

## ZEUS, RHESUS, AND THE MYSTERIES\*

### I. WHO IS ΖΕΥΣ Ο ΦΑΝΑΙΟΣ IN *RHESUS* 355?<sup>1</sup>

About a quarter of the way through the *Rhesus* (276ff.), a mood of excited anticipation spreads throughout the Trojan camp: according to an eye-witness report, an important ally, king Rhesus of Thrace, is actually about to arrive in Troy. An ecstatic chorus of Trojan soldiers address Rhesus, even before his arrival, as a veritable ‘god, Ares himself’ (θεός . . . θεός, αὐτὸς Ἄρης, *Rhesus* 385), and go as far as to attribute him the title of Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος (355).<sup>2</sup> There can be little doubt that these *outré* modes of address are meant to enhance the rhetorical effect of the chorus’ welcoming ode: Rhesus has to be superlatively exalted. It is also likely that we have here an echo of a well-known epic *cliché* whereby a valiant warrior is compared to a θεός, to a δαίμων, or specifically to Ares.<sup>3</sup> However, neither explanation can adequately account for the obscure Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος, which has all the trappings of a cult epithet although it is otherwise unattested. If it is to be used effectively as a rhetorical trope, a cult title such as Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος must be founded on actual religious practice rather than be a mere construct of poetic fancy.<sup>4</sup> One of this article’s major concerns will be, precisely, to explore the possible meaning and function of Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος in the context of contemporary religion. Since the passage under discussion, *Rhesus* 355, is the sole surviving attestation of Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος, part of my argument will inevitably involve some speculation, but none that cannot be extrapolated from, or

\* Earlier drafts of this paper were presented at the Classical Association of Canada Annual Meeting (Quebec City, 17 May 2004) and at the Columbia University Department of Classics Fall 2004 Colloquia (12 October 2004). I extend my thanks to those audiences. Warm thanks are also due to Marco Fantuzzi for his encouragement, to Dan Dana for his shrewd remarks on Zamolxis, and especially to Pierre Bonnechere, who offered typically learned criticism and saved me from several errors. The *CQ* reader also raised some important points that needed to be addressed. A large part of the research for this article was conducted thanks to a Margo Tytus Summer Residency Fellowship granted by the Department of Classics, University of Cincinnati (July–August 2004): I am grateful both to the Department and to the Programme Director, Professor Getzel Cohen. My thanks go also to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for generous financial support.

<sup>1</sup> The question featured prominently among the *Rhesus* desiderata that E. Fraenkel (*Gnomon* 37 [1965], 228–41, here 240) urged future commentators to deal with. As far as I am aware, this tantalizing problem has never been the object of proper study, and remains unanswered to this day.

<sup>2</sup> Presumably the chorus take their cue from the messenger who had shortly before likened Rhesus to ‘a deity’ (301 ὥστε δαίμονα).

<sup>3</sup> θεός: e.g. *Il.* 11.58, 24.258; δαίμονι ἴσος: e.g. *Il.* 5.438, 459, 884; 16.705, 786; 20.493; 21.18, 227; Ares: e.g. *Il.* 7.208, 11.295, 13.295–300, 16.784. However, as Wilamowitz pointed out (*Der Glaube der Hellenen*<sup>3</sup> [Darmstadt, 1959], 2.259–60), addressing a mortal as θεός by virtue of his timely and salutary arrival would have been highly unconventional in the *fifth* century. As I shall argue below, the audience of *Rhes.* probably knew that they had before their eyes a man-god in the making (ἀνθρωποδαίμων, *Rhes.* 971).

