



CHAPTER 8

Ζεύς, Ζαγρεύς, Ἀϊδωνεύς

*Δήμητερ ἢ θρέψασα τὴν ἐμὴν φρένα,
εἶναί με τῶν σῶν ἄξιον μυστηρίων.*
“Aeschylus” apud Aristophanis *Ranas*, 886-7.

As the first part on the Sacred Obscenity of the Mysteries revolved around the interpretation of a few highly significant Orphic verses, so this second step in the Inquiry will consist in a commentary on a crucially revealing philosophical dictum. And having previously studied religious sexuality in its potent, pregnant aspect, we now turn our curious but thus purified eyes into the phase where the generative power bears its first tremendous fruits through horror, pain and ecstasy.

A

Heracleitus oracularly declared: *ὡυτὸς Ἀΐδης καὶ Διόνυσος, ὅτεω μαίνονται καὶ ληναΐζουσιν* or *ληνεύουσιν*¹. (Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* 362A; Clement *Protrept.* 34, 5 = p. 26.8-9 Stählin Fr. 15DK)². He, like the God of Delphi, neither reveals nor withholds truth but signifies the hidden harmony, as lightning momentarily unveils things secret and dark roots.

People *μαίνονται* and *ληναΐζουσιν* in their worship of Dionysus, but, whether this stroke of penetration enters their consciousness or not, they in fact offer these exhilarating revels to none other than the God of Death, who is in reality their self-same Bacchus. This is the startling, enigmatic revelation that the Dark Philosopher strikingly offers us here. *Ληναΐζειν* essentially pertains to Dionysus, one of whose sacred *ἐπίθετα* was *Ληναῖος*. Diodorus Siculus III, 63: *τὸν δ' οὖν Διόνυσον ἐπελθόντα μετὰ στρατοπέδου πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, διδάξαι τὴν τε φυτείαν τῆς ἀμπέλου, καὶ τὴν ἐν ταῖς ληνοῖς ἀπό-*

θλιψιν τῶν βοτρύων· ἀφ' οὗ Ἀθηναίων αὐτὸν ὀνομασθήναι. And in IV, 5, explaining some of the divine eponyma: *Ἀθηναίων δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατήσαι τὰς σταφυλὰς ἐν ληνῷ*. Similarly we find in the ancient and Byzantine catalogues of Epitheta Deorum: *ἐπίθετα Διονύσου... Ἀθηναίου* (Anonymus Laurentianus p. 268 Schöll); Nicetas A. IV, 6 (p. 276 Schöll) and B.II. 3 (p.282 Schöll). Hesychius finally gives the gloss: *Ἀθηναῖος· Διόνυσος*. In Mykonos there took place a sacrifice to Dionysus *Ἀθηνεύς* on the 12th of *Ἀθηναίων*, *ὑπὲρ καρπῶν*, a very important connection of wine pressing with the fruits of the trees, the *ὀπῶραι*, two central Dionysiac responsibilities; v. S1G1 373.25. The epithet relates to the *ληνός*, the wine-press, *ὅπου σταφυλὴ πατεῖται* according to Hesychius s.v. and Pollux VII, 151 *...ἐν ᾧ δὲ* (sc. *κρατῆρι* vel *δοχείῳ*) *τὰς σταφυλὰς βάλλουσι οἱ τρυγῶντες σταφυλοβολεῖον· ὁμοίως δὲ ᾧ ἐμπατοῦνται ληνός*. τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τοῦ Ἰσαίου πρὸς Διοκλέα ὕβρεως. (Regarding of course the immediately preceding names from «καὶ τὸ μὲν ξύλον ἐν ᾧ τοῦλαιον πιέζεται ὄρος etc. following, excepting probably the all too common last one, *ληνός*, which does not stand in need of a testimony).

This divine eponymon must have been esteemed a central one among the Ionians, as it gave the name to the month *Ἀθηναίων*, a subject leading to a complexity that I shall examine later. Athens in particular worshipped the God as *Ἀθηναῖον* and this name related also to a location where a sanctuary was dedicated to him under this epithet. In the area to the south of the Acropolis, and somewhat towards the east, which was known as *Λίμναι*, that is, in the immediate vicinity of the classical theater of Dionysus, there was a large sacred enclosure called probably *τὸ Ἀθήναιον*, within which the ancient dramatic exhibitions took place before the construction of the stone-theater, and which also contained the most ancient sanctuary of the primeval Dionysos. So the valuable Hesychius glosses s.v. *ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίῳ· ἀγρός* (I propose in place of the ms. *ἀγών³*) *ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἄστει, Ἀθήναιον, περίβολον ἔχων μέγαν*, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ Ἀθηναίου Διονύσου ἱερόν· ἐν ᾧ ἐπετελοῦντο οἱ ἀγῶνες Ἀθηναίων (or τῶν Ἀθηναίων as Wilamowitz suggested) *πρὶν τὸ θέατρον οἰκοδομηθεῖναι*. And similarly Photius in his lexicon s.v. *Ἀθήναιον* (Alberti pro *Ἀθήμιον*)· *περίβολος μέγας Ἀθήνησιν, ἐν ᾧ [ἐπὶ] ἀγῶνας ἤγον πρὸ τοῦ θεάτρον (pro θεάτρον) οἰκοδομηθῆναι, ὀνομάζοντες ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίῳ*. Ἔστιν δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἱερόν Διονύσου Ἀθηναίου. The same information is

provided in an abbreviated form by the Lexicon Rhetor. In Anecd. Bekker p. 278.8: *Λήναιον· ἱερὸν Διονύσου, ἐφ' οὗ τοὺς ἀγῶνας ἐτίθεσαν πρὸ τοῦ τὸ θέατρον ἀνοικοδομηθῆναι*, by the Etymologicum Magnum s.v. *ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ· περίβολός (pro περίαιλοι) τις μέγας Ἀθήνησιν, ἐν ᾧ ἱερὸν Διονύσου Ληναίου· καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας ἦγον τοὺς σκηνικούς;* and by Suda s.v. *ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ· περίβολός τις μέγας ἐν ᾧ τοὺς ἀγῶνας ἦγον τοὺς σκηνικούς*. A good example of successive content trimming. The locality was called *Λήναιον* or *Ληναίων* obviously by virtue of its being the regular place of universal Athenian wine-pressing in antique times; it must have been of an agrarian, consequently farm-like character, a sort of *ἀγρός*. It is through the expression *ὁ ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ ἀγών* that Aristophanes refers to the Attic Lenaea, *Acharnenses*, 504. And thus Plato, *Protagoras* 327D: *οὓς πέρυσιν Φερεκράτης ὁ ποιητῆς ἐδίδαξεν ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ*. And so Euegorus' law apud Demosthenes *Contra Meidiam* 10 (p. 517-8): *καὶ ἡ ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ πομπή καὶ οἱ τραγωδοὶ καὶ οἱ κωμωδοὶ (sc. ἡ τῷ Διονύῳ)*. Also S1G 1029.9 (we are told of IV B.C) *Διονύσια τὰ ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ*. The same expression must be supposed to occur in the ancient inscriptions CIA II 741 frg. I (of 334/3 BC [*ἐπὶ Κτησ[μ]κλέους ἄρ[χον]τος*]); frg. II (333/2 BC); and frg.d (331/0 BC): in all of which the last or more letters are missing. It is of course different to find in CIA II 834b (329/8 BC) col. II l. 46: *ἐπιστάταις ἐπιλήναια εἰς Διονύσια θῦσαι ΔΔ*. *θῦσαι ἐπιλήναια* is to make the appropriate sacrifice of a Lenaeian character and purport during the *Διονύσια* (the *ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ* most naturally). I agree in correcting the *ἐπὶ Ληναίων* of the papyrus in Aristotle's *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* LVII to *ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ*. That Pollux drawing on this very passage paraphrases (VIII, 90): *ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς μυστηρίων προέστηκε μετὰ τῶν ἐπιμελητῶν, καὶ Ληναίων* etc., is in tune with the standard later use of *Λήναια* to signify *Διονύσια ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ*. A habit, no doubt, of impeccable origin, as we read in Aristophanes' *Acharnenses* 1155: *ὅς γ' ἐμὲ τὸν τλήμονα Λήναια χορηγῶν ἀπέλυσ' ἄδειπνον*. The form *ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ* determines the place, as *ἐπὶ Παλλαδίῳ* (Fr. Aristophanes 533), *ἐπ' Ἀρταμιτίῳ* (Aristophanes *Lys.* 1251), *τὸ ἐπὶ Δελφινίῳ δικαστήριον* (Demosthenes p. 644, 20): it is the location of a sanctuary.

The *Λήναιον* was in the region called *Λίμναι*; for as we learn from Hesychius, it was there that the *Λήναια* took place: *Λίμναι· ἐν Ἀθή-*

ναις τόπος ἀνειμένος Διονύσω, ὅπου τὰ Λήγαια ἤγετο. (Τὰ Λήγαια specifically, we shall see, as they were celebrated even before τὰ ἐν ἄστει or μεγάλα Διονύσια). To such a location fits nicely what is reported by the antiquarian and atticographer Phanodemus apud Athenaeus XI, 465A = Fr. Gr.H. 325 F12: Φανόδημος δὲ πρὸς τῷ ἱερῷ (τὸ ἱερόν Jacoby, quite unnecessarily, despite his argument in IIIb (Supplement) vol. I p. 185. Πρὸς τῷ ἱερῷ can easily mean in the sanctuary, πρὸς connoting the movement signified by φέροντας), φησί, τοῦ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου τὸ γλεῦκος φέροντας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐκ τῶν πίθων τῷ θεῷ κινᾶναι, εἰτ' αὐτοὺς προσφέρεσθαι· ὅθεν καὶ Λιμναῖον κληθῆναι τὸν Διόνυσον, ὅτι μυχθὲν τὸ γλεῦκος τῷ ὕδατι τότε πρῶτον ἐπόθη κεκραμένον. διόπερ ὀνομασθῆναι τὰς πηγὰς (perhaps to be omitted with Kaibel) Νύμφας καὶ τιθήνας τοῦ Διονύσου, ὅτι τὸν οἶνον αὐξάνει τὸ ὕδωρ κινᾶμενον. ἡσθῆντες οὖν τῇ κράσει ἐν ᾧδαῖς ἐμελπον τὸν Διόνυσον, χορεύοντες καὶ ἀνακαλοῦντες *Εὔαν τε* (so, correctly Kaibel referring to Hesychius s.v. *Εὔας*: Διόνυσος pro *Εὔάνθη*; Schweighäuser before had conjectured *Εὔαν τε* or *Εὔαντα* or *Εὔαν τε* referring to Etym. M. p. 553.46; Jacoby keeps the more unlikely ms. *Εὔάνθη*) καὶ *Διθύραμβον* καὶ *Βακχευτὰν* καὶ *Βρόμιον*. Γλεῦκος is in the standard common and later usage, namely, the must, grape-juice, the liquid resulting from the compression of the grapes; as the glossae Greco-Latinae have it: *Γλεῦκος*: Mustum; Mustus; pluralia non habet. Must, during its period of fermentation fell under the general appellation of wine, called especially new wine or must-wine although, strictly speaking, the must turns into wine through fermentation, cf. Plinius XIV 9, (11) §83: medium inter dulcia vinumque est quod Graeci aigleucos (i.e. *ἀείγλευκος*) vocant, hoc est semper mustum. Id evenit cura, quoniam fervere prohibetur sic appellant musti in vino transitum; explaining in the sequel the manner of this curious inhibition. Isidorus *Etymologiarum* XX, 3, 4 employs the laxer and commoner usage: Mustum est vinum e lacu statim sublaturum. Dictum autem creditur mustum quod in se limum et terram habeat mixtam; nam mus terra, unde et humus. Cuius tanta vis fervoris est ut vasa quamvis grandia ex eo repleta absque spiramine ilico disrumpat. (On the earthly nature and composition of the must v. e.g. the Aristotelian *Meteorologica* Δ, 385b1 sqq.); in this process of expurification and digestion, there were segregated from the boiling liquid on the one hand the sedimentary

lees at the bottom of the vat (τρύξ, faex: cf. Glossae Gr. Lat. τρύξ· faex, fex and τρυγία οίνου· Fex, Faex; Fax, faecis), and on the other the foamy excrescence on the surface (called ἄνθος οίνου). A succinct description of the mighty ebullient transformation we have e.g. in Galen's *De Usu Partium* IV, 3 where the crucial parallel between blood and wine is drawn: ἔστω δὴ τις οἶνος ἄρτι μὲν τῶν βοτρύων ἐκτεθλιμμένος, ἐγκεχυμένος δὲ πιθάκναις, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς ἐμφύτου θερμασίας ἔτι κατεργαζόμενος τε καὶ διακρινόμενος καὶ πεττόμενος καὶ ζέων· καὶ αὐτοῦ τῶν περιττωμάτων τὸ μὲν βαρὺ καὶ γεώδες, ὅπερ οἶμαι τρύγα καλοῦσιν, ἐν τοῖς πυθμέσι τῶν ἀγγείων ὑφίστασθω, τὸ δ' ἕτερον τὸ κοῦφόν τε καὶ ἀερῶδες ἐποχείσθω· καλεῖται δ' ἄνθος τοῦτο καὶ πλεῖστον ἐξίσταται τοῖς λεπτοῖς οἴνοις, ὥσπερ τοῖς παχυτέροις θάτερον ὑφίσταται πάμπολυ. Κατὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ παραδείγματος εἰκόνα νόει μοι τὸν ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας εἰς τὸ ἦπαρ ἀναδοθέντα χυλὸν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν τῷ σπλάγχνῳ θερμασίας ὥσπερ τὸν οἶνον τὸν γλεῦκινον ζέοντά τε καὶ πεττόμενον καὶ ἀλλοιούμενον εἰς αἵματος χρηστοῦ γένεσιν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ζέσει ταύτῃ τὸ μὲν ὑφιστάμενον αὐτοῦ τῶν περιττωμάτων ὅσον ἰλυῶδες τε καὶ παχύ, τὸ δ' ἐπιπολάζον, ὃ δὴ λεπτόν τε καὶ κοῦφον οἶον ἀφρός τις ἐποχείται τῷ αἵματι. That this, and not what the term would suggest today, is the meaning, we are informed by Etym. Gudianum p. 126.56 Sturz s.v. Γλυκὺς: ...γίνεται παρὰ τὸ γλεῦκος, ὃ σημαίνει τὸν νέον οἶνον, ὃ νεωστὶ ἀποστάζων ἐκ τοῦ ληνοῦ οἶνος. And this is conclusively elucidated by the exquisite analogy drawn by Alexis between wine fermentation and age blossoming, a vivid life image alongside Galen's recondite physiological picture. Athenaeus II, 36E; Stobaeus *Floril.* CXV, 7 (who ascribes the fragment to Δημήτριος (ἢ Φιλέταιρος) = Fr. Com. Gr. III p. 405 Meineke = Fr. 46 PCG vol. II p. 48:

ὁμοίωτος ἄνθρωπος οἶνω τὴν φύσιν
 τρόπον τιν' ἐστὶ· καὶ γὰρ οἶνον τὸν νέον
 πολλή 'στ' ἀνάγκη καὶ τὸν ἄνδρ' ἀποζέσαι
 πρώτιστον ἀφυβρίσαι τ', ἀπανθήσαντα δὲ
 σκληρὸν γενέσθαι, παρακμάσαντα δ' ὦν λέγω
 τούτων ἀπάντων, ἀπαρυθέντα τὴν ἄνω
 ταύτην ἄνοιαν ἐπιπολάζουσιν, τότε
 πότιμον γενέσθαι καὶ καταστήναι πάλιν,
 ἡδὺν θ' ἅπασιν τοῦπίλοιπον διατελεῖν.

The new wine and the young man alike have their time of boiling, unbridled indulgence in desires and passions, of brisk and rough fermentation, which produces the pubic blossoming, the foam of the must and of the ephebe. A hardness sets in temporally then, which, with the passing of the acme and the removal of that foamish disorder, mellows down into a stable, drinkable enjoyment; we possess now the highest pleasures: old wine and full manhood.

Naturally, despite this essential identification of *γλεῦκος* with *νέος οἶνος* we can easily maintain a distinction between the two: for *γλεῦκος* can be explicitly applied to the liquid produce of the pressing in so far as the immediately settling in process of autofermentation has not begun or has not proceeded far and for long; whereas *νέος οἶνος* can be exclusively utilized to signify that product once the brisk stage of fermentation (say the nine first days) is over. Thus we can easily understand the Hippocratic *Περὶ Διαίτης* Β' I 223L = I 684 K: *οἱ νέοι μᾶλλον τῶν οἴνων διαχωρέουσιν, διότι ἐγγυτέρω τοῦ γλεύκεος εἰσὶ καὶ πρόφιμοι* etc. *Γλεῦκος* always connotes a boiling condition, *ibid.* *γλεῦκος φυσᾶ καὶ ἐπιταράσσει καὶ τὴν κοιλίην ὑπάγει· φυσᾶ μὲν ὅτι θερμαίνει, ὑπάγει δὲ ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ὅτι καθαίρει, ταράσσει δὲ ζέον ἐν τῇ κοιλίῃ καὶ διαχωρίζει*. Admittedly, *νέος οἶνος* can be used with a certain laxity up to, say, December. It may also bear then, besides, a relative sense contrasted to really old stuff. But this is *οὐδὲν πρὸς Διόνυσον*.

For the standard sense of *γλεῦκος* cf. e.g. the peripatetic Phnias from Eresus apud Athenaeus I p. 31e = Fr. 41 Wehrli vol. IX p. 19: *περὶ δὲ τῆς τοῦ ἀνθοσμίου οἴνου σκευασίας, Φανίας ὁ Ἐρέσιος φησὶ τάδε· «Γλεύκει παρεγγεῖται παρὰ χούς πεντήκοντα εἰς θαλάσσης καὶ γίνεται ἀνθοσμίας»* etc. And to ascend from the pupil to the teacher. In Aristotle it is made clear that one uses the word in the must-signification, *Meteorologica* 3.380b31 sqq.: *καὶ τὰ ὑγρὰ δὲ ἔψεσθαι λέγομεν οἶον γάλα καὶ γλεῦκος, ὅταν ὁ ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ χυμὸς εἰς εἶδος τι μεταβάλλῃ ὑπὸ τοῦ κύκλω καὶ ἔξωθεν πυρὸς θερμαίνοντος* etc. This refers to the production of various sweet wines (*dulcia, γλυκεῖς*) by cooking the must (chief among the artificial processes of obtaining them, others being inhibited fermentation, or previous sun-drying of the grapes). V. e.g. Plinius XIV, 9 (11) §80: *nam siraeum, quod alii hepsema (= ἔψημα), nostri sapam appellant, ingeni, nor naturae, opus est musto usque ad tertiam mensurae decocto. quod ubi*

factum ad dimidiam est, defrutum vocatur (depending that is on the degree of condensation by evaporation). Similarly XXIII (30): vino cognata res sapa est, musto decocto, donec tertia pars supersit. (V. Appendix I, On Maturation and Decay).

B

We return to the Phanodemean passage. Phanodemus refers to the institution of wine *κράσις* with water under the auspices of the Marshy Dionysus, and the consequent festivities of ebullition and hilarity, as the very appellations under which the presiding divinity is invoked (to be analysed infra in detail) demonstrate. People brought their newly squeezed-out blood of the God to his presence, to ferment in *πίθοι*, maybe under his protection or at any rate to receive his blessing. They took from those dolia the sacred substance and offered it to its divine primary Source and Cause, to its genitor and procreator, before tasting it themselves to satiety (softened by water says Phanodemus, in different proportions we must understand, some partaking even of the unmitigated fervour of the godly potion). Song and dance and acerbic scurrilousness and *φιλοπαίγμων* disposition and ecstatic elevation and wild eruption of instinctive active passion naturally and divinely ensued the bacchic force released and self-indulging in all its splendour of unbridled vehemence. Naturally we see displayed in those festivals the milder aspect of *Ἐνθασμός*, as the complementary destructive extremities of its furor are missing. Thus their chief character emerges: universal, excessive mirth and exuberance. Hence, the Bacchic women were called *λήναι* in Arcadia (Hesychius s.v. *λήναι*; (cf. scholia to Clement, *Protrepticus* 34, 5 = Heracleitus B15DK, *ληναίζουσιν· βακχεύουσιν· λήναι γὰρ αἱ βάκχαι*). This is clearly the explained, *λήνος* as wine press the expaining circumstance — not the other way round).

There can be no doubt that the origins reported by Phanodemus related to vindemia on the one hand and to the sanctuary of the God in *Λίμναι* on the other. Vintage time is indicated. And whether the actual treading of the grapes took place in the vicinity of the sacred place; or whether the jars of must were left there to ferment, both of which I have suggested, there can be no doubt that the God of Wine, (especially under the epithet which signifies the essential turn taken by treading in wine production, the necessary prerequisite of

fermentation as it frees and unbinds the inner fiery divine principle which will change the sweet grape liquor into the intoxicating liquid which leads to ecstatic freedom) that *Ληναῖος* was the god of *Λίμναι* and of its ancient temple.

Congruous with this is Apollodorus' testimony apud Scholia ad Acharnenses 960. It is a question of the *Χόες* in Anthesteria: *φησὶ δὲ Ἀπολλόδωρος Ἀνθεστήρια καλεῖσθαι κοινῶς τὴν ἄλην ἑορτὴν Διονύσῳ ἀγομένην, κατὰ μέρος δὲ Πιθολίαν, Χόας, Χύτραν* (sic instead of *Πιθολίαια, Χύτρος*). *Καὶ αὐθις* (sc. *φησὶ ὁ Ἀπολλόδωρος*), *ὅτι Ὁρέστης μετὰ τὸν φόνον εἰς Ἀθήνας ἀφικόμενος, ἦν δὲ ἑορτὴ Διονύσου Ληναίου, ὡς μὴ γένοιτο σφίσιν ὁμόσπονδος ἀπεκτονῶς τὴν μητέρα, ἐμηχανήσατο τοιόνδε τι Πανδίων etc.*⁴. As Anthesteria were connected with the sanctuary of Dionysus in *Λίμναι* (cf. e.g. the Thucydidean passage to be quoted infra, II, 15), we must identify *Διόνυσος Ληναῖος* with the god of that sanctuary (whether he was also called hieratically *Λιμναῖος* or not). It does not follow from this fragment that Apollodorus equated the later standard feasts of *Ἀνθεστήρια* and *Ληναία*: he simply identified the god and the place for both celebrations. There remains of course the problem of the time for the initial festivities of Lenaea, as they may be presumed to originally have followed very soon after vintage. To this original dispensation may be taken to allude the isolated testimony of the Scholia on Aristophanes Acharn. 378: *τὰ δὲ Λήναια ἐν τῷ μετοπώρῳ ἤγετο*. (What is added there makes it clear that the final scholiast took this as pertaining to Aristophanes' time as well, which is downright wrong. But the autumnal date may reflect an independent piece of evidence lost among the mass of information that securely locates the classical Lenaia at the Attic month Gamelion, Ionian Lenaion, about January-February). Assuming a September vintage, an aboriginal wine (or rather must) festival could have been celebrated towards the end of September; or (less likely), if new wine after brisk fermentation was the focal point, we can go to around the end of October for the celebrations. The *Λήναια* was clearly initially as agrarian festival. So Stephanus Byzantius s.v. *Λήναιος*: *ἀγῶν Διονύσου ἐν ἀγροῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ληνοῦ. Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν τρίτῳ Χρονικῶν* (244F17 Jacoby). Hence it is that my proposal to emend the Hesychian lemma s.v. *ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ* so as to read *ἀγρός* pro *ἀγῶν* gains support. Similarly sch. on Aristophanes Acharn. 202: *ἄξω τὰ κατ'*

ἀγρούς (sc. Διονύσια)· τὰ Λήνια λεγόμενα... Λήναιον γάρ ἐστιν ἐν ἀγροῖς ἱερὸν τοῦ Διονύσου διὰ τὸ τπλεκτοὺς ἐνταῦθα γεγονέαι, ἢ διὰ τὸ πρῶτον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ τόπῳ ληνὸν τεθῆναι. Maybe Λήνια covered various phases of the potent and portentous wine-transformation: a must-festival, a feast of the first fermentation, the carousal of the new wine. Hence the differing accounts of its time, and of the connection between what later on was separated as Λήνια on the one hand and κατ' ἀγρούς Διονύσια on the other. (For the identity of the two cf. Sch. on Aristophanes, Acharn. 504-6(b)). For the settled time of these various festivities, v. Bekker, Anecdota Graeca I p. 235: Διονύσια· ἑορτὴ Ἀθήνησι Διονύσου· ἤγετο δὲ τὰ μὲν κατ' ἀγρούς μηνὸς Ποσειδεῶνος (December-January), τὰ δὲ Λήνια Γαμηλιῶνος (January-February), τὰ δὲ ἐν ἄστει Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος (March-April). Hesychius s.v. Διονύσια and Scholia on Aeschylus i.43 give the same timing while ascribing the Λήνια to Ληναίων which is the Ionian equivalent of the Athenian Γαμηλιών. The scholia on Plato, Respublica 475d (p. 234 Greene) repeat the same information but give Μαιμακτηρίων (November-December) for the Λήνια: possibly an early wine feast, as the first full cycle of intense fermentation of the wine lasts for about 40 days. The three-day Anthesteria were celebrated in Ἀνθεστηριῶν (February-March).

Λήναιον, it is established, was then in Λίμναι. Λίμναι were to the south of the Acropolis⁵, as Thucydides' high authority testifies. Speaking in II, 15 of the συνοικισμός of Athens by Theseus he adds: τὸ δὲ πρὸ τούτου ἡ ἀκρόπολις ἢ νῦν οὔσα πόλις ἦν, καὶ τὸ ὑπ' αὐτὴν πρὸς νότον μάλιστα τετραμμένον. Τεκμήριον δέ· τὰ γὰρ ἱερά ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀκροπόλει καὶ ἄλλων θεῶν ἐστί, καὶ τὰ ἕξω πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως μᾶλλον ἴδρυται, τό τε τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου, καὶ τὸ Πύθιον, καὶ τὸ τῆς Γῆς, καὶ τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου, ὧ τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια τῇ δωδεκάτῃ ποιεῖται ἐν μηνὶ Ἀνθεστηριῶνι, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἀπ' Ἀθηναίων Ἴωνες ἔτι καὶ νῦν νομίζουσι. (The antiquity of the feast is confirmed by the fact that even then the Ionians celebrated it similarly and at the same time, which shows that it must have been common before the Ionian colonization).

The place was at the foot of the Acropolis rock and is well defined by the topography of the area and its extant remains. The theater of Dionysus was built later (finished under Lycurgus in the second half of the 4th century) in its immediate vicinity. Pausanias perambulating

from the *Πρυτανεῖον* in the Agora to the Theater along the *Τρίποδες* street, through the modern Plaka, on the side of which⁶ choregic monuments in the form of chaplets, and probably devoted to Gods, existed with tripods on the top (the best preserved among them being the Lysicratic, with the beautiful Dionysian relief of the punishment of the corsairs by Satyrs and Sileni), finally reaches the Dionysiac Sanctuary by the Theater. As the text in the beginning of I, 20 is difficult, I subjoin it corrected: "Ἔστι δὲ ὁδὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Πρυτανεῖου καλουμένη Τρίποδες (perhaps to be read <ἐς> Τρίποδας as the word signified rather the place at and round the end of the road). Ἄφ' οὗ <δὲ> καλοῦσι τὸ χωρίον, ναοὶ θεῶν εἰσὶ οὗτοι (vel. οὔτι; so I emend pro ἐς τοῦτο) μεγάλοι, καὶ σφίσι ἐξεστήκασιν τρίποδες χαλκοῖ μὲν, μνήμης δὲ ἄξια μάλιστα περιέχοντες εἰργασμένα. (Not that the tripods supported those worthy works, but the ναοὶ contained them; it is σφίσι ἐξεστήκασιν μὲν - περιέχοντες δέ, not χαλκοῖ μὲν - περιέχοντες δέ; a harsh hyperbaton, a forced construction and an awkward turn, but of the manneristic and recherché kind in which Pausanias delighted, and no doubt considered very artistic and elegant. One may soften a bit the angle of the built-up by substituting περιέχουσι for περιέχοντες; but we had better leave it as it stands. Theoretically it could be that the memorable works stood on the tripods at the very top; but if γάρ in the next sentence is sound, the Praxitelean Satyr would be up there too, contrary to what is stated below. Cf. I, 21, 3: ἐν δὲ τῇ κορυφῇ τοῦ θεάτρου σπήλαιόν ἐστιν ἐν ταῖς πέτρας ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν· τρίπους δὲ ἔπεστι καὶ τούτῳ (as in the similar monuments mentioned in the passage here quoted). Απόλλων δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ Ἄρτεμις τοὺς παῖδας εἰσὶ ἀναιροῦντες τοὺς Νιόβης. This grand scale glorious divine butchery could not stand on or in a tripod; ἐν αὐτῷ sc. τῷ σπηλαίῳ - not τῷ τρίποδι. It must have consisted in statues in the round. It is true that Stuart and Revett (1761) drew the monument with a seated female figure on the top; they omitted to represent the two columns that still stand on either side at the top of the cave. These are not mentioned by Pausanias either. The tripods that they might have supported were missing in his time, so he did not consider the columns as a (telling) part of the structure. The tripod Pausanias saw was perhaps substituted later by one of the statues that existed within, though only Leto would suit the drawn form if it existed. Σάτυρος γάρ ἐστιν, ἐφ' ᾧ Πραξιτέλην

λέγεται φρονῆσαι μέγα· καὶ πότε Φρύνης αἰτούσης Φρύνη μὲν οὕτω τὸν ἔρωτα αἰρεῖται· Διονύσω δὲ ἐν τῷ ναῷ [τῷ] πλησίον Σάτυρός ἐστι παῖς καὶ δίδωσιν ἔκπωμα· Ἔρωτα δ' ἐστηκότα ὁμοῦ καὶ Διόνυσον Θυμίλος ἐποίησεν. (Ὁ ναός is one of the ναοὶ Pausanias was speaking of in the beginning of the chapter. Satyrus stands by Dionysus and offers him a drink⁷; Dionysus and, also, Eros, are the work of Thymilus. The temple cannot be one of the two in the sanctuary: for (1) it is clearly stated above that Satyrus stand in one of the chaplets in the place *Τρίποδες*; (2) which one of the two temples would probably be specified otherwise⁸; (3) Atheneaus XIII 591B writes: ἐκλογὴν δὲ αὐτῇ (sc. τῇ Φρύνη) τῶν ἀγαλμάτων ἔδωκεν (sc. ὁ Πραξιτέλης), εἶτε τὸν Ἔρωτα θέλοι λαβεῖν εἶτε τὸν ἐπὶ Τρίποδων Σάτυρον etc. the Satyrus of the Tripods, that stood in the place or road called *Τρίποδες*; (4) the description of the sanctuary that commences immediately after seems to open a fresh topic.

Thus he says (I, 20, 3): Τοῦ Διονύσου δὲ ἐστὶ πρὸς τῷ θεάτρῳ τὸ ἀρχαιότατον ἱερόν. Δύο δὲ εἰσὶν ἐντὸς τοῦ περιβόλου ναοὶ καὶ Διόνυσσοι, ὅτε Ἐλευθερεὺς καὶ ὃν Ἀλκαμένης ἐποίησεν ἐλέφαντος καὶ χρυσοῦ (he goes on to describe the pictures I mentioned in the note, one of which, the ἀναγωγὴ of Hephaestus to Olympus by Dionysus and the seductive power of wine, is very archaic and fits well with what I argued concerning its existence in the older temple and, as it were, God). We have the *περίβολος* of the glossographers. The sanctuary is the ancient *Ληναῖον*. The Dionysus (worshipped) was the *Ληναῖος* (and, partly by location, partly by nature, *Λιμναῖος*). Διόνυσος Ἐλευθερεὺς was the ancient ξόανον brought from Eleutherae. V. Pausanias I, 38, 8: ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πεδίῳ (sc. of Eleutherae, at the boundaries with Boeotia) ναός ἐστὶ Διονύσου, καὶ τὸ ξόανον ἐντεῦθεν Ἀθηναίοις ἐκομίσθη τὸ ἀρχαῖον· τὸ δὲ ἐν Ἐλευθεραῖς ἐφ' ἡμῶν εἰς μίμησιν ἐκείνου πεποιήται. He refers to that antique statue in the important ceremony alluded to in I, 29, 2 by that name: (in Academy)... καὶ ναός οὐ μέγας ἐστίν, εἰς ὃν τοῦ Διονύσου τοῦ Ἐλευθερέως τὸ ἄγαλμα ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος κομίζουσιν ἐν τεταγμέναις ἡμέραις. The subject will be discussed in detail below. Those ordained days must have preceded the Great Dionysia. For Philostratus, *Vitae Sophistarum* II, 1, 3 speaking of Herodes Atticus' magnificent displays of gloriously spent opulence, writes: ...ὁπότε δὲ ἦκοι Διονύσια, καὶ κατίοι εἰς Ἀκαδημίαν τὸ τοῦ Διονύσου ἔδος, ἐν Κεραμεικῷ ποτίζων

ἀστοὺς ὁμοίως καὶ ξένους κατακειμένους ἐπὶ στιβάδων κιττοῦ. The road to the Academy, was the road to Eleutherai and Boeotia; the ceremony reenacted the original Coming of the God. So the statue must have been brought back for the festivities. It was placed on the orchestra: Dio Chrysostomus, *Oratio XXXI* §121 (p. 386 Di.) condemning the Athenian madness to hold gladiatorial games in the very theater, compares them unfavourably to their Corinthian teachers in this kind of sight: οἶον εὐθὺς τὰ περὶ τοὺς μονομάχους οὕτω σφόδρα ἐξηλώκασι (sc. the Athenians) Κορινθίους, μᾶλλον δ' ὑπερβεβλήκασι τῇ κακοδαιμονίᾳ κακείνους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἅπαντας ὥστε οἱ Κορίνθιοι μὲν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως θεωροῦσιν ἐν χαράδρᾳ τινι, πλῆθος μὲν δυναμένῳ δέξασθαι τόπῳ, ρυπαρῶ δὲ ἄλλως καὶ που μηδενὶ ἂν μηδὲ θάψειε μηδένα τῶν ἐλευθέρων, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ θεῶνται τὴν καλὴν ταύτην θεάν ὑπ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, οὐ τὸν Διόνυσον ἐπὶ τὴν ὀρχήστραν τιθέασιν· ὥστε πολλάκις ἐν αὐτοῖς τινα σφάττεσθαι τοῖς θρόνοις, οὐ τὸν ἱεροφάντην καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἱερεῖς ἀνάγκη καθίζειν. (They further, he relates, took amiss, in their very classical way, the advice that a philosophical reformer thought incumbent on him to give them, so much so, that, he, seeing his life rendered disagreeable by their rough scoffing no doubt, was obliged to leave them to their alien but enthralling obsession, and depart). The xoanon, was, in the final stage of the ceremonies present before the theatrical performances, conveyed to the theater, from a sacred place where it had stood by an ἐσχάρα: the Ephebes brought it, in solemn procession with torches (thus by night) thence to the theater. CIA II 471 B12 εἰσήγαγον (sc. the Ephebes) δὲ καὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσχάρας εἰς τὸ θέατρον μετὰ φωτός, for the thymelic performances of the Great Dionysia. The holy image was placed on or by the θυμέλη in all likelihood (cf. supra: τὸν Διόνυσον ἐπὶ τὴν ὀρχήστραν τιθέασιν): for thus is a stiff, primitive Icon of a mature man wrapped in a mantle represented in an early 5th century red-figure crater, with a tragic hemichoir of young men dancing solemnly before it (see a picture of it in E. Simon *Die Götter der Griechen* Fig. 262). On the altar there are ποικίλαι ταινίαι, fillets, bands bearing diverse decorations, and what looks like olive branches. (They are rather emblems of victory than funereal anathemata). More important than the determination of the exact place where the Eidolon was placed in the Theater's orchestra, is the discovery of the place where the ἐσχάρα

was, whence with nocturnal pomp Dionysus was brought to the theater. It must have been an important and unique yearly sight, as is clearly signified by Alciphron's reference to it put to the hand of Menander himself, *Epistolae* II, 3, 16: ἐμοὶ γένοιτο τὸν Ἀττικὸν αἰεὶ στέφεσθαι κισσὸν καὶ τὸν ἐπ' ἑσχάρας ὑμνῆσαι κατ' ἔτος Διόνυσον, τὰς μυστηριώτιδας ἄγειν τελετάς, δραματουργεῖν τι καινὸν ταῖς ἐτησίαις θυμέλαις δράμα etc. But whether the ἑσχάρα in question was in the temple by the Academy, or within the *Ληναῖον* sanctuary (could one dare suggest the possibility of its being identical to the euphemistically called *βωμός*?), or, perhaps, whether the Eleusinian Ἑσχάρα is meant, will have to be resolved elsewhere. The foundations of the two temples, as well as traces of a *περίβολος* have been excavated immediately to the south of the theater (the succession of buildings is: the scenic structure, a stoa (constituting the northern part of the *περίβολος*), a smaller and apparently older temple and a large one next. Nearby, to the East of the theater and the precinct lies the Odeion as Pausanias correctly informs us (§4 sqq.). The immediate juxtaposition of the theater with the sanctuary is also testified by the Scholia on Demosthenes' *Contra Meidiam* pp. 517-8. Concerning the solemn public assembly convened in the Dionysian theater (ἐν Διονύσου) the day after Pandia, and taking special cognizance of various irregularities committed during religious festivities, it is explained: ἐν Διονύσου μὲν, ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ συνήπτο γὰρ τῷ θεάτρῳ τὸ τέμενος.

In the Demosthenic (which, if not by Demosthenes, is in his style⁹) oration LIX *Contra Neaeram*, there is repeated reference to the sanctuary. It is called τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Διονύσου ἐν Λίμναις and τὸ ἀρχαιοτάτον καὶ ἀγιώτατον ἱερόν τοῦ Διονύσου ἐν Λίμναις (§76). Nothing is specified about temple(s), thus ἱερόν, as in Thucydides, must be the entire enclosed sacred area. There was a *βωμός* there again in the open, by implication and norm, (although the more mystic worship becomes the less olympian orderliness and harmonious uniformity is observed) by which there was a very ancient stone inscription in evanescent old Attic letters proclaiming the sacred law regulating some aspects of the performance, according to the ancient customs, of ἄρρητα ἱερά ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως by the queen: the author mentions explicitly the conditions she should satisfy in order to safeguard the validity of the awesome rites. He refers the enactment of

such restrictions to the Post-Thesaic time, when kingship as supreme and sovereign authority was abolished and the basileus was elected by the people (*δῆμοι ἐκ προκρίτων κατ' ἀνδραγαθίαν χειροτονῶν*) (§75 p. 1370 Reiske). Assuming that the author had ample reasons, maybe internal and conclusive to connect this definite assertion regarding the appointment of Basileus, with the requirements concerning the Queen¹⁰, it is important to determine the approximate time of the inscription. That it could be of the aristocratic age, I consider unlikely; although it is still possible that some kind of assembly-confirmation of the well-known aristocratic appointment might be at work at some phase of the ominous development from natural aristocracy to constitutional (or rather conventional) democracy. Indeed Theseus' reputed philodemocratic tendencies may have chiefly resulted in the more secure political establishment (as a customary authority) of the confirmation powers of the aboriginal Popular Assembly, a measure occasioned and rendered feasible and even desirable by his *συννοικισμός* and the creation of the first important (proto-)πόλις in Attica. The *Θεσμοθέται*, having been constituted after the institution of the annual archonship, were, according to Aristotle (*Ἀθ. Πολ.* III, 5) entrusted with the writing of the *θέσμια*: *θεσμοθέται δὲ πολλοῖς ὕστερον ἔτεσιν ἠρέθησαν, ἤδη κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν αἰρουμένων τὰς ἀρχάς, ὅπως ἀναγράψαντες τὰ θέσμια φυλάττωσιν πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀμφισβητούντων κρίσιν* etc. Thus we have magistracy elections before Draco; though it remains undecided whether an internal aristocratic arrangement alone is meant or an assembly-confirmation is also implied. As the law in question is essentially religious it could conceivably be the codificatory work of Thesmothetae even before Draco, sometime, say between the 4th and 7th or 8th decades of the seventh century B.C. But as it probably pertains to a larger set of enactments consolidating the manner and prerequisites in archontic elections, I consider it more likely that Draco's arrangements may be meant; according to which, Aristotle, *Ἀθ. Πολ.* IV, *ἀπεδέδοτο μὲν ἡ πολιτεία τοῖς πλεονεχέουσιν·¹¹ ἠροῦντο δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἐννέα ἀρχοντας καὶ τοὺς ταμίαις οὐσίαν κεκτημένους οὐκ ἐλάττω δέκα μνῶν ἐλευθέραν, τὰς δ' ἄλλας ἀρχάς <τὰς> ἐλάττους ἐκ τῶν ὅπλα παρεχομένων, στρατηγούς δὲ καὶ ἱππάρχους οὐσίαν ἀποφαίνοντας οὐκ ἐλάττων ἢ ἑκατὸν μνῶν ἐλευθέραν, καὶ παῖδας ἐκ γαμετῆς γυναικὸς γνησίους ὑπὲρ δέκα ἔτη γεγονότας* etc. This situation best fits the

Demosthenic formulation; there most probably was some phyletic *πρόκρισις* involved, as this is nearer to the spirit of natural aristocracy, and as it was taken over by Solon on whose constitutional system Aristotle, *Ἀθ.Πολ.* VIII - τὰς δ' ἀρχὰς ἐποίησε κληρωτὰς ἐκ προκρίτων, οὓς ἐκάστη προκρίνειεν τῶν φυλῶν. προύκρινεν δ' εἰς τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχοντας ἐκάστη δέκα, καὶ τοὺς ἐννέα ἐκλήρου. This final lottery substantially disagrees with the statement in the oration. Hence, on the whole and under the initial presupposition, the inscription would belong to the time of Draco's codification of constitutional and judicial legislation, or slightly afterwards, in, say, the 8th or 9th decade of the 7th century B.C. To such high antiquity the evanide letters in a stone inscription amply testify.

