concentrates on the religious context of the event which made it significant while in itself unobjectionable and rather instructive (why else should the master choose to punish his slave in this public way?): *Ludis mane serrum quidam paterfamiliae, nondum commisso spectaculo, sub furca caesum medio egerat circo. Coepti inde ludi, velut ea res nihil ad religionem pertinuisset. And the God peremptorily tells Latinius (thus the name stands in Dionysius, and so should it be corrected from the Livian Ti. Atimus with Niebhur) «Sibi Ludis praesultatorem displicuisse: nisi magnifice instaurarentur hi ludi, periculum urbi fore. Iret, ea consulibus nuntiaret». In Dionysius the God enjoins Latinius (VII, 68); Ἰθι, Λατίνιε, καὶ λέγε τοῖς πολίταις ὅτι μοι τῇ νεωστὶ πομπῇ τὸν ἡγούμενον ὀρχηστὴν οὐ καλὸν ἔδωκαν, ἵν' ἀναθῶνται τὰς ἐορ-*

τὰς καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐτέρας ἐπιτελέσωσιν· οὐ γὰρ δέδειγμαι ταύτας. The displeasure is given of course an objective foundation. More importantly Dionysius expands the narrative and yet retains absolute neutrality for an event which in itself was neutral (ibid. 69). Ἀνὴρ Ρωμαῖος οὐκ ἀφανὴς θεράπωντα ἴδιον ἐπὶ τιμωρία θανάτου παραδοὺς τοῖς ὁμοδούλοις ἄγειν, ἵνα δὴ περιφανῆς ἢ τιμωρία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου γένηται, δι' ἀγορᾶς αὐτὸν ἐκέλευσε μαστιγούμενον ἔλκειν, καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος ἦν τῆς πόλεως τόπος ἐπιφανῆς, ἠγούμενον τῆς πομπῆς ἦν ἕστελλε τῷ θεῷ κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν ἢ πόλις. Then follows the description of the punishment: οἱ δὲ ἄγοντες τὸν θεράπωντα ἐπὶ τὴν τιμωρίαν, τὰς χεῖρας ἀποτείναντες ἀμφοτέρας καὶ ξύλῳ προσδήσαντες παρὰ τὰ στέρνα τε καὶ τοὺς ὤμους καὶ μέχρι τῶν καρπῶν διήκοντι (the furca or patibulum) παρηκολούθουν ξαίνοντες μάστιγι γυμνὸν ὄντα. Finally comes the crucial point, what the «unbeauty» (οὐ καλόν) of the proceedings which caused the divine displeasure consisted in: ὁ δὲ ἐν τοιαύτῃ ἀνάγκῃ κρατούμενος ἐβόα τε φωνὰς δυσφήμους, ἃς ἢ ἀλγηδὼν ἐβούλετο, καὶ κινήσεις διὰ τὴν αἰκίαν ἀσχήμονας ἐκινεῖτο. Τοῦτον δὲ πάντες ἐνόμισαν εἶναι τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μηνυόμενον ὀρχηστὴν οὐ καλόν. Here is visualised the «Olympian» side of the Greek experience of the world: to call it «aesthetic» in the modern connotation of the word is to fail totally to comprehend the objective import and anchorage of the Apollonian beautiful order of harmony. In Plutarch, the similar description of the slave's unseemly behaviour takes a dramatic tone producing a melodramatic (in the circumstances) pathos (*Coriolanus*, 24): ταῦτα πράττουσιν αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον αἰκίζομένους στροφάς τε παντοδαπὰς ὑπ' ὀδύνης στρεφόμενον καὶ κινήσεις ἄλλας ἀτερπέεις τῷ περιπαθεῖν κινούμενον, ἢ πομπὴ κατὰ τύχην ἠκολουθήκει. Plutarch, in the sequel, presents the circumferation of the flogged, naked slave as arousing the vexation of «many» of the spectators - although he has to confess that nobody did anything to halt the procedure, but that they (the «many»), only expressed their displeasure with sneers and curses! For, he adds, the Romans then were very indulgent towards their slaves διὰ αὐτουργίαν καὶ τὸ κοινωνεῖν διαίτης ἡμερώτερον ἔχοντες πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ συνηθέστερον - as an example he gives a perfectly correct milder mode of chastisement of slaves under the furca, but which of course proves nothing as to extreme cases and capital punishment. To complete the picture as he saw it, Plutarch has the cruel master punished afterwards by the consent of the priests (ibid., 25). Following in the steps towards modern, hollow humanism, Praetextatus in Macrobius loc. cit. mentions the story as an argument in favour of God's cura servorum: audi igitur quanta indignatio de servi supplicio caelum penetraverit ... vides quanta de servo ad deorum summum cura pervenerit. The truth of the matter is that the exciting punishment was a spectacle practically as enjoyable as the Circenses that followed; and that Zeus was

offended at the religious impropriety of the proceedings: it would, for example, have been entirely appropriate if the flogging of the naked slave was part of a cathartic ritual - just consider the very similar case of *φαρμακός*.