<sup>4</sup> Two other cult epithets of Zeus are mentioned in the context of the same ode, both of them well attested and well established in cult: Zeus Φίλιος (*Rhes.* 347) and Ζεὺς Ἐλευθέριος (358–9). On the former see below n. 53; on the latter see V. J. Rosivach, *PP* 42 (1987), 262–85; K. Raaflaub, *The Discovery of Freedom in Ancient Greece* (Chicago, 2004), 102–17; on the sanctuary of Zeus Eleutherios in Athens see E. Lippolis, *ASAA* 76/78 (1998–2000), 139–218, esp. 162–78.

paralleled by, comparable religious phenomena. Conclusions will perforce be tentative, but (it is hoped) none the less enlightening for that.

As a cult title, *φαναῖος* is otherwise only attested in connection with Apollo on the island of Chios, according to Hesychius (4.230 Schmidt):

*Φαναῖος· Ἀπόλλων. Ἀχαιοὺς Ὀμφάλην. παρὰ Χίους οὕτω λέγεται.*

*Phanaios*: Apollo. (The dramatist) Achaëus in (his tragedy) *Omphale* (*TrGF* 20 F 35). This is a name he (sc. Apollo) has among the Chians.

This piece of information is corroborated by a number of inscriptions from Chios, some of which possibly date back to the sixth century B.C.; these feature *Φαναῖος tout court*, as in the Hesychius.<sup>5</sup> Stephanus Byzantius (A.D. sixth century) supplements this by reporting that *Φαναῖος* is actually derived from the Chian promontory of *Φάναι*—a toponymic mentioned as early as Thucydides and Aristophanes:<sup>6</sup>

*Φάναι, ἀκρωτήριον τῆς Χίου, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκεῖθεν ἀναφανῆναι τῇ Λητοῖ τὴν Δῆλον. οἱ οἰκήτορες Φαναῖοι καὶ Φαναία τὸ θηλυκόν.*

*Phanai*: a promontory on Chios, thus named because it was from there that Delos appeared [*anaphanēnai*] to Leto. Its inhabitants [are called] *Phanaioi*; the feminine [form is] *Phanaia*.

(Stephanus Byzantius s.v. *Φάναι*, p. 657, 13–15 Meineke<sup>7</sup>)

The connection between the cult title of Apollo *Φαναῖος* and the Chian site of *Φάναι* is confirmed by Strabo 14.1.35 (645C, 4.34.10–14 Radt), who reports that *Φάναι* is a ‘harbour of great depth’<sup>8</sup> not a long way from the capital:

*ἡ δὲ Χίος τὸν μὲν περίπλουν ἔστί σταδίων ἑννακοσίων παρὰ γῆν φερομένῃ [. . .] ἐν δὲ τῷ περίπλῳ δεξιὰν τὴν νῆσον ἔχοντι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως πρῶτον μὲν ἔστι τὸ Ποσίδειον, εἴτα Φάναι, λιμὴν βαθύς, καὶ νεὺς Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἄλσος φοινίκων [. . .].*

Chios has a periphery of nine hundred stadia, assuming that one circumnavigates it keeping close to the coast [. . .] If one embarks on such a voyage at the city and keeps the island on one’s right, they will come first to Posideion, then to Phanai, a harbour of great depth, with a temple of Apollo and a grove of palm-trees [. . .]

All in all, then, the cult title of Apollo *Φαναῖος* derives from *Φάναι*, the name of the Chian port and nearby promontory where the god’s temple was situated.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>5</sup> See F. Graf, *Nordionische Kulte* (Rome, 1985), 52, 442 (under ‘I.Ch. 32’).

<sup>6</sup> See Thuc. 8.24.3 and Ar. *Av.* 1694 (see Dunbar ad loc.). *Φάναι* survives today as *Πάνω* and *Κάτω Φανά*.

<sup>7</sup> The popular etymology implicit in *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκεῖθεν ἀναφανῆναι τῇ Λητοῖ τὴν Δῆλον* was conjectured into Herodian’s *Π. καθολικῆς προσωιδίας* by Lenz on the basis of the Steph. Byz. (*Grammatici Graeci* 3.1, 256.11–13, with app. crit.).