The content broadly supports such a conclusion. For the essential point is that the necessity for the law was created, or significantly enhanced, when kingship could be conferred *de facto* on persons with less than absolute pride in indigence, with somehow diluted aristocratic sensitivities concerning purity of blood and natural nobility of excellence, and with rather reduced eugonic preoccupations. As those former features were bound up with the other virtues and characters that in their wonderful cohesion constituted the austere yet glorious value-system of natural aristocracy, any degree of adulteration of their purity could originally proceed from the intrusion of a principle that was both the first to make itself effectively independent from the Great Whole (by virtue of its wielding pragmatic influence in life) and the last objectively in grade of reputability and implicit authority: and that principle was the cause of Artificiality (of artificial organization and institutionalisation), this sinister, universal Disrupter and Uglifier, the pernicious chief catalyst in the dissolution of the divine Commonwealth upon Earth. It can be shown that this was the only possible Rebel in pristine times. But I shall pass over this more theoretical fact here.

Unperverted human feeling accepts Wealth, as the concomitant manifestation and tangible proof of real intrinsic excellencies; and even then demands magnanimous employment of it. The perfect condition of such a state of affairs is marvellously portrayed in Pindar's sublime hieronics addressed to the magnificent Sicelian tyrants. Left in itself and isolated, dissociated from the principle of excellence, Wealth becomes the sign of artificial societal organization, and thus the

evidence of Injustice. It is then quintessentially unjust as it segregates itself from Virtue and Worth to foully fraternise with Valuelessness and Vulgarity. This is rendered possible by organizational artificiality. For there is a natural linkage of wealth with excellence, as in the inherent bond between ability and efficiency, virtue and success. The problem arises when structures appropriate to one human condition are retained in the face of significant intellectual, economic and material progress. The institutional framework of the old aristocratic regimes could not contain the new content of a rapidly developing situation on pain of fossilisation and consequent malfunction and inefficiency. Tumultuous upheaval results upon any imprudent insistence on holding fast to outdated structures. Their fossilisation makes them brittle, and in time they collapse, the monstrous skeletons of a body once teeming with life. Unnatural artificiality (i.e. misalignment of institutional structures to the real historic content of human activity) is the veritable Arch-Fiend, not merely because it generates a perpetual vicious circle of social Injustice (both in following it and in resisting), but chiefly because it transmits its hideous miasma to the entire axiocracy of values, causing everywhere consternation, Envy, Hate and universal social disorder, finally destroying Aristocracy (meritocracy) as the universal principle of human organization under whatever constitutional arrangement of societal order. It can effectively be scourged and beaten only by the full adoption of the principle of freedom.

The invidious workings of that Evil principle of non-alignment begin much earlier than its constitutional, so to speak, recognition as a social factor of prime importance in itself that has to be corrected. Much before, thus, Draco's first timocratical enactments, was the worm writhing within the bowels of the beautiful body of natural Aristocracy, polluting and deforming its noble spirit¹². But the time of its official acknowledgment is the most appropriate for an enactment circumscribing, in its proper sphere, the expected worthlessness of hideous artificiality, its feared disastrous negligence of the primeval and eternal, man-and-city-saving sacred Customs, a real negligence under a hollow, pretended subservience to them.

This is the sense of the passage which follows and it accords nicely with our former determinations. *Τὸ γὰρ ἀρχαῖον, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, δυναστεία ἐν τῇ πόλει ἦν* (i.e. the simple rule of the most

wholly and holy powerful), καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν αἰὲ ὑπερεχόντων διὰ τὸ αὐτόχθονες εἶναι (kingship belonged to those who excelled in each case by virtue of their nobility and indigenoussness¹³), τὰς δὲ θυσίας ἀπάσας ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔθνε (sc. τὰς ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως, the publica sacra, the city sacrifices), καὶ τὰς σεμνοτάτας καὶ ἄρρητους ἢ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἐποίει, εἰκότως, βασιλίσσα οὔσα. ἐπειδὴ δὲ Θησεὺς συνώκισεν αὐτοὺς καὶ δημοκρατίαν ἐποίησε καὶ ἡ πόλις πολυάνθρωπος ἐγένετο, τὸν μὲν βασιλέα οὐδὲν ἦττον¹⁴ ὁ δῆμος ἤρειτο ἐκ προκρίτων κατ' ἀνδραγαθίαν χειροτονῶν¹⁵, τὴν δὲ γυναικα αὐτοῦ νόμον ἔθεντο ἀστὴν εἶναι καὶ μὴ ἐπιμειγμένην ἐτέρῳ ἀνδρὶ, ἀλλὰ παρθένον γαμεῖν, ἵνα κατὰ τὰ πάτρια θύηται τὰ ἄρρητα ἱερά ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ τὰ νομιζόμενα γίνηται τοῖς θεοῖς εὐσεβῶς, καὶ μηδὲν καταλύηται μηδὲ καινοτομήται. Καὶ τοῦτον τὸν νομὸν γράψαντες ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ ἔστησαν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Διονύσου παρὰ τὸν βωμὸν ἐν Λίμναις (καὶ αὕτη ἡ στήλη ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἔστηκεν, ἀμυδροῖς γράμμασιν Ἀττικοῖς δηλοῦσα τὰ γεγραμμένα), μαρτυρίαν ποιούμενος ὁ δῆμος ὑπὲρ τῆς αὐτοῦ εὐσεβείας πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ παρακαταθήκην καταλείπων τοῖς ἐπιγιγνομένοις, ὅτι τὴν γε θεῷ γυναικα δοθησομένην καὶ ποιήσουσιν τὰ ἱερά, τοιαύτην ἀξιοῦμεν εἶναι: sc. true citizen and virgin when married to the king¹⁶.

That chief altar is mentioned and in another respect. Upon the entrance of the new Athenian year, and on the assumption of authority by the new Archon-Basileus together with the other magistrates, his wife, the Queen, had all-important religious duties to perform. They are nicely related, probably in order of succession, by the author of the oration in §73 (1369-70R): καὶ αὕτη ἡ γυνὴ ὑμῖν ἔθνε τὰ ἄρρητα ἱερά ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ εἶδεν ἂ οὐ προσῆκεν αὐτὴν ὄραν ξένην οὔσαν, καὶ τοιαύτη οὔσα εἰσῆλθεν, οὐ οὐδεὶς ἄλλος Ἀθηναίων τοσοῦτων ὄντων εἰσέρχεται, ἀλλ' ἢ ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως γυνή, ἐξώρκωσέ τε τὰς γεραρὰς τὰς ὑπηρετούσας τοῖς ἱεροῖς (1), ἐξεδόθη δὲ τῷ Διονύσῳ γυνή (2), ἔπραξε δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως τὰ πάτρια τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς, πολλὰ καὶ ἄγρια καὶ ἀπόρρητα (3). The Γεραραί (a better form than γεραιραί, from γέρας rather than from γεραίρω; in Attic it was possibly pronounced γέραραι. For as Eustathius remarks p. 341.13 sqq. they often accented παρὰ τὴν ἀνάλογον συνήθειαν, adducing as examples, inter alia: οἱ δ' αὐτοὶ καὶ βδέλυρος λέγουσι καὶ πόνηρος καὶ μόχθηρος ἔξω ἀναλογίας. Πᾶν γὰρ εἰς -ρος λήγον παρώνυμον, παρεσχηματισμένον τοῖς γένεσιν [i.e.

with three genera formally differing] ὀξύτονον ἐστι καθ' Ἡρωδιανόν etc. The signification of the word could be taken as active, not passive: those that confer γέρα, not the receptors; so Dionysius Halicarnaseus as we shall see. But both senses are appropriate and accurate: they were Honourable in themselves as worthy of honouring the God in unspeakable rites; and they had the honour of honouring Him as well; and they honoured Him) were fourteen women sacred to Dionysus each year appointed by the king principally for the performance of special, mystic rites. Thus Hesychius s.v. Γεραραί· ἰέρειαι κοινῶς. Ἰδίως δὲ αἱ τῷ Διονύσῳ τῷ ἐν Λίμναις τὰ ἱερὰ ἐπιτελοῦσαι, τῷ ἀριθμῷ δεκατέσσαρες. Identically Lex. Seguer. (Anecd. Bekkeri p. 231.32) s.v. Γεραραί (pro Γεραραί; for the change is postulated by the word order): ἰέρειαι κοινῶς, ἰδίως δὲ παρὰ Ἀθηναίους αἱ τῷ Διονύσῳ etc.¹⁷. That the king appointed them we learn from Pollux VIII, 108: γεραραί· αὐταὶ ἄρρητα ἱερὰ Διονύσῳ ἔθνον μετ' ἄλλης θεωρίας (i.e. with other ceremonies). Καθίστη δὲ αὐτὰς ὁ βασιλεὺς οὕσας τετρασκαίδεκα. Dionysius Halicarnasseus apud Etym. Magnum s.v. Γεραραί gives his reason for their number as well as their etymology: παρὰ Ἀθηναίους γυναικῆς τινες ἱεραί. ἃς ὁ βασιλεὺς καθίστησιν ἰσαριθμούς τοῖς βωμοῖς τοῦ Διονύσου, διὰ τὸ γεραίρειν τὸν θεόν· οὕτω Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀλικαρνασεύς. (Perhaps διὰ τὸ γ. τὸν θεὸν οὕτω <καλουμένης> Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀλ.). There were apparently in all fourteen altars of the God. Harpocration refers to our very passage, without doubting its origin: s.v. γεραραί (some mss. give γεραραί of which in a moment) αἱ τῷ Διονύσῳ ἱερωμέναι γυναικῆς. Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Νεαίρας. The γεραραί form is with reference to and connected with the Homeric γεραίας of Iliad Z, 87; 270; 296. Suda does not distinguish the forms at all, s.v. γεραία (vel. γεραία)· ἢ γραῖς. Καὶ γεραραὶ αἱ τῷ Διονύσῳ ἱερωμέναι γυναικῆς. But it is γηραιός, -ά which signify old age. And after all old age does by the divine and natural Law possess a specific honour of reverence. As to the Homeric use, Hesychius correctly explains s.v. γεραίας· ἐντίμους γυναικῆς, τὰς γέρα τι ἐχούσας, namely to take care in a specific way of the (Icon of) divinity. Despite some dissonant testimonies, that is, (1) an intermarginalium in Scholia A ad 270: γεραίας γρ. καὶ γεραραί; (2) Sch. B ad 87: γεραίας· τινὲς γεραραὶ ἀναγινώσκουσι, ἵνα δηλοῖ τὰς ἱερείας, τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν γέρας δεχομένας. (3) The identical in meaning Schl. T ad loc. (but for the γεραράς instead of

γεραιάς; in the former we either must assume an irregular extension in the penultimate; or correct to the latter form); there can be no doubt that these stem from some Alexandrian wits, and that the Homeric meaning is, as Hesychius nicely explains, honourable matrons with the connotation of enjoyment of a specific honour¹⁸. It is remarkable however that the γεραιαί are requested to offer to Athena's Icon a πέπλος invoking her help at the particular juncture of circumstances the very same offering that was made as an annual ritual by the Argive γεραράδες to the very substitute of that self-same Palladium.

Of the multiple origination, the varied role, the polyvalence of significance attached to the Γεραραί we can form some impression from the details related by Pausanias' regarding the similar body of the Sixteen in Olympia (V, 16). We should have anyway assumed their old age by virtue of the important function and intrinsic respectability connoted in their appellation. But the Oath they took upon entering into office implies that they were γηραιαί too, over the climacteric period at any rate; for they swore (§78): *Ἀγιστεύω καὶ εἰμὶ καθαρὰ καὶ ἀγνή ἀπὸ τε τῶν ἄλλων τῶν οὐ καθαρειόντων καὶ ἀπ' ἀνδρὸς συνουσίας* etc. This did not pertain to the particular time alone, but was rather a declaration of perpetual purity and chastity from whatever religious stains and incapacitates for the performance of holy rites they might possess.

The Γεραραί were appointed by the King, but the Queen administered to them the awesome oath in the sanctuary by the altar upon the sacred things lying in baskets: (§78): *Βούλομαι δ' ὑμῖν καὶ τὸν ἱεροκῆρυκα καλέσαι, ὃς ὑπηρετεῖ τῇ τοῦ βασιλέως γυναικί, ὅταν ἐξορκοῖ τὰς γεραρὰς ἐν κανοῖς πρὸς τῷ βωμῷ, πρὶν ἄπτεσθαι τῶν ἱερῶν, ἵνα καὶ τοῦ ὄρκου καὶ τῶν λεγομένων ἀκούσητε, ὅσα οἶόν τ' ἐστὶν ἀκούειν, καὶ εἰδῆτε ὡς σεμνὰ καὶ ἅγια καὶ ἀρχαῖα τὰ νόμιμά ἐστιν.* (There follows that part of the oath which could with impunity be said and heard: (§79) *τοῦ μὲν ὄρκου τοῖνον καὶ τῶν νομιζομένων πατρίων* (those mentioned also in the inscribed law), *ὅσα οἶόν τ' ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν, ἀκηκόατε* etc). We clearly have to do with mystic rites.

From these passages I reconstruct the general outline of the ceremonies in Limnae which took place near the beginning of the Athenian year, as follows: The Queen, a special *ἱεροκῆρυξ* and the 14

elderly women entered the tabooed precinct, and stood round the Great Altar. The Queen alone entered the holy of holies (the ancient temple most likely or some abaton within it) and took the Sacred Baskets with the Sacred Objects that they contained perhaps covered so that the male *ἱεροκήρυξ* might not see them. The language used is *καὶ τοιαύτη οὖσα* - i.e. it is not now a question of citizen or alien - *εἰσηλθεν, οἱ οὐδεὶς ἄλλος Ἀθηναίων τοσοῦτων ὄντων εἰσέρχεται, ἀλλ' ἡ ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως γυνή;* this is preceded by the exclamation: *καὶ εἶδεν ἃ οὐ προσήκεν αὐτὴν ὄραν ξένην οὖσαν*, the point here being her unindigenous growth; for indeed the *Γεραραί* were seeing the same awful sights in assisting her. She brought the baskets by the Altar, where on them and with the assistance of the *ἱεροκήρυξ* the *Γεραραί* took their not-to-be-divulged Oath. The Man then left the place and the Queen with the consecrated Women's help¹⁹ performed²⁰ the Unspeakable Rites on behalf, and to the universal beneficence, of the City (*τὰ ἄρρητα ἱερά ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως*) by the handling of the Sacred Things (*πρὶν ἄπτεσθαι τῶν ἱερῶν* §78). It was not *fas* for the participants to relate to anybody else what had taken place there: (§79) *καὶ ὅτι οὐδ' αὐταῖς ταῖς ὁρώσαις τὰ ἱερά ταῦτα οἶόν τ' ἐστὶ λέγειν πρὸς ἄλλον οὐδένα*. The *ὁρώσαις*, finally, implies that the Queen the main holy action alone, the performed assistance of the by-standing *Γεραραί* being secondary.

Soon after the performance of these Mystic rites followed the sacred Marriage of the Queen with Dionysus (phase (2) supra). Cf. Hesychius s.v. *Διονύσου γάμος*: *τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως γυναικὸς καὶ θεοῦ γίνεται γάμος*. This was consummated in the so-called *Βουκόλιον* in the Agora; Aristotle *Ἀθ. Πολ.* III, 5 ...*ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν βασιλεὺς εἶχε τὸ νῦν καλούμενον Βουκόλιον πλησίον τοῦ Πρυτανείου (σημείον δέ ἐτι καὶ νῦν γὰρ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως γυναικὸς ἢ σύμμειξις ἐνταῦθα γίγνεται τῷ Διονύσῳ καὶ ὁ γάμος)* etc. *Βουκόλιον* (or *Βουκολεῖον* as Wilamowitz and Kaibel unnecessarily corrected it, cf. the *Παρασίτιον*, v. Appendix II On the Parasitism and the Hieron in the Royal Law) is a pregnant expression in this application, the God being the divine Bull. The sacred marriage was followed by the performance of many symbolic rites by the Queen-Mortal Wife of the God pro urbe addressed to various gods and goddesses, §73: *...ἐξεδόθη δὲ τῷ Διονύσῳ γυνή, ἔπραξε δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως τὰ πάτρια τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς, πολλὰ καὶ ἅγια καὶ ἀπόρρητα*.

We learn further from the oration that the sanctuary was closed during the year, and only opened to the public once, on the 12th of Anthesterion, in the festival of Anthesteria: (§76 p. 1371 R): *καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἀρχαιοτάτῳ ἱερῷ τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ ἀγιωτάτῳ ἐν Λίμναις ἔστησαν* (sc. *τὴν λιθίνην στήλην*), *ἵνα μὴ πολλοὶ εἰδῶσι τὰ γεγραμμένα* (we deduce that there were probably other arcana as well written on it; although the eupatrids were always, and rightly, rather reticent about religious matters in general, and only with extreme reluctance, and in as enigmatic and hidden way as possible, did they divulge sacra, when, with the deterioration of the natural state of things, it was made unavoidable to vulgarize and write down the unwritten *πάτρια*. Even in the time of the oration, Areopagus institutes inquiries and chastises the king for his guilty error, of ignorance as he pleads, secretly (§80): *ὡς γὰρ ἐγένετο τὰ ἱερά ταῦτα* (with the beginning of the new civil year as I have explained above) *καὶ ἀνέβησαν εἰς Ἄρειον Πάγον οἱ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες ταῖς καθηκούσαις ἡμέραις* (on a certain date after their assumption of authority they presented themselves to the Court that was highest in prestige, of which they were later to become ordinary members), *εὐθὺς ἢ βουλή ἢ ἐν Ἀρείῳ Πάγῳ ὥσπερ καὶ τᾶλλα πολλοῦ ἀξία ἐστὶ τῇ πόλει περὶ εὐσέβειαν, ἐξήτει τὴν γυναῖκα ταύτην τοῦ Θεογένους ἣτις ἦν, καὶ ἐξήλεγε, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν πρόνοιαν ἐποιεῖτο, καὶ ἐξημίον τὸν Θεογένην ὅσα κυρία ἐστιν, ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ δὲ καὶ διὰ κοσμιότητος· ἅπαξ γὰρ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκάστου ἀνοίγεται, τῇ δωδεκάτῃ τοῦ Ἄνθεστηριῶνος μηνός*. That was the date on which, according to Thucydides II, 15 (v. supra) *τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια τῇ δωδεκάτῃ ποιεῖται ἐν μηνὶ Ἄνθεστηριῶνι* in that very sanctuary.

Γ

The unspeakable rites above described, the sacred marriage of the God with the Queen, as well as the Feast of the 12th Anthesterion pertain to an aboriginal Dionysus initially distinct from the Theban incomer. There is nothing but smooth, indigenous acceptance in the sacra pro urbe; instituted at a time when the king was alone the unquestionable principle of the people, plenipotentiary of sacred majesty, whom the very God deigned to substitute in his marital duties in an annually consummated copulation thereby securing divine grace for the entire town (Babylonian parallels spring

immediately to mind); while the Anthesteria guarded eternally their definitely chthonic singularity. By contrast the Cadmean God met nothing but determined resistance in his thrice-repeated attempts at infiltration of Attic territory, and it may well be that he was finally officially naturalized only by the accession of the previously Boeotian Eleutherai, an eminent centre of his cult and even then not without explicit Pythic and Dodonean sanction.

In illustrating the whole matter in some detail, firstly the character of the autochthonous Attic Dionysiac worship will be clarified. And then the distinctive nature of the Semelian offspring together with the reasons for the opposition he encountered and for its final triumphal overcoming, must be elucidated.

In the immediate vicinity of the Acropolis the area to the SE was abundant in waters as the Asclepeion there, and the famous Peisistratean *ἐννεάκρουσις* fountain nearby (Pausanias I, 14, 1), amply testify. The waters would have formed small rivulets and a marshy field with tiny lakes before joining the Ilissus below or, perhaps, the river itself may have been transformed in the area to extensive marshes. The place must have been a highspot of orgiastic multifarious plantation. The God in the Marshes, *ὁ ἐν Αἴμναις Διόνυσος*, was fundamentally the principle of Fecundity and Life appropriately located and worshipped in the midst of the liquid element and its manifest procreative power²¹. He is the Great Lord of Potent Juices, and thus particularly connected with the fruits of trees (*ἀκρόδρυα, ὀπῶραι*), which constitute, in their liquid exquisiteness, the resplendent maturation, semen-like, of all succus workings within the living wood, itself the dried up residuum of these transformations. The sacred marriage renders this indubitable: it constituted the blessing of the year for all natural generation, from the slightest physical transformation to human birth, when the divine Semen irrigated the City in the person of her female head and colophon: the Queen. The intercourse took place in the building of the Agora by the old Prytaneion called *Βουκόλιον*²². Nothing more significant than the name.

Βουκόλιον (from *βουκολέω* = tend cattle) means ordinarily a herd of cattle, but here is the place where cattle are tended, a cattle shed (via *βουκολία* = tending of cattle. The weak, as was observed, bring the papyrus to their standards with *βουκολεῖον*). The Divine Beast tended

is the Great Bull, Dionysus himself. (Dionysus is called *βούκερος* by Sophocles Fr. 959 Pearson; *ταυρόκερος* by Euripides, *Bacchae*, v. 100; *ἄδαμος παῖς ταυρωπός* by Ion of Chios Fr. 5 Page. In Argos he was referred to by the divine epithet *βουγενής*, Plutarch, *de Osiride et Iside*, 364F. His statues were in many cases bovine, Plutarch *op.cit.*, 364E; one instance was in Cyzicus, Athenaeus 476A: ...τὸν Διόνυσον κερατοφυῆ πλάττεσθαι· ἔτι τε ταῦρον καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ πολλῶν ποιητῶν. ἐν δὲ Κυζίκῳ καὶ ταυρόμορφος ἴδρυται. Probably Plutarch means that his statues gave him oxhorns). Among the numerous divine beings connected to the God, his Tenders were included, Lucianus *de Saltatione* 79: ἡ μὲν γε Βακχικὴ ὄρχησις, ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ μάλιστα καὶ ἐν Πόντῳ σπουδαζομένη, καίτοι Σατυρικὴ οὔσα, οὕτω κεχείρωται τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς ἐκεῖ, ὥστε κατὰ τὸν τεταγμένον ἕκαστοι καιρὸν ἀπάντων ἐπιλαθόμενοι τῶν ἄλλων κἀθηνται δι' ἡμέρας Τιτᾶνες καὶ Κορύβαντας καὶ Σατύρους καὶ Βουκόλους ὀρῶντες. In imitation to them, humanly composed religious associations also bore the name, e.g. IG XII, 9, 262 (from Eretria): Τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Βουκόλ(ω)ν Ζώπυ[ρον] Ἀσκληπιάδου. The Cratinian *Βουκόλοι* probably refers to such a company of immortal or mortal (at)tendants of the God, just as his *Σάτυροι*. The poet's fervant dithyrambic style, together with his marked vinosity, is exquisitely commented on in the masterly *εὐφήμια* of his great adversary by Aristophanes, *Ranae* 353 sqq.:

εὐφημῆν χρὴ καξίστασθαι τοῖς ἡμετέροις χοροῖσιν
 ὅστις ἄπειρος τοιῶνδε λόγων ἢ γνώμην μὴ καθαρεύει,
 ἢ γενναίων ὄργια Μουσῶν μῆτ' εἶδεν μῆτ' ἐχόρουσε,
 μηδὲ Κρατίνου τοῦ ταυροφάγου γλώττης βακχεῖ' ἐτελέσθη,
 etc.

The bacchanalia of the Cratinian tongue aptly alludes to his infamous attachment to the God's liquor (cf. *Pax*, 70 sqq.). But it chiefly bears testimony to the Cratinian dithyrambology (cf. Hesychius s.v. *πυρπερέγχει* i.e. *πῦρ, πῦρ ἔγχει*, vel *πῦρ ἐπὶ πῦρ ἔγχει*), his full productive imbibement of the bacchic spirit, as the divine dionysiac eponymon *ταυροφάγος* bears witness, of which more later. In Euripides, *Antiope* Fr. 202 Nauck = Fr. XXXVII Kambitsis, *L' Antiope d' Euripide* p. 12 (from Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* I,

163, 5 (p. 151 Sylb.)) there is some difficulty with the transmitted text:

<iambic dipodia> ἔνδον δὲ θαλάμοις βουκόλον
κομῶντα κισσῶ στῦλον Εὐίου θεοῦ.

The στῦλος is the κίων, Idol of the God, dressed and masked (v. e.g. the picture on the stamnos in Naples, E. Simon *Die Götter der Griechen* p. 275. This stamnos belongs to the group of Lenäervasen carrying similar depictions correctly associated by their first commentator to the Lenaia; Frickenhaus, *Lenäervasen*, 72nd Winckelmannsprogramm. With - in most cases - or without ecstatic maenadic display, there can be no doubt as to the ascription). But it cannot with propriety be called Βουκόλος unless by extreme violence. Timidly shrinking, then, from boldly construing βουκόλος στῦλος as βουκολούμενος στῦλος (much care and cura being obviously spent in the dressing of the symbolic column), one may either suppose with e.g. Dindorf and Nauck the missing part of the metre to follow βουκόλον (or to immediately precede it as with Kambitsis *loc.cit.*), but this looks merely like trying to avoid the problem. Or change to βουκόλων with Wilamovitz (*Aristoteles und Athen* II p. 42), an exercise of sheer naivety. Or, of a different order, adopt Toupius' conjecture κοσμοῦντα (ad Longinus *de Sublimitate* XL, 5), even though he perversely prefers his other proposal βουκόλου. Βουκόλος στῦλος may likely signify the cattle tender's rod: that could be what was dressed up as a symbol of the bull-god. In any case the pregnant religious sense of our word seems unmistakable.

Let us ascend now from the tenders to the tended. The Eleians were particularly given to the worship of Dionysus (Pausanias, VI, 26, 1: θεῶν δὲ ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα Διόνυσον σέβουσιν Ἠλεῖοι). Indeed they claimed that it was in Elis, in particular in a pagus (demus) known as Orthia, that first of all honours were rendered to Dionysus by Physcoa with whom he copulated and Narcaeus their offspring - all highly significant names. The god visited the stuffed Tumous, cf. φύσκη, φύσκων from φυσάω (ultimately φύω) in the Erect location (Ὀρθία) and procreated the Narcous (Numbing, Deadening). The phallic creative potency of the God is clearly already combined with a lethiferous result (Pausanias V, 16, 6-7). A clear epiphany of the God

took place in a feast called *Θυῖα*, when wine, out of divine grace filled three *λέβητας* locked up and secured against human manipulation (VI, 26, 1). Theopompous, relating the same story, claimed for the Olympian banks of Alpheius the honour of the first appearance of vine (Fr. 265 Grenfell-Hunt, apud Athenaeus I p. 34a). The Sixteen old Eleian women (analogous to the Fourteen Athenian *Γεραραί*, v. supra), of whom such cardinal offices and important services are related in extenso by Pausanias in V, 16 (among which functions was included a sacred dance called *Physcoa* in honour of that *Physcoa* who suffered the divine coitus with Dionysus), these women were particularly devoted to Dionysus: Plutarchus, *Mulierum virtutes*, XV, 251E: *αἱ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ἱεραὶ γυναῖκες, ἃς Ἑκκαίδεκα καλοῦσιν* etc., where the extreme reverence they commanded is also illustrated, even at the time of the Aristotimean tyranny (v. the story in Plutarch, cf. Pausanias V, 5, 1; Justinus XXVI, 1).

These Sixteen must have thus been at the head of the Elean Women, who in their hymn to Dionysus besought his epiphany or mystic presence in his temple, chanting thus (Plutarch, *Aetia Graeca*, XXXVI, 299 A-B):

ἐλθεῖν, Ἥρω Διόνυσε,
 ἄλιον ἐς ναὸν
 ἀγνὸν σὺν Χαρίτεσσιν
 ἐς ναὸν τῷ βοέῳ ποδὶ δύων²³.
 Ἄξιε Ταῦρε.
 Ἄξιε Ταῦρε.

The change of Ἥρω to ἦρ' ᾶ by Cook, adopted by Titchener (BT) is exceedingly shallow even though Ἥρω is itself rather troublesome, if not properly understood. On the other hand, the two instances of *ναόν* are unlikely both to have occurred. If the former is kept, as is more likely, we can emend the fourth verse to either *ἐς μυχόν... δύων* (cf. in Homer *Odyssey* n, 82 where Athena *δῦνε δ' Ἐρεχθῆος πυκινὸν δόμον*, the temple in Acropolis) or *ἐς βωμόν... θύων* (Dionysus and Graces being *σύμβωμοι* in Olympia; *θύων* is Diehl's reading, *Anthologia Lyrica* p. 206), arranging thus:

ἀγνὸν σὺν Χαρίτεσσιν ἐς μυχόν
 τῷ βοέῳ ποδὶ δύων

or:

ἀγνὸν σὺν Χαρίτεσσιν
 ἐς βωμὸν τῷ βοέῳ ποδὶ θύων.

The second is preferable as the God is called upon to appear in a triple layer of meaning: first, *θύων* in divine rage his characteristic influence being translated to himself; then, secondly, *θύων* seething (with blood), swollen with a double entendre on a distended foot, a bulging membrum; finally, *θύων* offering a sacrifice (in particular sacrificing by tearing to pieces as in Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 137), a sacrifice in fact of himself as the sacred bull.

And ἄλιον is also problematic, deficient in sense and metre. Despite the valiant but far-fetched attempt by Kerenyi (v. *Dionysos* pp. 181-2), a marine temple lacks significant power in the invocation; if *βωμόν* is accepted for the second *ναόν*, then the location was in Olympia where the double altars were to be found; and the tribrachys is radically out of tune with the basically dactylic rhythm of the hymn. Ἄλιον (Welcker; better than Bergk's Ἀλείων) is a somewhat doubtful improvement; one does not normally give the territorial location of the Temple in an invocation therein; only some relevant significant feature may be referred to; and so one may be tempted by *θύϊον*, in relationship to the feast of *Θυῖα* above mentioned. Or, rather, we may boldly understand ἄλιον from ἀλίζω, collect, gather together, assemble (as in ἄλιος, the Pythagorean name for nine, *Theologoumena Arithmeticae*, 57): ἄλιος ναός would then be like the Christian ἐκκλησία.

Perhaps more than everything so far mentioned is the ἄξιε, as ordinarily understood, jejune. If it is really an adjective that is wanted here, ἄγιε would be much more in place. But I feel that the epodos encapsulated the entire point of the invocatory hymn, the imperative imploration / imprecation for the divine manifestation; and that therefore an epiphanic infinitive would fit nicely, such as ἄξεσθαι, which Hesychius s.v. glosses: ἀγαγέσθαι, ἀφίξεσθαι, παραγενέσθαι; making the correspondence ἐλθεῖν Διόνυσσε - ἄξεσθαι ταῦρε complete²⁴. One may further think of the secret Samothracian Cabeiric triad Ἀξίερος, Ἀξιόκερσα, Ἀξιόκερσος (Scholia in Apollonius, *Argonautica* A, 916-18b; Et. Magnum s.v. *Κάβειροι* p.

482.28 Sylb.; Et. Gudianum s.v. p. 289.20 Sturz; cf. the talismanic, prophylactic inscription on an amulet, Orelli, *Inscriptiones Latinae*, 440; cf. Strabo X p. 427-3 Cas.). Cf. also the Athena Ἀξιόποινος in Pausanias III, 15, 6. In all such names the common first component ἄξιος bears fully its aboriginal derivation and meaning ὁ ἄγων (ἄγ-σ-ιος), the leader, one who weighs down, the chief, hence, also, ἄξιος, ὁ ἄγων σταθμόν τόσον (μείζονα), and thus so much priced. From such senses is the correlative ἄγ-νυ-μι enlivened with or without the digamma: by the sheer onus and momentum of following the leading force, so to speak, the Principal Driver breaks clear. Hence the various toponymia, as Ἄξιος or Ἀξιός the great Macedonian river (a deep and rapid stream with several apparent changes of its flow through the ages); another river in Caria whom Plinius (V 27 (29) §103) calls Axon; cf. the Ἀξιούπολις on the Ἀξιός river in lower Moesia (Ptolemy iii.10 §11); the Ἀξίος or Ἄξιος or Ἄξος or Ἄξος in Crete, a town not far from Eleutherne and Mount Ida (Herodotus IV, 154; Stephanus Byzantium s. both forms, the second being the remnant of an initial digamma, just as the Οἰαξίς of Apollonius Argonautica A, 1131, explicitly betokened by the numismatic Φάξιοι) on a high (Etym. Magnum s.v. Οἰαξίς p. 616.54 Sylb.) and precipitous location (Stephanus Byz. s.v. Ἄξος... τινὲς δὲ διὰ τὸ καταγῆναι τὸν τόπον καὶ κρημνώδη ὑπάρχειν· καλοῦσι γὰρ τοὺς τοιοῦτους τόπους ἄξιος, καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς [the ordinary common usage] ἀγμούς), where furthermore a rapid river flowed (Virgil, *Eclogae* I, 66: et rapidum Cretae veniemus Oaxen, which we must understand of a river in the island Creta despite the unbearably forced Servian interpretation, *ad loc.*) the Ἀξία town of the Ozolian Locri (Stephanus Byz. s.v.) where an Ἄξιος son or Ἀξία daughter of the euphemistic Κλύμενος give a sufficient hint to the Great Masher; a homonymous town in Italy (Steph. Byz. s.v.) in all probability the same with the castellum in Etruria, in agro Tarquiniense mentioned by Cicero, *pro Caec.* 7, whose remains have been identified with Castel d' Asso or Castellaccio some 10 km west of Viterbo (with an important necropolis), located in the angle between two small streams flowing through deep ravines with precipitous escarpments on each side (Smith, *Dict. of Geogr.* p. 352a); of Ἀξιάκης and Ἀξιάκαι in Sarmatia I shall not speak, and less of Axona in Galatia.

We may therefore compose the final invocational cry of the Eleian women as

Ἄξιόταυρε

understanding the Ur-Bull, the Fully-Priced Beast. Or even, maybe, with emphasis on the ἄγ-νυμι offspring, the Destroyer of Bulls (cf. *ταυροφάγος* as divine epithet of Dionysus, the Consumer of Bulls) an ambivalence very systematically exploited in ancient religiosity. This second signification would connect with *ταυροφάγος*, and the ultimate sacrifice where the victim is the God himself, the slayer is the God himself, and he to whom the sacrifice is offered, is the God Himself (an enhancement of the Christ archetype).

The awesome epodos is repeated twice, as the chthonic character of the divinity invoked requires evenness, according to the general syzygy philosophically articulated by the Pythagoreans.

The sanctity (ἀγνός *μυχός* or *βωμός* or even *ναός*) of the Bacchic orgies is a matter to which the sacred obscenity revealed, as far as allowable, in the first part of the study on ἄρρητα *ιέρα* has accustomed us.

In Delphi an archaic, life-size bull has been found constructed from silver layers with golden genitalia, a precious dedication most likely to Dionysus, the other, darker side of Delphic religiosity.

The combination of Dionysus with the *Χάριτες* is well attested in the Eleian cult. In his detailed enumeration of all altars in the Olympian Altis according to the customary sacrificial succession, Pausanias (V, 14, 4-15, 9) mentions (§10) one near Pelopeion *Διονύσου μὲν καὶ Χαρίτων ἐν κοινῷ* (with two others in the vicinity sacred to Muses and Nymphs, appropriate neighbours of the God). This common altar was in fact one of the six principal ones, devoted in pairs to the Eleian Dodecatheon; their institution was traditionally ascribed to Hercules, v. Apollodorus *Bibliotheca* II, 7, 2, 5 (§141): ἔθηκε δὲ (sc. ὁ Ἡρακλῆς) καὶ τὸν Ὀλυμπιακὸν ἀγῶνα, Πέλοπός τε βωμὸν ἰδρύσατο, καὶ θεῶν δώδεκα βωμοὺς ἕξ ἑδείματο. This is confirmed by Pindar (Olymp. X, 25 βωμῶν ἐξάριθμον ἐκτίσσατο sc. Hercules). He also refers to this singular *συμβωμία* in Olymp. V, 5 (βωμοὺς ἕξ διδύμους), where the scholia quote Herodorus' account and the list of these six double altars: καὶ πρῶτον τὸν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου, ᾧ σύμβωμον ἐποίησε (always Hercules) τὸν Ποσειδῶνα, δεύτερον Ἥρας καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς, τρίτον Ἑρμοῦ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος,

τέταρτον Χαρίτων καὶ Διονύσου, πέμπτον Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ Ἀλφειοῦ, ἕκτον Κρόνου καὶ Ρέας. Of these Pausanias *loc.cit.* mentions the 5th (14 §6); the 3rd (14 §28); the 4th (14 §10). In 14 §4 there is a lacerated passage where some common altars were mentioned; the Mss. have: *τρίτα δὲ <...> ἐπὶ ἑνὸς βωμοῦ καὶ αὕτη καθέστηκεν ἢ θυσία. πέμπτα Ἀρτέμιδι θύουσι + λαοὶ δι' Ἀθηνᾶν+. ἕκτα Ἐργάνη.* Clearly third in the series was a *συμβωμία*, and similarly the fourth, followed by the remark *ἐπὶ ἑνὸς βωμοῦ καὶ αὕτη καθέστηκεν ἢ θυσία.* The text for the fifth is corrupt. To harmonize the text with the Herodorian information one may read, attending mostly the older editions and judiciously ignoring the calamitous modern ones: *τρίτα δὲ <ἐπὶ ἑνὸς βωμοῦ Κρόνω καὶ Ρέα. τέταρτα Διὶ καὶ Ποσειδῶνι.>²⁵ ἐπὶ ἑνὸς βωμοῦ καὶ αὕτη καθέστηκεν ἢ θυσία. πέμπτα Ἀρτέμιδι θύουσι. Ἡρᾶ καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ ἕκτα Ἐργάνη.* The last correction is somehow precarious; for Zeus and Poseidon one cannot doubt; as to Saturn and Rhea, there is no other obvious place for their insertion, nor indeed any other mention of them in the Pausanian list. It is, on the other hand, quite possible that they were in later times omitted from the monthly worship at the altars (15 §10), the Cronian temple and worship becoming all but extinct, save for the lingering memory of the pre-jovian state of affairs and the myths concerning the birth of the New Tyrant (cf. Pausanias V, 7, 6 and 10), surviving also in the name of the hill superintending Altis from the North the *Κρόνιον* (V, 21, 2; VI, 19, 1), on whose top the only certain remnant of an aboriginal Cult to Cronus was performed (VI, 20, 1: *ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ὄρους τῆ κορυφῆ θύουσιν οἱ Βασίλαι καλούμενοι τῷ Κρόνω κατὰ ἰσημερινὰν τὴν ἐν τῷ ἡρι Ἐλαφίῳ μηνὶ παρὰ Ἡλείοις.* Was this what in ancient times was the common altar?). If we then consider the Saturno-Rhean altar as unavailable to the regular service performed to those included in the Pausanian list, we can plausibly recast the defective passage thus: *τρίτα δὲ <ἐπὶ ἑνὸς βωμοῦ Διὶ καὶ Ποσειδῶνι. τέταρτα Ἡρᾶ καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ.> ἐπὶ ἑνὸς βωμοῦ καὶ αὕτη καθέστηκεν ἢ θυσία. πέμπτα Ἀρτέμιδι θύουσι Λατωίδι. Ἀθηνᾶ ἕκτα Ἐργάνη* etc. There is another rather likely place in which to effect our harmonizing operations: in 14, 8 Pausanias mentions the primeval altar of Hera Olympia, then the common one to Apollo and Hermes, upon which (§9) he proceeds thus: *ἐφεξῆς δὲ ὁμοιοῖας βωμὸς καὶ αὐθις Ἀθηνᾶς, ὃ δὲ Μητρὸς Θεῶν.* But *αὐθις* bears its full point when preceded by

the corresponding mention in the immediate, near vicinity. But no such reference to Athena is forthcoming. One may suggest then ἐφεξῆς δὲ ὁμονοίας βωμῶς καὶ αὐθις (*Ἦρας κοινὸς καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς*²⁶, ὁ δὲ (vel ἄλλος δὲ) etc.