But let us take leave of such frivolous sensitivities.

7. The meaning of v. 150 was disputed in antiquity and the verse signaled by the *διπλή* (v. Sch. A). But the true sense is without a doubt: *ἐρχομένους εἰς τὴν μάχην* (i.e. going to the war) *οὐκ ἐμαντεύσατο. ἔστι δὲ ὅμοιον τῷ «ἀλλ' οὗ οἱ τότε γε χραῖσμ' Ἄρτεμις»* (E, 53), as we read in Sch. B; the *ἀλλὰ* in verse 55 makes this interpretation certain. For *ἐρχομένους* cf. with Heyne E, 198.
8. We know that it was connected with inspirational frenzy induced by exhalations from the interiors of Earth passing through a cleft; the tripod on which afterwards Pythia was seated was placed just above the schism of a cavernous chasm; it was a dangerous experience we are told, cf. Strabo IX, 419; Diodorus XVI, 26; Pliny Nat. Hist. II, 208; [Aristoteles] de Mundo 395b 26-29; Justinus XXIV, 6, 9; Cicero De Divin. I, 38; 79; Plutarch, de def. Orac., 50; Pausanias X, 5, 3. These sources speak of *πνεῦμα ἐνθουσιαστικόν, ἀναθυμίασις, vis terrae, ἀτμός* etc. And chthonic exhalations from entrances to the underworld - *Πλουτώνεια* or *Χαρώνεια* -, some morbid, pestiferous and deadly, are well documented - cf. references given by Pease in his edition of the De divin. on the latter passage. And yet Wilamowitz, in his usual colossal insensitivity and scholarly irresponsibility, in so far as symbolism, mystery and multidynamic ancient reason is concerned, suggested that the entire tradition was fabulous! Hermes 38 (1903) 579.
9. Cf. on the subject, the beginning of Aeschylus' *Eumenides*; Diodorus XVI, 25; Pausanias X, 5, 5; Sch. on Pindar Pythion. the introductory arguments, where the aboriginal possession of the oracular spot is ascribed to Night; Tzetzes to Lycophron Alex. 202 attributes it to Saturn - both equally definitely chthonic associations.
10. For dream divination cf. Xenophon *Cyrop.* VIII, 7, 21; Nemesius, *De Natura Hom.* III p. 57; Philo, *de Somn.* 2, 1. For the combination of the first and the second element on the pattern of the above adduced Aristotelian passage, cf. Cicero, *De Divinat.* 63-4; and the Photian passage above mentioned. For the idea of soul collecting herself from her dissipation in the service of the body, and operating in herself, above all cf. Plato's doctrines, e.g. *Phaedo* 76d; 81a; Iamblichus, *de Mysteriis* III, 3; Hippocrates, *de Insomm.* p. 1 Kühn; Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 1, 72; 75; Tertullianus, *De Anima* 45 (and cf. 43-49). And to seal the subject, what best than give the grave words of Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, 104-5:

*εὐδουσα γὰρ φρήν ὄμμασιν λαμπρύνεται,  
ἐν ἡμέρα δὲ μοῖρ' ἀπρόσκοπτος βροτῶν.*

11. That Herodotus ascribes the introduction of sacrificial divination to Egyptian influence is not incongruous with my point. For he evidently refers to the formative period of Greek religiosity, when the Egyptian contribution is abundantly attested and uninhibitedly affirmed by ancient traditions. Whether the extent of the influence was as great as Herodotus believed it to be is another question, again distinct from the truth of his repeated, definite statements as to the identities and parallelisms between Egyptian and Greek worship. The ascription relevant here is made in the context of his description of several of the similarities and points of contact between the two religions. He has reported the accounts of the origin of the Dodonean oracle, and then concludes (II, 57): *ἡ δὲ μαντηίη ἢ τε ἐν Θήβησι τῆσι Αἰγυπτίησι καὶ ἐν Δωδώνῃ παραπλήσια ἀλλήλησι τυγχάνουσι εἶδωσαι* (a most definite statement by a first-hand witness on the close similarity between the divinational techniques practised in the august Aegyptian center and in the Ogygian Pelasgic Oracle). Herodotus follows this statement up with another on the derivation of Greek haruspice from an Egyptian origin; for this assertion he perhaps had drawn on local Greek traditions, besides inferring from, no doubt, an exact parallelism between the corresponding methods: *ἔστι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἱρῶν* (three of the best mss. have *ἱρέων*) *ἢ μαντικὴ ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου ἀπιγμένη*. This *μαντικὴ τῶν ἱρῶν* has been taken to mean divination in temples - erroneously; cf. Schweigheuser's note ad loc. confirming the correct reading and natural meaning: *μαντικὴ τῶν ἱρῶν* = sacrificial divination, haruspicium.