<sup>8</sup> Phanai is designated a harbour (*Phanas portum Chiorum*) also in Livy 36.43.11; in 44.28.7 it is however a *promunturium Chiorum*, as in the Steph. Byz.; cf. *Φαναία ἄκρα* Ptolemy 5.2.30. Presumably, both the port and the adjoining promontory were named *Φάναι*.

<sup>9</sup> So also Graf (n. 5), 51. There is scarcely any need to cite parallels for cult titles derived from toponyms: e.g. Apollo *Δήλιος* from the god’s cultic centre on Delos; Apollo *Ἀμυκλαῖος* from Laconian Amyclae; Apollo *Ἀσκραῖος* from Ascrea in Boeotia; and Apollo *Μαλεάτας* is most likely derived from Cape Malea in south-east Laconia (thus A. B. Cook, *Zeus* [Cambridge, 1925], 2.487–8, n. 3(1), although there are other possibilities). F. Vater’s (*Euripidis Rhesus cum scholiis antiquis* [Berlin, 1837], xcν–xcvi) theory that *Φαναῖος* refers to Apollo’s appearing (*ἐφάνη*) as a protector to the Mytilenean supporters of Archeanactides in the war against the Erythreans (he

According to Stephanus Byzantius, as we saw, the name *Φάναι* itself originates in an episode of the Apollo myth: it was from *Φάναι* that Delos appeared (*ἀναφανῆναι*) to Leto. This is surely a piece of pseudo-etymologizing speculation, of the kind that we often find in late authors with respect to some of Apollo's cult epithets, notably *Φαναῖος* and *Δήλιος*.<sup>10</sup> That this is a linguistic impossibility should be immediately manifest: *Φάναι* must denote a place that is itself notable for 'brilliance' or 'resplendence' (*φαίνειν*), not a place whence an 'apparition' (*ἀναφανῆναι*) was merely noticed. Indeed, a more promising etymology, proposed by Fritz Graf, associates *Φάναι* precisely with notions of conspicuity and prominence: the Phanai promontory would have been so named because it was a 'prominent' or 'conspicuous' landmark for seamen.<sup>11</sup> Although Graf is not explicit about the specifics of his etymology, it seems clear that he derives *Φάναι* from the adjective *φᾶνός*, a contract form of *φαεινός* (i.e. *αἱ φαναί* > *αἱ Φάναι*).<sup>12</sup> However, this encounters three major difficulties. First, Graf's explanation requires *φανός* to mean 'prominent' or 'conspicuous' ('ein sichtbares Wahrzeichen'), but the primary meaning of the word is 'bright', 'resplendent', which fits a geographic landmark rather less well.<sup>13</sup> Second, even if we assume that it is the secondary meaning of *φᾶνός* (i.e. 'conspicuous') that is dominant in *Φάναι*, this meaning can still only be applied to the promontory, not to the harbour. Third, *Φαναῖος* in *Rhesus* 355 has short *α*; the long *α* in *φᾶνός* is irreducible since it results from contraction. In theory, it would be perhaps possible to assume that Apollo *Φαναῖος* and the Chian *Φάναι* bear no etymological relation to *Φαναῖος* in *Rhesus* 355, and that they may therefore have long *α*. But such an assumption would be not only uneconomical (cf. below pp. 384–5) but also impossible to underpin by any sort of evidence whatsoever. *Φάναι* occurs again in a poetic context in Aristophanes' *Birds* 1694, where the reference is doubtless to the Chian harbour, although wordplay with *φαίνειν* 'denounce' must also be at work.<sup>14</sup> It is however impossible to determine the quantity of the first *α* there, since it occupies an anceps position. The corresponding