In the François vase Dionysus is followed by three Horae and preceded by three divinities two of which bear the inscriptions *Ἥεστία*, *Χαρικλώ*, while the third's name probably began by *Δελ-* or *Δερ-* (or less probably *Δεγ*). These may be meant for a group of Ur-Charites, so multi-named and multiple. The significance of the strong Eleian cultic association of Dionysus with them lies in their safeguarding a positive and beneficent epiphany of the Great Generative power. For they superintend natural growth and perfect maturity (as, e.g. *Ἀξώ* and Hegemone in Athens, Pausanias IX, 35, 2); they constitute splendid radiance in beauty (as *Κλήτα* and *Φάεννα* in Laconia id. 35, 1 or as daughters of Sun and *Ἄγλη* according to Antimachus id. 35, 5); they control festive joy, gladness of heart and merry splendour (as *Θάλεια*, *Εὐφροσύνη*, *Ἄγλαία* according to the Hesiodic Theogony, in this followed by Orphism, *ibid.*). Without their graceful attendance what could not be expected from the manifestation of the Divine Beast, raving with his bull- *πούς* or *πέος*? For the phallic significance of *πούς* is clear from the elsewhere-discussed Pythian oracle given to Aegeus (Plutarch, *Theseus* III; scholia Euripides *Medea* 679; scholia Lycophron 493; Apollodorus *Bibl.* III §207). The etymological connection of the words *πούς*, *πέος*, *πόσις*, *πόσθη*, *Ποσειδών*, *pes*, *penis*, *περῶ*, *πόρος*, *πόρ* and *πῶς* (Lacedaimonian for *πούς*, Hesychius s.v.) *por* (for puer), *puer*, *πότνια*, *Δεσ-πότ-ης*, *potens* (possum), *potior* is evident. Their sense affinity stems from some initial root meaning unwithstandable action and irresistible overcoming, striking (down), penetrating (through), tearing (asunder), pressing (heavily), dispersing (around) etc.

Lastly *Ἦρας* should not confound us. It is of course truest that hero cult was most clearly distinguished from divine worship. But there existed beings, born from a mortal parent (almost always female, an *Οἶα*; the reversed situation, with a mortal father, is rare: see the Hesiodic enumeration Theogony 963 sqq.; and notice vv. 1019-22) by the felicitous intervention of a God, who have lived as humans, performed transcendent prodigies indubitably superior to the extreme

limits of mere humanity, and finally became, by virtue of their inhuman preeminence, even Gods. A few among them attained the superiority of panhellenic worship (Hercules, the Theban Dionysus, the peculiar divinity of the Dioscuri, Asclepius). The address as Hero to Dionysus on the part of the Eleian women may draw attention precisely to his heroic life here on Earth. He was a Hero on Earth, but of a higher origination, calibre and destiny; and thus though a New God and absolutely honoured with full divine Worship, he may still be fondly invoked in terms of his unforgettable sojourn among men. Nothing more easy and acceptable than this.

But I believe there is deeper significance in the application. Especially, since such a hero-becoming-God Dionysus fits the Semelean offspring, better than the mystic Zagreus. Seeking a hidden dimension in such cultic invocations, we observe that fundamentally and aboriginally *Ἥρω*s is but the masculine of *Ἥρα*, a king by the Queen, the Potent One next to the *Πότνια* (v. supra). The evident power implicit constitutionally in heroism is duly recorded also by the lexicographers; so Hesychius s.v. *Ἥρω*s· δυνατός, ἰσχυρός, γενναῖος, σεμνός (thus corrected by Palmerius and Kusterns from the blunderous nonsense *ἥρως*· δυνατῶς etc.; cf. Suda s.v.); and Zonaras s.v. *Ἥρω*ες· ἡμίθεοι, δυνατοί. The same root appears in the explosive might of spring, *ἔαρ* - *εἶαρ* - *ἦρ* - ver; the digamma in the Greek form is rendered certain, dialectically at least, by Hesychius *γίαρ*ες· *ἔαρ*. Cf. also *γέαρ*· *ἔαρ* and *βηράνθεμον*· *νάρκισσος*. οἱ δέ, *τηράνθεμον* (?). The sense in this application relates also to blood, Narcissus' death transforming the beautiful youth into the flower. Cf. the similar case of Hyacinthus in Ephorion's fragment. (I do not know whether the same component *βηρ*-*ἦρ*-*ἦρ*- enters into *βηρίχαλκον*· τὸ *μάραθ*ον *Λάκωνες*). To the same basic meaning points unmistakably the Alexandrine poetic usage (no doubt a learned, recherché, but ancient, *γλωσσο*) of *ἔαρ* for the liquid of life blood²⁷ - Callimachus 328.2 (*εἶαρι*); 523 (*εἶαρ*); Euphorio 40.3 *Collectanea Alexandrina* Powell; cf. Nicander *Alexipharmaca* 314; *Theriaca* 701; and Oppianus *Halieutica* II, 618. Hence metaphorically used for the juice of the olive, Nicander *Alexipharmaca* 87 and Callimachus Fr. 177.22. The Scholia T ad Ilias T 87 (*ἡεροφοῖτις Ἐριννύς*) mention a variant thus: *ἔνιοι δὲ ἱεροπῶτις παρὰ τὸ Αἰσχύλειον*· οἱ δὲ *εἱαρ*οπῶτις *ἐγκειμέν*· *νου τοῦ ε*, *εἶαρ*· ὅπερ ἐστι κατὰ *Σαλαμινίου*ς αἶμα. (This was so

strong as to be considered a variant to the Homeric *ἡεροφοῖτις*). And so the EM s.v. *Ἡεροφοῖτις ἐριννύς* 421.54 sqq.: ...*ἢ παρὰ τὸ ἔαρ, ὃ σημαίνει τὸ αἶμα· καὶ ὁ αἵματοπότης, ἡαροπότης* (vel. *εἰαροπότης*) (sic to be corrected from *ἡεροπότης*). As s.v. *εἶαρ* (294.47) *εἶαρ, τὸ αἶμα· καὶ εἰαροπότης ὁ αἵματοπότης, ὡς φησι Καλλίμαχος* (Fr. 247): *τὸ δ' ἐκ μέλαν εἶαρ ἔλαπτεν* (so with Bentley and Rittershusius pro *ἔδαπτεν*). The master-lexicographer testifies abundantly to the glossema; v. s.vv. *ἔαρ· αἶμα, Κύπριοι* (a Cyprian, and specifically Salaminian as we saw, usage, which points to the highest Peloponnesian antiquity); *εἶαρ· αἶμα· ἢ ψυχὴ* and *εἰαροπότης· αἵμοπότης· ψυχοπότης* and *ἦαρ· αἶμα· ψυχὴ* which all intensify the force of meaning by bringing in the principle of life itself and even more, the all-powerful absolute dispensation in s.v. *ἴαρα· αἶμα· ἢ μοῖρα*. Cf. also s.vv. *ιαροπότης* and *ἡεροπότης* as also *ιαρπάλεμος* (i.e. *ἴαρ + παλάμη*)· *ἀκρόχειρος* (this rendered by Hesychius himself as *ἀνδροφόνος*). Finally cf. Eustathius ad *Odysseam* 367, p. 1851.42 sqq.

To conclude on the Eleian invocation, this is then how it should read:

*ἐλθεῖν Ἡρω Διόνυσε
ἄλιον ἐς ναὸν
ἀγνὸν σὺν Χαρίτεσσιν
ἐς βωμὸν τῷ βοέῳ ποδὶ θύων.
Ἄξιόταυρε!
Ἄξιόταυρε!*

The singular importance of the invocation of the Elian women lies in the fact that we possess an unmistakable ritualistic testimony to the God-Beast, the Divine Bull. We can thus draw freely on poetic and other usages of the cultic fact, arrogantly unmindful of the moribund vociferations of those who would class their inconvenience or prurience as a religious improvement of one sort or another.

Δ

There was an aboriginal Lenaeon god, whose cult was associated with wine and its transformations from grape juice to full liquor. The character of his worship was consonant to the ebriety caused by wine: from mirthfulness to ecstatic delirium, from joviality to rough scoffing

(τὰ ἐξ ἀμάξης seem to belong also at least to the Lenaean festivities)²⁸ and from expressive movement to maenadic dancing (see the Lenäervasen), the god let loose (λύσιος) tongue, mind and body. This was also a beast-god, the Holy Bull, the divine archetype of a powerful animal marked by the ambivalence of pliable tameness and uncontrollable rage. Wine and bull: symbols of a quite productive power that can be raised to terrible heights of intensity. At the limit of extreme manifestation the beneficial productivity inherent in every power becomes harmful and destructive; and the genial serenity of awe is turned into horror.

The horror of eating raw flesh (ὠμοφαγία) was an essential part of the sanctifying rites to Zagreus, the Mystic-Orphic Dionysus. Clemens Alexandrinus testifies to the connection of omophagy, Dionysian frenzy, and the sacredness of the phallic serpent; *Protrepticus*, 12, 2: Διόνυσον μαινόλην ὀργιάζουσι βάκχοι ὠμοφαγία τὴν ἱερομανίαν ἄγοντες, καὶ τελίσκουσι τὰς κρεονομίας τῶν φόνων ἀνεστεμμένοι τοῖς ὄφεσιν, ἐπολολύζοντες Εὐάν, ... καὶ σημείον ὀργίων βακχικῶν ὄφεις ἐστὶ τετελεσμένος. More full evidence comes from much older sources. The chorus in Euripides' *Cretans* proclaims their pure life (ἀγνὸν βίον), in particular their strict observance of various taboos including the prohibition of animal food, after having undergone three ritual transformations: a) they have become initiates of Zeus Idaeus; b) they have performed the mystic rites of raw flesh-eating as attendants of the nocturnal wanderer, Zagreus; and c) they have raised the sacred torches in the Couretic (Corybantic) rituals to the Mountainous Mother. As a result they are now true bacchoi, they are sanctified as saints (ὄσιωθεῖς). *Κρήτες* Fr. 79.9-20 Austin pp. 51-2:

ἀγνὸν δὲ βίον τείνομεν ἐξ οὐ
 Διὸς Ἰδαίου μύστης γενόμεν
 καὶ νυκτιπόλου Ζαγρέως βούτης (Diels correction as βούτας,
 προ βροντᾶς)
 τὰς (Bergk deleting the transmitted τὰς [τ']) ὠμοφάγους δαίτας
 τελέσας
 μητρὶ τ' ὀρέα δάδας ἀνασχῶν
 μετὰ Κουρήτων
 βάκχος ἐκλήθη ὄσιωθεῖς.

πάλλευκα δ' ἔχων εἴματα φεύγω
 γένεσίν τε βροτῶν < >
 καὶ νεκροθήκαις οὐ χριμπτόμενος
 τὴν ἐμφύχων
 βρῶσιν ἐδεστῶν πεφύλαγμαι.

(Cf. Euripides, *Bacchae*, 72-83). Congruously (in the above adduced passage), Clemens Alexandrinus, *Protrepticus*, 12, 2: Διόνυσον μαινόλην ὀργιάζουσι βάκχοι ὠμοφαγία τὴν ἱερομανίαν ἄγοντες, καὶ τελίσκουσι τὰς κρεονομίας τῶν φόνων ἀνεστεμμένοι τοῖς ὄφεισιν, ἐπολολύζοντες Εὐάν etc. To be a bacchus and to act bacchicly was essential to Dionysian worship; cf. Herodotus IV, 79: Σκύθαι δὲ τοῦ βακχεύειν πέρι Ἑλλησι ὀνειδίζουσι· οὐ γὰρ φασι εἰκὸς εἶναι θεὸν ἐξευρίσκειν τοῦτον, ὅστις μαινέσθαι ἐνάγει ἀνθρώπους. The divine frenzy is of the substance of such worship. Ὠμοφάγιον was a terminus technicus in Dionysian worship; cf. a Milesian inscription LSAM 48.2-3: ὠμοφάγιον ἐμβαλεῖν... [ἢ ἰέ]ρεια ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ἐμβάλη...; and 48.2-3: μὴ ἐξεῖναι ὠμοφάγιον ἐμβαλεῖν μηθεὶ πρότερον [ἢ ἰέ]ρεια ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ἐμβάλη. The worshippers did what the god by his nature was doing; in Lesbos there was a Dionysus ὠμηστής (eater of raw flesh), Alcaeus Fr. 129.9 Voigt. Dosiadas confirms the religious practice of human sacrifice to Dionysus (Fr.Gr.H. 458 F7). In fact Clemens Alexandrinus who mentions Dosiadas' testimony reports also on Anticleides' evidence that in the Cretan Lyctus there was a similar rite to Zeus, Clement, *Protr.* 3, 42, 5 (= Eusebius, *Preparatio Evangelica*, IV, 16, 12): Λυκτίους γὰρ Κρητῶν δὲ ἔθνος εἰσὶν οὗτοι - Ἀντικλείδης ἐν Νόστοις (Fr.Gr.H. 140F7) ἀποφαίνεται ἀνθρώπους ἀποσφάττει τῷ Διὶ· καὶ Λεσβίου Διονύσῳ τὴν ὁμοίαν προσάγειν θυσίαν Δωσικάδης λέγει (loc.cit.). The Cretan connection is all-important in view of Euripides' *Κρήτες*. In Chios and Tenedos, the human sacrifice to Dionysus Ὠμάδιος was not made in the customary way (by σφαγή), but by tearing apart the victim (διασπῶντες); Porphyry *de abstinentia*, II 55: ἔθνον δὲ καὶ ἐν Χίῳ τῷ Ὠμαδίῳ Διονύσῳ ἀνθρωπον διασπῶντες, καὶ ἐν Τενέδῳ, ὡς φησὶν Εὐέλπις ὁ Καρύστιος (cf. Eusebius, *P.E.* IV, 16, 5).

Further, Βούτης, a herdsman (Aeschylus, *Prometheus* 568; Euripides, *Andromache* 280) is equivalent to the βουκόλος met above. The worshipper is in attendance of the divine Beast, the Bull-

Dionysus. Here we see the perfect correspondence of the God-Bull presiding over the rituals of raw flesh-eating - sacrificing and eating of what? Preeminently and characteristically a bull. So we learn (again) that in Crete the worshippers, during a special trieteric ritual, ate a live bull with their bare teeth; Firmicus Maternus, *De errore prof. rel.* VI, 5 (p. 16.23 Ziegler): *vivum laniant dentibus taurum*. The bull torn apart constitutes the symbolic presence of the God himself dismembered by the Titans. Firmicus Maternus clearly inscribes the Cretan rite into the framework of the Zagreus story (although he colours that story with naïve decorations), VI, 1-5 (pp. 15.6-17.6 Ziegler). In fact he reports that the bull sacrifice took place in the context of what the divine child suffered in the hands of the Titans; p. 16.19 sqq.: *Cretenses ut furentis tyranni (sc. Zeus, Dionysus' father who was inconsolate at his son's fate, there is Euhemerism in Firmicus' relation) saevitiam mitigarent, festos funeris dies statuunt, et annum sacrum trieterica consecratione componunt, omnia per ordinem facientes quae puer moriens aut fecit aut passus est. Vivum laniant dentibus taurum etc.* That the God (and precisely the God as Zagreus) was the ultimate sacrificial victim appears also from a curious rite in Tenedos, the little island where there prevailed the cult of Dionysus the Raw-Eater. So Aelianus, *De natura animalium*, XII, 34 p. 310.23-28 Hercher: *Τενέδιοι δὲ τῷ ἀνθρωπορραίστη Διονύσῳ (a variant epithet to Ὠμάδιος, making the human sacrifice explicit) τρέφουσι κύουσαν βοῦν, τεκοῦσαν δὲ ἄρα αὐτὴν οἶα δήπου λεχῶ θεραπεύουσι, τὸ δὲ ἀρτιγενὲς βρέφος καταθύουσι ὑποδήσαντες κοθόρνους. ὃ γε μὴν πατάξας αὐτὸ τῷ πελέκει λίθοις βάλλεται δημοσίᾳ, καὶ ἔσται ἐπὶ τὴν θάλατταν φεύγει.* The *κόθορνοι* make the young ox symbolically Dionysus. His mother is tended as a woman who has just given birth (*λεχῶ*). And the people throw stones at the sacrificer, who has to escape to the sea (as Dionysus did when pursued by Lucurgus).

The *ὠμοφαγίαι* are coupled with *διασπασμοί* in Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum*, 14, 417C. In the Orphic hymn 30 to Dionysus we find the epitheton *Ὠμάδιος* (5), together with the descriptive adjectives that make Dionysus horned and bull-like (*δικέρωτα*, 3; *ταυρωπόν*, 4); we also see him explicitly identified with the mystic Dionysus, i.e. Zagreus:

6. *Εὐβουλεῦ, πολύβουλε, Διὸς καὶ Περσεφονείης
ἀρρήτοις λέκτροισι τεκνωθείς* etc.

Zagreus διασπασμοί is an essential part of Orphism. The god torn apart was the Wine-God of inebriation and divine frenzy. The Scholia to Clement, *Protrepticus* I, 2 on ληναῖζοντας observe: ληναῖζοντας· ἀγροικικὴ ὠδὴ ἐπὶ τῷ ληνῷ ἀδομένη, ἣ καὶ αὐτὴ περιείχεν τὸν Διονύσου σπαραγμόν. The shedding of the grape's sap in the wine-press is symbolically associated to the shedding of Zagreus' blood at his dismemberment at the hands of the Titans. (To object that grapes are not torn asunder as Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*², p. 35 n. 2 is naïve). Ληνός, the wine-press is indeed the mangling-place of the grapes, just as λῆναι become thus the manglers or tearers of the God (G.W. Elderkin, *Archaeological Papers* V, 1943). Ληνός was also appositely a burial coffin, as well as, generally, a large chest. The multiple evidence from the cultus shows that the story must have been primeval. And so the Orphic Zagreus is very early. He certainly goes beyond Onomacritus, despite Pausanias VIII 37, 5: παρὰ δὲ Ὁμήρου Ὀνομάκριτος παραλαβὼν τῶν Τιτάνων τὸ ὄνομα Διονύσω τε συνέθηκαν ὄργια καὶ εἶναι τοὺς Τιτᾶνας τῷ Διονύσω τῶν παθημάτων ἐποίησε αὐτουργούς. In fact, what Pausanias claims here is not that Onomacritus invented the story of Dionysus being torn apart (σπαραγμός), but that he was the one who ascribed the atrocity to the Titans. And indeed this Titanic aboriginal sin is Orphic. Only Orphism and Orphic hexameters pre-existed the Peisistratean codification, just as Homeric poetry pre-existed the Peisistratean recension and collection of the Homeric corpus.

The markedly protracted unalterability of cultus, and the secure foundation this provides to the inner meaning of the symbolism involved, can everywhere be traced, but also here in connection with what is reported in the Euripidean passage from the *Κρῆτες* quoted above. There is significant correspondence between the cultic observances affirmed therein, and the injunctions proclaimed in a sacred law from Smyrna (F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*, No. 84 pp. 186-9).

- | | |
|---|--|
| Euripides, <i>Κρητες</i> Fr. 79
(Austin) | Smyrna Inscription No. 84
Sokolowski |
| 1. v. 16: πάλλευκα δ' ἔχων
εἴματα | v. 10: μηδὲ μελανφάρους προ-
σῖναι (sic) βωμοῖσι ἄνακτ[ος] |
| 2. vv. 16-7: ...φεύγω / γένεσίν τε
βροτῶν <...> | vv. 3-5: τεσσαράκοντα μὲν
ἤματα ἀπ' ἐχθέσεως πεφύλα-
χθε / νηπιάχοιο βρέφους, μὴ
δὴ μήνεμα γένηται, / ἔκτρο-
σιν τε γυναικὸς ὁμοίως ἤματα
τόσσα. |
| 3. v. 18: καὶ νεκροθήκαις οὐ χρι-
μπτόμενος | vv. 6-9: ἦν δέ τιν' οἰκείων
θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα καλύψη, /
εἴργεσθαι μητρὸς τρίτατον
μέρος ἐκ προπύλοιο· / ἦν δ' ἄρ'
ἀπ' ἀλλοτρίων οἴκων τι μί-
σμα γένηται, / ἡλίου τρισ-
σοὺς μῆναι νέκυος φθιμένοιο. |
| 4. vv. 19-20: τὴν ἐμφύχων / βρω-
σιν ἔδεστῶν πεφύλαγμα | vv. 11-5: μηθ' ἀθύτοις θυσίαις
ιερῶν ἐπὶ χίρας ἰάλ[λιν],
/ μηδ' ἐν βακχείοις ὠδὸν ποτὶ
δαῖτα τ[ίθεσθαι], / καὶ κρα-
δίην καρποῦν ἱεροῖς βωμοῖς
[...]/ ἦδὲ ὄσμοῦ τ' ἀπέχεσθαι,
ὄν δη[.....]/ ἐχθροτάτην ρίζαν
κυάμων ἐκ σπέ[ρματος..] /
Τειτάνων προλέγειν μύσταις
[.....] |
| 5. | v. 17: καὶ καλάμοισι κροτεῖν οὐ
θέσ[μῖόν ἐστιν...] / ἤμασι οἷς
μύσται θυσί[ας.....] |
| 6. | v. 19: [μηδ]ὲ φορεῖν συ[.....] |

1. Wearing white garments is also a Pythagorean trait; Diogenes Laertius VIII 19; 33; Iamblichus, *De vita Pythagorica*, 100; 149; 153; 155; cf. Herodotus II 81; Diodorus X, 9, 6.

2 and 3. Birth and death, as mighty manifestations of natural processes, were sacred and impure simultaneously. For their status in connection with cultic sanctity v. Diogenes Laertius VIII, 33 (for the Pythagoreans): *τὴν δὲ ἀγνείαν εἶναι διὰ καθαρμῶν καὶ λουτρῶν καὶ περιρραντηρίων καὶ διὰ τοῦ αὐτὸν καθαρῆσαι ἀπὸ τε κήδους καὶ λεχοῦς καὶ μιάσματος παντός* etc. Cf. Iamblichus *V.P.* 153. These Pythagorean taboos were also observed by superstitious common people, Theophrastus, *Χαρακτῆρες*, XVI (περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας), 9: *καὶ οὔτε ἐπιβῆναι μνήματι οὔτ' ἐπὶ νεκρὸν οὔτ' ἐπὶ λεχῶ ἐλθεῖν ἐθέλησαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ μιάνεσθαι συμφέρον αὐτῷ φῆσαι εἶναι*. When the Athenians purified Delos they decreed that no one should die or give birth on the island, Thucydides III.104.2: *θῆκαι ὅσαι ἦσαν τῶν τεθνεώτων ἐν Δήλῳ πάσας ἀνεῖλον, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν προείπον μήτε ἐναποθνήσκειν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ μήτε ἐντίκτειν*. Cf. Euripides, *Alcestis* 22 (Apollo leaves the palace when the queen is almost dead *μὴ μιάσμα μ' ἐν δόμοις κίχῃ*). The combination of strict sanctity with the quintessential pollution, human killing, is eloquently displayed in the cultus of Artemis Tauropolos, Euripides, *Iph. in Taur.* 381 sqq.:

ἦτις (sc. Ἄρτεμις) βροτῶν μὲν ἢ τις ἀίηται φόνου,
ἦ καὶ λοχείας ἢ νεκροῦ θίγη χερσῶν,
βωμῶν ἀπείργει, μυσσάρων ὡς ἡγουμένη,
αὐτὴ δὲ θυσίαις ἥδεται βροτοκτόνοισι.

The taboo was widespread. For example at Hierapolis in Syria entrance to the temple of Astarte was forbidden to anyone who had seen a corpse (Lucianus, *Dea Syria*, 53). The Pythagorean prohibitory injunctions (the *καθαρμοί*) were mostly taken over from mystery cults and initiatory rites, as Alexander Polyhistor remarks at the very end of his account; Diogenes Laertius VIII, 33: *τὴν δὲ ἀγνείαν εἶναι... καὶ διὰ τοῦ αὐτὸν καθαρῆσαι... καὶ ἀπέχεσθαι... καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὧν παρακαλεῦνται καὶ οἱ τὰς τελετὰς ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐπιτελοῦντες*. Similarly Iamblichus *V.P.* 138: *ἔστι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀποταγμάτων τὰ πολλὰ* (most of the Pythagorean taboos) *ἐκ τελετῶν εἰσηγμένα*. We also see extensive concordances with the Eleusinian cathartic ritual;

Porphry, *De abstinentia* IV, 16: παραγγέλλεται γὰρ καὶ Ἐλευσίνοι ἀπέχεσθαι... καὶ κνάμων... καὶ ἐπ' ἴσης μεμίανται τό τε λεχοῦς ἄψασθαι καὶ τὸ θνησειδίων. θνησειδία are animal corpses, including here human ones, so that ἄψασθαι θνησειδίων would mean both touching a dead body and eating animal food. Θνησειδία properly are (already) dead bodies. So that a prohibition of eating the flesh of θνησειδία would be tantamount to a taboo on eating the flesh of an animal that is not slaughtered on the spot (in sacrifice), with its blood pouring out.

4. v. 11 of the Smyrna inscription posits a difficult problem of interpretation. The ἄθυτοι θυσίαι were the slaughter of animals instead of proper sacrificial killing? Or are they sacrifices of living beings tout court, i.e. impermissible offerings? In the latter case we have the total taboo on animal food more usually associated with Pythagoreanism. But an objection (not yet overwhelming; for v. Aelianus, *Varia Historia*, IV, 17: προσέττατε δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς Πυθαγόρας καρδίας ἀπέχεσθαι καὶ ἀλεκτρύονος λευκοῦ καὶ τῶν θνησειδίων παντὸς μᾶλλον) to this construal is provided by the special mention of the heart, and the prohibition of its offering (v. 13). The ἄθυστα ἱερά (animals slaughtered in a non-sacrificial context or perhaps again illicit sacrifices?) of Semonides Fr. 7.56 West is not exactly parallel: in the inscription we have a doubly emphatic μηθ' ἀθύτοις θυσίαις ἱερῶν ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἰάλλειν. Nevertheless, the sense seems to be improper sacrifices, so that we do not have an absolute taboo on animal eating, something that is also attested with the Pythagoreans, obviously on the part of a less severe sect of them. One reported case of restricted carnal prohibition is eating oviparous animals; cf. Diogenes Laertius loc.cit. (VIII 33): ἀπέχεσθαι ὠῶν καὶ τῶν ὠσοτόκων ζώων. Another case is the testimony that (some of) the Pythagoreans were tasting flesh as participants in an animal (proper) sacrifice; Porphry, *De abstinentia*, I 26 (Heracleides Ponticus Fr. 40 Wehrli): ἱστοροῦσι δὲ τινες καὶ αὐτοὺς ἄπτεσθαι τῶν ἐμφύχων τοὺς Πυθαγορείους, ὅτε θύοιεν θεοῖς.

We have in the inscription a series of other food taboos besides this partial prohibition of flesh eating. The egg taboo is Orphic; Plutarch, *Quaestionum Convivalium*, II, 3, 1 (635E): ...ἐνέχεσθαι δόγμασιν Ὀρφικοῖς ἢ Πυθαγορικοῖς, καὶ τὸ ὠόν, ὥσπερ ἔνιοι καρδίαν καὶ ἐγκέφαλον, ἀρχὴν ἡγούμενος γενέσεως ἀφοσιοῦσθαι. The taboo relates to the cosmic significance of the Ovum in Orphism; *ibid.* 2

(636D-E): τὸν Ὀρφικὸν καὶ ἱερὸν λόγον, ὃς οὐκ ὄρνιθος μόνον τὸ ὦδὸν ἀποφαίνειν πρεσβύτερον, ἀλλὰ καὶ συλλαβῶν ἅπασαν αὐτῷ τὴν ἀπάντων ὁμοῦ πρεσβυγένειαν ἀνατίθησι. καὶ τᾶλλα μὲν «εὖστομα κείσθω» καθ' Ἡρόδοτον· ἔστι γὰρ μυστικώτερα· ζῶων δὲ πολλὰς φύσεις τοῦ κόσμου περιέχοντος, οὐδὲν ὡς εἰπεῖν γένος ἄμοιρον ἔστι τῆς ἐξ ὦδὸς γενέσεως· ...ἔθεν οὐκ ἄπο τρόπου τοῖς περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ὀργασμοῖς ὡς μίμημα τοῦ τὰ πάντα γεννῶντος καὶ περιέχοντος ἐν ἑαυτῷ συγκαθωσίωται.

The taboo on heart has to do principally with the various sacred accounts on what befell Zagreus' heart when he was torn apart by the Titans.

Ὁσμὸς is tantalizing. It probably refers to the leguminous plant that is also mentioned by Dioscorides (II, 147; III, 131) as *ὄσμάς* or *ὄνοσμα* (perhaps the modern Greek *διόσμος*?). Some with less probability have thought of the smells and odorous vapours arising after eating fava-beans (*κύαμοι*).

The *κύαμοι* appear next in the inscription in an incomplete context. The taboo on beans goes back to Eleusinian and Orphic origins; Pausanias I, 37, 4: ...*ναός*... *Κυαμίτου*· σαφές δὲ οὐδὲν ἔχω λέγειν εἴτε πρῶτος *κύαμους* ἔσπειρεν οὗτος εἴτε τινα ἐπεφήμισαν ἥρωα, τι τῶν *κύαμων* ἀνενεγκεῖν οὐκ ἔστι σφίσιν ἐς *Δήμητρα* τὴν εὔρεσιν. ὅστις δὲ ἤδη τελετὴν Ἐλευσίνι εἶδεν ἢ τὰ καλούμενα Ὀρφικὰ ἐπελέξατο, οἶδεν ὃ λέγω. Besides being Orphic-Eleusinian, the taboo was Pythagorean as well (as we should expect it, from the totality of our evidence in general and on grounds of the pregnant Herodotean disclosure at II 81 in particular). So the learned poet, scholar and literateur Callimachus, Fr. 553 Pfeiffer:

καὶ *κύαμων* ἄπο χεῖρας ἔχειν, ἀνιῶντος ἐδεστοῦ,
κῆγῶ, Πυθαγόρης ὡς ἐκέλευε, λέγω.

(That beans are noxious food represents a negative valuational attitude which as will be seen only simplistically captures the essence of the case, and if emphatic, distorts it). The taboo was also Egyptian (Herodotus II, 37, 5).

The polyvalent symbolism of the beans (cf. Iamblichus *V.P.*, 109: καὶ «*κύαμων ἀπέχου*» διὰ πολλὰς ἱεράς τε καὶ φυσικὰς καὶ εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν ἀνηκούσας αἰτίας; cf. *infra*) endowed them with sacred power

(just as in the case of birth and death). A mighty Orphic symbolism is explained by Heracleides Ponticus Fr. 41 Wehrli: ὁ δὲ Ποντικός Ἡρακλείδης φησίν, ὡς εἴτις τὸν κύαμον ἐν καινῇ θήκῃ ἐμβαλὼν ἀποκρύψει τῇ κόπρῳ ἐπὶ τεσσαράκοντα πάσας ἡμέρας, εἰς ὅψιν ἀνθρώπου σεσαρκωμένου μεταβαλόντα τὸν κύαμον εὐρήσει, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὸν ποιητὴν φάναί·

ἶσον τοι κύαμους τε φαγεῖν κεφαλᾶς τε τοκῶν.

By burying the bean (θήκη = coffin, tomb, grave), a fully fleshed human appears after forty days, the interval required for the intense fermentation of the new wine; but also the period of gestation of the human embryo required for its first significant articulation in the case of the male offspring. So Aristotle, *Historia Animalium*, H, 3. The formative movement occurs 40 days after conception for the male embryo; 583b3-5: ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἀρρένων ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ ἐν τῷ δεξιῷ μᾶλλον περὶ τὰς τεσσαράκοντα γίνεταί ἡ κίνησις. This is the start of articulation of an up to then undifferentiated fleshy mass; 583b10-2: περὶ δὲ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον καὶ σχίζεται (i.e. is differentiated) τὸ κύημα· τὸν δ' ἔμπροσθεν ἀναρθρον συνέστηκε κρεῶδες. If a 40 days old aborted embryo is taken and appropriately treated (put in cold water and then scratched and cut so as to remove its enclosing membrane) then one can observe the basic articulation of human being; 583b15-21: τὸ μὲν οὖν ἄρρεν ὅταν ἐξέλθῃ τεσσαρακοσταῖον, εἰ μὲν εἰς ἄλλο τι ἀφῆ τις, διαχεῖται τε καὶ ἀφανίζεται, εἰ δ' εἰς ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ, συνίσταται οἶον ἐν ὑμένι· τούτου (sc. τοῦ ὑμένος) δὲ διακνισθέντος φαίνεται τὸ ἔμβρυον τὸ μέγεθος ἡλικὸν μύρμηξ τῶν μεγάλων, τὰ τε μέλη δῆλα, τὰ τ' ἄλλα πάντα καὶ τὸ αἰδοῖον, καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ζώων μέγιστοι. In the case of the female embryo this happens in the 90th day; 583b21-4: τὸ δὲ θῆλυ, ὅ,τι μὲν ἂν διαφθαρή ἐντὸς τῶν τριῶν μηνῶν, ἀδιάρθρωτον ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ φαίνεται· ὅ,τι δ' ἂν ἐπιλάβῃ τοῦ τετάρτου μηνός, γίνεταί ἐσχισμένον (differentiated) καὶ διὰ τεχνῶν λαμβάνει τῆν ἄλλην διάρθρωσιν. Accordingly, we have the corresponding report of what happens if one buries within a vase and into the earth a mature flower of a bean for 90 days; only now it is a child's head ("the same as eating parental head") that one finds after this interval in the vase, or a pudendum muliebre, as a result of the bean-flower

transformation. Porphyry, *De vita Pythagorica*, 44: εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀνθοῦντος ἐν τῷ βλαστάειν τοῦ κυάμου λαβὼν τις περκάζοντος τοῦ ἄνθους βραχὺ ἐνθείη ἀγγείῳ κεραμεῷ καὶ ἐπίθημα ἐπιθείς ἐν τῇ γῆ κατορύξειεν καὶ ἐννεήκοντα παραφυλάξειεν ἡμέρας μετὰ τὸ κατορυχθῆναι, εἶτα μετὰ ταῦτα ὀρύξας λάβοι καὶ ἀφέλοι τὸ πῶμα, εὖροι ἂν ἀντὶ τοῦ κυάμου ἢ παιδὸς κεφαλὴν συνεστῶσαν ἢ γυναικὸς αἰδοῖον. The genetic symbolism of the bean is well complemented by another report there loc.cit.: εἰ γάρ τις διατραγῶν κύαμον καὶ τοῖς ὁδοῦσι λεάνας ἐν ἀλέα τῆς τοῦ ἡλίου βολῆς καταθείη πρὸς ὀλίγον, εἴτ' ἀποστὰς ἐπανέλθοι μετ' οὐ πολὺ, εὖροι ἂν ὀδωδότα ἀνθρωπέου γόνου, smells like human semen. There is a metaphysical cause given there for these facts: that in the beginning of the world-formation, the same deliquescence of conflated parts in earth gave rise to both man and bean: ἱστοροῦσι δ' αὐτὸν (sc. Pythagoras) ἀπαγορεύειν τὸ τοιοῦτο ὅτι τῆς πρώτης τῶν ὄλων ἀρχῆς καὶ γενέσεως ταρattoμένης καὶ πολλῶν ἅμα συνηγεγμένων καὶ συσπειρομένων καὶ συσσηπομένων ἐν τῇ γῆ κατ' ὀλίγον γένεσις καὶ διάκρισις συνέστη ζώων τε ὁμοῦ γεννωμένων καὶ φυτῶν ἀναδιδόμενων, τότε δὴ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς σηπεδόνος ἀνθρώπους συστήναι καὶ κύαμον βλαστῆσαι. This account of origins is Orphic (κατὰ Ἱερώνυμον καὶ Ἑλλάνικον), with an Empedoclean hue. It explains also occult elective sympathies among very different things. Iohannes Lydus mentions as his source for these stories (which he relates verbatim) Antonius Diogenes ἐν τρισδεκάτῃ τῶν ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἀπίστων - not the best source. But Antonius would preserve such exquisite lore. Besides, the learned Hippolytus (*Elenchus omnium heresium*, I, 2, 14) ascribes the source of this Pythagorean lore to Zoroaster. The account is expressed in an almost identical way evidencing a common source: κυάμους δὲ λέγεται παραγγέλλειν μὴ ἐσθίειν (sc. Pythagoras), αἰτία τοῦ τὸν Ζαράταν (= Zoroaster) εἰρηκέναι κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ σύγκρισιν τῶν πάντων συνισταμένης τῆς γῆς ἔτι καὶ συνσεσημμένης γενέσθαι τὸν κύαμον. τούτου δὲ τεκμηρίον φησιν, ... (there follows the report on the semen-like smell of beans chewed and then exposed to the sun). σαφέστερον δὲ εἶναι καὶ ἕτερον παράδειγμα λέγει· εἰ ἀνθοῦντος τοῦ κυάμου λαβόντες τὸν κύαμον καὶ τὸ ἄνθος... (now the other report follows on the burying of the bean within a χύτρα in the earth, upon which, in a few days) ἴδοιμεν <ἂν> αὐτὸ εἶδος ἔχον τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὡς αἰσχύνην γυναικός

(*puerum muliebre*), μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα κατανοούμενον παιδίου κεφαλὴν συμπεφυκυῖαν. I wonder whether this παιδίου κεφαλὴ might not be the βάλανος of a puerile male membrum thus repeating the Baubonic spectacle in the bean! Be this as it may, another sign of the generative symbolism of beans comes from pointed allusions in the names of things. Thus we learn that the first swelling of the paps at puberty was called κύαμος. Pollux, 2, 163: ὁ δὲ περὶ τῆς θηλῆς μελαινώμενος κύκλος φῶς (sc. καλεῖται), ἢ δὲ πρώτη τοῦ γάλακτος ὑπ' αὐτῷ πῆξις κύαμος. And more explicitly Eustathius, Scholia in Iliadem I 219 p. 749.24: ...καὶ ἡ θηλή τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ μαστοῦ, οὗ φασὶν ἢ πρώτη ἐν τῷ ἡβάσκειν αὔξεισις κύαμος λέγεται. Cf. Rufus, *Onomast.* 92. Does that swelling resemble the bean?

The ποιητής in the Heracleides testimony is Orphic (Kern, OF, 291 p. 301). In view of the conjunction of the verse quoted with the Empedoclean B141 DK (δειλοί, πάνδειλοι, κνάμων ἄπο χεῖρας ἔχουσαι) in *Geoponica* II 35, 8, one may ascribe the hexameter in question to the Empedoclean *Καθαρμοί* as well. The symbolic generative power of the beans illustrated by Heracleides' relation is manifested in the Orphic mystic assimilation of them to the pudenda; Aristotle Fr. 180 (V. Rose, *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus*) = *Περὶ τῶν Πυθαγορείων* Fr. 5 Ross: φησὶν δ' Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῷ περὶ Πυθαγορείων περὶ τῶν κνάμων παραγγέλλειν αὐτὸν ἀπέχουσαι τῶν κνάμων ἦτοι ὅτι αἰδοίοις εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι etc. The kidney-like shape of the bean resembles that of the testicles and ovaries, especially in their embryonic development. And this testicular shape also represents the bent position of the embryo in the womb; Aristotle, *op.cit.* H, 7, 586a35-b4: σχῆμα δ' ἔχει ἐν τῇ ὑστέρα... καὶ ἄνθρωπος συγκεκαμμένος ρίνα μὲν μεταξὺ τῶν γονάτων ἔχει, ὀφθαλμοὺς δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς γόνασιν, ὧτα δ' ἐκτός. This is also the position used for burials to represent the foetal return. Furthermore, there were in fact some more knowledgeable interpreters who construed the similarity in shape observed by Aristotle between fava beans and pudenda to a symbolic identity of the two, especially in explaining the Empedoclean taboo in his *Καθαρμοί*: δειλοί, πάνδειλοι, κνάμων ἄπο χεῖρας ἔχουσαι (B141 DK). Given that Aristoxenus maintained that Pythagoras was particularly prone to eat beans for their beneficial intestinal influence (Fr. 25 Wehrli), he is probably to be credited with the account reported by Aulus Gellius of how such a false opinion about

the Pythagorean practice in this particular case came to prevail (which is indeed the natural reading of Gellius). This is the account; Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, IV, 11, 9-10: videtur autem de *κνάμῳ* non esitato causam erroris fuisse, quia in Empedocli carmine (one Empedoclean poem is presupposed here!), qui disciplinas Pythagorae secutus est, versus hic invenitur:

δειλοί, πάνδειλοι, κνάμων ἄπο χεῖρας ἔχεσθαι.

Opinate enim sunt plerique *κνάμους* legumentum dici, ut a vulgo dicitur. Sed qui diligentius scitiusque carmina Empedocli arbitrati sunt, *κνάμους* hoc in loco testiculos significare dicunt, eosque more Pythagorae aperte atque symbolice *κνάμους* appellatos, quod sint *αἵτιοι τοῦ κνεῖν* et geniturae humanae vim praebant; idcircoque Empedoclen versu isto non a fabulo edendo, sed a rei veneriae prolubio voluisse homines deducere. Whatever the merits of this symbolic signification (and I think it is basically correct) it does not show that the taboo did not exist; rather to the contrary, it testifies to the existence of the prohibition. Some sect afterwards interpreted the injunction spiritually no doubt, i.e. as not binding in its material dimension. But this is clearly a later attitude.