The fact of the wide and significant correspondence between the Egyptian and Greek Religion as vouchsafed by Herodotus, and to the extent that he affirms it, is to be taken as indubitable. Erroneous and incompetent interpretations of his meaning mostly account for apparent contradictions, inveracities and unacceptabilities supposedly discovered in his painstaking and intelligent testimony. But whether close similarity entails transmission and adoption from one source or merely parallelism in the development of similar experiences along similar lines in various parts of a space exhibiting marked geocultural integration, is a question that has to be decided separately after the closest scrutiny of each case and always in the appropriate general chorological perspective. It has also to be borne in mind that oftentimes «adoption» means for an ancient author (a) close similarity, (b) priority in time of one of the things compared, and (c) existence of multiple points of contact among the environments in which the compared things occur, i.e. essential communicative proximity of a relatively comprehensive type between their determinative locations, which again means a sufficiently integrated geocultural and geopolitical field proper to the broader space in question, capable of bringing to the surface the inherent affinity of its parts at

their own appropriate time-scales. As ontological «truth» and genuine «reality» wherever found strike a familiar note in a chord deep down the ancient man's existential roots, so he gladly receives the gift of such spiritual «instruction», and gratefully incorporates and assimilates in his life-experience, what has been given him ungrudgingly and has spontaneously enabled him to hasten his own process of «maturation» so that he might reach earlier and more easily what he would in any case have to discover by the necessity of his own nature and its propitious evolution. However, as further precision over the present case would not affect the main argument, I shall leave for the moment the matter at that.

12. The interpretation of *ὄνειροπόλος* and the resolution of problems that it presented to the ancient critics, has been clarified supra p. 19 sqq. So I need not reemphasize the unimportance of the apparent divergence when in sch. A we find Porphyry reported to have meant by *ὄνειροπόλον δὲ τὸν ὄνειροκρίτην*.
13. V. the exquisite and learned disquisition on *στέφανοι* in Athenaeus, *Deipnosoph.* XV, 669c-686c.
14. For the incident cf. Appianus, *Bella Civ.* II, 18; Dio Cassius XXXIX, 39-40. Briefly mentioned by Velleius Paterculus II, 46, 3; Florus, *Epitoma* I, 46, 3. Confused interpretations are given of the relevant Ciceronian locus *De Divin.* I, 16 (29), based on misleading contrasts and a fundamental misunderstanding of the situation. Thus some think (v. e.g. Pease in his edition of *De Div.* pp. 137 sq.) that Cicero ascribes to Ateius report of bad omens only, and not positive execrations, contrary to the testimony of the rest of our sources. But surely Ateius could not publicly utter maledictions out of sheer bad will or personal or political enmity without some real or feigned justification. The imprecations were the last resort in his attempt to persuade or force Crassus not to lead the army against the Parthians; and his avowed motive in this was naturally that the expedition was ill-fated, that the omens were dire, and hence the campaign was doomed to failure, to the grave detriment of Rome, its Senate and People. So he believes he knows the disaster hanging above the army; he as a tribune, does everything possible to abort an expedition which is destined to end in tragic ruin: he reports the unpropitious signs; he tries to hold back Crassus by virtue of his tribunician potestas. When everything fails he imprecates him not to go. The maledictions were meant positively: if Crassus had paid attention (at least) to them, he would have been saved, together with his army. The sequence is natural and transparent; Appianus briefly indicates as much, in the above referred to passage: *ἀλλὰ τῷδε μὲν ἐξιόντι τῆς πόλεως πολλά τε ἄλλα ἀπαίσια (dira) ἐγίνετο, καὶ οἱ δῆμαρχοι* (in fact only Ateius was prominently active) *προηγόρευον μὴ πολεμεῖν Παρθυαίοις οὐδὲν ἀδι-*



κοῦσιν, οὐ πειθομένῳ δὲ δημοσίας ἀρὰς (diras) ἐπηρώωντο, ὧν ὁ Κράσσος οὐ φροντίσας ἀπώλετο ἐν τῇ Παρθυνηῇ σὺν τε παιδὶ ὁμωνύμῳ καὶ αὐτῷ στρατῷ.