adduces as evidence Alcaeus fr. 444 Voigt) is an irrelevance: even if one accepts the impossibility that *Φάναι* can mean 'the place where Apollo showed himself' (see against this below in the text), it is inconceivable that a Chian promontory was named after a Mytilenean incident—not to mention the fact that the Alcaeus passage is concerned with Apollo *μυρκαῖος*, not *φαναῖος*; cf. *ΣNic. Ther.* 613 (cf. p. 230.11–15 Crugnola): *καὶ ἐν Λέσβῳ δὲ ὁ Ἀπόλλων μυρικής κλάδους ἔχει, ὅθεν καὶ Μυρκαῖος καλεῖται. καὶ Ἀλκαῖος φησιν {ἐν del. Welcker} τοῖς περὶ Ἀρχεανακτίδην κατὰ (Welcker : καὶ codd.) τὸν πρὸς Ἐρυθραίους (Meineke : -αῖον codd.) πόλεμον φανῆναι τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα καθ' ὕπνον ἔχοντα μυρικής κλῶνα.*

<sup>10</sup> Such pseudo-etymologies profess to reveal mythical or philosophical meanings which supposedly lie behind such cult titles. Thus, *Φαναῖος* and *Δήλιος* are explicated (in a glaringly contrived and artificial fashion) as allusions to the god's power to 'make known' and 'illuminate' (*φαίνειν* / *φωτίζειν*), or to 'reveal' (*δηλοῦν*). Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 385B, where Apollo is said to 'make known' and 'reveal' the truth to the philosophically apt: *Δήλιος δὲ καὶ Φαναῖος* [sc. *ἐστὶν ὁ Ἀπόλλων*] *οἷς ἥδη τι δηλοῦται καὶ ὑποφαίνεται τῆς ἀληθείας*. In Cornutus (*De nat. deor.* p. 196 Osann), Apollo's epithets suggest his power to 'shine' (*φωτίζειν*) upon the world, and thus to 'reveal' (*δηλοῦν*) the things that are in it, in his capacity as the sun-god: *Δήλιον δὲ αὐτὸν ὠνόμασαν καὶ Φαναῖον, ἀπὸ τοῦ δηλοῦσθαι δι' αὐτοῦ τὰ ὄντα καὶ φωτίζεσθαι τὸν κόσμον*. Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.17.34) is even worse: according to him, *Φανεός* (sic) derives from *φαίνειν* and *νέος*, *quia sol quotidie renovat sese*. Cf. E. Syska, *Studien zur Theologie im ersten Buch der Saturnalien des Ambrosius Theodosius Macrobius* (Stuttgart, 1993), 192–3.

<sup>11</sup> Graf (n. 5), 51: 'das Kap seinerseits wird ein sichtbares Wahrzeichen für die Seeleute gewesen sein'.

<sup>12</sup> For the recessive accent cf. below n. 17.

<sup>13</sup> Even when *φᾶνός* does bear the secondary meaning 'conspicuous', the primary notion of brightness is still there; e.g. in Pl. *Symp.* 197A *ἐλλόγμιος καὶ φανός* are contrasted to *σκοτεινός*.

<sup>14</sup> See Dunbar *ad* 1694–6.

syllable is long in the metrically equivalent but remote 1470 and 1482; nonetheless, it is undoubtedly short in the strophe closest to 1694ff., i.e. 1553 Σκιάποσιν.