In his account of the symbolism of the bean taboo, Aristotle adds (just after mentioning the similarity to the pudendum) a similarity to the Gates of Hades; loc.cit. *παραγγέλλειν* (sc. Pythagoras) *ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν κνάμων ἥτοι ὅτι αἰδοίοις εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι· ἢ ὅτι Ἰδαίου πύλαις ἀγόνατον γὰρ μόνον*. The Gates of Hades are the pudenda muliebria through which the souls of the dead re-enter the world. This is manifestly indicated by an *ἱερὸς λόγος*, a sacred explanation why the Orphic (and Pythagorean) taboo on beans equates eating them to tasting parental head. Scholia (T) on *Ilias* N 589 (also Eustathius, p. 948.24 sqq.): *οἱ δὲ ἱερὸν λόγον φασίν· «ἰσὸν τοι κνάμους τε φαγεῖν κεφαλᾶς τε τοκήων»* (OF 291) *διὰ τὸ*

*ψυχῆς αἰζῶν βάσιν ἔμμεναι ἢδ' ἀναβαθμὸν
ἐξ Αἴδαο δόμων, ὅταν ἀγὰς εἰσανίωσιν.*

(= Thesleff, *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*, p. 199.19). The female womb represents Hades, the Cosmic Womb.

There is a difficulty in the Pythic explanation offered from Aristotle as to why the bean resembles the Gates of Hades (Diogenes Laertius VIII, 34): ἀγόνατον γὰρ μόνον. Scaliger despaired emending to ἄγονον. He might have in mind what Clemens Alexandrinus reports (Stromata III, 24, 2-3 p. 207.1-4 Stählin): (Pythagoras prohibited the beans' use) μᾶλλον δὲ τι κύαμοι ἐσθιόμενοι ἀτόκους ἐργάζονται τὰς γυναικάς. Θεόφραστος γοῦν ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ τῶν Φυσικῶν αἰτίων (*De caus. plant.* V 15, 1) τὰ κελύφη τῶν κῦαμων περὶ τὰς ρίζας τῶν νεοφύτων δένδρων περιτιθέμενα ξηραίνειν τὰ φυόμενα ἱστορεῖ, καὶ αἱ κατοικίδιοι δὲ ὄρνιθες συνεχῶς ταῦτα σιτούμενοι ἄτοκοι γίνονται (cf. *Geoponica* (Didymos) II 35, 1 and 5). But on the other hand, it is related that beans fertilise the earth where they are sown; Pliny, op.cit. §210: solum, in quo sata est, laetificat stercoris vice. We have to do with the customary potency of the opposites for this symbol of Dionysian power. But evidently the solution to the problem is explicitly given by Porphyry, *De antro nympharum*, 19 (as Delatte noted): καὶ κῦαμοις οὐκ ἐφιζάνουσι (sc. αἱ μέλισσαι, the bees), οὓς ἐλάμβανον εἰς σύμβολον τῆς κατ' εὐθείαν γενέσεως καὶ ἀκαμποῦς (i.e. progression without return in Neoplatonic parlance) διὰ τὸ μόνους σχεδὸν τῶν σπερματικῶν δι' ὅλον τετρήσθαι, μὴ ἐγκοπτομένους ταῖς μετὰ τῶν γονάτων ἐμφράξεσι. The stalk (rather than the seed-vessel, cf. Pliny's observation infra) of the bean, almost alone of all leguminous plants, is completely bored through, without division bars or stoppages at the joints. So it is ἀγόνατον, jointless, one continuous vessel pierced all along. So Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* XVIII, 12 (30) §122: ni genicula abessent, molli calamo similis (sc. scapus favae).

It all fits nicely together. Furthermore, the beans symbolize the divine unity of creativity and destructiveness signified by the Heraclitean dictum about the identity of Dionysus and Hades in the person of Zagreus; and they carry a similar ambivalence to that of the God. They are generative in character, but also particularly apt to the realm of the dead and for mortuary rites. V. Lucian, *Mort. dial.* 20, 3; the heroic dead celebrate their victory in Hades by boiling and eating beans, Lucian, *Vera historia* II, 24. Varro mentioned that the souls of the dead were believed to reside in beans (cf. supra) and lugubrious letters on their leaves; Pliny *Nat. Hist.* XVIII §§118-9: (eating of beans is condemned), ut alii (from Pythagoras) tradidere, quoniam mortuorum animae sint in ea, qua de causa parentando utique

adsumitur. This seems to imply that they were to be used only in connection with mortuary rites. Pliny goes on to invoke Varro's authority: Varro et ob haec flaminem ea non vesci tradit et quoniam in flore eius litterae lugubres reperiantur. The beans were also used in a peculiar mode of divination: in eadem peculiaris religio, namque fabam utique ex frugibus referre mos est auspici causa, quae ideo referiva appellatur (cf. Festus, 344L). Verrius Flaccus (Festus, 77L) confirms and amplifies: Fabam nec tangere nec nominare Diali flamini licet, quod ea putatur ad mortuos pertinere. nam et Lemuralibus iacitur larvis et Parentalibus adhibetur sacrificiis et in flore eius luctus litterae apparere videntur. V. Ovid, *Fasti*, V 427 sqq. on the rites of the Lemuria:

.....
 435 Cumque manus puras fontana perluit unda,
 vertitur, et nigras accipit ore fabas,
 aversusque iacit. sed dum iacit, haec ego mitto,
 his, inquit, redimo meque meosque fabis.
 hoc novies dicit, nec respicit. umbra putatur
 colligere et nullo terga vidento sequi.
 rursus aquam tangit, Temesaeaque concrepat aera,
 et rogat, ut tectis exeat umbra suis.
 cum dixit novies, manes exite paterni,
 respicit et pure sacra peracta putat.

But again, in dialectical opposition to its mortuary character, the bean has the symbolic potency of the sap of life, blood. (Pseudo)Acronis scholia velustiora in Horatii *Sermones* II, 6, 63: Pythagoras fabam quoque animal esse dicebat, quod cocta sanguinis humorem ex se emitteret. And: Pythagoras philosophus ab omnibus animalibus abstinens, etiam faba abstinuit, quod viridis in pyxide aerea diutius servata vertatur in sanguinem. (Or in an attenuated formulation *ibid.*: Pythagoras legumen omne negaverat comedendum, praecipue fabam velut parentem coluerat; nam colorem eius dicebat veluti humano sanguine infectum. The milder statement as to the bean-blood connection is counterbalanced by the extreme view that Pythagoras enjoined abstention from all leguminous fruits). The strong idea expressed in the first lemma that the bean is a kind of animal, stands as an explanation of the association of the respective

taboos against beans and (ultimately human) flesh; Porphyry, V.P. §43: ἴσα δὲ κνάμων παρήγει (sc. Pythagoras) ἀπέχεσθαι καθάπερ ἀνθρωπίνων σαρκῶν. Ioannes Lydus reports a Roman practice of eating beans in March, Mars month; and a Roman ritual to paint each other faces with a bean-solution in Martial worship; IV 42 (p. 99.9-14): πάντες δὲ κατὰ τὸν Μάρτιον τροφήν τὴν ἐκ κνάμων ἐλάμβανον. Ἄρεος δὲ ὁ κύαμος, παρὰ τὸ κύειν αἷμα· ἔχριόν τε τὰς ἀλλήλων ὄψεις ἀντὶ αἵματος τὸ χρίσμα τοῦ κνάμου λαμβάνοντες, ταύτη γε τὸν Ἄρεα θεραπεύοντες. The Martial association of the beans refers to the destructive aspect of their symbolism. In the symbolic etymology offered we find combined the generative (κύω+blood, the liquid of life) with the destructive (shedding of blood, killing, Mars) moments in the Bean-Meaning.

The religious and metaphysical, creative and destructive, always chthonic symbolism of the beans was accompanied by physico-psychical representations in their symbolic meaning. A primary characteristic in this dimension was the spiritual potency of the bean, conceived physically as windy nature, also as flatulence disturbing digestion in the ventricular organs and causing turbulent sleep and tumultuous dreams; Diogenes Laertius VIII, 24: τῶν δὲ κνάμων ἀπηγόρευεν ἀπέχεσθαι (sc. Pythagoras) διὰ τὸ πνευματώδεις ὄντας μάλιστα μετέχειν τοῦ ψυχικοῦ· καὶ ἄλλως κοσμιωτέρας ἀπεργάζεσθαι, μὴ παραληθθέντας, τὰς γαστέρας καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὰς καθ' ὕπνου φαντασίας λείας καὶ ἀταράχους ἀποτελεῖν. Beans were also reputed to be an aphrodisiac; Ioannes Lydus, *De mensibus*, IV 42 (p. 99.14-7 Wunsch): ὅτι ὁ Πυθαγόρας πάνυ τὸν κύαμον ἀπεστρέφετο· διαφερόντως γὰρ παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους καρποὺς διεγείρει τὰ σώματα πρὸς συνουσίαν ἐσθιόμενος, καὶ ταύτη καθέλκει τὰς ψυχὰς ἐπὶ τὴν γένεσιν. Pliny testifies to the same with Diogenes Laertius' effect; *Hist. Nat.* VIII, 30 (12) §118: Quin et prisco ritu fabata suae religionis diis in sacro est, praevalens pulmentari cibo et hebetare sensus existimata, insomnia quoque facere, ab haec Pythagoricae sententiae damnata est. This dulling effect on the senses of the relish is part of a general cordial bluntness caused by it; *Geoponica* (Didymus), II, 35, 3: οἱ δὲ φυσικοὶ φασι τοὺς κνάμους ἀμβλύνειν τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἐσθιόντων αὐτοῦς. διὸ καὶ ἐμποδίζειν ταῖς εὐθυνοιρίαις νομίζονται, εἰσὶ γὰρ πνευματώδεις. Οἱ φυσικοὶ in this context are primarily the physicians and medical writers. Cf. e.g. Hippocrates, *Περὶ Διαι-*

της Β, 45, 1: κύαμοι τρόφιμόν τι καὶ στατικόν καὶ φυσῶδες· φυσῶδες μὲν ὅτι οὐ δέχονται οἱ πόροι τὴν τροφήν ἀλέα ἐπιούσαν· στάσιμον δὲ ὅτι ὀλίγην ἔχει τὴν ὑποστάθμην τῆς τροφῆς. For other passages from medical treatises to the same effect v. notes ad loc. *Geoponica* ed. Niclas. Cf. Artemidorus, *Oneirocriticon*, I, 68. A compendium on their nutritive qualities and effects when eaten is provided in the work of the Byzantine writer Simeon Seth, *Syntagma de alimentorum facultatibus*, lemma *περὶ φαβάτων*, pp. 113-5 Langkavel. The beans create a tension in the entire body caused by their flatulence: *φυσῶδες δὲ ἔδεσμά εἰσι καὶ αἴσθησιν παρέχουσι τοῖς πάσχουσι τάσεως τινος ὑπὸ πνεύματος καθ' ὅλον τὸ σῶμα καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν ἀήθης τις τούτων μεταλάβῃ* (p. 113.16-9). They inspire the lower belly: *τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ὀσπρίων τὰ ἄνω μᾶλλον τῆς γαστρὸς μέρη ἐμπνευματούντων, οὗτοι μᾶλλον τὰ κάτω* (p. 114.5-7). We learn that it is the later physicians that considered the beans bad-tempered and unwholesome, adducing the fact that they supply an appropriate matrix for the generation of all sorts of bugs and other little animals: *οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι κακοχύμους τούτους ἐδόξασαν, στοχασάμενοι τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ ἀπογεννᾶσθαι ἐν αὐτοῖς ζυῦφια, αἰεὶ γενομένων τῶν τοιούτων ἐκ σήψεως καὶ ἐκ κοπρίας καὶ ρυπωδῶν ὑγροτήτων* (p. 114.11-4). This is a negative reading of the same potency that we saw above hailed in the Orphic context as making the beans symbols of the original world-creation out of primeval slime and rottenness. It is further claimed that their effects on man do not come only through the digestive tract, but their insalubrious consequences can be felt through living in a place full of these plants and breathing the accordingly affected air: *διῶχυρίζονται δὲ οἱ τῆς δόξης ταύτης προϊστάμενοι, ὡς οὐ μόνον μεταλαμβάνόμενοι θολοῦσι τὸν λογισμὸν οἱ κύαμοι ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀμβλύνουσι τῶν ἀναστρεφόμενων διηνεκῶς, ἐν ᾧ τόπω πλήθός ἐστι τῶν φερόντων τούτους φυτῶν, ὡς ἀτμῶν μοχθηρῶν καὶ σχεδὸν λοιμωδῶν ἀναδιδομένων ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ μολυνόντων τὸν περίξ ἀέρα, ὃς διηνεκῶς εἰσπνεόμενος μετατρέπει τὴν τοῦ ἐγκεφάλου κρᾶσιν, ἧς μετατρεπομένης καὶ αἱ λογικαὶ δυνάμεις ἀμβλύνονται* (p. 114.15-24). A general mental obtuseness and psychic darkening is ascribed to them. Which extends to the dormant condition and the sort of dreams one has under their nefarious influence. Such being one set of reasons for which the Pythagoreans abstained from their eating; while it is recognized that

different kinds of explanations had been offered for this taboo: λέγουσι δὲ καὶ ὡς διὰ τὸ κακόχυμον ὄνειρους παραχῶδεις ἐργάζονται καὶ οὐκ ἀληθεῖς, καὶ ὡς διὰ τὰς τοιαύτας αἰτίας οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι τούτων ἀπείχοντο, εἰ καὶ διαφόρους ἀπέδωσαν αἰτίας τῆς ἀποχῆς αὐτῶν (pp. 114.24-115.2). In fact our sources notice and repeat the fact of the multi-dynamism inherent in the bean-taboo, a result of the multiple symbolism of the bean. Cf. also the Anonymous in Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 249 p. 439a 24-31 (Bekker): ὅτι οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι τῶν ἐμψύχων ἀπείχοντο, τὴν μετεμψύχωσιν ἀφρόνως (the Patriarch's comment) ὡς ἀληθῆ ὑπολαμβάνοντες, καὶ ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν βρωμάτων παχύνει τὸν νοῦν, τροφιμώτερα ὄντα καὶ πολλὴν ἀνάδοσιν ποιοῦντα. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τοῦ κνάμου ἀπείχοντο, ὅτι φυσώδης καὶ τροφιμώτατος. καὶ ἄλλας δὲ τινὰς αἰτίας πλείους ἀποδιδόασιν, αἷ αὐτοὺς ἐνῆγον ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν κνάμων. Further on the multiplicity of the reasons cf. Apollonius, *Hist. memor.* 46; some expressed their preference for one single explanation e.g. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, III, 24, 1-3 (pp. 206.20-207.5 Stählin) an erroneous and modern attitude that misses the whole point of sacred symbolism. The basic digestive qualities of the beans are that they are stopping (non-laxative) and flatulent. They consequently cause perturbation of soul and mind; Cidero, *De divinatione*, I, 30, §62: iubet igitur Plato sic ad somnum proficisci corporibus adfectis ut nihil sit quod errorem animis perturbationemque adferat. Ex quo etiam Pythagoriis interdictum putatur ne faba vescerentur, quod habet inflationem magnam is cibis tranquillitati mentis quaerenti vera contrariam. (Cf. on this Ciceronian passage Aulus Gellius, *Noctae Atticae*, 4, 11, 3-4). The turbulence interfering with the eater's sleep makes the beans unsuitable for divination through dreams; Plutarch, *Quaestionum Convivialium* VIII, 10, 1.

Aristotle mentioned also as a reason for the Pythagorean taboo on beans the fact that ἡ ὅτι φθείρει (D.L. VIII, 34). This destructive potency of the beans seems particularly to refer to their alleged capacity to cause sterility in women, maybe by aborting (φθείρειν) their conception. V. Clement, *Stromata*, *loc.cit.* (p. 207.1 St.): μᾶλλον δὲ ὅτι κνάμοι ἐσθιόμενοι ἀτόκους ἐργάζονται τὰς γυναῖκας (the explanation preferred by Clement). Another consideration was the beans' destructive efficacy (φθορά) against the trees (esp. young ones) in whose roots their pods were put; Clement *loc.cit.*, with reference to

Theophrastus, *De causis plantarum*, V, 15, 1: ...καὶ ὅσα παραβαλλόμενα παρὰ τὰς ρίζας αὐαίνει, καθάπερ τὰ τῶν κνάμων κελύφη καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο τοιοῦτον ἕτερον (this and similar effects are called *φθοραί* by Theophrastus). Cf. Apollonius, *Mirab.* 46. Iamblichus brings that destructive quality under two heads, destructive of divine communication and of divine divination; *Protrepticus*, 21, 37: τὸ δὲ κνάμων ἀπέχου συμβουλεύει φυλάττεσθε πᾶν ὅσον ἐστὶ φθαρτικὸν τῆς πρὸς θεοὺς ὀμιλίας καὶ τῆς θείας μαντικῆς. Intercourse with gods is inhibited as a result of eating beans because of their physical flatulent potency and turbulent effects on mind and body.

The symbolism of the destructive potency of the beans should not of course be taken negatively. It is the reverse side of a powerful coin whose obverse manifests creative might. The proper human attitude to both aspects is awe. Lucian, in his burlesque piece *Vitarum auctio*, preserves the true spirit of Pythagoreanism in the midst of his ridicule and scoffing. The taboo does not mean that one loathes them; on the contrary they are sacred and of a wonderful nature. So *op.cit.* 6:

ΠΥΘΑΓΟΡΑΣ. ἐμφυχῆϊον μὲν οὐδὲ ἐν σιτέομαι, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα πλὴν κνάμων.

ΑΓΟΡΑΣΤΗΣ. τίνος ἔνεκα; ἢ μυσάττη τοὺς κνάμους;

ΠΥΘΑΓΟΡΑΣ. οὐκ· ἀλλὰ ἱροὶ εἰσι καὶ θαυμαστὴ αὐτῶν ἢ φύσις· πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ τὸ πᾶν γονή εἰσι καὶ ἦν ἀποδύσης κνάμον ἔτι χλωρὸν ἔοντα, ὅψει τοῖσι ἀνδρῆϊοισι μορίοισι ἐμφερέα τὴν φυήν· εἴσηθέντα δὲ ἦν ἀφῆς ἐς τὴν σεληναίην νυξὶ μεμετρημένῃσι, αἰμώδεα ποιήσεις.

Two main points are made by Pythagoras. First, if you take the skin off the fresh bean, the form resembles that of the virile member. It has been seen that it allegedly is similar to the shape of pudenda muliebria; which both forms together make up Baubo's type. Secondly, there is the beans transformation (after an appropriate preparation) into a blood-like substance. (A third reason adduced by Pythagoras was not primary, but superadded later not without reason; although it is jestingly given pride of place by Lucian: that Athenian democracy used beans for their lottery in the magistrates' appointments: τὸ δὲ μέζον, Ἀθηναίοισι νόμος κνάμοισι τὰς ἀρχὰς αἰρέεσθαι. (Cf. Plutarch, *De liberis educandis* 17 p. 12F: «κνάμων ἀπέχεσθαι», ὅτι

οὐ δεῖ πολιτεύεσθαι etc.; Hippolytus, *Elenchos*, ΣΤ, 27). This interpretation is also testified by Aristotle; as the last symbolism in his enumeration, he explained: ἢ ὅτι ὀλιγαρχικόν· κληροῦνται γοῦν αὐτοῖς (sc. τοῖς κνάμοις). The taboo in this sense represents an oligarchic manifesto against lot-democracy.

Ever-present was, however, an ambivalence in the valuation of things tabooed. The beans are in one account associated with the Saturnian era, when allegedly bread was made from them, as agriculture proper had not yet appeared, nor was its need felt. Scholia (T) in Il. N 589, p. 513.49-51 and Eustathius, Comm. in Iliadem N 589 p. 948.25: οἱ δέ φασιν ὅτι ἐπὶ Κρόνου ἄρτος ἐξ αὐτῶν (sc. τῶν κνάμων) ἐγίνετο τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ὕστερον δὲ μὴ γεύεσθαι αὐτῶν ἐπετράπη, ἵνα μηδὲ μνημὴ τοῦ Κρόνου φυλάττοιτο (presumably because of Zeus' tyranny, at least initially). It is memorable, but expectable, that Aristotle's fragment gives all principal dimensions of the symbolic meaning in this connection. To repeat it (*Περὶ τῶν Πυθαγορείων* fr. 5 Ross p. 134): φησὶ δ' Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν Πυθαγορείων περὶ τῶν κνάμων παραγγέλλειν αὐτὸν (sc. Pythagoras) ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν κνάμων ἥτοι (1) ὅτι αἰδοίοις εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι· ἢ (2) ὅτι Ἄδου πύλαις (ἀγόνατον γὰρ μόνον)· ἢ (3) ὅτι φθείρει· ἢ (4) ὅτι τῇ τοῦ ὄλου φύσει ὅμοιον· ἢ (5) ὅτι ὀλιγαρχικόν (κληροῦνται γοῦν αὐτοῖς). Items (1) to (3) and (5) have been analysed above. (4) may refer to the association with Orphic accounts of world-creation (like the one κατὰ Ἱερώνυμον καὶ Ἑλλάνικον), as has been observed above; or to some such similar community in significant character between beans and *Κόσμος*, on which magic and symbolism work. Something appears to escape us, some significant detail. Compare what is reported, again on Aristotelian testimony (v. D.L. VIII 36), on the symbolic meaning of the precept ἄρτον μὴ καταγνύειν, do not break the bread. After some other explanations, we learn that some (οἱ δέ) interpreted it ἐπεὶ ἀπὸ τούτου (sc. τοῦ ἄρτου) ἄρχεται τὸ ὄλον. This goes much further than the reference to the Saturnian bread from beans mentioned above. Delatte (*La vie de Pythagore*, p. 132) appositely refers to Empedocles B34DK, in fact an Aristotelian quotation (*Meteorologica* Δ4.381b31): τὸ γὰρ ὕγρον τῷ ξηρῷ αἴτιον τοῦ ὀρίζεσθαι καὶ ἐκάτερον ἐκατέρῳ οἶον κόλλα γίνεσθαι, ὥσπερ καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐποίησεν ἐν τοῖς Φυσικοῖς·

ἄλφитον ὕδατι κολλήσας...

Flour mixed with water is the substance of bread. And it is taken to represent the cosmic interplay between the dry and the wet as principles conjugatively determining the existence of things.

Plutarch, *Aetia Romana*, 95 ascribes the same polyvalence of the beans to all leguminous products: they are erebal and symbols of forgetfulness (of the *λήθη θανάτου*) as in the case of the *λάθυρον* and *ἐρέβινθος* (supposedly also indicated on etymological grounds); they are mortuary (*πρὸς τὰ περιίδειπα καὶ τὰς προκλήσεις τῶν νεκρῶν μάλιστα χρῶνται τοῖς ὀσπρίοις*); they are flatulent and with large sediment in digestion which leads away from mental sanctity and corporeal purity; they incline to sexual coition because of their flatulence and windiness (*καὶ πρὸς συνουσίαν παρορμᾶ διὰ τὸ φυσῶδες καὶ πνευματικόν*).

The Smyrna inscription is damaged and mutilated. There are more taboos in it of uncertain content. It is not allowed to make noise (or play music) with reeds (or reed-instruments?): *καλάμοισι κροτεῖν οὐ θέσ[μὸν ἐστίν...]*. *Καλάμη* might more likely perhaps here refer to the stalk of wheat-corn, as in Callimachus, *Hymn to Demeter*, 19: *ὡς καλάμαν τε καὶ ἱερά δράγματα πράτα ἀσταχύων ἀπέκοψε...* One should not bring in (the sanctuary or the worship) something unknown: *[μηδ]ὲ φορεῖν συ[.....]*.

The identical purifications and taboos of the Smyrna inscription and of the Euripidean chorus are part of the mystic worship of Dionysus Zagreus. The mention of the Titans in the inscription (v. 16), albeit in an unclear context, shows that this Dionysus and these rituals and symbols related to the Titanic incident in the life of the Divine Child, his dismemberment in their hands. In another inscription from Teos (of the first century B.C.) there are reported honours decreed by the society of the Dionysiasts (v. 51) to the priestess of Dionysus Hediste (= The Most Pleasurable). We read there, in an unfortunately damaged context, (SEG IV 598.19-20 = Dionisismo B10.19-20 Scapri (*Le Religioni dei Misteri* vol. I pp. 253-4)): *...καὶ ὄργια [π]αντὸς ἱερο[ῦ] τοῦ Διονύσου κατοικομένου ἔτους [... κατοικομένου* has to go with *Διονύσου*, as it is inappropriately related to either *ἱεροῦ* or *ἔτους*. This then is the Dying God, next to be Resurrected. (On the theme of dying gods v. Philodemus, *De pietate*, 44, 45b, 46b (pp. 16-8 G); Aeschylus Fr. *260 Radt). The principle of life is the principle of death, just as we have seen in detail the

symbolism of life and death to coalesce in the tabooed beans. This deity is the Divine Beast, the Bull-God. (The initiates of Euripides' *Κρήτες* are Tenders βούται, βουκόλοι of the God. And they have partaken in the holy rites of omophagy in representation of Zagreus dismemberment). This is also the Wine-God and the Raving-God, from whom we started this inquiry. We have a number of symbolic dimensions bound together in the mystic image of a Mild-Wild Wine-Bull, giver of Life and Death himself Dying and Rising, Custodian of Generation and Destruction. The Heracleitean Hades-Dionysus fits perfectly into the essence of this God, as does - remarkably - the only occurrence of Dionysus in the Homeric corpus. In the story of Lycurgus the enemy of the God (*Ilias* VI 130-40), Dionysus is a young child as he still has his nurses (τιθήνας v. 132) and he panics and flees to Thetis, terror-stricken on Lycurgus' onslaught (...Διώνυσος δὲ φοβηθεὶς / δύσεθ' ἄλδος κατὰ κύμα, Θέτις δ' ὑπεδέξατο κόλπῳ / δειδιότα· κρατερὸς γὰρ ἔχε τρόμος ἀνδρὸς ὀμοκλή, vv. 135-7); he is described by the divine epithet frenzied, μαινόμενος (μαινόμενοιο Διόνυσοιο v. 132); while the weapon of Lycurgus in his attack on the God and his nutrices is βουπλήξ (v. 135), the ox-goad! There is also mention of the mythical Nysa, where the incident takes place, located in Thrace rather than in exotic Arabia. The main components are here already. Zagreus is primeval.

E

By the side of this Dionysus Antiquus, who is Dionysus the Newcomer and what does he signify that is not already present in the symbolism of the Older One? It appears nothing.

The Semelean Dionysus of Euripides' *Bacchae* (vv. 1 sqq.: *Ἦκω Διὸς παῖς τήνδε Θηβαίων χθόνα / Διώνυσος, ὃν τίκτει ποθ' ἢ Κάδμου κόρη / Σεμέλη* etc.) has all the symbolic attributes and potencies of the older Bacchus-Zagreus. He causes ecstatic behaviour, to the remotest limits, the tearing apart (διασπασμός) of Pentheus by maenads. He is wild of appearance and even theriomorphic; vv. 99 sqq.:

ἔτεκεν (sc. Zeus) δ', ἀνίκα Μοῖραι
τέλεσαν, ταυρόκερων θεὸν
στεφάνωσέν τε δρακόντων

στεφάνοις, ἔνθεν ἄγραν θη-
ροτρόφον μαινάδες ἀμφι-
βάλλονται πλοκάμοις.

In fact the entire choral hymn to Dionysus (*Διόνυσον ὑμνήσω*, v. 71) in *Bacchae* 64-167 loudly bespeaks the identity of old and new Dionysus. The correspondence between this hymn and the fragment from *Κρήτες* is closest. Beatus (*μάκαρ* v. 72) is he who having been initiated (*τελετὰς θεῶν εἰδώς* v. 73) leads a pure life (*βιοτὰν ἀγιστεύει* v. 74) participating in mystic thiasos (*θιασεύεται ψυχάν* v. 75) and being an active bacchos up in the mountains (*ἐν ὄρεσσι βακχεύων* v. 76) by sanctifying purifications (*ὄσίοις καθαρμοῖσιν* v. 77), observing the sacred rites of the Great Mother Cybele (*τά τε ματρὸς μεγάλας ὄργια Κυβέλας θεμιτεύων* vv. 78-90). So in *Κρήτες*: *ἀγνὸν δὲ βίον τείνομεν... μύστης γενόμην... μητρὶ τ' ὄρεϊα... βάκχος ἐκλήθη ὄσωθείς*. This blessed saint is a tender of Zagreus (*Ζαργρέως βούτης*) in *Κρήτες*, a servant of Dionysus (*Διόνυσον θεραπεύει* v. 82) in *Bacchae*. The torches (*δᾶδες*) of the *Κρήτες* fragment is here what Dionysus himself holds in his hand: *ὁ Βακχεὺς ἀνέχων / πυρσώδη φλόγα πεύκας* (vv. 145-6). The *Κουρήτες* of the *Κρήτες* now become *Κορύβαντες* (v. 125). They are made to have invented the drum (*βυρσότονον κύκλωμα* v. 124) the main musical organ that together with the flute (*Φρυγίων/αὐλῶν* vv. 127-8) was used to induce or accompany orgiastic bacchic dancing (cf. the locus classicus, Aeschylus Fr. 57 Radt, where again the flute, the cymbals and the drum - *ταυρόφθογγοι δ' ὑπομυκῶνται / ποθεν ἐξ ἀφανοῦς φοβεροὶ μῖμοι, / τυπάνου δ' εἰκὼν ὥσθ' ὑπογαίου / βροντῆς φέρεται βαρυνταρβῆς* create and signal the ecstatic situation). Crete is brought into the picture here as the place where the invention of the drum was made by the Kouretes (vv. 122-4), the land of Crete is hailed as the birthplace of Zeus (*ζάθεοί τε Κρήτας / Διογενέτορες ἔναυλοι*, vv. 121-2) and Zeus *Κρηταγενής* himself is invoked as the one reared by the Kouretes in a (subterranean) cave (*θαλάμευμα Κουρήτων* v. 120; *θαλάμευμα* from *θαλαμείω*, keep (to protect) in a *θαλάμη*, is passive and not equivalent to *θαλάμη*, contrary to the vulgate understanding); which all point to the initiation into the mystic worship of the Idaean Zeus (*Διὸς Ἰδαίου μύστης γενόμην*) in the *Κρήτες* fragment.

Euripides is indeed stretching things in trying to cope with the circumstance of the Semelean, Theban birth of his Dionysus in the Bacchae amidst so many pointers to Crete: the connection is made overtly to reside in the fact that the Kouretes invented the drum in Crete - a tenuous relationship. There are however some other indices of significant convergence. First, omophagy is mentioned (*ὠμοφάγιον χάριν*, v. 139). Secondly, Dionysus *ἀγρεύων* (v. 137; cf. *ὁ γὰρ ἄναξ ἀγρεύς* v. 1193) points to Zagreus, the mysteric (Orphic-Eleusinian) Dionysus. Thirdly, the sacred playful strains of the sacred sonorous pipeflute (*λωτὸς ὅταν εὐκέλαδος / ἱερὸς ἱερὰ παίγματα βρέμῃ* vv. 160-4) recall the mysteric Eleusinian symbol proclaiming *ἱερὸν ἔτεκε πότνια κοῦρον Βριμῶ Βριμόν* (Hippolytus *Ref. Omn. Her.* 3,8,40 = 3[B8] Colli). And fourthly, *αἶμα τραγοκτόνον* (v. 138) brings to mind the *ἔριφος* (*ἐς γάλα ἔπετον*) of some Orphic gold plates (IIB1.10 and IIB2.4 Carratelli)²⁹.

There is no distinction of an essential character to be drawn between the old, mysteric Dionysus and the young Semelean one for Euripides (*Κρηῆτες, Βάκχες*). Nor is the case any different for Sophocles. In the famous chorus from *Antigone* (vv. 1115-1152) the mysteric Eleusinian god (Dionysus-Iacchus) is identified with the Semelean offspring from Thebes. He is *Καδμείας ἄγαλμα νύμφας* (= *Σεμέλης*), his mother Semele is thunderstruck (*ματρὶ σὺν κεραυνία*, v. 1139), his residence is in Thebes, the metropolis of bacchic worship (*ὦ Βακχεῦ, / Βακχᾶν ματρόπολιν Θήβαν / ναιετῶν*, vv. 1121-3, the city honoured most by him (*τὰν*, sc. Thebes, *ἐκ πασᾶν τιμᾶς / ὑπερτάταν πόλεων*, vv. 1138-9). Simultaneously, he rules over the common-to-all bosom of the Eleusinian Demeter (*μέδεις δὲ / παγκόνοις Ἐλευσινίας / Δηοῦς ἐν κόλποις* vv. 1119-21), he is the mysteric Iacchus (*αἶ σε... χορεύουσι τὸν ταμίαν Ἴακχον*, vv. 1151-2). Bosom, *ἐν κόλποις*, alludes also to the Cereal Womb where a Baubic Iacchus (Clemens Alexandrinus) or pusio (Arnobius) is lurking, as well as signifying the Thriasian fields which team with throngs of initiates at the Eleusinian mystery celebrations, or Demeter's all-accepting lap³⁰. The *μολεῖν καθαρσίῳ ποδί* (v. 1144) parallels the Eleian invocation *ἐλθεῖν... τῷ βοέῳ ποδί θύων*. Divine madness and rage in nocturnal rites of ecstatic dances is a characteristic trait of the God's female especially followers, vv. 1150-2:

... σαῖς ἄμα περιπόλοις
 Θυίαισιν, αἶ σε μαινόμεναι πάννηχοι
 χορεύουσι τὸν ταμίαν Ἰακχον.

We find associated here another factor in the unitary Dionysian symbolism. The God is invoked as Lord of the Fire-breathing Stars, *πῦρ πνειόντων / χόραγ' ἄστρων* (vv. 1146-7). Why so? Correctly the scholia ad loc. observe: *χοραγέ· τὸν χορὸν ἄγων· ἢ τῶν ἄστρων χορηγέ· κατὰ γάρ τινα μυστικὸν λόγον τῶν ἀστέρων ἐστὶ χορηγός*. We should not thus be content, here as elsewhere, with a mere metaphor indicating nature's exulting celebration on a mighty divine presence. The clue to the inner symbolism (*μυστικὸς λόγος*) is provided by Menander, *Rhetor.* ix. 329: (Apollo as Sun identified with Dionysus is thus addressed) *πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ χώραν καὶ πᾶν ἔθνος διέπεις καὶ καθάπερ τὸν οὐρανὸν περιχορεύεις ἔχων περὶ σεαυτὸν τοὺς χοροὺς τῶν ἄστρων*. In Macrobius, *Saturnalia* I, 18, 22, the identity of Dionysus with the Sun is ascribed to Orphism: item Orpheus, *Liberum atque Solem unum esse deum eundemque demonstrans* etc. (he continues by explaining the hieratic bacchic vestment as an image of the cosmic lordship of the Sun, citing OF 238; cf. also OF 236). And immediately afterwards (§23): *hinc et Vergilius sciens Liberum patrem solem esse et Cererem lunam* etc. There was a Greek poetic precedence to these identifications as is hinted in Macrobius, *op. cit.*, I, 24, 3. (Evangelus there protest at Praetextatus' use of Vergil as testimony for all religious arcana that he exposed; he specifically suggests that *Liber et alma Ceres* (*Georgica* I, 7) for the Sun and the Moon is imitation of an older - Greek - poet)³¹.

Homer (Z 133) associates Dionysus with Nysa. The context suggests the coastline of Thrace as the location of the Lycurgan chase of the divine prize. The scholia ad loc. suggest specifically the Edonean vicinity of Mount Pangaion (*Δρύαντος· Ἡδωνῶν τῶν πρὸς Παγγαίῳ βασιλεύς*), thus pointing in an Orphic direction, within Homer. On *Νυσήϊον* (v. 133), the sch. wisely observe: *ἐν διαφόροις τόποις ἱστοροῦσι τὰ περὶ Νύσαν· ἄμεινον δὲ τὰ περὶ Θράκην ἀκούειν καὶ κατὰ Σαμοθράκην δύνειν τὸν Διόνυσον* (as Homer relates), *ἐνθα καὶ Θέτις διῆγε «μεσσηγὺς <δὲ> Σάμου τε καὶ Ἰμβρου παιπαλοέσσης»* (Ω 78). The Homeric Hymn I, 8-9 places Nysa as a mountain south

of Phoenice, near Egypt (perhaps near and to the east of Nile, if *Αἰγύπτιοιο ροάων* signifies the great river). The learned Antimachus (fr. 70 = 127W) and some other poets opted for an Arabian Nysa (allocating there the Homeric incident), not necessarily different from the one close to Egypt. So Diodorus III, 64; cf. 63. Nysa is also the place where Dionysus grew up in a cave according to the Homeric Hymn XXVI, 5. Stephanus Byzantius sub v. lists ten places called Nysa; Hesychius s.v. fifteen.

Sophocles also confirms this association of Dionysus with Nysa, speaking of the *βούκερως* *Ἰακχος*, obviously the mystic Dionysus or Zagreus. Fr. Fabul. Incert. 874 N2:

ὄθεν κατείδον τὴν βεβακχιωμένην
βροτοῖσι κλεινὴν Νῦσαν, ἣν ὁ βούκερως
Ἰακχος αὐτῷ μαῖαν ἡδίστην νέμει etc.

Strabo (XV, 6 p. 687, the source for this fragment, mentions it in immediate juxtaposition to the Homeric *Ilias* and Euripidean *Bacchae*, 13 sqq. passages. In Homer the telestic Dionysus of the divine raving ecstasis is already indicated by the standing attribute *μαινόμενιο Διωνύσοιο*. The Nysean Dionysus is the old Dionysus of the Athenian Limnae and the festival of Anthesteria, Aristophanes, *Ranae*, 215-8:

Let us sing the song (*αἰοιδάν*)
ἀν ἀμφὶ Νυσῆϊον
Διὸς Διωνύσσον ἐν
Λίμναισιν ἰαχήσαμεν
ἀνίχ' ὁ κραιπαλόκωμος
τοῖς ἱεροῖσι Χύτροισι
χωρεῖ κατ' ἐμὸν τέμενος λαῶν ὄχλος.

And this Dionysus is (at least aspectually) identified with the mystic Dionysus-Iacchus of the Eleusinian triad Demeter - Kore - Iacchus. For in the mock re-enactment of the mystic ceremonies of Boedronion 20th in the *Ranae*, we find Iacchus invoked, *op. cit.* 313 sqq.:

... καὶ δάδων γέμε
αὔρα τις εἰσέπνευσε μυστικωτάτη...

...

Ἰακχ' ὦ Ἰακχε.

Ἰακχ' ὦ Ἰακχε.

Iacchus is described as acting in the exact manner of a Dionysiac epiphany, 340 sqq.:

ἔγειρε φλογέας λαμπάδας ἐν χερσὶ τινάσσω,
Ἰακχ' ὦ Ἰακχε,
νυκτέρου τελετῆς φωσφόρος ἀστήρ etc.

There follows the triple invocation of the priest and the mystic choir to the Saviouress (*Σώτειρα* = *Κόρη*, vv. 377 sqq.), to Demeter (382 sqq.) and to Iacchus, the adolescent god (*τὸν ὠραῖον θεόν*, vv. 394 sqq.). Iacchus in particular is associated with song, dance, laughter, jest and mirth, and some light lewdness (398-413); v. esp. 403 sqq.:

σὺ γὰρ κατισχύσας ἐπὶ τε γέλωτι (I conjecture, in place of the
transmitted *κατεσχίσω* (or *κατασχίσω*) μὲν ἐπὶ γέλωτι)
κάπ' εὐτελεία τόν τε σανδαλίσκον
καὶ τὸ ράκιον ἐξηῦρες ὥστ'
ἄζημίους παίζειν τε καὶ χορεύειν etc.

Aristophanes turns the practice of the initiate's wearing the same dress and shoes during each year's sacred procession as that of his initiation, to an occasion for fun: the worn out dress would be rent and reveal naked parts of the body of female celebrants. This is the mixture to which the scholiast calls our attention when he observes ad v. 398 sqq.: *μεμιγμένως λέγει τὰ μὲν πρὸς τὸν Ζαγρέα Ἰακχον, τὰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον*. He employs later distinctions of many Dionysuses to account for diverse functions, which basically and initially were integrated and summed up in the character of one Dionysus-Zagreus. Even for the Hellenistic scholar, however, Iacchus is Zagreus. That Dionysus attends with Hercules at the mock ritual where he is worshipped and invoked adds an extra comic dimension to the dramatic action, besides referring to, and illustrating, the original (certainly Homeric) Greek experience of Gods actively

entering (as manifestations of their divine substance) the ordinary world of men. The mystic Iacchus is (also expressed characteristically in) the thunderous cry of the initiates when on the sacred day they invoke in procession *Βρόμιος*, the Roaring One with allusion to the oxen's lowing (Dionysus the Bull). So clearly Euripides, *Palamedes*, Fr. 586 Nauck²: ὄς (sc. Dionysus) ἀν' Ἴδαν / τέρπεται σὺν ματρὶ φίλα / τυμπάνων <ἐπ' > ἰάκχοις. The relevant locus classicus on the invocatory boisterous shout called *μυστικός ἰακχος* is Herodotus VIII, 65, 1-2; 4.