Cicero represents the matter in a way that will clear Ateius from any suspicion or stain of ill behaviour in the affair. The tenour of his argument is that all responsibility lies with him who chooses to disregard adverse divine signs and the warnings and endeavours of those who, having taken proper notice of these inauspicious messages try, in their official capacity, to stop him from embarking in a foredoomed, ill-fated, god-offending course of action. Thus he introduces the matter right from the beginning: M. Crasso quid acciderit videmus, dirorum obnuntiatione neglecta. I think we should write here *dirorum* for the mss. *dirarum*, rather than change with Turnebus and the vulgate *dira* below to *dirae*. The neutral fits the meaning «evil, calamitous, dire signs»; the feminine the sense of imprecations, execrations. And although we can understand *dirae res* as *dira signa*; it is evidently more natural and accordant to the spirit of the classical languages to take the neutral plural in significations of things generally. *Dira* was certainly used in connexion with augural divination to signify dire omens; v. Cicero, *de Legib.* II, 8 (21): Quaequae augur iniusta, nefasta, vitiosa, dira defixerit, irrita intestaque sunt. And so in *De divin. loc. cit.*: Etenim *dira* (so the mss; *dirae* Turnebus and now vulgate), sicut cetera auspicia ut omina, ut signa, etc. The two Plinian examples usually adduced to maintain *dirae* absolutely posited in the sense of bad omens are *Nat. Hist.* XXVIII, II (4 §17): In augurum certe disciplina constat neque diras, neque ulla auspicia pertinere ad eos, qui quamque rem ingredientes observare se ea negaverint, where we should rather correct to *dira*; and *ibid.* 5 §26: Nam sternumento revicari ferculum mensamve, si non postea gustetur aliquid, inter diras habetur, aut omnino non esse, we can easily understand *res* or (with Gessner), significaciones. There is surely no need to correct throughout, as such cases are really an inconsiderable, innocuous minority.

15. Ὅτι τὸ θυμῷ χρῆσθαι καλοῦσιν ἐρινύειν οἱ Ἀρκάδες, Pausanias VIII, 25, 6; and Etym. M. 374: ἐρινύειν, κατὰ Ἀρκάδας τὸ ὀργίζεσθαι. This Pelasgic signification, perhaps to be connected with the commoner sense in ἔρις, best suits the meaning of the word rather than the rest of the valuable and pertinent explanations offered in Et.M. and elsewhere. More on this when the aspectual identification of Demeter herself with Erinys will be examined in connexion with Δημήτηρ Ἐριννύς and Ξιφηφόρος.
16. The common interpretation, based on a text like:

250 ----- ἢ μὲν ὑφήσσω  
 Ἄτροπος οὐ τι πέλεν μεγάλη θεός· ἀλλ' ἄρα ἡ γε  
 etc.,

and construing ὑφήσσω with Ἄτροπος and μεγάλη θεός predicatively, cannot be borne grammatically by ἄρα. Compare the exactly parallel case with the expression ἀλλ' ἄρα τόν γε in *Odyssey*, γ 259: ἄρα must have a consecutive, not a contrasting power. On the other hand Dionysius Periegeta, *Orbis Descriptio* 47: Δεύτερος αὐτ' ὀλίγος μὲν, ἀτὰρ προφερέστατος ἄλλων (he speaks of the grandest κόλποι) would analogically support a sense of the sort: Ἄτροπος was inferior to, say, A, yet superior to the rest. We must either negate the modelling of the Dionysian passage on the Hesiodic one, something that is difficult to accept (notice by the way the indirect confirmation of my emendation) or, reluctantly but preferably in the circumstances, impeach Dionysius for misconception.

17. Cf. e.g. Servius on Vergilius, *Aeneas* VII, 337, where Hera, addressing Alecto as endowed with a certain horrendous pre-eminence among the infernal monstrosities,

323: Haec ubi dicta dedit (sc. Hera), terras horrenda petivit:  
 Luctificam Alecto Dirarum ab sede sororum  
 infernisque ciet tenebris: cui tristia bella,  
 iraeque, insidiaeque, et crimina noxia cordi.  
 Odit et ipse pater Pluton, odere sorores  
 tartareae monstrum: tot sese vertit in ora,  
 tam saevae facies, tot pullulat atra colubris -

calls her appositely *virgo sata Nocte* and describes her as (337): *tibi nomina mille, / mille nocendi artes*. And here Servius explains: *Tibi nomina mille. Id est facies, ut et sine nomine corpus. Mille autem secundum Euripidem (Fr. 1011 Nauck) in cujus tragoedia <...> the name has dropped out> dicit Furia (which one? The text is probably corrupt or perhaps Furia = Μανία (Λύσσα. Even so, with the character of the general entity is pre-eminently endowed its primal manifestation) non esse unius potestatis, sed plurimarum, se Fortunam, se Nemesin (which in Greece was aspectually identified with Ἀδράστεια), se Fatum, se esse Necessitatem. Ita dicit etiam Asper. - In the given Vergilian context, Servius must refer to Alecto specifically rather than to Furia generically).*