For Pindar (Dithyrambi II = fr. 70b, Maehler) Dionysus as *Βρόμιος* (cf. Euripides, *Bacchae*, 115: *Βρόμιος ὅστις ἄγη θιάσους*), the Bellowing, is revealed by orgiastic music (...*ρόμβοι τυπάνων*, / ἐν δὲ κέχλαδεν κρόταλ(α), vv. 9-10); processions with pine-torches (*αἰθομένα τε / δαῖς ὑπὸ ξανθαῖσι πεύκαις*, vv. 10-11); ecstatic shouts and dances (ἐν δὲ *Ναῖδων ἐρίγδουποι στοναχαί / μανίαι τ' ἀλαλαί τ' ὀρίνεται ριψαύχευι σὺν κλόνω*, vv. 12-14); the fire of the thunderbolt (ἐν δ' ὁ *παγκρατῆς κεραυνὸς ἀμπνέων / πῦρ κεκίνηται*, vv. 15-6). All this explosion of manifest power is described as a Bacchic *τελετή* occurring at the divine palaces, around Zeus' royal sceptre (*οἶαν Βρομίου τελετάν / καὶ παρ σκᾶπτον Διὸς Οὐρανίδα / ἐν μεγάροις ἴσταντι*, vv. 6-8). The divine madness in sound and movement is the prerogative of the Great Mother (i.e. the Cybele, v. Fr. 80 Maehler), as is explicitly stated in our passage: *σεμνῆ μὲν κατάρχει / Ματῆρι παρ μεγάλα ρόμβοι τυπάνων*, / ἐν δὲ κέχλαδεν etc., vv. 8 sqq.). Further, Enyalios' sword (*Ἐνναλίου / ἔγχος*, vv. 16-7), Athena's aegis (which is made to resound by the hissing of all its serpents heads, *ἀλκᾶεσσά τε Παλλάδος αἰγίς / μυρίων φθογγάζεται κλαγγαῖς δρακόντων*, vv. 17-8), and Artemis' lion-driven chariot (*ρίμφα δ' εἰσιν Ἄρτεμις οἰοπολὰς ζεύ- / ξαισ' ἐν ὀργαῖς / Βακχίαις φύλον λεόντων*, vv. 19-21): these symbols (and presences) of the corresponding deities participate also in the divine Bacchanalia. And the God is beguiled by these ravings and wild animal eruptions, ὁ δὲ *κηλείται χορευοίσασι καὶ θηρῶν ἀγέλαις* (vv. 22-3), thereby rendered mild of aspect to his initiates. His exuberance turns saving and creative from consumptive and destructive.

We have all the elements here of the Dionysiac nature. And they are associated with the Theban Dionysus, the son of Semele. This is all but certain in the sequel of this very fragment from the second

Dithyramb. For the talk is there (vv. 26 sqq.) of the marriage of Kadmos and Harmonia, and of their progeny, upon which a lost sentence begins with Dionysus' name at its start, referring to his maternal ancestry. A reference made explicit by Pindar's second Athenian Dithyramb, Fr. 75.9-12 Maehler:

ἐπὶ τὸν κισσοδαῆ θεόν,
τὸν Βρόμιον, τὸν Ἐριβόαν τε βροτοὶ καλέομεν,
γόνον ὑπάτων μὲν πατέρων (sc. Zeus) μελλόμενοι
γυναικῶν τε Καδμειᾶν (Σεμέλην).

Pindar decisively associates the Cereal connection with the Semelean descent of one and the same Dionysus; v. Isthmia VII, 1-5 where Thebes is praised partly on account of her being Dionysus' fatherland, Dionysus the assessor (πάρεδρος) of Demeter: ἦρα χαλκοκρότου πάρεδρον / Δαμάτερος ἀνίκ' εὐρυχαίταν ἀντειλας Διόνυσον. The bronze - sounding Demeter refers to the orgiastic music of the Cybelean Mother of Gods, in further aspectual identifications very frequent esp. in mysteric cults. The conjunction of Dionysus with Demeter points to the Titanic affair, the dismemberment of Zagreus, the aboriginal delict which plagues human destiny. And indeed Pindar testifies to the power of the Orphic eschatology; v. *Olympia* II, 56-77; Fr. 129, 131a, 130, 131b (cf. esp. the salvational mysteric rites in 131a: ὄλβιοι δ' ἅπαντες αἴσα λυσιπόνων τελετᾶν, an Orphic ritual); Fr. 132 is commonly considered spurious on inadequate grounds; for the Titanic abomination on Zagreus, v. fr. 133 (οἴσι δὲ Φερσεφόνα πονιὰν παλαιοῦ πένθεος / δέξεται etc.); and for the Eleusinian connection of the Orphic dimension cf. Fr. 137.

Z

There is one Dionysus in the ancient Greek religious system down to classical times, and this is equally reflected in contemporary poetic and speculative awareness. Congruous is the evidence of the iconographic testimony. Dionysus is among the main deities in early depictions of the Return of Hephaestus theme, which itself emphasises Dionysus' importance (as witnessed by Alcaeus Fr. 349b Voigt: ὥστε θέων μηδ' ἐν Ὀλυμπίῳ / λῦσ(αι) ἄτερ Φέθεν) and relates to Dionysus becoming one of the Celestial Divinities (cf. Antoninus

Liberalis *Narr.*, 7 (8, 38 Förster): ...ἡ δὲ (sc. Ἥρα)... πείθει τοὺς οὐρα-
 νίους θεοὺς ἔνα τῶν οὐρανίων θεῶν καὶ Διόνυσον εἶναι. Cf. Alcaeus
 Fr. 349e Voigt: εἰς τῶν δυοκαιδέκων). Becoming one of the
 Olympian Twelve presupposes Dionysus' marked (daemoniac) chthonicity: it does not primarily connect to a hero's divinisation. Official introduction of Dionysus to Zeus symbolises the Chthonic God's formal acceptance by the Olympian regime (cf. Boston 01.8053 = Carpenter, Plate 12B; Heidelberg 55 = Carpenter Plate 27). The return of Hephaestus is represented on a Middle Corinthian amphoriskos (early 6th century) in Athens (Athens NM. 664). Dionysus is probably depicted as an effeminate figure wearing a cloak with a scale pattern over a long dress. He is following Hephaestus portrayed as a beardless youth with twisted feet, who raises a drinking-horn to his mouth and rides side-saddle on a mule (V. T.H. Carpenter, *Dionysian Imagery in Archaic Greek Art*, Plate 5; cf. pp. 15 sqq., where Carpenter argues unsuccessfully against these identifications). The amphoriskos in Athens is dated before the François vase (cf. Payne, *Necrocorinthia*, p. 142). A Corinthian column krater in London (London B42; Carpenter, *Dionysian Imagery in Archaic Greek Art*, Plate 4B), (coeval to the François vase; cf. Payne *loc. cit.*: at least not later) repeats the basic pattern, although here Hephaestus is bearded and looks back to Dionysus, who is now depicted as a bearded and robed man holding also a drinking-horn. (One foot of the riding figure is probably deformed). A number of early Attic works with similar representations (although Dionysus usually leads the mule instead of following it, and the mule is standardly ithyphallic) testifies to the efflorescence of the theme in contemporary Athens, possibly due to Peisistratean policies. An example is provided by the black-figure neck-amphora in Oxford (c. 560 B.C., Ashmolean 1920.107 = T.H. Carpenter, *op. cit.* Plate 6). Dionysos with an ivy sprig precedes a young Hephaestus on an ithyphallic mule followed by a satyr, while four deities welcome them. In another early (c. 550 B.C.) Lydos column-crater (in New York, Metropolitan Museum 31.11.11 = T.H. Carpenter, *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece*, Fig. 5 = J. Boardman, *Athenian Black Figure Vases*, Fig. 65.1,2) the procession includes dancing satyrs and nymphs with snakes, grapes, wine-skins; the nymphs also wear a panther-skin. (Cf. another Lydos vase, a psykter amphora in London, British Museum B148 = Boardman, *op.*

cit. Fig. 66). On a later (c. 530 B.C.) neck-amphora signed by the potter Nikosthenes we see a display of full orgiastic dancing (in Kansas City, Nelson-Atkins Museum 52-22 = Carpenter, *Art and Myth*, Fig. 8). On a Caeretan hydria (c. 530 B.C.), a young crippled Hephaestus rides a galloping mule toward Dionysus who wears a leopard-skin and holds a kantharos in one hand, a small leopard in the other. A maenad wearing a leopard-skin and holding a snake, and a satyr playing pipes, follow dancing in wild excitement. On the other side, a standing satyr copulates with a naked woman. (In Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum 3577 = J. Boardman, *Early Greek Vase Painting*, Fig. 495.1, 2). Wine, ithyphallicism, hilarity and all other Dionysiac symbols are already present. In a late Corinthian work, a krater from Phlius, couples of ithyphallic satyrs and naked women run to the right behind a named Dionysus (cf. W. Biers, *Excavations at Phlius*, 1924; *The Votive Deposits*, in *Hesperia* 40 (1971), pp. 410-2, pl. 88.36).

In the François vase (Florence 4209; cf. Carpenter, *op. cit.* Plate 4A; J. Boardman, *Athenian Black Figure Vases*, Fig. 46-46.7), Dionysus leads a procession to the left with Hephaestus mounted on an ithyphallic mule, satyrs (named Σιληνοί) and nymphs. They are received by a series of seated waiting deities, with Aphrodite standing facing the procession. The two groups balance each other; Dionysos and Aphrodite are the focal figures defining the centre of the frieze. The Sileni (and the mule) are ithyphallic; one carries a wineskin, another plays double pipes, a third carries a nymph in his arms. After a gap, a nymph wearing a peplos follows, and in sequel another nymph who clashes small cymbals. We have in fact all attendants and articles witnessed by the literary sources. Above the gap the word ΝΥΦΑΙ (sic) appears on the vase, which may be a misspelling for ΝΥΜΦΑΙ. But in Sophilos' depiction of the Wedding of Peleus and Thetis - which exists in two versions, one on a vase in London (London 1971.11-1.30, another one in Athens (Ac. 587) - a group of five women in the London vase (one frontal-faced playing a syrinx, two to the right facing left and two to the left facing right all positioned like a choir) bears the inscription ΜΟΣΑΙ (for Μοῦσαι) and matches the remnants of a similar group in the Acropolis vase (the frontal face and the two to the right are preserved) which carry the inscription ΝΥΣΑΙ. Whether Sophilos' ΜΟΣΑΙ and the other vasepainter's ΝΥΦΑΙ are misprints for ΝΥΣΑΙ or not, the ΝΥΣΑΙ in the Athens vase should not be

explained away as *Νύμφαι*. The nymphs therefore in the previous mentioned examples as well may partly be construed as *Νύσαι*, may be Dionysus' nurses, the nymphs of the Nysa mountain, birthplace of the mystic Dionysus. In Kleitias' depiction of the Marriage of Peleus and Thetis (on the François Vase), Dionysus is accompanied by the three *HOPAI* (Ἑσπέραι) as well as by Chariklo (ΧΑΡΙΚΛΟ, a singular name for the Graces, *Χάριτες*, in all likelihood). The common worship of Dionysus with Charites in Elis (Olympia) has been emphasised above (cf. esp. scholia to Pindar, *Olympia*, V, 5). A common altar to Dionysus and the Charites is attested at Olympia near the sanctuary of Pelops (Pausanias, V, 19, 10); between the sanctuary and that altar there lay altars to the Muses and to the Nymphs (*ibid.*). Cultic realities, literary testimonies and iconographic evidence conspire and converge supplementing each other in reflecting a unique and unified picture of Dionysus in the archaic age. The Dionysus represented in the famous Cypselus chest was shown as a reclining bearded figure, wearing a long chiton, holding a golden drinking vessel in hand, lying in a cave surrounded by vines, apple trees and pomegranate trees (Pausanias, V, 19, 6). Apple is the symbol of Aphrodite, pomegranate of Persephone and vine Dionysus' special manifestation. We see here, also, the decisive congruence of iconographic depiction with literary accounts and religious data. In a representation on a Chalcidian cup by the Phineus painter, the Dionysian symbolism of attributes appears in Nonnian splendour. The chariot of Dionysus is drawn by lions, panthers and stags, accompanied by ithyphallic Sileni. It faces a lion fountainhead over which a vine grows luxuriantly and in front of which a huge crater is located: evidently the fountain is meant to pour wine into the crater. Behind satyrs ambush bathing nymphs: one hairy satyr is portrayed in the act of anal penetration over a bending black-figured nymph. (In Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum 354 = Boardman, *op. cit.* Fig. 479.1, 2; v. esp. E. Simon, *Die Götter der Griechen*³, Fig. 280).

The Nysa reference in the archaic iconography points to the mystic Dionysus. Simultaneously, Dionysus is associated in early vase paintings with *Θυώνη* = *Σεμέλη* (cf. Florence 3790; Carpenter, *op. cit.*, Plate 8A), with no sense of any contradiction or impropriety being involved in this Theban, Semelean origination. The Aphrodite connection is strongly represented (cf. Florence 4209 = Carpenter,

Plate 4A; Athens, Acr. 603a = Carpenter, Plate 9A; perhaps Munich inv. 7739 = Carpenter, Plate 7A). Orgiastic music and dancing by Maenads and Satyrs are also on the scene (cf. Louvre F75 = Carpenter, Plate 7B; Copenhagen inv. 5179 = Carpenter, Plate 19A; Würzburg 265 = Carpenter, Plate 19B; Louvre F36 = Carpenter Plate 24A; Basel Kδ 420 = Carpenter, Plate 24B; Munich 2302 = Carpenter, Plate 26; Boston 01.8052 = Carpenter, Plate 23A). Highly significant is the indication of a maenadic-orgiastic rending apart of an animal on an Amasis vase, Cab. Mid. 222 = Carpenter, Plate 17. Two dancing maenads, embracing each other, one sporting a panther-skin, approach Dionysus holding a hare and a stag. Wine-pressing revelry is drawn in Würzburg 265 = Carpenter, Plate 20A; Basel Kδ 420 = Carpenter Plate 20B. Grape gathering in Boston 63.952 = Carpenter, Plate 21; Cab Mid. 320 = Carpenter, Plate 23B. Ivy as Dionysiac symbol is frequent, as is cantharos, goat or fawn. Ithyphallic beams, like masts, or rather ploughs, with grotesque figures, testify to the chthonicity of the God (Florence 3897 = Carpenter, Plate 22). The carriage of a Dionysus ship (in a pattern similar to that portrayed in the immediately preceding case) is on a fragmentary Ionian amphora from Karnak belonging to the Northampton group (c. 540-530 B.C.; Oxford 1924.264 = I. Boardman, *Early Greek Vase Painting*, Fig. 487.1, 2). A giant, majestic Dionysus is drawn sitting in his ship rowed by satyrs, while others play kithara and double-pipes and still others dance. (In a black-figure Attic amphora c. 510 B.C., Tarquinia, Museo Nazionale = E. Simon, *Die Götter der Griechen*, Fig. 276). The splendid image of the Dionysus ship, with the god alone reclining in it and an overgrown vine heavy with grapes rising along the mast, is the exquisite work of Execias (c. 530 B.C. A phiale in München, Staatliche Antikensammlung = Simon, *op.cit.* Fig. 279). On a skyphos by the Theseus painter, the ship of Dionysus is a festive shipcar (in Athens, Acropolis 1281 = J. Boardman, *Athenian Black Figure Vases*, Fig. 247). Is the ship still another phallic symbol, appropriate to the Sea-Dionysus, as the plough is of the Land-One? The image of an animal rape by a Satyr by the side of a Dionysus mounted on an ithyphallic mule and surrounded by a troupe of maenads and satyrs orgiastically dancing can be seen on an Attic black-figure flat-mouthed oinochoe (in Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum 320 = Boardman, *op. cit.*, Fig. 288). Dionysian sexual exuberance is manifested in a scene of

masturbating satyrs on the neck of an early spherical aryballos signed by Nearchos (in New York, Metropolitan Museum 26.49 = Boardman, *op. cit.* 50). The satyrs carry characteristic inscribed names: *Τερπέκελος* (- *τέρπω*) is the name of the frontal figure, *Ψώλας* (*ΦΣΟΛΑΣ*, - *ψωλή* = *membrum virile praeputio retracto*) that of the right hand satyr, and (probably) *Δόκιος* (*ΔΟΚΙΟΣ*, - *δοκίς* = plank, beam) the name of the lefthand one. Dionysian sadist sexuality is evidenced on a later black figure lekythos by the Beldam Painter (name vase), where a gang of satyrs cruelly torture a woman (in Athens, National Museum 1129 = Boardman, *op. cit.* Fig. 277). A beautiful scene of a young Dionysus holding a kantharos and surrounded by dancing and drinking satyrs is on the splendid name piece, the Northampton Vase (in London, Niarchos, formerly Castle Ashby = Boardman, *op. cit.*, Fig. 485.1, 2). The maenadic condition is powerfully captured by the Brygos painter on the inside of a red-figure on white ground cup: the Maenad is depicted in violent movement, hair flowing, wearing a leopard skin, snake in head, thyrsos in one hand, a leopard in the other. On the outside of the cup Dionysos is portrayed sitting, holding a vine, from which a wine-skin hangs, surrounded by maenads in an orgiastic dance to the sounds of a double-pipe played by a satyr. (In München, *Antikensammlungen* 2645 = J. Boardman, *Athenian Red Figure Vases: The Archaic Period*, Figs. 218 and 256). The Brygos painter has also left us a magnificent icon of Dionysian ecstasis: Dionysus himself is shown entranced playing the lyre with satyrs around him in orgiastic dancing. (In Paris, *Bibliothèque Nationale* 576 = Boardman, *op. cit.*, Fig. 255).

The second birth of Dionysus from Zeus' thigh, where he was put after his immature abortion from Semele's womb, is represented in a unique Attic black-figure neck amphora by the Diosphos Painter (name vase). Zeus with his sceptre is sitting slightly bending forward. He keeps on his thigh a fully grown youth with a beautiful body in reduced dimensions. The boy apparently holds in his raised hands two torches. He is cast as light-bringer, and this is reflected in the name inscribed next to him, *ΔΙΟΣΦΟΣ* *Διόςφως* = *φῶς* *Διός*, the Light of Zeus. Hera (identified by an inscription) stands in front of Zeus, with her right hand extended to Zeus, the fingers patterned as if she was holding something delicate, while her left raises the lower part of her long dress: she seems to be ready to leave. She may be acting the role of

Eileithyia, the divine midwife, the Parturition goddess. *ΚΑΛΟΣ* is written above Zeus. (In Paris, Cabinet des Médailles 219 = J. Boardman, *Athenian Black Figure Vases*, Fig. 272). The moments just preceding the childbirth are probably represented on a belly amphora by the Princeton Painter. (In Princeton, Princeton University Museum 168 = Boardman, *op. cit.*, Fig. 138). Zeus, in an untypically very full shape, (as if to indicate pregnancy) is seated, while two winged figures stand in front and behind him, the one in front black, the other white: a male and female daemonic attendant is probably indicated. The one in front extends his left hand towards Zeus lightly touching his thigh: we may thus think of Eileithyiae, although normally they are generically female. One step behind each winged figure stand two naked youths, the left one with a stunning erection. Round the neck of the amphora an ivy decorative pattern is displayed. Dionysos' birth is very likely meant.

Dionysos as *Διόσφως*, Zeus' Light, is also highly significant as an early testimony to Hippolytus' late report on the Attic Phlyan Mysteries. In Phlya was the seat of mysteries acted in the name of the Great Goddess. Hippolytus V 20: (the sexual import of the Orphic *λεγόμενα* and *δρώμενα* can be observed in these rites) *τετέλεσται δὲ ταῦτα καὶ παραδέδοται ἀνθρώποις πρὸ τῆς Κελεοῦ καὶ Τριπτολέμου καὶ Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης καὶ Διονύσου ἐν Ἐλευσίνι τελετῆς, ἐν Φλοιοῦντι* (sic. cod. But the name of this Attic deme was in classical times *Φλυεῖς*, *Φλύα* or *Φλύεια*; cf. Plutarch, *Themistocles*, I, 4; Pausanias, I, 31, 4; Harpocration; Stephanus Byzantius; Suda; Photius. We should probably emend to *Φλυεῦσι* (or *Φλυᾶ* Schneidewin) here and in the next occurrence of the word, as well as further down in the passage: *τὰ τῆς Μεγάλης Φλυέων* (or *Φλυεῦσιν* or *Φλυῆσιν* Maass) *ὄργια*. Just possibly however an alternative name of the region might have been *Φλυοῦς*, on the analogy of the Peloponnesian *Φλιοῦς*. More probably it is an error of Hippolytus or of the scribe) *τῆς Ἀττικῆς: πρὸ γὰρ τῶν Ἐλευσινίων μυστηρίων ἔστιν ἐν τῇ Φλοιοῦντι <τῆς> λεγομένης Μεγάλης ὄργια*. On the walls of a sacred *παστάς* (cubiculum or porticus, porch, hall or inner room and bed chamber, really a *τελεστήριον*) in the sanctuary of the Great Goddess, there were paintings among which one represented a winged grey-haired old man with erect membrum pursuing a canine woman (*ἔστι δὲ... καὶ πρεσβύτης τις ἐγγεγραμμένος πολὺς πτε-*

ρωτὸς ἐντεταμένην ἔχων τὴν αἰσχύνην, γυναῖκα ἀποφεύγουσαν διώκων κυνοειδῆ). The dog-like face (?) of the woman is enigmatic unless a Hecataean connection is meant to be emphasised. It has been proposed to convert it to κυανοειδῆ (black, or dark blue, coloured), which would fit closely to Hippolytus' interpretation of the wall-painting (*ibid.*): ἔοικε δὲ εἶναι κατὰ τὸν Σηθιανῶν λόγον ὁ φάος ρύεσσης τὸ φῶς, τὸ σκοτεινὸν ὕδωρ δὲ ἡ φικόλα (sic) etc. The name inscribed above the old man was φάος-ρυνέντης (sic *ibid.*, apparently meant to be declined by Hippolytus or his source (Plutarch, probably, in his *Ten Books Against Empedocles*, *ibid.*) as one word, like φαοσ-ρυνέντου if the correction in the second place where it occurs from the (again) φάος ρυνέντης of the codex to φάος ρυνέντου is adopted as the easiest emendation) it is associated by him to the flow of the light: ἐπιγέγραπται δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ πρεσβύτου «φάος-ρυνέντης»... ἔοικε δὲ εἶναι κατὰ τὸν Σηθιανῶν λόγον ὁ φάος-ρυνέντης τὸ φῶς... . τὸ δὲ ὄνομα τοῦ φάος-ρυνέντου τὴν ρύσιν ἄνωθεν τοῦ φωτός, ..., δηλοῖ κάτω. This Φάος-ρυνέντης is in all probability the Phliasian Mystic Dionysus, the Old-Age manifestation of the just born perfect youth Διός-φῶς on the vase-painting. Such an old-age Dionysian manifestation can be aspectually identified furthermore to Dionysus' father, Zeus himself. (Cf. Orphei Hymni 52.6 θεῶν πάτερ ἡδὲ καὶ νιὲ as addressed to Trieteric Dionysus; although here the symbolism relates to the (aspectual) identification of Phanes as divine ulterior ancestor with Dionysus as the latest progeny of the gods, specifically of Zeus, with cosmic royal claims and jurisdiction). Ρυνέντης, if correct, seems to be a substantivised form of the 2nd aorist participle of ρέω, ρυεῖς (as in Plato, *Timaeus*, 84), ρυνέντ-ος. Just possibly, the inscription may be meant in the genitive φάους ρυνέντος, an idea that would gain confirmation if we could propose a related appropriate conjecture on the undeciphered row of letters above the female image in the wall painting, +περηφικόλα (taken as containing the name ἡ Φικόλα by the scribe, Hippolytus or his source). We may see in this corrupt, meaningless, expression two components, περάω = penetrate sensu obsceno and φικιδίζω or φικιῶ = παιδεραστέω (according to Suda s.v. φικιδίζω), i.e. copulate more virili. The sense of the picture would then be that the female figure is given to, or is about to indulge in, or is pursued with a view to, the type of copulation practised intra mares. And in actual fact, we find an Etruscan mural in the Tomba dei Tori,

where a male figure penetrates anally a bending woman in front of a human headed, bearded bull with well marked genitalia. (V.G. Vorberg, *Glossarium Eroticum*, 1965, Fig. on p. 473). The anthropo-faced bull represents Dionysus. The young man, with flowing hair, turns his head back, to avoid looking at the woman whom he penetrates from behind. These details suggest an attitude if not of aversion, at least of uncommittedness to the act. And it suits well the Sethian (and other Gnostic) lore of a higher and spiritual, nongenerative employment of sexuality for salvation; a lore that I suggested was also operative in Greek (in particular the Eleusinian) Mysteries. The same general tenor and specific connections are preserved if we consider the (admittedly problematic) *ρύντος* as corrupt, and adopt Maass' ingenious conjecture *ἐριέντης* for it. (E. Maass, *Orpheus*, pp. 301-3, esp. p. 303; his other suggestion to read *ἐριέντου κόρη* for *Περεηφικόλα*, tests the limits of arbitrariness). *Ἐριέντης* is a mysterious divine epithet for Aphrodite (Hesychius s.v.). Construing the word as *ἐριτέντος* (weapon, armour, sword) is not particularly persuasive. An association with *Ἐρινύς* (rather than *Ἐριννύς*) has been suggested. Another Hesychian lemma (slightly out of word order) has *ἀράντισιν· Ἐριννύσιν, Μακεδόνες*. One may think of a dialectal, plural dative of a feminine *ἡ Ἀράντις* or *Ἀράντις, τῆς Ἀράντιδος*; thus connecting to *ἀρά* = prayer, curse³². But an association of *ἐριέντης* with *ἀράντι(η)ς* is wilful. Unless mediated by the Laconian divinity *Ἄροντία* (IG V, 1, 1 No. 213.24; 40), in whose honour athletic games were celebrated. These are rather idle speculations. Better to construe *Ἐριέντης* as He of the Mighty Erection, from *ἐρι* and *τείνω* (cf. *ἔντασις*). The form may also be connected to *ἐντύω* / *ἐντύνω*, furnish, equip, deck out, prepare: *Ἐριέντης* would then connote the Mightily Endowed, the Greatly Equipped, the Highly Prepared, a condition of supreme preparedness. In a mysteric context, it comes to much the same effect as in the previous connection. *Ἐριν(ν)ύς* might just be indirectly related to this etymological meaning field, if construed as *ἐρι+Ἐννώ* (cf. *Ἐννάλιος*), the Mighty Killer (cf. the war god (or warlike) *Ἐννάλιος* and the goddess of war *Ἐννώ*). This is more plausible than a connection to *ἐννυμι* / *ἐννύω* / *ἐννυμαι* Ionic *εἴνυμι, εἴνύω*, put on, clothe, wear. But Pausanias (VIII, 25, 6) is probably right to derive the word from an Arcadian *ἐρινύειν* meaning *θυμῶ χρησθαι* (being enraged, furious).

Returning now to the main line of development. The significant, ritualistic and primary use of light in the Eleusinian Mysteries is well attested. Cf. the *πολὸν πῦρ* of the unspeakable ceremonies in the Greater Mysteries, Hippolytus V, 8, 40: ...αὐτὸς ὁ ἱεροφάντης ...*νυκτὸς ἐν <Ε>λευσίνι ὑπὸ πολλῶ πυρὶ τελῶν τὰ μεγάλα καὶ ἄρρητα μυστήρια* etc. *Φωσφόρος* in the mysteric symbolism was precisely the mystic light; Scholia to Aristophanes, *Ranae*, 343 (= J. Tzetzes ad Aristophanem, *Ranae*, 340a). One of the supreme officials of the Eleusinian cultus was precisely the *Δαδοῦχος*, the Torch-Bearer; another the *Πυρφόρος*. Plutarch speaks of the *μέγα φῶς* in the mysteric *τελεταί*; *Quomodo quis suos in virtute sentiat profectos*, 10 (81d-e): ...οἱ τελούμενοι κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν ἐν θορύβῳ καὶ βοῇ συνίασι πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὠθούμενοι. δρωμένων δὲ καὶ δεικνυμένων τῶν ἱερῶν προσέχουσιν ἤδη μετὰ φόβου καὶ σιωπῆς... ὁ δ' ἐντὸς γενόμενος καὶ μέγα φῶς ἰδὼν, οἶον ἀνακτόρων ἀνοιγομένων, ἕτερον λαβὼν σχῆμα καὶ σιωπῆν καὶ θάμβος etc. (Cf. the *αἰγλήεν ἀνάκτορον* of the mysteric inscription IG II2 3709, 10-1). The ritual was meant to imitate the extreme death experience of the soul in exitu; cf. the awesome description in Plutarch Fr. 178 (Sandbach), esp.: *τότε* (sc. while in the pangs of death) *δὲ πάσχει* (sc. ἡ ψυχὴ) *πάθος οἶον οἱ τελεταῖς μεγάλας κατοργιαζόμενοι. διὸ καὶ τὸ ρῆμα τῷ ρήματι καὶ τὸ ἔργον τῷ ἔργῳ τοῦ τελευτᾶν καὶ τελείσθαι προσέοικε. πλάναι τὰ πρῶτα καὶ περιδρομαὶ κοπῶδεις καὶ διὰ σκότους τινὲς ὑποπτοὶ πορεῖαι καὶ ἀτέλεστοι* (the labyrinth of existence), *εἶτα πρὸ τοῦ τέλους αὐτοῦ τὰ δεινὰ πάντα, φρίκη καὶ τρόμος καὶ ἰδρῶς καὶ θάμβος· ἐκ δὲ τούτου φῶς τι θαυμάσιον ἀπήνησεν καὶ τόποι καθαροὶ καὶ λειμῶνες ἐδέξαντο* etc. An outpouring of this holy condition of pure light constitutes the flowing light of this world, which as light flown down, as *φάος ρυέν(της)*, is symbolised by the abnormal sexuality, i.e. a sexuality that abrogates its this-worldly role and function, channelling its power to counteract the gravity of the world towards salvation. Furthermore, the relation of the Phliasian *Φάος ρυέν(της)* to Phanes (*φαίνω, -ομαι, φανός* etc.), the characteristic Orphic divinity, the bisexual *Πρωτόγονος* of cosmogony and aspectual ancestor of Dionysos, is unmistakable.

In these connections, we discover the inner affinity of early mysteric cultus and Orphism with late Gnostic speculations, as in Sethianism. And Hippolytus' insistence, as well as that of the Fathers

of the Church, that the turn Gnosis gave to Christianity was au fond a reductionism of the new faith to old mysteric religion, appears no more as such an extravagant perversion, as it is usually taken to be.

The Phlyan Mysteries, older according to Hippolytus' and Plutarch's sources than the Eleusinian ones, are important also because of their strong, attested Orphic dimension. The deme bore the same name with that of the people's progenitor, Φλύος, son of Earth. Earth was the Great Goddess of the Phlyans (Pausanias, I, 31, 4). Φλύος was her eponymous son. He probably was held to have transmitted mysteric initiation to Eleusis itself. For his grandson Kaukon transferred the Great Goddesses' orgies from Eleusis to Andania in Messenia. And all this, teste Pausania, was reported in the Hymn to Demeter that was composed for Lycomidae by Mousaius; Pausanias, IV, 1, 5: ...παρὰ ταύτην τὴν Μεσσήνην (aboriginal queen of Messenia) τὰ ὄργια κομίζων τῶν μεγάλων Θεῶν Καύκων ἦλθεν ἐξ Ἐλευσίνος ὁ Κελαίνου τοῦ Φλυοῦ. Φλυὸν δὲ αὐτὸν Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι παῖδα εἶναι Γῆς· ὁμολογεῖ δὲ σφισι καὶ ὕμνος Μουσαίου Λυκομίδαις ποιηθεὶς ἐς Δήμητρα.

The Λυκομίδαι was a sacral family, like the Eteoboutadae of Athens. Themistocles belonged to that family and he took care to rebuild the Telesterion in Phlya after it was destroyed by the Persians; he oversaw its adornment with mural paintings; Plutarch, *Themistocles*, I, 4: ὅτι μέντοι τοῦ Λυκομίδων γένους μετείχε, δῆλόν ἐστι· τὸ γὰρ Φλυῆσι τελεστήριον, ὅπερ ἦν Λυκομίδων κοινόν, ἐμπρησθὲν ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων αὐτὸς ἐπεσκεύασε καὶ γραφαῖς ἐκόσμησεν, ὡς Σιμωνίδης ἰστόρηκεν. This telesterion or Hall of Initiation, was then the παστάς of Hippolytus where the mysteric wall paintings existed. This παστάς was also called κλίσιον; Pausanias, IV, 1, 7: ἀνέθηκε δὲ (sc. Methapus the Athenian, an initiator of mysteric rites) καὶ ἐς τὸ κλίσιον τὸ Λυκομίδων εἰκόνα ἔχουσαν ἐπίγραμμα etc. (Κλίσιον or κλισίον, from κλίνω, here is rather a place where one could recline, a bed-chamber, rather than an outbuilding like a porch; it could mean (κλεισίον) an outhouse or shed as well, even in appropriate contexts a shrine or chapel. Nothing prohibits of course that the sanctuary where Lycomidae were hereditary priests was a complex structure with wall paintings to be found in many of its sections. One would however expect that the more pregnant and

symbolic murals would had been painted in the *τελεστήμιον*, the hall of the holy mysteric rites). From what follows in the text it is evident that the inscriptions on the wall paintings could be pretty long. The particular picture and (partly quoted) epigram relates to the initiation of Kaukon, the descendant of Phlyous, in the Andanian (Messenian) mysteries to the Great Goddesses.

The Lycomidean ritual in Phlya involved the singing of songs, among which prominent position was occupied by hymns to Eros, reportedly composed by Pamphos and Orpheus. Pausanias informs us that scholars erudite in (the beginnings of) poetry know well that the genuine Orphic hymns were relatively few in number and rather short; they were incanted by Lycomidae during the performance of their rites; they are second only to the Homeric ones in beauty of form, and more profoundly inspired in religious significance. Pausanias, IX, 30, 12: *Ὅστις δὲ περὶ ποιήσεως ἐπολυπραγμόνησεν ἤδη, τοὺς Ὀρφείως ὕμνους οἶδεν ὄντας ἕκαστόν τε αὐτῶν ἐπὶ βραχύτατον καὶ τὸ σύμπαν οὐκ ἐς ἀριθμὸν πολὺν πεποιημένους. Λυκομίδαι δὲ ἴσασί τε καὶ ἐπάδουσι τοῖς δρωμένοις. κόσμῳ μὲν δὴ τῶν ἐπῶν δευτερεία φέροντο ἂν μετὰ γε Ὀμήρου τοὺς ὕμνους, τιμῆς δὲ ἐκ τοῦ θείου (ἂν ἐς τὸ θείου?) καὶ ἐς πλεόν ἐκείνων ἤκουσι.* Lycomidae intoned hexametre hymns to Eros reputedly composed by both Pamphos and Orpheus in their rituals. Pausanias IX, 27, 2: *Ὡλῆνος δὲ ὕστερον Πάμφως τε ἔπη καὶ Ὀρφεὺς ἐποίησαν· καὶ σφισιν ἀμφοτέροις πεποιημένα ἐστὶν ἐς Ἔρωτα, ἵνα ἐπὶ τοῖς δρωμένοις Λυκομίδαι καὶ ταῦτα ᾄδωσιν.* The symbolism of Eros especially in Orphic cosmogony (but in Hesiod, too) is mighty. And fits well with the above-analysed picture painted on the walls of the telesterion. This *sanctum sanctorum* particularly could preserve at the time of Plutarch and Hippolytus' source the original paintings executed under the supervision of Themistocles.

H

Nowhere do we find any significant indication of a multiple Dionysus systematic experience in the archaic and classical periods. Nor would that have been consonant with the basic essentials of ancient religiosity. The integration of many like characters and functions in one hypostasis (using advisedly this philosophically and

theologically pregnant term) was of its nature. And this explains both the greater or lesser *πολυωνυμία* of each divinity (its multiplicity of divine epithets) and its indivisible unity. It also accounts for the omnipresent phenomenon of aspectual identification (in essence) of hypostatically different deities. Trinitarian theology and Christology knew where they were treading.

The multiple Dionysus theory has grown characteristically in the bosom of Hellenistic, esp. Alexandrian, scholarship. (The Pergamene School of Criticism was more traditional in this respect, given also its Stoic predilections and integrating tendencies; but see *infra*). In fact, there existed in Hellenistic times as well a (traditional) line of thought which viewed alternative accounts of a given divinity (even repugnant or contradictory accounts) as revealing essential characteristics of the god without construing them as attributed to different hypostases or persons. Thus we learn that Euphorion considered Dionysus as having three distinct births, one from Semele, one from Zeus and still another when the god was resurrected after his dismemberment at the hands of the Titans. Remarkably, this account does not make room for the mystic Persephonian origination of Dionysus, although it recognises the Orphic Titanic abomination committed against him. The passage (Philodemus, *De pietate*, 44, p. 16.1 sqq. Gomperz = Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, Euphorio Fr. 36 = O. Kern, OF 36) is significant in a number of ways: [*πρώτην τοῦ*]των (sc. *γέννησιν*, birth) *τὴν ἐκ τῆς μητρὸς*], *ἑτέραν δὲ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ μηροῦ*, [*τρίτην δὲ τὴν τε διασπασθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν Τιτάνων Πέρας τὰ*] μέλη *συνθε[ίσης] ἀνεβίω{ι}*. καὶ [*ἐν*] *Μοισοπία δ' Εὐ[φορί]ω[ν ὁ]μολογεῖ [τοῦ]τοις, [ὁ] δ' Ὀρ[φεὺς ἐν Ἄιδου] καὶ πάντα [χρόνον] ἐνδιατρε[ίβειν]* (sc. *τὸν Διόνυσον*). The Semelean Dionysus - born prematurely as a consequence of his mother having been struck by Zeus as Zeus' thunderbolt when the God entered her in his full divine power, and born a second time from his divine father's thigh where he had been put to complete his appropriate gestation period - he was the bull-horned (*ταυρόκερως*) *θεός* (Euphorio Fr. 14 Powell), he was the one that suffered the Titanic atrocity; having been dismembered he was then put in the cauldron over the fire at Delphi, he was offered an unholy meal to Apollo there (cf. Euphorio, Fr. 13 Powell; cf. also Scholia on Lycophron 208 (p. 98.5 Scheer); further cf. OF 210; 211; 213; 214; 215), and was raised afterwards by the Mother of Gods

(Rhea in the present account). This was Euphorion's exposition, whereas the Orphic account had the god remaining in Hades forever (i.e. not being resurrected), as well as (we may add) having him born from Persephone (the early and canonical Orphic relation). And in fact we only hear of a dead Dionysus (ruler of the Nether world, identified or aspectually identified with Aidoneus ~ Pluto ~ Hades) and not of his resurrection in the Orphic reports about the Aboriginal Sin. Indeed, a resurrection from the kingship of the realm of dead does not make much sense in an ancient Greek religious context, unless the translation to the heavenly stratum of the celestial divinities is indicated. But that introduction is only an acceptance of his potent status on the part of the Olympians, not any transfiguration of his full chthonicity into an Olympian condition. After all, Zeus is the Lord of the Sky, and Dionysus had taken a seat on the celestial throne just for a while as the New King, the Child Dominus, before suffering atrociously what his ecstatic spirit and orgiastic infatuation committed against others. It might appear that Herodotus' identification of Dionysus with Osiris, II, 144 (in its phallic nature; v. Herodotus II 48; cf. Heraclitus B70 DK), the luctus associated with Osiris worship (Herodotus II, 61; 132; cf. Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, 39, 366 sqq.; cf. also 70; Clement, *Cohortatio*, 2 p. 21; Plutarch, *Amatorius*, 18; Maximus Tyrius 8.5; Orphica *Argonautica* I 32; Minucius Felix, Oct. 22; Arnobius, *Contra Nationes* I, 36; Porphyrius apud Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* V. 6; 7 etc.; Diodorus I.83), and the Egyptian resurrection belief would point to or suggest a correspondingly early faith in the Resurrected Dionysus. But Osiris as Resurrected is King of the Netherworld, not of this world or of the celestial realms just as Dionysus-Zagreus is in his aspectual identification with Hades-Pluto.

There is but one Dionysus in the religious and speculative, original and mainstream experience of ancient Greece. And this immediate and reflective oneness of the god is carried on and expressed in later times by the war-cry of his devotees: εἰς Διόνυσος. (Cf. the exclamation «Εἰς ἅγιος, εἰς Κύριος (Ἰησοῦς Χριστός)» in the Orthodox liturgy of Saint Chrysostom, when the priest has raised the transformed bread of life and calls upon the faithful τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις. On εἰς θεός in Christian aretalogy cf. E. Peterson, *Εἰς Θεός*, Diss. Gottingae 1920, 17). Significantly, once such important affirmation of «εἰς Διόνυσος» occurs within what has been called the ritual of the

mysteries, and certainly exhibits an Orphic-Bacchic-Eleusinian confluence in the context of corresponding rites presented as a *lex sacra*: the testament appears in a Gurob papyrus from the third century B.C. OF 31 I.23 = 4[A 69]23 Colli. The confessional statement is expanded according to later testimonies in conformity with an early peculiar Orphic heliolatry; it runs:

εἰς Ζεὺς, εἰς Ἄδης, εἰς Ἥλιος, εἰς Διόνυσος

(OF 239; from Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, I 18,17 and Ps.-Justinus, *Cohortatio ad Gentiles*, 15). In Julian, *Oratio* IV, the modified verse is ascribed to Apollo's oracular pronouncement, presumably in Delphi:

εἰς Ζεὺς, εἰς Ἄδης, εἰς Ἥλιός ἐστι Σάραπις.

This is surely late. But the previous form goes back, in basic underlying fact, to earliest Orphism. (Cf. the study on the origin of Greek Solar Theology in the second volume this work volume).



The notion of a multiple Dionysus has neither a religious (ritualistic or mythical) nor a philosophical (speculative or scientific) origin: it is a scholarly construction, and of a particular type of scholarship for that matter. It constitutes an Alexandrine convention. And we can fortunately trace the origin of that scholarly convention. The particular issue relates to a certain system of divine «πολυπρόσωπον», a theory of multiple personality affecting accounts of the divinities in some later authors. Extensive description of such a system appears for the first time in Cicero (*De Natura Deorum*, III §§41-60, the so-called mythological section). The group of writers in which considerable parts of it can be found in summaries includes Clemens Alexandrinus (*Protrepticon*), Ampelius (*Liber Memorialis*), Arnobius (*Adversus Gentes*) and Ioannes Lydus (*De Mensibus*). The relevant data can be surveyed conveniently in Joseph B. Mayor's edition of *de Natura Deorum*, vol. III, Appendix on the Mythological Section pp. 199-209. A clue to the correct understanding of such approaches in ancient literature is provided by Ioannes Lydus, op.cit. IV 48 Roether = 71 Wuensch p. 122. In a context of philosophically (and Stoically)

etymologizing the name of Zeus, he mentions various alternative construals and then adds: *τινὲς δὲ κατὰ τὸν ἡρωϊκὸν καὶ μεριστὸν λόγον τρεῖς Δίας εἶναι βούλονται* etc. We have thus to do with a theorizing that splits up the deity into a number of heroes. But this heroicizing of divinities (although not their division) is exactly what Euhemerus (in)famously did or at least did explicitly and systematically. Diodorus reproduces Euhemerus verbatim (teste Eusebio, *Praeparatio Evangelica* II, 2, 52-3 = Diodorus VI 1, 1-2 = Euhemerus T 25 Winiarczyk): *περὶ θεῶν τοίνυν διττὰς οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῖς μεταγενεστέροις παραδεδώκασι ἐννοίας. τοὺς μὲν γὰρ αἰδίου καὶ ἀφθάρτους εἶναι φασιν, οἷον ἥλιόν τε καὶ σελήνην καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἄστρα τὰ κατ' οὐρανόν, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἀνέμους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς τῆς ὁμοίας φύσεως τούτοις τετευχότας· τούτων γὰρ ἕκαστον αἰδίου ἔχει τὴν γένεσιν καὶ τὴν διαμονήν· ἑτέροις δὲ λέγουσιν ἐπιγείους γενέσθαι θεούς, διὰ δὲ τὰς εἰς ἀνθρώπους εὐεργεσίας ἀθανάτου τετευχότας τιμῆς τε καὶ δόξης, οἷον Ἡρακλέα, Διόνυσον, Ἀρισταῖον, τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς τούτοις ὁμοίους.* Prodicus had already developed the view that things beneficial to human life were elevated to divine status, like the sun, moon, rivers, lakes, meadows, fruits etc. (Prodicus DK 84B5). Euhemerus, on the other hand, worked out in particular the second branch of the theory: (he) *ἔλεγε τοὺς νομιζομένους θεοὺς δυνατοὺς τινὰς γεγονέναι ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων θεοποιηθέντας δόξαι θεούς* T23 Winiarczyk (= Sextus, *Adversus Mathematicos* IX 50-52); cf. T27 = Sextus, *op.cit.* IX 17. Cf. Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, 359E-360B (=T15 Winiarczyk), esp. ...*τοὺς νομιζομένους θεοὺς πάντας ὁμαλῶς διαγράφων* (sc. Euhemerus) *εἰς ὀνόματα στρατηγῶν καὶ ναυάρχων καὶ βασιλέων ὡς δὴ πάλαι γεγονότων* etc. As Iohannes Lydus puts it (*De mensibus*, IV 154 p. 170.13 sqq. = F55 Winiarczyk, esp. 17 sqq.): ...*ἐν τ]ῶ περιὶ Διονύσου φησὶ* (sc. an unpreserved writer; perhaps Polemo if we supply the lacuna in p. 170.16-7 Wunsch as follows: [*ὥστε καὶ κ]α[λῶς] ὁ Π[ολέμων γε ἐν τ]ῶ περιὶ Διονύσου* etc. Polemo is mentioned among other authors just a few lines above p. 170.12) *τοὺς [δικαίους τῶν βασ]ιλέω[ν καὶ ἐ]ρέων ταῖς ἴσαις τιμ[αῖς μὲν] ὑπ' αὐ[τῶν τῶν] θεῶν καὶ προσηγορίαις τιμηθῆν[αι καὶ] ταύτη [μὲν θεοὺς κληθῆναι μυθ]ικῶς, τὴν δὲ ἱστορίαν πεπ[λασμένως] παρα[δεδόσθαι].* (This represents a variant of orthodox Euhemerism in that the existence of real gods (of a

different order) is presupposed, if ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν θεῶν is a correct restriction. But the untranslated gods are, according to this train of thought, physical entities bereft of personality and thus of the possibility of honouring eminent mortals. Hence I propose to read ὑπ' αὐ[τῶν ὡς] θεῶν meaning that these same important people initiated their divinization. This is an Euhemerean notion, as Sextus testifies infra. In which case we should take the Iohannes Lydus passage as referring to Euhemerus himself. But whether in the supposed case of (designs for, and cultivation of) autodeification, or in the public acclaim that is presumed to have raised the mortal death of mighty, important people to divine eternity (similarly to the canonization of Christian saints), there is a crucial difficulty unresolved: according to which standard of divinity were those mortals autodeified or divinised by others? A naturally real status of godhead is presupposed by any conventional or positive deification. (Just as an idea of natural law is presupposed in human conduct by all positive law). Sextus Empiricus registers the knot, *adversus mathematicos*, IX 34: οἱ δὲ λέγοντες τοὺς πρώτους τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡγεμονεύσαντας καὶ διοικητὰς τῶν κοινῶν πραγμάτων γενομένους, πλείονα δύναμιν αὐτοῖς περιθέντας καὶ τιμὴν πρὸς τὸ ὑπακούειν τὰ πλήθη, τούτους χρόνῳ τελευτήσαντας θεοὺς ὑποληφθῆναι, πάλιν οὐ συνιᾶσι τὸ ζητούμενον. αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἱ εἰς θεοὺς ἀνάγοντες αὐτοὺς πῶς ἔννοιαν ἔλαβον θεῶν εἰς ἣν αὐτοὺς ἐνέταξαν; τοῦτο γὰρ δεόμενον ἀποδείξεως παρείται. Indeed! But overwhelming power and profound utility do provide an answer if one primarily applies the insight into the workings of the world-order and its major cosmic forces). -Real history has been misrepresented and transmitted as myth. Prodicus' and Euhemerus' respective approaches are well delineated by Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, I 118-119 (= T14 Winiarczyk): quid Prodicus Cius, qui ea quae prodessent hominum vitae deorum in numero habita dixit, quam tandem religionem reliquit? quid qui aut fortis aut claros aut potentis viros tradunt post mortem ad deos pervenisse, eosque esse ipsos quos nos colere precari venerarique soleamus, nonne expertes sunt religionum omnium? quae ratio maxime tractata ab Euhemero est, quem noster et interpretatus est et secutus praeter ceteros Ennius; ab Euhemero autem et mortes et sepulturae demonstrantur deorum. (Minucius' account somehow confuses the propria, *Octavius* 21, 1-2 = T9 Winiarczyk). According to Sextus (*Adversus Mathematicos* IX, 17

= T27 Winiarczyk), Euhemerus thought that the eminent men themselves cultivated the appearance of a transcendent power around them and thus prepared the ground for their subsequent divinization: *Εὐήμερος δὲ ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς ἄθεός φησιν· ὅτ' ἦν ἄτακτος ἀνθρώπων βίος, οἱ περιγεγόμενοι τῶν ἄλλων ἰσχυῖ τε καὶ συνέσει ὥστε πρὸς τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν κελευόμενα πάντας βιοῦν, σπουδάζοντες μείζονος θαυμασμοῦ καὶ σεμνότητος τυχεῖν, ἀνέπλασαν περὶ αὐτοὺς ὑπερβάλλουσάν τινα καὶ θεῖαν δύναμιν, ἔνθεν καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐνομισθησαν θεοί.*

Lactantius combines the two considerations for divine canonization, that the men elevated to the condition of godhead excelled in capacity and power or that they had greatly benefitted human life through their inventions; he also relates this theory to Cicero's third book of *De Natura Deorum*: ...ii omnes, qui coluntur ut dii, homines fuerunt et idem primi ac maximi reges. sed eos aut ob virtutem qua profuerant hominum generi divinis honoribus adfectos esse post mortem aut ob beneficia et inventa quibus humanam vitam excoluerant immortalem memoriam consecutos quis ignorat? (Something taught by the oldest Greek writers and those Latin ones that followed and imitated them). quorum praecipue Euhemerus ac noster Ennius, qui eorum omnium (sc. of all worshipped beings) natales coniungia progenies imperia res gestas obitus sepulcra demonstrant, et secutus eos Tullius tertio De Natura Deorum libro dissolvit publicas religiones (T28 Winiarczyk = Lactantius, *De Ira Dei*, 11, 7-9). By oldest Greek writers (vetustissimi Graeciae scriptores) Lactantius means apparently no one necessarily older than Euhemerus, as is clear from *Epitoma Divinum Institutionum* 13,1: Evhemerus fuit Messenius, antiquissimus scriptor. And of course Lactantius disregards Cicero's final word in the book, where he declares that: mihi Balbi (sc. disputatio) ad veritatis similitudinem videretur esse propensior. Even in such a circumspect way, Cicero testifies feeling closer to Stoic theology than to Academic criticism of it, expounded by Cotta in the third book following the Academician Clitomachus (cf. Mayor's edition, vol. III, *On the Sources of the third Book of the De Natura Deorum*, pp. LX-LXX). In fact Theophilus Antiochenus combines Clitomachus (and his atheistic stance) with Euhemerus as well (ad Autolyicum III7 = T19 Winiarczyk). The core implication of Euhemerism is well caught by Cicero, *De natura*

deorum III 53: dicamus igitur, Balbe, oportet contra illos etiam, qui hos deos ex hominum genere in caelum translatos non re sed opinione esse dicunt, quos auguste omnes sancteque veneramur.

There were antecedents to Euhemerus' articulate position as to the nature of gods. On the one hand, the entire system of the various theories of natural theology or divine physics developed by Presocratic thinkers leads to the construal of the deities of positive religion as cosmic forces. Allegory (already applied to the Homeric pantheon of personal divinities in the 6th century, for instance, by Theagenes) provided the theoretical context for such theological reinterpretations. What started as a rational request for real equivalences to the mythological entities of positive religion and of poetic anthropomorphism was transformed under the spirit of hypercriticism (lurking in every thorough rationalism) that emerged in that archetypal Age of Reason, the Greek golden fifth century B.C., into a search for the causes of and reasons for divine worship in general and also in specific cults. Prodicus, as we saw, emphasised the utilitarian motive in the origin of the belief in gods. He remained, however, within the cosmic framework of Presocratic philosophy (or theology or physiology). But, on the other hand, the sacred accounts of Middle Eastern cultures projected the mythological stories about gods as historical events at the beginning of time and thereafter. The divine realm was thus explicitly or implicitly temporalised as the start of human history, and not merely as a temporal or eternal cosmogonic process. (Cf. e.g. for a clear statement of the principle involved in the account of Egyptian history, Diodorus, I, 44, 1-4. Similarly Manetho apud Eusebium, *Chronicorum Liber* I, 7, p. 134 sqq. Schöne). This second prime factor was effectively transplanted into Greek soil with Alexander the Great's conquest of the East and the subsequent accelerating Greco-Oriental fusion. There is no compelling evidence (pace Schwartz, *Rheinisches Museum*, 40, 1885, 223-62; RE V (1905), 670-2 and Jacoby, RE VIII (1912) 2750-69; Fr.Gr.H. IIIa Kommentar, pp. 75 sqq. Jaeger's arbitrary combinations in Diokles von Karystos, Excurs I: Theophrast über Ägyptische Königslisten und Hekataios von Abdera, pp. 123-33 certainly do not prove the point) that Hecataeus of Abdera (Fr.Gr.H. 264) is the chief source or indeed foundation of Diodorus' elaborate account of things Egyptian in Book I of his *Universal History*. (Jacoby prints the relevant part of Diodorus'

work as Anhang, F25 = Diodor I, 10-98). Closer to the truth is W. Spierri's more prudent estimate (*Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter*) that Diodorus presents a composite account reflecting the syncretism of his age. In the entire Diodorean survey, Hecataeus is explicitly invoked once, in connection with a very specific topic, the magnificence of the Pharaonic tombs in the vicinity of Egyptian Thebes (I, 46,6 and 8 with 47,1 sqq.). Even in the section most likely to report Hecataeus' description it starts with a *φησὶν* that should refer to Hecataeus (47,1), but at the conclusion he reverts to *ἔφασαν* and *φασὶν* (49,5 and 6). It is not unlikely that Hecataeus included in his account the Egyptian belief in an aboriginal but real human history, when Gods ruled in Egypt. This would be certain if the phrase: *ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν πρώτων τάφων, ἐν οἷς παραδέδοται τὰς παλλακίδας τοῦ Διὸς τεθάφθαι* etc. (47,1), should be taken to come from him, as is likely. (The expression refers in all probability to the location known as the Valley of the Queens, which is in fact distant about 2 km (~ 10 stades) from the majestic Rameseum, apparently described by Hecataeus-Diodorus as the tomb of Pharaoh Ὀσυμανδύας). But even so, it does not follow that Hecataeus had developed the entire theory about the two kinds of divinised beings, cosmic powers and heroic men. It is one thing to believe that in the beginning of time gods ruled directly over men, completely another to claim that eminent personalities were elevated to the divine status during or after their earthly sojourn. In fact such views as the Euhemerian theory (which also underlies Diodorus' *Αἰγυπτιακά*) are nowhere to be found or indicated in Hecataeus' testimonials and fragments. We notice rather in him a philosophical preoccupation (on the standard Greek pattern) to construe divinities as cosmic factors. Thus he identified Osiris with Sun and Isis with the Moon on behalf of and for the Egyptians (F1); while he claimed that both the Egyptians and the Magians believed that everything within the world is subject to coming into being and passing away (F1; F3). On the other hand he thought that the first and supreme Egyptian god was identified with the world system in its entirety (a typical Greek projection that goes back to Hecataeus, and is not parenthetically introduced by Plutarch himself in his account; it nicely fits a Presocratic survival in the late classical thought-world), and that he was Ammon (F4). This patently contradicts the theology of Diodorus' *Αἰγυπτιακά*, both on the level

of the eternal, celestial gods (*περὶ τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ θεῶν καὶ γένεσιν αἰδίου ἐσχηκότων*), and on that of the terrestrial deified mortals (*ἄλλους δ' ἐκ τούτων ἐπιγείους γενέσθαι*). Among the first order gods, Osiris and Isis are mentioned as supreme (v. in particular Diodorus I, 11,5), while Zeus, Hephaistus, Demeter, Oceanus and Athena are identified with primary constituent parts of the world, spirit (*πνεῦμα*), fire, earth, liquid, air respectively (Diodorus, I 11-12). There is no place here for Ammon, the Universal Whole and his supremacy. (If, furthermore, in the *Αἰγυπτιακά* we are allowed - as we in all probability should be - to identify Zeus with Ammon, we have an explicit contradiction to Hecataeus' Egyptian theological construal). Nor is the Diodorean sequence of terrestrial gods congruous with Hecataean theology: the series starts with Helios or Hephaistus, then proceeds to Cronus and Rhea, then to Osiris and Isis according to a minority view, while the majority of the mythologists continue with Zeus-Hera and then to Osiris, Isis, Typhon, Apollo and Aphrodite (Diodorus I, 13). Again this is consistent with Ammon (= Zeus) as World-God.

The composite and late character of Diodorus' presentation of Egyptian theology is also evident from the tensions if not downright contradictions between the two levels of divine discourse, the celestial and the terrestrial. Thus the ontological sequence of the eternal gods diverges significantly from the chronological one of the divinised mortals. While Osiris = Dionysus is differentiated from Helios in the theology of the terrestrial gods (I, 13,2 and 4-5), he is nonetheless identified with the Sun in the theology of the celestial divinities (I, 11, 1-3). The varying field of multiple aspectual identifications for Osiris and Isis is aptly emphasised by Diodorus I, 25, 1-2: *καθόλου δὲ πολλή τις ἐστὶ διαφωνία περὶ τούτων τῶν θεῶν. Τὴν αὐτὴν γὰρ οἱ μὲν Ἴσιν, οἱ δὲ Δήμητραν, οἱ δὲ Θεσμοφόρον, οἱ δὲ Σελήνην, οἱ δὲ Ἥραν, οἱ δὲ πάσαις ταῖς προσηγορίαις ὀνομάζουσι. Τὸν δὲ Ὅσιριν οἱ μὲν Σάραπιν, οἱ δὲ Δίονυσον, οἱ δὲ Πλούτωνα, οἱ δὲ Ἄμμωνα, τινὲς δὲ Δία, πολλοὶ δὲ Πᾶνα νενομίκασι λέγουσι δέ τινες Σάραπιν εἶναι τὸν παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλήσι Πλούτωνα νομιζόμενον.* Furthermore, still another indication of the syncretistic manner of the Diodorean account is the variation in the explanatory construals of apparent animal worship among the Egyptians. Thus there is an ineffable doctrine (*ἀπόρρητόν τι δόγμα* I, 86,2, referring to I, 21, 5-6) and

three more common explanations (I, 86, 3; 4-5; and 87-9. For the second, quasi-totemistic interpretation v. also 90, 1-2). For a fifth, political, explanation v. 89.5-6. Hecataeus had maintained the third of the common explanations, namely that animal worship had to do with respectful acknowledgement of the beneficial character of the animals in question. Hecataeus F1: *τά τε ἄλλα φυσιολογεῖν, ὡς Ἑκαταῖός τε καὶ Ἀρισταγόρας ἱστοροῦσιν. ...καὶ τὰ εὐχρηστα τῶν ζώων θεοὺς ἐδόξασαν.* Notice also that in the extensive Diodorean account, there is scarcely talk about the divinity of the animals involved, but rather of their dedication (*ἀφιέρωσις, ἀφιερωμένων ζώων*), their receiving honours equal to, or next to that of, the gods (*τιμᾶν ἴσα θεοῖς, τιμᾶσθαι παραπλησίως τοῖς θεοῖς*). In most instances there is mention only of honouring the animals (*τιμᾶσθαι*), and this is how the entire subject is introduced (86, 1): *πάντα δὲ θαυμάσια καὶ μείζω πίστεως ἐπιτελοῦντες οἱ κατ' Αἴγυπτον εἰς τὰ τιμώμενα ζῶα πολλὴν ἀπορίαν παρέχονται τοῖς τὰς αἰτίας τούτων ζητοῦσιν.*

Hecataeus of Abdera (c. 330-300 B.C.; cf. T1; T3a; T4; T7a; T7b) designed a natural theology for the Egyptian religion (*φυσιολογεῖν*, F1). He probably accounted for its apparent animal worship by the theory of utility (*ibid.*). He covered Egyptian history according to the native priestly accounts (T4). Thus he must have reported the divine kingdom on earth at the opening of human history³³. But he cannot be credited with the origin of the formal theological theory about the mortal origin and subsequent deification of the *ἐπίγειοι θεοί* (despite his Pyrrhonian apprenticeship (T3a); he was a philosopher of the Abderite school, T3b).

Thus, for the source-point of those theological speculations, we come back to where we started from, namely, to Euhemerus (c. 317-298 B.C.; cf. T3 Winiarczyk = Fr.Gr.H. 63T1; he was one of the philosophers frequenting Cassander's court, Theophrastus, Demetrius, Dicaearchus; cf. T1 Winiarczyk = 63T2a and T4a), consonant with the emphatic ancient tradition. Here we find the explicit theorizing on the elevation to divine status of important men (and women? Cf. Lactantius, *De ira Dei* 11, 7-9 = T28 Winiarczyk p. 19.6 ... *nec tantum mares, sed et feminas*), eminent in power, capacities, excellence and/or beneficiality for human life. This involved a novel construal of eastern accounts about an aboriginal divine kingdom on

earth. It also included the application of the generalised theory to Greek religion. Hence Euhemerus *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ* (*Ἱερὸς Λόγος*, sacra Historia) on the pattern of the oriental priestly ones. (An antecedent to this is Plato's invocation of inscriptional evidence, on the testimony of Egyptian prophets, about the Atlantis story in connection with earliest Athenian polity, eminence and achievements; v. *Timaeus* 23b-25d; cf. Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum commentaria*, I p. 75.30 sqq. Diehl). Still Euhemerus' account retained the unitarian conception of the personal divinities. Nowhere in the testimonies do we meet with an application of the theory of divine polypersonality as a way out of variant and conflicting traditions regarding the same deities. There is always a single account among competing ones that is adopted by Euhemerus and elevated to the realm of true (proto)history. In fact, when once we meet the question of multiple *θεῖα ἐπιθέτα* addressed by Euhemerus, we see him have recourse to the peculiar idea that this multiplicity of divine names reflects the multiplicity of various rulers who instituted the worship of the god concerned (Zeus) at his command while still on earth, following his guest-friendship with the ruler. T62 Winiarczyk (= Lactantius, *Divinarum Institutionum*, I 22, 21-27 = 63 F23): Historia vero Sacra testatur ipsum Iovem, postquam rerum potitus sit, in tantam venisse insolentiam, ut ipse sibi fana in multis locis constituerit. nam cum terras circumiret, ut in quamque regionem venerat, reges principesve populorum hospitio sibi et amicitia copulabat, et cum a quoque digrederetur, iubebat sibi fanum creari hospitis suo nomine, quasi ut posset amicitiae ac foederis memoria conservari. sic constituta sunt templa Iovi Ataburio, Iovi Labrayndio: Ataburus enim et Labrayndus hospites eius atque adiutores in bello fuerunt; item Iovi Laprio, Iovi Molioni, Iovi Casio et quae sunt in eundem modum. quod ille astutissime excogitavit, ut et sibi honorem divinum et hospitibus suis perpetuum nomen acquirerent cum religione coniunctum. gaudebant ergo illi et huic imperio libenter obsequabantur et nominis sui gratia ritus annuos et festa celebrabant etc.

I

Another step is therefore needed to land us at the full-blown theory of divine multipersonality as testified by Cicero and the group of later sources noted above³⁴. Having adopted the view that personal gods are

excellent and powerful specimens of humanity who have greatly benefitted human life, one may now employ it to harmonise the various stories about gods, by reducing them to different nuclear individualities. Who started the trend? (The *πρῶτος εὐρετής*). Mayor (in his edition of Cicero's *De natura deorum*, vol. III, p. LXX; esp. pp. 199-201) suggested Mnaseas of Patara (rather than of Patrae) as the ultimate source: (p. 201) "As Mnaseas is mentioned by three different writers, Arnobius, Harpocration and Fulgentius, as the source from whom they have borrowed, and as he is a noted Euhemerist of the *Alexandrian School* [my emphasis], the evidence, so far as it goes, seems to point to him as the mythologist followed by Clitomachus, i.e. by Carneades". This is very plausible. We learn from Harpocration s.v. Ἰππία Ἀθηνᾶ that Mnaseas held her to be daughter of Poseidon and Coryphe, daughter of Oceanus: *Μνασέας ἐν α' Εὐρώπης τὴν Ἰππίαν Ἀθηνᾶν Ποσειδῶνος εἶναι φησι θυγατέρα καὶ Κορύφης τῆς Ὠκεανοῦ, ἄρμα δὲ πρώτην κατασκευάσασαν διὰ τοῦτο ἰππίαν κεκληθῆσθαι*. (Cf. also Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca*, I p. 350.25-31). This means that the Athena under the divine epithet of ἰππία is a different person from the Athena as genealogised by the mainstream mythological account, which is exactly what is at stake as the major leap forward to that theory of divine multipersonality. Besides we meet with the same maternal descent in the case of one of the various Athenas in Cicero's account (III §59): *Minerva ... tertia illa, quam a Jove generatam supra diximus, quarta Jove nata et Coryphe, Oceani filia, quam Arcades Κορίαν nominant et quadrigarum inventricem ferunt etc.* If we substitute Poseidon for Zeus in this fourth Athena (the more so since the third one is Zeus's proper daughter) we have absolute congruence with Mnaseas' construal.

Further, Ammonius (*De adfinium vocabulorum differentia* s.v. *Νηρείδες*) testifies that Didymus (in his commentary on Bacchylides' ἐπίνικοι) reported the view according to which the Nereids are a subgroup of the daughters of Nereus, those, namely, that were borne of Doris. Didymus made use in extenso of Mnaseas' account to that effect: *Νηρείδες τῶν τοῦ Νηρέως θυγατέρων διαφέρει. Δίδυμος ὁμοίως ἐν ὑπομνήματι Βακχυλίδου ἐπινίκων. φησὶ γὰρ κατὰ λέξιν: «εἰσὶ τοίνυν οἱ φασι διαφέρειν τὰς Νηρείδας τῶν τοῦ Νηρέως θυγατέρων. καὶ τὰς μὲν ἐκ Δωρίδος γνησίας αὐτοῦ θυγατέρας νομίζεσθαι· τὰς δὲ ἐξ ἄλλων (sc. γυναικῶν) ἤδη κοινότερον Νηρείδας*

καλείσθαι. καὶ τὰς μὲν γνησίας κε' (with Valckenaer for the corrupt transmitted καὶ) τὸν ἀριθμὸν, πλείους δὲ τὰς ἄλλας. ταυτὰ φησι Μνασέας ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον». εἶτα ἐκτίθεται (sc. Didymus) διὰ μακρῶν τὴν λέξιν (sc. Mnaseas' report) καὶ ἐπιφέρει (i.e. he concludes): «πιθανῶς τὰς μὲν ἐκ μιᾶς τῆς Δωρίδος γνησιωτέρας τῶν ἄλλων οὔσας Νηρέως θυγατέρας λέγεσθαι, τὰς δὲ συμμίκτους αὐτῷ (or better συνεισάκτους as in Eustathius, *Commentaria in Odysseam* ad ω p. 824; the sense must be those borne by various women and not by his νόμιμος γαμετῆ) μόνον Νηρεΐδας. Mnaseas harmonised the extraordinary variety of stories and functions regarding the Nereids (cf. Judith M. Barringer, *Divine Escorts; Nereids in Archaic and Classical Greek Art*; for four disparate lists of names v. pp. 5-6) by postulating different motherhoods for distinct groups of them.

Again, Mnaseas gave a special parenthood to Κτήσιος, a divine epithet of Zeus. Suda and Photius s.v. Πραξιδική: ...Μνασέας δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Εὐρώπης Σωτήρος καὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς Πραξιδικῆς γενέσθαι Κτήσιον υἱὸν καὶ θυγατέρας Ὀμόνοϊαν καὶ Ἀρετήν, ἃς ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς Πραξιδικῆς κληθῆναι. Zeus Κτήσιος was a personality other than Zeus, not merely another aspect or function or relation of the same divine being.

Mnaseas (Arnobius, III 37) recognized four (?) Muses, daughters of Heaven and Earth, no doubt distinct from the offspring of Zeus and (ordinarily) Mnemosyne in the mainstream tradition (cf. Hesiod, *Theogony*, 25; 36; 52; 104; 916-9; 966; 1022): Musas Mnaseas est auctor filias esse Telluris et Caeli, Iovis ceteri praedicant ex Memoria uxore vel Mente etc. This descent is in fact not reported in Cicero's testimony (*De natura deorum*, III 54). Again he transmitted the awkward information about the ignominious death of Apollo, the Olympian God par excellence, Fuglentius, *Mythologiarum libri*, FHG III p. 152: Mnaseas tertio Europae libro scripsit Apollinem, postquam a Jove ictus et interfectus est, a vespillonibus ad sepulturam elatum esse. As Apollo is reported to have been struck by Zeus' thunderbolt, this event may be related to the certamen between Zeus and Apollo for possession of Crete, testified by Cicero (*op.cit.* III, 57). This Apollo, we are told, was the son of Corybas, born in Crete (*ibid.*).

Mnaseas multiplied divine-mythological-historical personalities. Cf. e.g. Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Ἀκανθος; or Scholia to Theocritus

XIII, 75c. The *Στυμφαλίδες ὄρνιθες* are for him not birds but daughters of Stymphalus and Ornis (Scholia to Apollonius Rhodius II 1052-57a), a technique he used repeatedly to account for double naming by parenthood. So similarly the Idaean Dactyls were named after their father Dactylos and their mother Ida; scholia to Apollonius Rhodius, I 1126-31b p. 101.16-102.1 Wendel, a very simplistic account esp. relative to the momentous significance of the issue and the wonderful array of attempted explanations that it occasioned. Very typical of him is the way he generates some kinds of fish; Athenaeus VII, 301d: *Μνασέας δὲ ὁ Πατρεύς (Παταρεύς rather) φησιν· Ἰχθύος δὲ γίνεται καὶ Ἑσυχίας τῆς ἀδελφῆς γαλήνη* (an γαλή, mustela piscis? Schweighäuser) *καὶ μύραινα καὶ ἡλακατῆνες!* Of course there was a priestess Melissa that found the honeycombs and instituted the wineless rites of *ὑδρομέλι*; she gave her name to the bees; Scholia on Pindar, Pythionici IV, 106a. And to explain the proverb *πύθου χελιδόνος*, he routinely invokes a sage and wizard *Χελιδών*; v. Photius, *Lexicon*, s.v. *πύθου χελιδόνος*. Mnaseas knew of a sister of Odysseus by the name of Lentil (*Φακῆ*), alias *Καλλιστώ* (the Fairest); this piece of information was important enough to be quoted by Lysimachus in his comprehensive work on *Νόστοι* (Athenaeus, IV 158c-d). Also, he postulated two Dodones to account for Homeric perplexities; v. Stephanus Byzantius s.v. *Δωδώνη* (p. 247.15-6 Meineke; he was followed by Philoxenus *op.cit.* p. 246.6-12, and by others (p. 247.16)). Against the customary identification (even if aspectual) of Sabazius with Dionysus, Mnaseas duly made the former son of the latter; Harpocration and Photius s.v. *Σαβοί*. He identified the gods Dionysus, Osiris and Serapis with the mythical hero and king of Egypt Eraphus, Plutarch, *de Iside et Osiride*, 365 F: *ἐὼ δὲ Μνασέαν τῷ Ἐπάφῳ προστιθέντα τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ τὸν Ὅσιριν καὶ τὸν Σάραπιν*. The Oriental goddess Atargatis, of cruel rites, was just a cruel queen; v. the detailed report in Athenaeus VIII, 346d-e. To the speculations that rose from the traditions that called the Arcadians *προσέληνες* and went to the extent of explaining an Arcadian history before the existence of the Moon, Mnaseas posited an Arcadian king by the name of *Προσέληνος*; Scholia to Apollonius Rhodius, IV 263-64b = Scholia to Aristophanes, *Nubes*, 397. Similar singular feats of mythological historization we can expect from his Pan account; Scholia to Euripides, *Rhesus* 36, p. 329.7-8 Schwartz: Mnaseas δὲ

ξενικώτερον ἀφηγεῖται τὰ περὶ Πᾶνα (unfortunately we miss the details).

However, for all that, Mnaseas cannot be simply put aside. For example he gives unique, valuable information on the Samothracian Mysteries by naming the three of the four *Κάβειροι* (Scholia to Apollonius Rhodius I, 916-8b). In his account of the name of the *Δώτιον πεδίον* (surely postulating a certain Dotus son of Pelasgus, Stephanus Byzantius s.v. *Δώτιον* p. 257.1-2 Meineke) he was followed by no lesser authority than Herodianus, the *τεχνικός* par excellence (*ibid.* p. 257.15-7 Meineke). Mnaseas' collection of Delphic oracles (*Δελφικῶν χρησμῶν συναγωγή*) was an extremely useful work widely employed³⁵.

The divine multipersonality doctrine, once invented, was cultivated in Alexandrian scholarship though we do not know how widely. In Clement's recension (similar to Cicero's) of the different personalities of various deities, the account of multiple Apollos is in all probability taken from Aristocles (correcting the erroneous transmitted Aristotle); *Protrepticus* II, 28, 3: *ναὶ μὲν Ἀπόλλωνας ὁ μὲν Ἀριστοκλῆς* (with V. Rose pro *Ἀριστοτέλης*) *πρῶτον <τὸν> Ἐφαιστου καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς (ἐνταῦθα δὴ οὐκέτι Παρθένος ἢ Ἀθηνᾶ), δεύτερον ἐν Κρήτῃ τὸν Κύρβαντος, τρίτον τὸν Διὸς καὶ τέταρτον τὸν Ἀρκάδα τὸν Σιληνοῦ· Νόμιος οὗτος κέκληται παρὰ Ἀρκάσιν· ἐπὶ τούτοις τὸν Λίβυν καταλέγει τὸν Ἀμμωνος· ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος ὁ γραμματικὸς τούτοις ἕκτον ἐπιφέρει τὸν Μάγνητος.* (Didymus' work *Ξένη Ἱστορία* may be referred to, Fr. 6 N. Schmidt p. 363. But what more specific can be said regarding a scholar that reputedly wrote thousands of books?!). Among the group of writers that preserved lists of multipersonal deities, Ampelius gives the five Apollos of Aristocles, while Cicero tells us of the four first, with additional characteristic details. Didymus (the *χαλκέντερος*, the *βιβλιολάθας*, *grammaticorum omnium quique sint quique fuerint instructissimus*, as Macrobius puts it, *Saturnalia*, V 22) lived in the first century B.C., *γεγονὼς ἐπὶ Ἀντωνίου καὶ Κικέρωνος* (is the consulship of Antony and Cicero in 63 B.C. meant?) *καὶ ἕως Αὐγούστου* (Suda s.v.). Aristocles, if the Rhodian is intended, was a contemporary of Strabo (XIV, 655 §13, *Ἀριστοκλῆς ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς* in a list of eminent Rhodians). Strabo was born c. 60 B.C. (cf. Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, III p. 553) and was still alive in 14 A.D. Didymus must have used

Aristocles' accounts of divine multipersonality as is all but postulated in Clement's passage above: Clement read Didymus' report that clearly marked what was due to Aristocles and what was the Didymeian addition to the Aristoclean enumeration. This fact elevates Aristocles' work on the theological subject of multipersonality to a high level of authority if Didymus himself employed it as near definitive, a flattering compliment. It is plausible that we possess another instance of such complimentary utilization of Aristocles' scholarship on Didymus' part, as V. Rose contends, *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus*, p. 619, in the section entitled *Fragmenta quae librorum errore Aristoteli tribuuntur pro Aristocle*, Fr. 10 (= Scholia on Apollonius Rhodius IV 973 p. 300.7 sqq. Wendel). The question is about ὀρείχαλκος, its existence being disputed. The information (probably literal quotation) comes from Didymus' work *Κωμικὴ λέξις* (the work even if its author is not mentioned), Didymus Fr. I 5, 43a Schmidt 70. Aristocles (with Rose in place of the transmitted Ἀριστοτέλης) maintained, in a work called *Τελευταί*, that there exists no such thing, nor did its name occur in credited authors or in proper common usage. (Aristotle's employment of the word in *Analytica Posteriora* B, 92b22, may imply that he considered the thing of questionable existence, but he in any case presupposes the validity of its occurrence as a name). Macrobius (*Saturnalia* I, 18,1-3 = Rose, *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus*, p. 616 Fr. 5) refers to Aristocles' (again the mss. reading is Aristoteles; but Macrobius' manner of reference itself points to someone other than the great Aristotle: nam +Aristoteles+, qui Theologoumena scripsit etc., i.e. Aristocles, he who wrote Theologoumena) elaborate argumentation concerning the putative identity of Apollo with Dionysus. The arguments have to do with religious facts, ritual, oracular and celebrational observances; they have nothing to do with the ethico-metaphysical speculations of Porphyry (e.g. Macrobius, *op.cit.* I, 17,70), like that Minerva is the virtue of the Sun, administering prudence to human minds. Macrobius invokes in the same (I, 18,4) passage the authority of Varro and Granius Flaccus Licinianus to the same effect. Now Granius is referred to by Arnobius (*Adversus nationes*, III, 31 = *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus* p. 616 Fr. 4) as quoting from Aristocles' (inevitably the Arnobian ms. has Aristoteles) detailed argumentation involving literary documentation, that Athena is (theologically) the Moon: Aristocles (correcting from

Aristoteles with Rose), ut Granius memorat, vir ingenio praepotens atque in doctrina praecipuus, Minervam esse Lunam probabilibus argumentis explicat et litterata auctoritate demonstrat. (Nobody would refer to Aristotle himself as *vir ingenio praepotens atque in doctrina praecipuus*; rather one writes in this way about some more obscure scholarly figure whom he wants to commend as one of the finest). The theology of this passage, as well as that of the one previously mentioned with regard to the Baccho-Apolline identity, belongs to the great department of natural theology, the one more specifically with an emphasis on divine *συνοικειώσεις* and Solar (and Lunar) religious preeminence. Aristocles thus must have combined this type of theology with the one that practises divine multipersonalism in connection with the doctrine of deified mortal superexcellence.

Other pieces of evidence fit nicely in this picture. For an instance of physical explanation of divine stories, v. Scholia on Pindar, *Olympionici* VII 66a-d (two similar scholia, I quote the second and fuller): Ἀριστοκλῆς δὲ ὑφίσταται τὴν γένεσιν Ἀθηνᾶς (one evidently among her various personalities) ἐν Κρήτῃ· νέφει γάρ φησι κεκρύφθαι τὴν θεόν, τὸν δὲ Δία πλήξαντα τὸ νέφος προφᾶναι αὐτήν. A Cretan Athena is a unique variant to the lists of multiple Athenas reported by Cicero, Ampelius, Clement and Arnobius. But it is found in the list of Firmicus Maternus, *De errore profanarum religionum*, 16, p. 37.17 sqq. Ziegler: quinque Minervas fuisse legentibus nobis tradit antiquitas. Una est Vulcani filia quae Athenas condidit, ... (this and the second Athena correspond to the first two in the other accounts; the third one is the daughter of Cronus as in Clement and Arnobius). Quarta Jovis Cretici regis fuit filia, quae occisum patri detulit Liberum. (And the fifth is Athena Pallas in tune with the other reports). This Cretan Athena substitutes the Arcadian Coryphasian in one of the other lists³⁶. And she is brought into connection with the Cretan Zeus (a king as we are told) and the Titanic dismemberment of Dionysus; she would relate to the role played by Athena in the sequel to that abomination.

For another instance of divine multiple personality according to Aristocles v. Scholia to Euripides *Rhesus*, 29, II pp. 327-8 Schwartz; (p. 328.4 sqq.): διττὰς δὲ τὰς Εὐρώπας ἀναγράφουσιν ἔνιοι· μίαν μὲν Ὠκεανίδα ἀφ' ἧς καὶ τὸ ἐν μέρος τῆς οἰκουμένης κληθῆναι,

καθάπερ Ἀπίων ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἐπωνύμων καὶ Ἀριστοκλῆς (with Rose and Schwartz from Ἀριστοτέλης in cod. A (Vaticanus 909)) ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῆς Θεογονίας, ἐτέραν δὲ Φοῖνικος τοῦ Ἀγήνορος etc. (others, like Callimachus and Zenodotus identified the two). εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ καὶ τρίτην ἀναγράψαντες ἱστοροῦσιν», καθάπερ Ἡγήσιππος ἐν τοῖς Παλληνιακοῖς γράφων οὕτως etc. (Fr.Gr.H. 391F3). Hegesippus, so far as this testimony goes, would not have gone beyond the differentiation of various heroic persons of demigod status. We do not know, in still another case, who first postulated two Phineis and what his theological theory was; Etymologicon Genuinum (cod. A (Vaticanus 1818), s.v. ὀπίζεσθαι. It is finally conceivable that the various groups of Couretes (and other similar divinities) distinguished directly and indirectly in Strabo's great excursus on mystic and ecstatic cults (X, 3 esp. 466-74) may come from Aristocles the Rhodian, whom we saw Strabo mentioned as his contemporary. Καθ' ἡμᾶς in Strabo includes phase-differences in synchronization of life-cycles, so it is consistent with persons older than himself. (Cf. Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, III pp. 553-4). Thus if Didymus is probably the strict contemporary of Strabo, Aristocles is an older one. And so Didymus could also employ Aristocles as argued above. Granius Flaccus Licinianus (perhaps the contemporary of Pliny, cf. Rose, *op.cit.* p. 617) would be drawing on Aristocles and Didymus collections. And we can envisage the rough outlines of a series of similar endeavours: Mnaseas - Aristocles - Granius Flaccus. The game exercised the Romans well. Who might be hidden behind the corrupt Caruilius in Lactantius Placidus, *In Statii Thebaida commentum* IV 481-483 p. 290 Sweeney, is anybody's guess; for a choice of possibilities v. the critical apparatus *ad loc.* Perhaps Caruilius Pictor the Vergiliomastix is not an unattractive suggestion (Bickel). The passage reports the many Heremeses, four of them. Hermetic multipersonality is a good example of greater and lesser diversities among all extant reports: they bespeak a composite tradition and many sources after the 1st century B.C. The Euhemerist theory of the double nature of divinity was transplanted to Latin soil as the distinction between *dei naturales* and *dei ab hominibus instituti* (e.g. St. Augustinus, *De civitate dei*, VI, 6), the doctrine being ascribed to Varro. But Dionysius the Stoic, teaching in Athens c. 50 B.C., distinguished similarly between *dei nativi* and *dei facti* (cf. Tertullian, *Ad nationes*, II, 14).

Κ

It does not seem that this line of thought (the Euhemerist-Mnasean theological theory of religious polypersonalism) was particularly widespread. When Diodorus comes to treat of the specifically Greek mythology regarding Dionysus (III, 62 IV 5), he observes at the beginning of his detailed account (III, 62, 2): *τῶν δὲ παλαιῶν μυθογράφων καὶ ποιητῶν περὶ Διονύσου γεγραφότων ἀλλήλοις ἀσύμφωνα καὶ πολλοὺς καὶ τερατώδεις λόγους κατεβέβλημένων, δυσχερές ἐστιν ὑπὲρ τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου καὶ τῶν πράξεων καθαρῶς εἰπεῖν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἓνα Διόνυσον, οἱ δὲ τρεῖς γεγονέναι παραδεδώκασιν, εἰσὶ δ' οἱ γένεσιν μὲν τούτου ἀνθρωπόμορφον μὴ γεγονέναι τὸ παράπαν ἀποφαινόμενοι, τὴν δὲ τοῦ οἴνου δόσιν Διόνυσον εἶναι νομίζοντες.* These last exponents of natural theology have of course a unitarian account (whose basic outlines follow in §§3-10). Diodorus emphasises that such a Dionysiac natural theology is consistent with Orphism (§8). On the other hand the upholders of a personal divinity with physical existence are divided between those who keep to a unitarian understanding of Dionysus and those who introduce three hypostases, distributing functions, roles and benefices to them according to an appropriate collocation of characters (63, 1-2). The three Dionysi involved are (63, 3 sqq.) the Indian (bearded giver of wine and the fruits of the trees), the son of Zeus and Persephone or Demeter (agriculturalist, horned), and the Semelean one (the author of mysteries, of *τελεταί*, ecstatic rites, of Orphic religiosity). The very artificiality in the distribution of attributes and functions is a mighty index of the unnatural arbitrariness of the whole conception. How can one separate the Orphic-teletic-mysteric Dionysus from Zagreus, the Son of Persephone? And how can one divide ecstatic rites from wine inebriation or intoxication, and the Eleusinian ritual from the Orphic symbolism? Or how can one segregate hypostases according to the age of the god, the beautiful youth being indicative of another hypostasis from that signified by the mature or older man of earlier depictions? Diodorus then goes on (III 67 sqq.) to report a reputedly Libyan (= African) account (according to Dionysius, v. supra). This story postulates three Dionysi again. Only now the first one combines in his person practically everything Dionysiac: his passion at the hands of the Titans, wine, fruits, horns, exploits, campaigns and wars. Only the

mysteric rites (*τελευταί*) are left for the second one, a son of Zeus and Io who ruled Egypt (74, 1). As to the third one, the Semelean, *ζηλωτὴν γενέσθαι τῶν προτέρων. τὰς δ' ἀμφοτέρων προαιρέσεις μιμησάμενον* etc.: he did what the other two had done in combination! And for this irrational, not any less than irreligious duplication he has just a chronological incompatibility to adduce (74, 6): *ὑπὲρ δὲ τοῦ πλείους Διονύσου γεγονέναι σὺν ἄλλαις ἀποδείξεσι πειρῶνται φέρειν τὴν ἐκ τῆς Τιτανομαχίας· συμφωνομένου γὰρ παρὰ πᾶσιν ὅτι Διόνυσος τῷ Διὶ συνηγωνίσαστο τὸν πρὸς τοὺς Τιτᾶνας πόλεμον, οὐδαμῶς πρέπειν φασὶ τὴν τῶν Τιτάνων γενεὰν τιθέναι κατὰ τοὺς τῆς Σεμέλης χρόνους οὐδὲ Κάδμον τὸν Ἀγήνορος ἀποφαίνεσθαι πρεσβύτερον εἶναι τῶν Ὀλυμπίων θεῶν.* It is clearly the Euhemerist notion of a historical mythology that creates this intellectual havoc.

With Book IV Diodorus starts anew an investigation into Dionysiac stories. He does not hesitate to accommodate still another source in his composite account. He speaks of two Dionysii now distinguished only culturally, the one belonging to the Egyptian, the other to the Indian religion (IV, 1, 6-7). He once more passes onto the Greek stories. There is the story of the Semelean Dionysus, again with all attributes, exploits and functions (IV, 2-3). There is now no mention of Dionysus' dismemberment. A second Dionysus is introduced (IV, 4, 1-2) merely as Sabazius the son of Zeus and Persephone. There are nocturnal and hidden rites of obscenity associated with him (the *τελευταί* previously mentioned). In addition, he is horned given his involvement in the yoking of bulls and in agricultural pursuits. The age difference between the two is now pictorially represented (§2): *καὶ τὸν μὲν ἐκ Σεμέλης γενόμενον ἐν τοῖς νεωτέροις χρόνοις φασὶ τῷ σώματι γενέσθαι τρυφερὸν καὶ παντελῶς ἀπαλόν, εὐπρεπεία δὲ πολὺ τῶν ἄλλων διενεγκεῖν καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἀφροδισιακὰς ἡδονὰς εὐκατάφορον γεγονέναι* etc. Cf. 5 §2: *δίμορφον δ' αὐτὸν δοκεῖν ὑπάρχειν διὰ τὸ δύο Διονύσου γεγονέναι, τὸν μὲν παλαιὸν καταπύγωνα διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἀρχαίους πάντας πωγωνοτροφεῖν, τὸν δὲ νεώτερον ὠραῖον καὶ τρυφερὸν καὶ νέον.* That the Semelean was given to sexual pleasures oddly configures with the emphasis on the obscene rites of the older Dionysus. Not to mention that the representational difference in Dionysiac depictions has clearly to do with the change in late archaic times from bearded

and older Dionysus to the youth of exquisite beauty, hardly the result of the introduction of another divine hypostasis!

We conclude that Dionysiac multipersonality boils down in the end to, first, a chronological observation alien to the nature of ancient religion; and, second, to a difference in the representational styles of the god in different epochs.

There are important religious, theological and philosophical issues, however, involved in Dionysus' birth, not unlike those that tormented the Christian Fathers in relation to the divine incarnation of the Son-Logos in and from the Virgin. In the context of ancient Greek religiosity, the theological equivalent of incarnation was discovered in the reality of divine epiphany.

The chronological incoherence in Dionysiac myths is related to a sharpened and clearer theological problematique in Arrian's argumentation (*Anabasis* II, 16), that there existed synonymous deities antecedent to the semigods of the heroic age that go by the same name. Arrian's point is to explain that the Hercules at Tyrus to whom Alexander the Great wanted to sacrifice was different, and of a primeval cult, from the Argive Hercules the son of Alcmena. He synchronises according to the usual generation count: Dionysus is third from Cadmus the Phoenician, hence coeval to Labdacus, another grandchild of Cadmus; while Hercules is a contemporary of Oedipus, hence, third again from Dionysus. But the Tyrian Hercules is worshipped there *πολλαῖς γὰρ γενεαῖς πρότερον τιμᾶται ἐν Τύρῳ Ἑρακλῆς ἢ Κάδμον ἐκ Φοινίκης ὀρμηθέντα Θήβας κατασχεῖν* etc. Besides, there is still another Hercules, an Egyptian god of the Dodecatheon, distinct from both the Tyrian and the Greek synonymous beings. §2: *σέβουσι δὲ καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι ἄλλον Ἑρακλέα, οὐχ ὑπερ Τύριοι ἢ Ἕλληνες* etc. Arrian employs the cultural as well as the chronological criterion of identity for deities. He argues that the Hercules worshipped at Tartessus of Spain must be the Tyrian one, on the grounds that the foundation of Tartessus is Phoenician, that the architecture of his Temple and the sacrificial ritual are also Phoenician; §4: *ὡς τόν γε ἐν Ταρτησσῶ πρὸς Ἰβήρων τιμώμενον Ἑρακλέα, ἵνα καὶ στήλαι τινες Ἑρακλέους ὀνομασμένοι εἰσι, δοκῶ ἐγὼ τὸν Τύριον εἶναι Ἑρακλέα, ὅτι Φοινίκων κτίσμα ἢ Ταρτησσοῦ καὶ τῶ Φοινίκων νόμῳ τε νεὼς πεποιήται τῶ Ἑρακλεῖ τῶ ἐκεῖ καὶ αἱ θυσίαι θύονται*. He goes on to pour fun on the myths that would

make the Greek Hercules go to the western extremities of the world to fetch Geryone's cattle for Eurysthenes (§§5-6). Within the same culture the chronological criterion becomes paramount in deciding identities. Different parentage has to be associated to chronological diversity. §3: *καθάπερ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι Διόνυσον τὸν Διὸς καὶ Κόρης σέβουσιν, ἄλλον τοῦτον Διόνυσον· καὶ ὁ Ἰακχος ὁ μυστικὸς τούτῳ τῷ Διονύσῳ, οὐχὶ τῷ Θηβαίῳ ἐπάδεται.*

This is neat but artificial. In the Lenaia, the priestly torch-bearer, one of the highest officials of the Eleusinian worship, called on the people to invoke the god of the festivity (Scholia to Aristophanes, *Ranae*, 479 = *Carmina Popularia*, 24 Diehl):

καλεῖτε θεόν.

To which demand the assembled people complied thus:

Σεμελήι' Ἰακχε πλουτοδότα.

The mysteric Iacchus was thus Semele's son in this sacred and hieratic invocation; not connected to Dionysus the son of Zeus and Kore. Or rather Semele was a manifestation of the Koric hypostasis. The Cretans maintained that the Dionysus who according to the Orphic ritual was dismembered by the Titans was the god who was born in Creta from Zeus and Persephone. Diodorus V, 75, 4: *τοῦτον δὲ τὸν θεὸν* (namely the god of vine and wine and of the fruits of the trees, the universal provider of man in his needs and sustenance) *γενεῖναι φασὶν ἐκ Διὸς καὶ Φερσεφόνης κατὰ τὴν Κρήτην, ὃν Ὀρφεὺς κατὰ τὰς τελετὰς παρέδωκε διασπώμενον ὑπὸ τῶν Τιτάνων.* Diodorus appeals to the doctrine of divine multipersonality in the case of Dionysus, too; but he makes clear that the Cretans considered theirs as the true god (§§4-5). Normative Orphism (*Ἱεροὶ Λόγοι ἐν Ραψωδίαις ΚΔ'*) for the later periods, seems to have adopted this parentage for Dionysus, from Zeus and Kore (OF 198 we have to subtract the Neoplatonic metaphysical language of Proclus to reach the presupposed Orphic datum. The same descent is affirmed in the Orphic theology according to Hieronymus and Hellanicus, OF58. It must have been the orthodox tradition. V. OF210). Simultaneously, there was there talk of god's birth from the thigh of Zeus, OF199 p.

222 Kern (cf. Orphici Hymni 47.3 (Σαβαζίου); 49.1; 3 (Ίπτας). Here also Iacchus is identified with Bacchus; Ipta is his *τροφός*). The divine Passion was applied to this new child god (*καίπερ ἔόντι νέω καὶ νηπιῷ εἰλαπιναστῆ*, OF207. Διόνυσος ὁ νέος θεός cf. OF205); v. OF209-216. How were the two births of Dionysus from Persephone and from Semele harmonized in one divine hypostasis (as they indeed were, if nothing singular is missing from the extant accounts in this case) is difficult to conceptualise³⁷. The Neoplatonic way to account within one and the same world- and thought-structure for the extreme mythological and ritual diversity of the same deity in positive religion, was the doctrine of homology: the same basic pattern repeats itself on all levels of reality, and thus a cohesive line (of procession) runs through all world-orders, constituted by the identical pattern in various manifestations. A locus classicus of this construal is to be found in Proclus' Commentary on the Timaeus, prooemium E (III 168,15 Diehl); the question is about the fundamental Orphic succession of Cosmic Rulers Φάνης - Νύξ - Οὐρανός - Κρόνος - Ζεὺς - Διόνυσος. Proclus then observes: οὗτοι δὴ πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς ἄνωθεν ἀπὸ τῶν νοητῶν καὶ νοερῶν ἀρξάμενοι θεῶν χωροῦσι διὰ τῶν μέσων τάξεων καὶ ἐς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα καὶ τὰ τῆδε κοσμήσωσι· Φάνης γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς νοητοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς νοεροῖς, ἐν τῇ δημιουργικῇ τάξει καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὑπερκοσμίοις καὶ τοῖς ἐγκοσμίοις· καὶ Νύξ καὶ Οὐρανὸς ὁμοίως. αἱ γὰρ ιδιότητες αὐτῶν διὰ πάντων χωροῦσι τῶν μέσων. αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ μέγιστος Κρόνος οὐχὶ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ Διὸς τέτακται καὶ μετὰ τὴν Δίῃον βασιλείαν, μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων Τιτάνων τὴν Διονυσιακὴν μερίζων δημιουργίαν, καὶ ἄλλος μὲν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ἄλλος δὲ ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ σελήνην, καὶ ἐν μὲν τῇ ἀπλανεῖ ἄλλος, ἐν δὲ ταῖς πλανωμέναις ἄλλος - καὶ Ζεὺς ὁμοίως καὶ Διόνυσος; ταῦτα μὲν οὖν καὶ διαρρήδην εἴρηται τοῖς παλαιοῖς. We have here a theory of metaphysical divine multipersonality at the other extreme of, but on a similar construal to, the Euhemerian historical multipersonalism.

Closer to the truth of the relevant religious experience is however what Proclus himself suggests on this problem in his poetic Hymn to Athena (vv. 11 sqq.):

ἢ κραδίην ἐσάωσας ἀμιστύλλευτον ἀνακτος
αἰθέρος ἐν γυάλουσι μερίζομένου ποτὲ Βάκχου

Τιτῆνων ὑπὸ χερσὶ - πόρες δὲ ἐ πατρὶ φέρουσα,
 ὄφρα νέος βουλήσιν ὑπ' ἀρρήτοισι τοκῆος
 ἐκ Σεμέλης περὶ κόσμον ἀνηβήσῃ Διόνυσος.

From the dismemberment of older Dionysus, Pallas Athena saved his heart and brought it to his father Zeus, in order that, conforming to the inscrutable designs of this paternal divine world-ruler, the god Dionysus might be reborn in the world from Semele, a human heroine. That is, the new Dionysus is a new Dionysiac world epiphany of the preeternal god. Diodorus (IV 3, 2-3) speaks in the plural of these divine presences in the human realm: *καὶ τὸν θεὸν νομίζειν κατὰ τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον* (sc. during the trieteric Bacchic celebrations) *ποιεῖσθαι τὰς παρὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐπιφανείας*.

The religious pressure to counteract the intellectual tendency to distinguish, and then separate, the god who is twice born from two mothers can be observed in actu in elements that show the process of the abstraction and the deification of Semele. She starts as a human heroine. But Aeschylus, in his *Semele*, represented her as showing the spirit of the god whom she bears in her womb: she would fall into fits of ecstasis; and women who touched her belly fell into ecstasis, too. Scholia to Apollonius Rhodius I 636a: *τὴν Σεμέλην Θυώνην καλοῦσιν, ἐπειδὴ Αἰσχύλος ἔγκυον αὐτὴν παρεισήγαγεν οὔσαν καὶ ἐνθεαζομένην, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐφαπτομένας τῆς γαστρὸς αὐτῆς ἐνθεαζομένας*. Already in the Homeric Hymns (I 21) Semele is called *Θυώνη*. Sappho speaks of *Θυώνας ἰμε[ρόντα παῖδα]* (17.10 Voigt, supplying what is missing with Wilamowitz). In any case Dionysus and his mother must be meant as the reference is to the great Lesbian Triad (Alcaeus 129.1-9 Voigt). The Great Aeolian Mother of All (*Αἰολίαν κυδαλίμαν θεόν / πάντων γενέθλαν*, Alcaeus 129.6-7) is in Sappho apparently identified with the Achaean Hera (17.1-10). Zeus is the second member of the triad and Dionysus Ὠμηστής (The Raw-flesh-eater) the third, in this order in both cases. The extreme opposition of Hera to Dionysus according to standard accounts is here resolved. Pindar also refers to Semele by the name of *Θυώνη* (Pythionici III, 99 Snell). And the Scholia ad loc. explain the name from the root *θύ-ω* or *θυί-ω*, rage, seethe: *Θυώνη ἢ Σεμέλη. οὕτω δὲ ὀνομάζεται ἀπὸ τοῦ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον πάθους, ὅτι θύει καὶ ἐνθουσιᾷ κατὰ τοὺς χορούς. οὕτω καὶ Θυάδες αἱ Βάκχαι, καὶ θύσθλα οἱ θύρ-*

σοι. (Cf. Etymologicum Magnum s.vv. *θύσθλα* and *θύρσος*). And the Scholia to Apollonius Rhodius III, 755 note: *ἔθλιεν: ὄρμα, ἐκινεῖτο* (a rapid, raving motion) *ἔνθεν καὶ Θυιάδες αἱ Βάκχαι*³⁸. The Delphic Thyiades performed the rite of the Raising of (Dionysus) Liknites (the god of the winnowing-fan). This ritual of arousing was connected to the Titanic dismemberment and death of Dionysus and his burial in Delphi. So Plutarch (with thorough and direct access to the arcana Delphica as well beyond the facts of open worship, drawing also here on *Περὶ Ὀσίων* by Socrates of Argos [rather than of Co]) work), *De Iside et Osiride* 364F-365A: *ὁμολογεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ Τιτανικὰ καὶ Νυκτέλια τοῖς λεγομένοις Ὀσίριδος διασπασμοῖς καὶ ταῖς ἀναβιώσεσι καὶ παλιγγενεσίαις· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ περὶ τὰς ταφάς. Αἰγύπτιοι τε γὰρ Ὀσίριδος πολλαχοῦ θήκας, ὥσπερ εἴρηται, δεικνύουσι καὶ Δελφοὶ τὰ τοῦ Διονύσου λείψανα παρ' αὐτοῖς παρὰ τὸ χρηστήριον ἀποκεῖσθαι νομίζουσι, καὶ θύουσιν οἱ Ὀσιοὶ θυσίαν ἀπόρρητον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ὅταν οἱ Θυιάδες ἐγείρωσι τὸν Λικνίτην. [For Dionysus' tomb at Delphi v. Philochorus Fr.Gr.H. 328F7. As Jacoby observes ad loc. (IIIb Supplement, *A Commentary on the Ancient Historians of Athens*, vol. I p. 272) the Orphic tradition to the same effect goes back earlier. V. OF35; Callimachus Fr. 643 Pfeiffer (where Pfeiffer's comment suffers from the wrong idea of Dionysiac bifurcation); Euphorio Fr. 13 Powell]. By this reckoning of the Thyiades' connection then, Semele-Thyone is the arch-maenad, the eponymous divinity of the Thyiades, the appropriate mother to the god of ecstasis.*

Pindar refers to Semele also by her proper name (*Olympionici* II, 26). He describes her as living among the Olympians after her death by Zeus' thunderbolt (Cf. *Pythionici* XI, 1). And he mentions three gods (and also perhaps the Muses) that are particularly fond of her: Zeus, Dionysus and, first of all, Athena (*ibid.*). Athena is involved here obviously because of her role in preserving Dionysus' heart during the Titanic abomination committed against the young boy. Thus Pindar takes for granted the identity of the Semelean Dionysus with the Dionysus of the Passion.

The common view seems to have been that Semele was called Thyone upon her apotheosis. V. Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, III, 38, 3; Diodorus, IV, 25, 4; (For a prosaic, Euhemerian account cf. Charax of Pergamon, Fr.Gr.H. 103F14). But for Orphism, it is rather the other

way round. Diodorus (III, 62) speaks of the cosmic interpretation of religion in connection with the mythology of Dionysus and Demeter. He comments that such a construal is (§8) *σύμφωνα δὲ τούτοις εἶναι τὰ τε δηλούμενα διὰ τῶν Ὀρφικῶν ποιημάτων καὶ τὰ παρεισαγόμενα κατὰ τὰς τελετάς* (i.e. mysteric cults), *περὶ ὧν οὐ θέμις τοῖς ἀμυήτοις ἱστορεῖν τὰ κατὰ μέρος* (i.e. in detail). And he goes on (§9): *ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐκ Σεμέλης γένεσιν εἰς φυσικὰς ἀρχὰς ἀνάγουσιν, ἀποφαινόμενοι Θυώνην ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων τὴν γῆν ὠνομάσθαι, καὶ τεθεῖσθαι τὴν προσηγορίαν [καὶ] Σεμέλην μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ σεμνήν εἶναι τῆς θεοῦ ταύτης τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ τιμὴν, Θυώνην δ' ἀπὸ τῶν θυομένων αὐτῇ θυσιῶν καὶ θυηλῶν* etc. This would make the two births of Dionysus to coincide: Semele is earth, and Demeter, too. In that context Diodorus had explicitly treated of Demeter (rather than Persephone) as the divine mother of Dionysus (II, 62, 6-7).

In these speculations, one feels one is present at the ancient Greek equivalent of the Christological disputes that so intensely agitated early Christian theological thought. And the solution to such intricate conundra of diverse and opposing moments in vividly significant religious experiences is essentially the same. In simple terms one either makes the hero god; or the god hero; or, best, one has to do with the incarnation, or manifesation (epiphany) of the god in human (proto)history.

The same pressure to escape from the difficulties of incarnation or epiphany by translating the (historical) time event onto atemporal (mythical or metaphysical) reality can be seen through the reports that make Dionysus' mother *Διώνη*. So, we learn, Euripides in his *Antigone* (fr. 177 Nauck):

*ὦ παῖ Διώνης, ὡς ἔφες μέγας θεός,
Διόνυσε, θνητοῖς τ' οὐδαμῶς ὑποστατός.*

A valuable gloss in Hesychius' Lexicon adds further fuel to this fire. S. v. *Βάκχου Διώνης*. *οἱ μὲν βακχευτρίας Σεμέλης* (i.e. they construe the *Βάκχου* adjectivally). *οἱ δὲ Βάκχου τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ Ἀφροδίτης τῆς Διώνης· παρόσον διωνυμία περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς. Πράξιλλα δὲ ἡ Σικωνία Ἀφροδίτης παῖδα τὸν θεὸν ἱστορεῖ.* (In *Anecdota Bekkeri* I, 225, 4-5 we should correct *Διώνης* from *Διώνη* and *βακχευτρίας* from *βακχεύτριαν*). *Διώνη* is (according to one tradition that boasted

of Homer as an upholder of it) the mother of Aphrodite. (Ilias, E, 371; cf. Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, I, 1,3 where Dione is one among the *Τιτανίδαι*). In later writers Dione is sometimes identified with Aphrodite (cf. Ovid, *Fasti*, 2,459-61; *Ars Amatoria*, 3,3). The Venereal connection of Persephone and Semele is capitalised in this tradition of Dionysus' parentage. What is significant in the present connection is the tendency to get rid of the problem of multiparentage by determining a divine mother for the god in whom all relevant accounts of positive religion can coincide.

The body of evidence tells us of the close significative association of mysteric, chthonic Dionysus-Zagreus with Orphism. There is however a vein of information that testifies to an Orphic emphasis on the Semelean offspring. Among the group of writers who preserve lists of divine multipersonalism, Ioannes Lydus (*De mensibus*, IV 51 p. 107.10 Wünsch), reports: *τέταρτος* (sc. Dionysus) *ὁ Διὸς καὶ Σεμέλης, ᾧ τὰ Ὀρφείως μυστήρια ἐτελείτο, καὶ ὑφ' οὗ οἶνος ἐκεράσθη*. But in the corresponding Ciceronian passage (*De natura deorum*, III, 58) we read: *quartum* (sc. Dionysum) *Jove et Luna, cui sacra Orphica putantur confici*. As Selene is in aspectual identification with Kore-Persephone³⁹ (and Herodotus patently means Selene and Dionysus as the equivalents of Isis [the identity of Demeter and Persephone and Rhea, as the Great Goddess] and Osiris, II, 47; cf. Diodorus I, 11,1), this account really points to the chthonic Dionysus. Thus, we should probably emend *Σεμέλην* in Lydus to *Σελήνην* (as suggested by Mayor, *op.cit.*, III p. 123, comment *ad loc.*), all the more so as there follows in his report a fifth Dionysus *ὁ Νίσου καὶ Θυώνης, ὃς κατέδειξε τριετηρίδα*. This last mention answers exactly to Cicero's testimony: *quintum Niso natum et Thyone, a quo Trieterides constitutae putantur*. The artificiality of this descent is evident even from the sole recourse to Nisus (obviously a construct out of Nysa) whose fantastic story is told by Hyginus, *Fabulae*, 167 and Commodianus, *Instructiones* I, 12.

A corresponding pattern emerges concerning the Eleusinian Mysteries and their Dionysus. Nonnus, in his extensive *Διονυσιακά*, drawing on a multitude of previous works, speaks of a *πρότερος Διόνυσος* from Zeus and Persephone who is dismembered by the Titans: the story of Zagreus is told in the 6th Book. This Dionysus is the only god that sat on the cosmic throne of Zeus (V. vv. 165-205). All the

other Dionysiac myths, the exploits, jurisdictions, traits and relationships, are ascribed to the νέος and νεώτερος Διόνυσος, books 7th to 48th. But the Eleusinian Bacchus, Iacchus, is singled out and identified with Zagreus. When Hera, envious and furious with Dionysus, attempts to raise Persephone's apprehensions and enmity against Dionysus the Younger, she of course reminds her of the cruel fate of her own son, and how he suffered the horrible death in the Titanic hands without Zeus marvellously extending help as he did later on behalf of his younger offspring. She warns the Queen of Hades to take concerted measures so that (XXXI, 66-9):

μηδὲ νέον Διόνυσον ἀνυμνήσωσιν Ἀθήναι,
μηδὲ λάχην γέρας ἴσον Ἐλευσινίῳ Διονύσῳ
μη τελετὰς προτέρου διαλλάξειεν Ἰάκχου
μη τάλαιρον Δήμητρος ἀτιμήσειεν ὀπώρη.

The identification of older Dionysus with the Eleusinian Iacchus is no mere idiosyncratic trait of Nonnus (cf. my study on Baubo and Iacchus). It explicitly reappears in Lucian's recension of subjects fit for orchestics, *de saltatione* 39: ...εἶτα Ἰάκχου σπαραγμόν καὶ Ἥρας δόλον καὶ Σεμέλης κατάφλεξιν καὶ Διονύσου ἀμφοτέρας τὰς γονάς (sc. the one from Semele and the other from Zeus thigh). The sequence also is the normative one, as in Nonnus. But this Eleusinian Dionysus-Iacchus-Zagreus we have seen is the Semelean one. Their identity is safeguarded since they coincide in the Eleusinian ritual and symbolism. Nonnus fails to draw the necessary conclusion: that the new Dionysus is the heroic manifestation, the hero-incarnation of the primeval Zagreus⁴⁰.

One Is Dionysus, *Εἷς Διόνυσος*.

Ovid has nicely caught the substance of the matter. And so he glowingly sings (*Metamorphoseon*, IV, 4 sqq.) of the unitary god:

festum celebrare sacerdos

5 immunesque operum famulas dominasque suorum
pectora pelle tegi, crinalis solvere vittas,
serta coma, manibus frondentis sumere thyrsos

- iuscerat et saevam laesi fore numinis iram
 vaticinatus erat: parent matresque nurusque
 10 telasque calathosque infectaque pensa reponunt
 turaque dant Bacchumque vocant Bromiumque Lyaeumque
 ignigenamque satumque iterum solumque bimatrem:
 additur his Nyseus indetonsusque Thyoneus,
 et cum Lenaeo genialis consitor uvae
 15 Nycteliusque Eleleusque parens et Iacchus et Euhan,
*et quae praeterea per Graias plurima gentes
 nomina, Liber, habes;* tibi enim inconsumpta iuventa est,
 tu puer aeternus, tu formosissimus alto
 conspiceris caelo; tibi, cum sine cornibus adstas,
 20 virgineum caput est; oriens tibi victus, adusque
 decolor extremo qua cingitur India Gange;
 Penthea tu, venerande, bipenniferumque Lycurgum
 sacrilegos mactas Tyrrenaque mittis in aequor
 corpora, tu biugum pictis insignia frenis
 25 colla prenis lyncum. bacchae satyrique sequuntur,
 quique senex ferula titubantis ebrius artus
 sustinet et pando non fortiter haeret asello.
 quacumque ingrederis, clamor iuvenalis et una
 femineae voces impulsaque tympana palmis
 concavaque aera sonant longoque foramine buxus.

What is missing (albeit alluded to) from this wonderful but rather mellow recension of Dionysiac characteristics, functions, works, followers, is the harsher (and antinomically saving) aspect of the god: his passion and action of wildest ecstasis, the extremity of horror in birth, love and death.

NOTES

1. According to Stählin (Clemens Alexandrinus) the second hand (Arethas) notices in the margin of P as a variant *ληνεύουσι* instead of the *ληναίζουσι* in the text. And the great authority of Hesychius comprises the gloss: *ληνεύουσι· βακχεύουσι*, without mention of *ληναίζουσι* which on the other hand is testified, unexplained, by Suda: *ληναίζω*. The corrupt reading of all the Plutarchian manuscripts: *+ὁῦτος ὅτε οὖν+ μαίνονται καὶ +ληραίνουσιν+*, supports optically the *ληναίζουσι*, though acoustically the *ληνεύουσι*

is nearer the later pronunciation. A derivation would be smoother for λην-εύ-ουσι. But ληναϊκός, ληναῖος, ληναίτης, Αθηναίων, all well-attested, point to ληναῖζω. And this form is on the whole preferable, despite, for once, Hesychius.

2. What is usually combined with this ponderous pythic statement as forming e.g. Fr. 15 DK is not necessarily in direct, intended relationship with it really. I mean the pointed dark clarification: εἰ μὴ Διονύσω πομπήν ἐποιοῦντο καὶ ὕμνεον ἄσμα αἰδοίοισιν, ἀναιδέστατα εἴργασται (where the reading εἴργασται of P can be easily retained, on the principle of anomaly, if necessary, with no substantial change of meaning. Only the nuance would be: it is being done, instead of it would have been done. The former concentrates on the fact of the ceremonies in question being again and again performed in the well-known way, the latter emphasises the reversal of character that would ensue upon their dissociation from religious worship. I believe Heraclitus wrote εἴργασται, with more rugged significant force: all is and has been futile, and indeed obnoxious, if not properly done. Grammatical smoothness was certainly not one of his priorities). Besides, Marcovich aptly cites (Heraclitus, ed. Maior, p. 252) Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 868 τέτρηται. In fact we encounter in the Aeschylean passage both forms consecutively, 866 sqq.:

καὶ τραυμάτων μὲν εἰ τόσων ἐτύγχανεν
 ἀνὴρ ὄδ' ὡς πρὸς οἶκον ὠχετεύετο
 φάτις, τέτρηται δικτύου πλέω λέγειν.
 εἰ δ' ἦν τεθνηκὼς ὡς ἐπλήθυσεν λόγοι,
 τρισώματός τ' ἂν Γηρυῶν ὁ δεύτερος
 [πολλὴν ἄνωθεν, τὴν κάτω γὰρ οὐ λέγω,]
 χθονὸς τρίμοιρον χλαῖναν ἐξηύχει λαβίων,
 ἄπαξ ἐκάστῳ κατθανῶν μορφώματι.

This Heraclitean statement belongs with Frs. 5, 14 and 68 DK to the commonly entirely misunderstood group of enigmatic utterances concerning actual observances of the positive Cultus. An even slightly careful reading of the Clementine context shows that it is Clement who brought the two Heraclitean pieces together. More on both will be said elsewhere.

3. The codex has ἐπὶ Αθηναίω ἀγών ἐστιν etc., which is evidently defective as it stands. If my correction (whose material point will be seen afterwards, plain as it is its palaeographical plausibility) displeases, one may adopt the old supplementation: ἐπὶ Αθηναίω ἀγών· <τόπος> ἐστιν etc. Unless one keeps more faithfully to our sole testimony's reading: ἐπὶ Αθηναίω ἀγών· ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἄστει Αθηναίων, περίβολον ἔχον μέγαν etc. (And so Ruhnken,

Auctarium Emendationum ad Hesychium ed. Alberti, ad p. 999; before him Meursius de populis Atticae, teste G. Hermanni, in *Commentarii in Aristophanes Acharnenses*, p. 16). And this is the vulgate construal now.

4. The scholia ad *Equit.* 95 (to which the commentator himself refers back later on in the present passage ...καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου Ἀθηναίους ἐορτῆ ἐνομισθη οἱ Χόες. Τοῦτο δ' ἡμῖν καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν εἴρηται) when giving the same overall information leaves unspecified the occasion under the general formula κατέλαβε δὲ αὐτὸν (sc. ὁ Ὀρέστης τὸν Πανδίονα) εὐωχίαν τινα δημοτελῆ ποιῶντα, an example of the dropping of information through repetition and transcription in its transmission.
5. Not of course in the Acropolis as the Scholia state evidently erring: *Λίμναι τόπος ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει τῶν Ἀθηνῶν*. Perhaps we should drastically emend ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, or ὑπὸ τῇ ἀκροπόλει.
6. Especially towards the final part. *Τρίποδες* was rather the name of that end section and of the place thereabout. It was probably in vogue to take afternoon walks there, judging from the charming incident that Carystius Pergamenus (FHG IV.358) relates concerning Demetrius Phalereus at the time of his decennian government of Athens: *ἐξηλοτύπουν δὲ πάντες οἱ παῖδες τὸν ἐρώμενον αὐτοῦ Δίοννιν. Καὶ τοσοῦτον ἦν τῷ Δημητρίῳ προσελθεῖν ὥστε μετ' ἄριστον αὐτοῦ περιπατήσαντος παρὰ τοὺς Τρίποδες, συνῆλθον εἰς τὸν τόπον παῖδες <οἱ> κάλλιστοι ταῖς ἐξῆς ἡμέραις, ἵν' ὀφθεῖεν αὐτῷ*.
7. This bronze Praxitelean Satyrus was so renowned that he was referred to as The Famous; v. Plinius XXXIV, 8(19) §69: Praxiteles quoque marmore felicior, ideo et clarior fuit; fecit tamen et ex aere pulcherrima opera... et Liberum patrem, et ebriolatum (so I correct in place of ebrietatem) nobilemque una Satyrum quem Graeci Periboeton cognominant etc. He was magically represented as both noble and half-intoxicated, an artistic tour de force no doubt of high artistry, by which lusty youth exhibited in conjugation the exhilarating strength and abandon of wine intoxication with the inebriating but sublimating power of beauty.
8. Maybe not necessarily. Though in §3 the pictures described (without explicit location) must very likely be supposed to decorate the more ancient temple as the previous sentence ended referring to it. Pausanias often employs exaggerate laconicity, relying on what is implied and to be deduced.
9. In this particular case I am rather suspicious (albeit appreciative) of the widespread ancient suspicions.
10. The inscription we are discussing was (part of) the Law concerning the Archon Basileus. On its existence cf. Crates' reference (apud Athenaeus VI, 235c) in his *περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς Διαλέκτου* «διὸ καὶ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Βασιλέως νόμῳ γέγραπται ταυτί etc.; cf. 235d: ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νόμῳ τάδε γέγραπται;

and Pollux III, 39: *γέγραπται δέ τοῦνομα τῶ τοῦ Βασιλέως νόμῳ*; also VI, 35: *καὶ ἀρχεῖόν τι Ἀθήνησι Παρασίτιον καλούμενον, ὡς ἐν τῶ νόμῳ τοῦ βασιλέως ἔστιν εὐρεῖν*. (Probably in both cases Pollux's source was Crates' work as it is a question of the same facts). That Polemon, abbreviating particular information supplied also by Crates, would refer to «*κὰν τοῖς τοῦ βασιλέως νόμοις*» in the plural (Athenaeus VI, 234f) is nothing peculiar: there were certainly many distinct chapters in the Law or various Laws comprised in a body. Some enactments may have been added later and on specific occasions such as the one in Athenaeus VI 235d quoted in Appendix II.

11. A well-known principle of reserved, moderate and mixed democracy.
12. In the ominous Aristotelian conjunction (*Ἀθ. Πολ.* III: *ἦν δ' ἡ τάξις τῆς ἀρχαίας πολιτείας τῆς πρὸ Δράκοντος τοιαύδε. τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς καθίστασαν ἀριστίνδην καὶ πλουτίνδην*), the root of the dissolution of the older type of a natural social state and the painful transformation into a new one based on freedom, is well encapsulated.
13. This, naturally, does not primarily refer to the primeval kingship and the first kings, among which we have regularly dynastic changes almost with each succession; although even then blood legitimation by marriage was often maintained or at least attempted. But it really applies to more rigid and later periods, especially from the time when, with the introduction of the more influential (from a civil point of view) magistracy of Eponymos Archon, and the option for it on the part of the up to then reigning Pylian dynasty, the Codrids, the post of Basileus must have been permanently occupied by the noblest indigenous noble, by the most respectful eupatrid, the reverend chief of a body of exquisite significance in matters religious, on whose tutelary attention so much of the king's function now was exercised. In fact the multiplication of archontes meant the segregation of powers originally vested in one authority and held by one person. From this devolution of authority there emerged the Eponymos Archon as civil magistrate; the Basileus as Tender of things sacred; the Polemarch as leader of hosts; and the Thesmothetae as controllers of the institutions, laws and customs of the public commonwealth, and as overseers of their completion and transcription into written codes.
14. No less than before the best in manly virtue was appointed, though the mode changed.
15. He antedates events, though this is here in tune with the general tendency of the Attic traditions regarding Theseus' reign. However, *καὶ ἡ πόλις πολυάνθρωπος ἐγένετο* may naturally refer to subsequent times and continual enlargement, which, although the almost identical meaning in Thucydides II, 15 repels (*ἐπειδὴ δὲ Θησεὺς ἐβασίλευσε, γενόμενος μετὰ τοῦ ξυνητοῦ*

καὶ δυνατὸς τὰ τε ἄλλα διεκόσμησε τὴν χώραν καὶ καταλύσας τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων (sc. in Attica; not πόλεις strictly speaking of course) τὰ τε βουλευτήρια καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐς τὴν νῦν πόλιν οὖσαν ἐν βουλευτήριον ἀποδείξας καὶ πρυτανεῖον ξυνώκισε πάντας, καὶ νεμομένους τὰ αὐτῶν ἐκάστους ἅπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ ἠνάγκασε μιᾷ πόλει ταύτη χρῆσθαι, ἢ ἀπάντων ἤδη ξυντελούντων ἐς αὐτὴν μεγάλη γενομένη παρεδόθη ὑπὸ Θησέως τοῖς ἔπειτα etc.), yet another Thucydidean passage provides a clue for its confirmation, I, 2: ἐκ γὰρ τῆς ἄλλης Ἑλλάδος οἱ πολέμῳ ἢ στάσει ἐκπίπτοντες, παρ' Ἀθηναίοις οἱ δυνατώτατοι ὡς βέβαιοι ὄν ἀνεχώρουν, καὶ πολῖται γιγνόμενοι εὐθὺς ἀπὸ παλαιοῦ μείζω ἔτι ἐποίησαν πλήθει ἀνθρώπων τὴν πόλιν· ὥστε καὶ ἐς Ἴωνίαν ὕστερον ὡς οὐχ ἰκανῆς οὕσης τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἀποικίας ἐξέπεμψαν. Thucydides evidently has in mind here especially the grand period of μεταναστάσεις from the Trojan War to the Ionian colonization. But to a much minor extent, the phenomenon must have continued up to the emergence of Athens as a considerable city-state in the Pesisistratean era.

16. The date conjecturally specified regards the time of the consolidation of primeval customs into a written kingship-Law; not, naturally, the age of their first institution.
17. Just before the lexicographer notices s.v. *Γεραράδες· αἱ τῶν ἀρίστων ἀνδρῶν γυναικες, καὶ* (an omittendum?) *αἱ τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐν Ἄργει ἄγαλμα ἐνδύουσαι.* Naturally the most respectable matrons would normally be deemed worthy of performing special, honourable services to divinity. The form *γεραράς* makes the active force of the word clear and obvious, as is derived from *γεραίρω* - *γεραρῶ* (**γεράρ-*). In p. 228.9 there is a general (but out of alphabetical order, and in a totally disrupted long sequence) entry: *Γεραράδας· τὰς ἱερείας τοῦ Διονύσου.* Maybe in some other place, priestesses or *πρόσπολοι* of the god were called thus.
18. Apollonius, *Lexicon* s.v. has *Γεραίας· τὰς γέρας τι* (pro *γέρατι*, with Alberti, Villoison and Tollius) *ἐχούσας γυναικας οἱ μὲν· οἱ δὲ τῆς* (pro *τὰς*) *ἱερείας προπόλους <οὔσ>ας.* So I emend to bring it in closer contact with the Homeric incident (cf. vv. 297-304). Eustathius does not even mention, let alone discuss, the undesirable variants .
19. §73: *ἐξώρκωσέ τε τὰς Γεραράς τὰς ὑπηρετούσας τοῖς ἱεροῖς.*
20. Both *ἔθνε* (§73) *θύηται* (§75) *ἔθυσε* (§110) and *ποιήσουσαν* (§76), *ἐποίει* (§79), *ποιῆσαι* (§81). In mystic ritual, *θύειν* does not centrally denote proper sacrifice even when it involves some fire offering of an animal or drink.
21. What Thales philosophized and Aristotle speculated on the Watery principle of the World was but the thought-projection of a deep experience, founded on self-evident observation and first articulated in religious myth and rite:

- that life is conceived, generated and maintained in and through moisture; that arid dryness is death to the body of nature.
22. Aristotle holds (*Αθ. Πολ.* III, 5) that it was the former official seat of the king (at the time of the full *έννεαρχία* and before Solon). But a seeming implication of his formulation (*ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν βασιλεὺς εἶχε τὸ νῦν καλούμενον Βουκόλιον*) that the peculiar name was only given later must be withstood. (No such connotation appears in *Suda* s.v. *ἄρχων* and Bekker *Anecdota* p. 449.17 who reproduce the information regarding the distribution of the magisterial offices at that time). Just as the *ἄρχων* was in the *Πρυτανεῖον* so the king was in the *Βουκόλιον*, which, at the most might have been more usually known as, say, *Βασιλειον* (cf. the *Βασιλειος Στοά*) at the time of its actual occupation by the king, whereas, at his removal together with the other high magistrates to the *Θεσμοθετεῖον* (*ibid.*), the building was universally henceforth called by its other singular name alone. It will turn out that this minutum is of high importance.
23. Or is it *θύων* (raving, seething)?
24. The infinitive is naturally more appropriate than a nude imperative addressed to a God; (let) it be done rather than do it, is the proper attitude.
25. Their common altar is explicitly mentioned in V, 24, 1; both were worshipped under the eponymon *Λαοίτας*.
26. Or in some other arrangement to the same effect.
27. The EM feels, but formulates superficially, the connection 307.44: *ἄρ... ἐπὶ τοῦ αἵματος· διὰ τὸ ἐν τῷ ἔαρι πλεονάζειν τὸ αἶμα*. (See the context there for some thin etymologizations). And similarly the Nicandrian Scholiast, and *Suda* s.v.
28. Photius and *Suda* s.v. *τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀμαξῶν: ...Ἀθήνησι γὰρ ἐν τῇ τῶν Χοῶν ἑορτῇ οἱ κωμάζοντες ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμαξῶν τοὺς ἀπαντῶντας ἔσκωπτόν τε καὶ ἐλοιδόρουν· τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ τοῖς Ληναίοις ὕστερον ἐποίουν*. (Lenaea after Choes) The Scholia on Aristophanes, *Equites*, 346-8 and *Suda* s.v. *ἐξ ἀμάξης* have a naive account which nonetheless supports the valid point: *ἑορτῇ παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὰ Λήναια, ἐν ἧ μέχρι νῦν* (hence, a very late report this is) *ἀγωνίζονται ποιηταὶ συγγράφοντές τινα ἄσματα τοῦ γελασθῆναι χάριν* (an awkward circumlocution for composing comedies) *ἽΟπερ ὁ Δημοσθένης (18.122) εἶπεν ἐξ ἀμάξης· ἐπὶ ἀμαξῶν γὰρ οἱ ἄδοντες καθήμενοι λέγουσι τε καὶ ἄδουσι τὰ ποιήματα (!)*.
29. For Dionysus as *ἔριφος* v. Hesychius s.v. *Ἐριφος*. And for the formulaic proclamation cf. Kerényi, *Dionysos*, pp. 252 sqq. (In IIB3 and IIB4 we have *ταῦρος* and *κριός* instead of *ἔριφος* in exactly the same connection). Arnobius describes the Omophagia as dilaceration practised in divine furor upon goats in place of bulls; *Adv. nationes* V 19: *Bacchanalia etiam praetermittemus inmania quibus nomen Omophagiis graecum est, in quibus*

furore mentite et sequestrata pectoris sanitate circumplectatis vos anguibus, atque ut vos plenos dei numine ac maiestate docelatis, caprorum reclamantium viscera cruentatis oribus dissipatis.

30. In v. 1119 Ἰκαρίαν should be read with Unger (the island Icaria) pro the mss. Ἰταλίαν (and against Dawe's Οἰχαλίαν). In v. 1145, ὑπὲρ κλειτὸν ἢ στονόε-ντα πορθμόν is a real alternative: Dionysos is being invoked to come to Thebes either over Parnassus to the west of Thebes, i.e. from his co-domicilium with Apollo at Delphi; or across a certain moaning sea. Πορθμός need not mean a literal strait, but can signify generally a relatively narrow sea considered appropriate for a passage (similarly with πόρος: as in Ἴονιος πόρος, Pindar Nemaion. 4.53; πέλαγος Αἰγαίου πόρου, Euripides *Helena* 130). So πορθμός the sea as a pathway even more generally, in Pindar, *Isthmion*. 4(3)57. Thus στονόεις πορθμός is here the Aegean Sea, famously often rough, and Dionysus is now expected to come from one or other island place of appropriation. Probably Icaria is meant, which fits nicely to its mention in v. 1120. The very ancient Homeric hymn to Dionysus (no. I in the collection) started with a recension of the competing places of birth for the divine child. (The beginning of the hymn is lacking in the mss. tradition and preserved by Diodorus III, 66, 3). First in the list is Dracanon in Icaria; we should read οἱ μὲν γὰρ Δρακάνω σε τ' Ἰκάρω ἀνεμοέσση in place of the transmitted ...Δρακάνω σ', οἱ δ'... Dracanon is the easterly promontory of Icaria; Strabo, 639: καὶ ἄλλο (sc. πολισμάτιον) Δράκανον, ὁμώνυμον τῇ ἄκρᾳ, ἐφ' ἣ ἰδρύεται, πρόσσορμον ἔχον. The topography and excavations there fit the description exactly. For the conjunction of island and chief promontory cf. Euphorio Fr. 141.3-4 Powell = *Anth. Palatina* VIII 651:

ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν Δολίχης τε καὶ αἰπεινῆς Δρακάνοιο
Ἰκάριον ρήσσει κῆμα περὶ κροκάλαις.

(Δολίχη is an old nme of Icaria, Apollodorus *Bibl.* ii, 6, 3. The island is indeed markedly oblong). The characterization of Dracanon as precipitous (αἰπεινή), although the fact that it also suits the topography of the place may further indicate a mountainous formation. And so Hesychius s.v. Δρακάνιον ὄρος < Ἰκαρίας. And so Theocritus speaks of snowclad Dracanon a certain hyberbole for even the highest peak of Icaria; but the case can be made that the Icarian mountain was also called Dracanon, at least in its easterly part. For Theocritus it is there that Zeus took over the gestation of prematurely aborted Dionysus, putting him into his divine thigh; XXVI 33-4:

χαίροι μὲν Διόνυσος, ὃν ἐν Δρακάνω νιφόνετι
Ζεὺς ὑπατος μεγάλην ἐπιγουνίδα κάτθετο λύσας.

This tradition is followed by Nonnus IX, 16-8:

Καί μιν ἔσω Δρακάνοιο λεχώιον ἀμφὶ κολώνη
πήχῃ κολπωθέντι λαβὼν Μαιήιος Ἑρμῆς
ἠερόθεν πεπότητο.

31. The *στέροψ λιγνύς* which confronts the bacchic epiphanies *ὑπὲρ διλόφου πέτρας* refer perhaps to thunderbolts on the exposed double summit of the *Φαιδριάδες πέτραι* (the Phaedriades rocks hanging above Delphi) and also, complementarily, torches held by the Bacchae as they went from Delphi to the *Κωρύκιον ἄντρον* further up on Parnassus, following the path that we can tread also today. For an epiphany of the God just there, holding pine-torches v. Euripides, *Bacchae*, 306-7:

ἔτ' αὐτὸν ὄψῃ καπὶ Δελφίσιν πέτραις
πηδῶντα σὺν πεύκαισι δικόρυφον πλάκα etc.

The upland (*πλάξ*) indicated must be the plateau of Livadi as Dodds suggested (in his edition of the play, p. 110) the stretch of wild but fairly level country which lies behind the two summits of the Phaedriades. This area lies en route from Delphi to the Corycian Cave. The Phaedriades rocks are shining bright as their very name suggests, esp. when the sunlight falls on them under particular weather conditions or at sunset. And this seems to be what primarily is referred to by Euripides, *Phoinissae*, 226-8:

ὡς λάμπουσα πέτρα πυρὸς
δικόρυφον σέλας ὑπὲρ ἄκρων
βακχειῶν Διονύσου etc.

Of course there was intrinsic interconnection between the natural shining of the Phaedriades, the dazzling gleam of the pine-torches in maenadic processions up the mountain to the place of the sacred orgies in the Corycian cave, and the mystic splendor of the light-carrying divine escorts of the god following his epiphany above Delphi. Cf. Euripides, *Ion*, 716-7:

ἵνα Βάκχιος ἀμφιπύρους ἀνέχων πεύκας
λαιψηρὰ πηδᾷ νυκτιπόλοις ἅμα σὺν βάκχαις

the divine procession properly conflated here with the human. The location is defined again in 1125-7:

*Ξοῦθος μὲν ὄχετ' ἔνθα πῦρ πηδᾶ θεοῦ
βακχείον, ὡς σφαγαῖσι Διονύσου πέτρας
δεύσειε δισσᾶς etc.*

32. Curiously enough, the Peloponnesian Phlius (just to the south of Sicyon) bore aboriginally the name Ἄραντία. Pausanias preserves the mythological tradition; II, 12, 4: *ἐν τῇ γῇ ταύτῃ γενέσθαι πρῶτον Ἄραντά φασιν ἄνδρα αὐτόχθονα· καὶ πόλιν τε ὄκισε περὶ τὸν βουνὸν τοῦτον, ὃς Ἄραντῖνος ἔτι καλεῖται καὶ ἐς ἡμᾶς... ἐνταῦθά τε δὴ πόλιν ὄκισε, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἢ γῆ καὶ ἢ πόλις Ἄραντία ἐκλήθησαν.* V. Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Ἄραντία. Cf. id. s.v. Ἀραιθυρέα for the second palaic name of Phlius: Ἀραιθυρέα was the daughter of Ἄρας. Cf. id. s.v. Φλιοῦς (where the former name is given as Ἀράντεια). Pausanias affirms that the Phliasians had no affinity with the Arcadians, but were rather Argives originally, who became Dorians when these tribes descended on Peloponnesus upon the famed Return of the Heracleids (II, 12, 3). The Macedonian dynasty ἀπὸ Καραίνου was also asserted to be Argive. Argive Achaean (Mycenean) could thus conceivably be the name in Phlius and the Macedonian glosseme ἀράντισιν (supra).

The Phliasian area was rich and contrarial in mythological accounts and religious symbolism. (Cf. Pausanias, *ibid.* §3: *διάφορα δὲ ἐς τοὺς Φλιασίους τὰ πολλὰ εἰδῶς εἰρημένα, τοῖς μάλιστα αὐτῶν ὠμολογημένοις χρήσομαι*). There existed a strong Eleusinian dimension in Phliasian religiosity. The certain cultic foundation of this dimension was the identity of the Phliasian Demeter-ritual with the Eleusinian τελετή. The differences between the two cults consisting in external characteristics, like: (a) the triennial celebration of the rites instead of the Eleusinian annual event; (b) the appointment by election of a different hierophant in each celebration of the rites as against the life-tenure of the corresponding family-reserved office in Eleusis; and (c) the discretion of the hierophant to have relations with a woman or not, in place of the obligatory celibacy of the Eleusinian hierophant (Pausanias, II, 14, 1). The content itself of the rites was the same, something that the Phliasians themselves explained as the imitation on their part of the Eleusinian ritus. Pausanias *ibid.*: *...τὰ δὲ ἐς αὐτὴν τὴν τελετὴν ἐκείνων (sc. τῶν Ἐλευσινίων) ἐστὶ μίμησις· ὁμολογοῦσι δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ μιμείσθαι Φλιάσιοι τὰ ἐν Ἐλευσίνι δρώμενα.*

But the co-implication does not stop there. The place where the ritual was celebrated was called Κελεαί, some thousand meters from the town. The name of the location suggests a reference to Κελεός, the Eleusinian leader at the time of Demeter's wandering and grief. In fact the Phliasian account held that the mysteries were transplanted from Eleusis by Dysaulēs, Celeus' brother; 14, 2: *Δυσαύλην δὲ φασιν ἀδελφὸν Κελεοῦ παραγενόμενον σφί-*

σιν ἐς τὴν χώραν καταστήσασθαι τὴν τελετὴν etc. Pausanias (in the sequel) finds fault with the reason invoked by the Phliasian account for Dysaules' immigration, but this is hardly much to the point. More significant is his criticism against the supposition that Dysaules was a relative of Celeus. He argues (14, 3) that if he really were brother to the Eleusinian leader or an eminent personality in Eleusis in whatever way, he would have been mentioned in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, when a recantation of those instructed by the Goddess on the Mystic Ritual takes place. Pausanias unhesitatingly accepts Homer as the author of the extant hymn; 14, 3: οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ Κελεῶ προσήκων (sc. Dysaules), ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, οὐδὲ ἄλλως ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἐπιφανέσειν Ἐλευσινίων· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε Ὅμηρος παρήκεν αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔπεσιν. ἔστι γὰρ καὶ Ὀμήρῳ πεποιημένα ἐς Δήμητρα· ἐν δὲ αὐτοῖς καταλέγων τοὺς διδασχθέντας ὑπὸ τῆς θεοῦ τὴν τελετὴν Δυσσαίλῃν οὐδένα οἶδεν Ἐλευσίνιον. ἔχει δὲ οὕτω τὰ ἔπη (Homeric Hymn to Demeter, 474-6):

δείξε, Τριπτολέμῳ τε Διοκλεῖ τε πληξίππῳ,
 Εὐμόλπου τε βίῃ Κελεῶ θ' ἡγήτορι λαῶν,
 δρημοσύνην ἱερῶν καὶ ἐπέφραδεν ὄργια πᾶσιν etc.

But this objection is irrelevant. Or rather reveals that the Phliasian story conformed to the Orphic rather than to the Homeric account of the potent events. In the Orphic reports Dysaules was indeed playing a cardinal role in the symbolic transactions. (V. the study on Baubo and Iacchus). The Phliasians insisted anyway that Celeus was their initiator, that he gave the name to the place *Κελεαί* and that he was buried there. Before him the aboriginal Aras was made to lie there (Pausanias, 14, 4). Aras and his two children were invoked before the Eleusinian *τελετή* proper (12, 5).

This specifically Orphic Phliasian Demetrian connection is supplemented by a Dionysian and a Pythagorean one. As to the former, Phlias (the eponymous leader) was Dionysus' son (Apollonius Rhodius whom Pausanias quotes I, 115 sqq.; Pausanias II, 12, 6; Scholia on Apollonius Rhodius I, 115; Stephanus Byzantius s.v. *Φλιοῦς*; scholia D to Ilias, B, 571). The name was also significant in a Dionysean context. *Φλέος* (and *Φλείος*) was an epithet of Dionysus in Priene; H. von Gärtringen, *Inscripfen von Priene*, 174; 162B. A (rare) variant is *Φλεύς*; v. Herodianus Technicus, ed. A. Lentz, I, 400.27-401.2; cf. Choeroboscus, *Epimerismi in Psalm.*, 70, 4 (Etymologicon Magnum 189.39): ...*παῦτα δέ, φημὶ τὸ Φλεύς καὶ Νεύς καὶ Δνεύς, οὐδὲ συνήθη εἰσὶ τοῖς Ἑλλησι* etc. V. Herodianus (*Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως*), Lentz II 911.4-5. Hesychius has the gloss *Φλέω Διονύσου ἱερόν* (sic, sine interpunctione legendum ut sanum esse). To the explanation of the term

Plutarch devotes half of one of his Symptotical Problems (Quaestionum Convivialium V, 8, 2. 683D-684B) in connection with the explication of Empedoclean verse (31B80 DK):

οὐνεκεν ὀψίγονοί τε σίδαι καὶ ὑπέρφλοια μῆλα.

The proposed etymology relates the word to φλοῖεν (a variant of φλέω), burst out, swell, be in full vigour or bloom: ...γραμματικοὶ τινες ἔφασαν «ὑπέρφλοια» λελέχθαι τὰ μῆλα διὰ τὴν ἀκμήν· τὸ γὰρ ἄγαν ἀκμάζειν καὶ τεθηλέναι «φλοῖεν» ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν λέγεσθαι. καὶ τὸν Ἀντίμαχον οὕτω πως «φλοῖουσιν ὀπώρας» (Fr. 36 Kinkel) εἰρηκέναι τὴν τῶν Καδμείων πόλιν· ὁμοίως τὸν Ἄρατον ἐπὶ τοῦ Σειρίου λέγοντα «καὶ τὰ μὲν ἔρρωσεν, τῶν δὲ φλόον ὤλεσε πάντα» (Phaenomena, 335), τὴν χλωρότητα καὶ τὸ ἄνθος τῶν καρπῶν «φλόον» προσαγορεύειν· εἶναι δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τινάς, οἱ Φλοῖω Διούσῳ θύουσιν. Similarly Aelianus, *Varia Historia*, III, 41: ὅτι τὸ πολυκαρπεῖν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ὠνόμαζον φλύνειν· ὅθεν τὸν Διόνυσον Φλεῶνα ἐκάλουσαν etc. There is a tantalizing variation in the orthography of the name, φλέ-, φλο-, φλοι-, φλυ-, φλύζ-, φλοιδ-. The various forms may reflect a shift of emphasis in their common semantic field, from swell to teem with abundance, abound, to be in full vigour or bloom, to boil over, bubble up, to burst out. The *Φλύακες*, a Dionysian play of tragic burlesque, is connected to the core meaning of this field. Both the Peloponnesian Phlius and the Attic deme Phlyeis are etymologically related to this field, just as they are mythologically. A wondrous local tradition would have Pythagoras to stem from Phlius. A certain Hippasus (synonymous to the famous later Pythagorean) was at the time of the Doric invasion head of the faction that called for vigorous resistance against the enemy. He failed to persuade the people and as a result he emigrated, together with those of the same mind, to Samos. A fourth-generation descendant of his was the great Pythagoras. Pausanias II, 13, 2: ...Ἴππασος δὲ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ διεκελεύοντο ἀμύνασθαι μηδὲ πολλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἀμαχεῖ τοῖς Δωριεῦσιν ἀφίστασθαι. προσεμένου δὲ τοῦ δήμου τὴν ἐναντίαν ταύτη γνώμην, οὕτως Ἴππασος σὺν τοῖς ἐθέλουσιν ἐς Σάμον φεύγει. Ἴππασου δὲ τούτου τέταρτος ἦν ἀπόγονος Πυθαγόρας ὁ λεγόμενος γενέσθαι σοφός· Μνησάρχου γὰρ Πυθαγόρας ἦν τοῦ Εὐφρονος τοῦ Ἴππασου. ταῦτα μὲν Φιλιάσιοι λέγουσι περὶ αὐτῶν, ὁμολογοῦσι δὲ σφισι τὰ πολλὰ καὶ Σικυῶνιοι. (Of course, there is no way that four generations can span more than half a millennium, the period from the Doric Descent to, say, the mid 6th century B.C. For a correct reckoning of time intervals relative to the Pythagorean doctrine of transmigration of souls, v. Iamblichus, *Theologoumena Arithmetica*, 40 p. 52, 8 de Falco = Aristoxenus Fr. 12

Wehrli. On the other hand, in the above-quoted passage the Doric challenge from Argos and Corinth against Phlius took place in the second generation after Temenos; Pausanias II, 13, 1: *Φηγνίδας ἐπ' αὐτὴν* (sc. Phlius) *ὁ Φάλκου τοῦ Τημένου Δωριεὺς ἔκ τε Ἄργους στρατεύει καὶ ἐκ τῆς Σικωνίας*. Even so the period cannot cover the entire interval. Obviously, the memory of those events was obscured by time; the attack may have happened earlier or later than the preserved genealogies inconsistently postulate). Significantly, Phliasians were the latest most eminent representatives of the Pythagorean movement, who held up the longest: with them the tradition was extinguished. Diogenes Laertius, VIII, 45-6: *Ἦκμαζε* (sc. Pythagoras) *δὲ [καὶ] κατὰ τὴν <πρώτην καὶ> ἐξηκοστὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα* (536-532 B.C.; Diodorus puts Pythagoras, *ἀκμή* at the 61st Olympiad, X, 3, 1 specifically on the year of eponymous archon Thericles, 533/2 B.C.; cf. Develin, *Athenian Officials* 684-321 B.C., p. 46) *καὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ σύστημα διέμεινε μέχρι γενεῶν ἑνέα ἢ [καὶ] δέκα. τελευταῖοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο τῶν Πυθαγορείων, οὓς καὶ Ἀριστοξένος εἶδε* (cf. Suda s.v. *Ἀριστοξένος* b), *Ξενοφίλος τε ὁ Χαλκιδεὺς ἀπὸ Θράκης καὶ Φάντων ὁ Φλιάσιος καὶ Ἐχεκράτης καὶ Διοκλῆς καὶ Πολύμναστος, Φλιάσιοι καὶ αὐτοί. ἦσαν δὲ ἀκροαταὶ Φιλόλαου καὶ Εὐρύτου τῶν Ταραντίνων*. Iamblichus (following Aristoxenus), *De vita Pythagorica*, 251: *ἦσαν δὲ οἱ σπουδαιότατοι* (sc. of the latest Pythagorean) *Φάντων τε καὶ Ἐχεκράτης καὶ Πολύμναστος καὶ Διοκλῆς Φλιάσιοι, Ξενοφίλος δὲ Χαλκιδεὺς τῶν ἀπὸ Θράκης Χαλκιδέων. ἐφύλαξαν μὲν οὖν τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἦθη καὶ τὰ μαθήματα, καίτοι ἐκλειπούσης τῆς αἰρέσεως, ἕως εὐγενῶς ἠφανίσθησαν* (= Aristoxenus Fr. 18 p. 13.30-34 Wehrli). Cf. Iamblichus *op. cit.* 266 p. 146.6 Deubner-Klein. For these Phliasian Pythagoreans v. 53 DK. Phliasians were among the friends gathered at Socrates' final moments in prison. Plato, *Phaedo*, 57a. The Phliasian Pythagorean Echecrates is Phaedo's interlocutor in the Platonic dialogue, v. *Phaedo* 88d (= 53 A4 DK). Diodorus (XV, 76, 4) puts the latest Pythagoreans on 366/5 B.C.

Phlius the city of Phlius, son of Dionysus according to the commonest traditions (cf. Pausanias II, 12, 6), the eponymous archegete of the Phliasians, This city was the birthplace of Pratinas and his son Aristias, most eminent satyrographers, second only to Aeschylus teste Pausanias II, 13, 6: *ἐνταῦθά ἐστι καὶ Ἀριστίου μνήμα τοῦ Πρατίνου. τούτῳ τῷ Ἀριστίᾳ σάτυροι καὶ Πρατίνᾳ τῷ πατρὶ εἰσι πεποιημένοι πλὴν τῶν Αἰσχύλου δοκιμώτατα*.

The bacchic element, Eleusinian rites and many details relate the Attic Phlyia and the Peloponnesian Phlius. The confusion in the Pausanian manuscripts around this matter has a substantive grounding.

33. Cf. F19; although the corrupt *+Κάτων+* there both in Porphyry, *Quaestionum Homericarum* I 383 (I, 138,18 Schrader) and in Stephanus

Byzantium s.v. *Διόσπολις*, should better be corrected to *Βάτων* with Ebert and Meineke. Baton was occupied with Homeric antiquities. Cf. Fr.Gr.H. 268F8 in conjunction with H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, vol. V, pp. 507-8; but Erbse's observations should be taken very cautiously: *Φιλίας* is less likely to be an error from *Φιλέας* (Synesius) = *Φιλουργός* (Isocrates); and the scholion probably pertains to where it is located in the papyrus, i.e. to v. Ω 721, not to Ω 729. Another possibility for the erroneous *+Κάτων+* is Wyttenbach's (and Dindorf's) *Κάστωρ*. Highly improbable is the δ' *Ἐκαταίος* of Heeren and Diels.

34. Two mentions of diversity (*ποικιλία*) in accounts and stories about the *ἐπί-γριοι θεοί* and in connection with Euhemerus do not authorise us to credit him with taking the additional step. V. F8 Winiarczyk (= Diodorus VI 1, 3): *περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐπιγείων θεῶν πολλοὶ καὶ ποικίλοι παραδέδονται λόγοι παρὰ τοῖς ἱστορικοῖς τε καὶ μυθογράφοις· καὶ τῶν μὲν ἱστορικῶν Εὐδήμερος, ὁ τὴν Ἰερὰν Ἀναγραφὴν ποιησάμενος, ἰδίως ἀναγέγραφεν* etc. And in F55 (= Iohannes Lydus, *De mensibus*, IV 154 p. 170 Wünsch): *...ἢ ὡς πᾶσα ἡ ἱστορία* (namely *ἡ περὶ Κρόνον*) *κατὰ τὸν Εὐδήμερον ποικίλλεται σοφῶς τὴν τῶν λεγομένων θεῶν [ύ]πογράφουσα θε[ωριαν...* etc. In the first instance diverse need not refer to anything but the variety of stories about gods. The second instance seems to restrict us to a variety in the Cronian account itself. But still does not appear significant in the special sense required.
35. The various constitutive moments in Mnaseas' theological theory (if his it really is) (or in other words the consecutive steps that led to that fully developed position), can be observed severally in isolation in a number of thinkers. Most of the relevant information comes not surprisingly from Philodemus, *De pietate*. That fruits of the earth and other things beneficial to human life were aboriginally believed to be endowed with divine nature was apparently the view of Diogenes the Cynic (*op.cit.* 6c p. 71 Gomperz). He followed Prodicus' theory, referred to above (cf. *op.cit.* 10 p. 76G). Somebody introduced the idea that another important set of deities consisted of mortals who by their discoveries and inventions of arts and utilities had greatly succoured and enriched human life, like the cases of Demeter and Dionysos and (probably) Dioscuri: *...λέγη* (Persaeus in all likelihood whose testimony is invoked in §9 just before) *φαίνεσθαι τὰ περὶ τὰ τρέφοντα καὶ ὠφελούν(τ)α θεοὺς νενομί(σθ)αι καὶ τετειμηθ(αι) πρῶτ(ο)ν <κατὰ τὰ> ὑπὸ (Προ)δίκου γεγραμμένα, μ(ε)τὰ δὲ ταῦτα τοῦ(ς εὐρ)ό(ν)τας ἢ τροφὰς ἢ (σ)κέπας ἢ τὰς ἄλλας τέχνας (ὡς Δ)ήμητρα (κ)αὶ Δι(όν)σον καὶ τοῦ(ς Διοσκόρους?) [= SVF I 448; cf. Cicero, *De natura deorum* I 38]. Prodicus thought that Dionysus and Demeter (together with other deities like Poseidon, Hephaestus, the Sun, the Moon, River and Lakes and*

Meadows and Fruits and other similar things) were natural factors or parts, as bread, wine, water, fire etc. Hence the elevation theory from man to godhead did not pertain to him. V. 84B5 DK. Euhemerus added the theory of mortal divinization. And the compound is met in Persaeus. Chrysippus also endorsed the full account, although he laid emphasis on the former factor, the divinity of natural factors, powers and parts. However he recognized the moment of mortal divinization as well. Philodemus, *De pietate*, 12-13 (pp. 79-80 G): ... (12.16) καὶ τὸν Ἄρη κατὰ τοῦ πολέμου τετάχθαι καὶ τῆς τάξεως καὶ ἀντιτάξεως· Ἡφαιστον δὲ πῦρ εἶναι, καὶ Κρόνον μὲν τὸν τοῦ ρεύματος ροῦν, Ρέα δὲ τὴν γῆν, Δία δὲ τὸν αἰθέρα· τοὺς δὲ τὸν Ἀπόλλω[ι] καὶ τὴν Δήμητρα γῆν ἢ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ πνεῦμα· καὶ παιδαριωδῶς λέγεσθαι καὶ γράφεσθαι κα[ε]ἶ πλάττεσθαι θεοὺς ἀνθρωποειδεῖς, ὃν τρόπον καὶ πόλεις καὶ ποταμοὺς καὶ τόπους καὶ πάθη· καὶ Δία μὲν εἶναι τὸν περὶ τὴν γῆν ἀέρα, τὸν δὲ σκοτεινὸν Ἄιδην, τὸν δὲ διὰ τῆς γῆς καὶ θαλάττης Ποσειδῶν· καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους δὲ θεοὺς ἀμήχοις ὡς καὶ τούτους συνοικεῖ (sc. Chrysippus). καὶ τὸν ἥλιον τε καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀστέρες θεοὺς οἶται καὶ τὸν νόμον· καὶ ἀνθρώπους εἰς θεοὺς φησι μεταβάλλειν etc. (- SVF II 1076). For a general and elaborate Stoic classification of the gods of positive religion v. SVF II 1009 p. 300.13-33. The seventh and last-mentioned category comprises precisely human deifications: ἔβδομον δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸ διὰ τὰς εἰς τὸν κοινὸν βίον εὐεργεσίας ἐκτετιμημένον, ἀνθρώπινον δὲ γεννηθὲν ὡς Ἡρακλέας ὡς Διοσκούρους ὡς Διόνυσον. Philodemus (op.cit.) observes that, while claiming the opposite, the Stoic doctrine maintains in effect either a total abolition of all gods (of positive religion), or at most concedes the existence of only one super-god; (§17.8-15 p. 84 G): πάντες οὖν οἱ ἀπὸ Ζήνωνος, εἰ καὶ ἀπέλειπον τὸ δαμόνιον, ὥσπερ οἱ μὲν οὐκ ἀπέλειπον, οἱ δ' ἐν τισὶν οὐκ ἀπέλειπον, ἓνα θεὸν λέγουσιν εἶναι. This is, for all their extreme sophistication, to revert to the simple position of Antisthenes (op.cit. 7a p. 72G): ...παρ' Ἀντισθένην δ' ἐν μὲν τῷ φυσικῷ λέγεται τὸ κατὰ νόμον εἶναι πολλοὺς θεοὺς κατὰ δὲ φύσιν ἓνα (utilizing the characteristic 5th century polarity of νόμος-φύσις).

The Stoics held the view that divinity consists primarily in cosmic factors and secondarily in superlative mortality. Since that was the general view held in common not only by Chrysippus but by Persaeus as well, the most faithful pupil of Zeno, the archegete himself of the school may probably be credited with the analysis. In effect, the theory meant the combination of a traditional Greek philosophical outlook with the Euhemerian transplant of Middle Eastern (in particular Egyptian) theological accounts about protohistory. It is significant however that this latter seems to have penetrated into the Peripatos, too. Satyrus of Kallatis (last part of third-beginning of the second

century B.C.) was apparently (I believe) the author of a work on gods that contained a collection of ancient myths. It is called *περὶ θεῶν* (F*30 Schorn) and is described as *Σάτυρος ὁ τοὺς ἀρχαίους μύθους συναγαγών* (F*31 Schorn). Cf. T*10 [St. Schorn, *Satyros aus Kallatis, Sammlung des Fragmente mit Kommentar*, pp. 138-9. Schorn includes these two fragments under the Dubia category, but does not exclude the identity of the biographic writer with the grammarian and antiquary, pp. 10-4. (Cf. T*7-11). In p. 13 he falsely assumes that Satyrus the scholar was a pupil of Aristarchus, and has therefore to press his date downwards. But the source (T*7) only says that he was Ἀριστάρχου γνώριμος a scholarly acquaintance, very likely in the Alexandrian Museum: Σάτυρος δ' ὁ Ἀριστάρχου γνώριμος ζῆτα ἐκαλεῖτο διὰ τὸ ζήτητικὸν αὐτοῦ]. Satyrus gives an account of primeval history that makes divine beings (mythical entities) to have been rulers of men for long periods of time. The details of the postulated successions are unclear: one may provisionally with caution have recourse to Schorn's construal: [ἐν τῷ] γὰρ Πικερῶν θεῶν...]ω (sc. [τρίτ]ω vel [έκτ]ω book) Σάτυρος Ἐρεβός] φησι βασιλεῦσαι πρώτον, εἰτ' Ἐρωτα] μυριάδας ἐπὶ δέκα ὅσας [Ἐρεβός πάντων] τῶν θεῶν ἄνακτα καταστῆναι, τρίτῳ δὲ [τὸν Οὐρανόν] αὐτῶν, καὶ ἄμρα [τῆ Γαίᾳ] κύριον [αὐτοῦ] γεινόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς ἑκτομῆς [τὴν ἀρχὴν Κρόνον λαβεῖν], τοῦ χρόνου [δ' ἐπίον]τος etc. One should expect definite time intervals to be assigned to the following successive kingships as well. But it is highly untypical and significant in a Greek context to give chronological specifications to the aboriginal divine kingdom on earth. It is still uncertain whether such a view in a peripatetic context meant the direct government of human protohistory by the gods or the explanation of the belief in (some) gods in terms of an original deification of mortal excellence (manifested preeminently as transcendent power and widespread utility). And certainly we do not yet have here the utilisation of these theories to explain the extreme, manifold diversity of mythological data even with regard to the same god, on the principle of theological multipersonalism.

The divinization of eminent mortals at the beginning of human history as an account of the supreme divine successions did enjoy a certain vogue in Hellenistic times. Dionysios the Skytobrachion employed the device as an account of the sacred history of the Atlantians in Africa (Fr.Gr.H. 32F7 §§56 sqq.) and of the Libyans there (32F8).

36. The Pindaric scholia here provide a nice illustration of the ignorance or confusion that led to the substitution of Aristotle (Ἀριστοτέλης) for Aristocles (Ἀριστοκλῆς) in a number of references and quotations. The first scholium from Ambrosianus C222 inf. has Ἀριστοτέλης. In the second scholium from five mss. (Parisinus 2774; Laurentianus 32,52; Laurentianus

32,87; Vaticanus 41; Laurentianus 32,35) we firmly find Ἀριστοκλήης: while the vulgate up to Boeckh had Ἀρίσταρχος!

Another precise illustration of the same point is provided by Proclus' transmitted text of the Commentary to Timaeus where we find the memorable concoction (on 27A): ὅτι γε μὴν τὰ Παναθήναια τοῖς Βενδιδέοις εἴπετο λέγουσιν οἱ ὑπομνηματισταὶ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ Ρόδιος (sic!) μαρτυρεῖ (vel ἱστορεῖ) τὰ μὲν ἐν Πειραιεῖ Βενδίδεια τῇ εἰκάδι τοῦ Θαργυλιῶνος ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, ἔπεσθαι δὲ τὰς περὶ τὴν Ἀθηναῖν ἑορτάς. The careful investigation of the religious facts is a characteristic of Aristocles.

37. In the extant Orphic Hymns we have all the elements of the puzzle without any sense of contradiction or incoherence. Dionysus simpliciter (without a divine epithet) is the son of Zeus and Persephone (30.6-7); but is simultaneously invoked as Τρίγονος (30.2; cf. 52.5 τριφύες), probably in relation to his aspectual identity with Φάνης the First Born (cf. Πρωτόγονον, 30.2) as well. [The Διόνυσος Ἀμφιετής (= the Yearly One) is also this chthonic Dionysus (53.1), the son of Persephone, who, after his dismemberment, sleeps in the sacred megara of the Queen of Hades, his mother (53.3-4). But he sleeps there τριετῆρα χρόνον, and thus is also the Other-Yearly, the Trieteric Bacchus. And, correspondingly, in Hymn 52 addressed to the Trieteric One, one sees him invoked as (v. 10) ἀμφιέτηρε, annual. Here is another mystery of symbolic fusion: the cult Dionysus of the trieteris is identical to the yearly Dionysus of annual cosmic rejuvenation]. The god of the vannus mystica, the Λικνίτης (46) is the Persephoneian one (ἀμφιθαλής 46.2, enjoying both his parents unlike the Semelean one whose mother was thunderstruck); he suffered the Titanic passion and thus was led to his mother as Queen of Death (vv. 6-7). All the other invocations refer in all likelihood primarily to the Semelean one. So the 44th hymn is addressed to Semele as Dionysus' mother (v. 3). She is honoured every second year when men celebrate the (re)birth of Bacchus (v. 8); these honours are bestowed on her by Persephone (v. 6), eternal Dionysus' divine mother. Dionysus Bassareus (Hymn 45) is the Trieteric one, the one born out of his mother's conflagration (πυρίσπορε v. 1). Dionysus the Pericicionian is the Semelean (Hymn 47). In the Hymn to Sabazius (48), the god is construed as Zeus who put the immaturely born Semelean Dionysus into his thigh to ensure for him the full period of gestation (vv. 2-3); upon which the father gave the new-born to the nymph Hipta (v. 4). In the following Hymn (49) to Hipta, Iacchus (v. 3) is referred to, who (as he of the Eleusinian Mysteries and Orphism) is therefore identified to the trieteric Dionysus. In Hymns 50 and, especially, 52 we have the solution to our travails. The Lenaeon, Lysian Dionysus is διμάτωρ (with two mothers and twiceborn, 50.1). The Trieteric One (the same with the annual cosmic one 52.10 ἀμφιέτηρε) is the

Semelean (*πυρίσπορε* 52.2), the one who was preserved in Zeus' thigh (52.3 *μηροτρεφής*). But he is also of two mothers (*διμάτωρ* 52.9), of three origins and natures (52.5 *τριφυές*; cf. *τρίγωνον* 30.2), as he is also (aspectually) identified with the First Born Ericepaeus (52.6) or Phanes; he is thus both father of Gods (as oldest Phanes) and their son (as newest god, *ὁ νέος θεός*), *θεῶν πάτερ ἤδὲ καὶ υἱέ* (52.6). He is finally the god of the mysteries, *ὁ διὰ κόλπου θεός* (*ὑποκόλπιε* 52.11; *μύσταισι* 52.13), the Bassaric Thracian one (52.12), the mystic Apollo (*Παιάν* 52.11).

38. Cf. Suda s.v. *Θυώνη*; Etymologicon Magnum s.v. *Θυάδες*; Eustathius, Commentaria in Iliadem, 114.37-44; Scholia to Lycophron 143 p. 67.8 Scheer. Lycophron calls the Bacchae *Θύσαι* (v. 106). In Philodamus' paeans (Diehl, Anthologia Lyrica, I, 252) *Θυώνα* is the name of Dionysus mother. In Rhodes Dionysus was worshipped as *Θυωνίδας* (Hesychius s.v.). Latin poets called him Thyoneus (Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, VI, 13; Horatius, *Odes*, i, 17,23; Statius, *Thebais*, V, 265) and Oppian *Θυωναῖος* (*Cynegetica* iv, 285). There existed some deviant, but related, traditions, some of high antiquity. Panyasis (8 Bernabi) mentioned her as Dionysus *τροφός*. Thyone is listed among the seven Liberi nutrices (Hyginus, *Astronomicon*, II 21, 885 Viré). She is made the wife of Nisus (from Nysa), by whom she bore Dionysus the fifth, according to Cicero's enumeration (*De natura deorum*, III, 58; so also Iohannes Lydus, *De mensibus*, IV, 38).
39. Esp. in Orphic contexts. V. OF42 for the birth from Demeter of Hecate-Chthonic Artemis. Cf. OF41; OF188; OF197; 204. Aeschylus' troubles regarding his divulgence of mystic doctrine probably related exactly to Artemis' mystic status; T93b Radt (all dramas mentioned are connected with Artemis; and the crime consisted *ἐν γὰρ τούτοις πᾶσι περὶ Δήμητρος λέγων τῶν μυστικῶν περιεργότερον ἄπτεσθαι ἔοικε*).
40. Does this failure on Nonnus' part count in favour or against his identification with the Christian synonymous poet?