A much simpler and more unproblematic etymology suggests itself: derive Φάναι from the appellative φαναί, 'torches'.<sup>15</sup> The advantages over Graf's etymology should be evident: the short α in φάναι is compatible with Φάναϊος, and the basic notion of 'brightness' (as opposed to the derivative one of 'conspicuity') is preserved. Moreover, deriving Φάναι from φαναί is, unlike Stephanus Byzantius' abstract speculations, consistent with the palpable specificity of many a Greek toponymic.<sup>16</sup> As for the recessive accent (φαναί > Φάναι), it distinguishes as usual the proper name from the corresponding adjective.<sup>17</sup> With respect now to Φαναίος, while its suffix -αῖος may denote provenance (from the locality of Φάναι, cf. Apollo Ἀμυκλαῖος, Ἀσκραῖος etc.), it is just as likely that it means 'related to' φαναί, 'torches'. In the latter case, a striking parallel would be of course Apollo στροφαῖος, 'of the door hinges' (στροφεῖς; cf. LSJ), and one may also compare Zeus and Hermes Ἀγοραῖος 'of the market-place'; Athena and Artemis Ἀγοραία; Zeus Ἀκραῖος, Hera, Aphrodite Ἀκραία, 'of the mountain-top';<sup>18</sup> Poseidon Κραναῖος, Athena Κραναία, 'of the fountains', etc.<sup>19</sup> Most interesting for this type of divine eponymy is Dionysus Ἀκταῖος (from ἀκτή: 'Dionysus of the Coast'), attested on the island of, precisely, Chios.<sup>20</sup>

Why should the Chian promontory bear the name of 'Torches'? One possibility is that torches were lit as beacons to guide ships into the harbour.<sup>21</sup> However, the *uox propria* in this case would have to be not φαναί but either φρυκτοί or πυρσά (cf. *Rhesus* 97). More importantly, whoever presumes that Chian Φάναι, and thus Apollo Φαναῖος, were specifically associated with a local feature, namely the Chian harbour beacons, will be hard put to it to account for Zeus φαναῖος in *Rhesus* 355. For evidently this Zeus has nothing to do with Chian Phanai or its hypothetical beacons,<sup>22</sup> and a different etymology would have to be devised for φαναῖος as applied to him. *At non sunt multiplicandi φαναῖοι praeter necessitatem*: Occam's razor demands that

<sup>15</sup> The earliest attestation of the word in the sense 'torch' is Hes. fr. 121 MW. In purely speculative mood, H. Usener (*Götternamen* [Bonn, 1896], 233) imagined that Φάναι derives from a deity \*Φάνη supposedly worshipped at the Chian promontory; but the only evidence he could adduce for the existence of such a deity was, typically, the dubious one of such proper names as Φαναγόρας, Φαναγόρα etc.

<sup>16</sup> E.g. Πύλος from πύλη, Ἄργος from (prob.) ἀργός, Σπάρτη from (prob.) σπάρτος.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. e.g. ξανθός > Ξάνθος; γλαυκός > Γλαῦκος; αἰόλος > Αἰόλος; γελών > Γέλων etc.; for further examples see H. W. Chandler, *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1881), §§224, 247–9, 280 etc.; cf. E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*<sup>2</sup> (Munich, 1953), 1.420.

<sup>18</sup> Zeus Ἀκραῖος: H. Schwabl, *RE* 10A (1972), 265–6; *SEG* 46 (1996), 621, 1405; *SEG* 48 (1998), 1330 I 6; H. Lloyd-Jones, *ZPE* 124 (1999), 4. Hera Ἀκραία: D. Novaro-Lefevre, *REG* 113 (2000), 42–69, esp. 53–4 with discussion of the epithet's possible meanings. Aphrodite Ἀκραία: *SEG* 51 (2001), 1896. For Arsinoe II (sister of Ptolemy II Philadelphos) as Ἀκραία cf. *SEG* 33 (1983), 1308.

<sup>19</sup> Poseidon Κραναῖος: *SEG* 35.590; Athena Κραναία: *IG* 9(1).109. For the suffix -αῖος signifying relation to, or belonging to, a (usually) material object cf. also e.g. ἀγελαῖος, ἀντραῖος, θαλασσαιῖος, θυραῖος, λεπαιῖος, ναπαιῖος, νησαιῖος, νυμφαῖος, ὄρφναῖος, πηγαῖος, χειρσαιῖος.

<sup>20</sup> Dionysus Ἀκταῖος: *CIG* 2214e.2 (2.1030). Cults of Apollo Ἀκταῖος are also attested in the Troad and in Actium: Str. 13.1.13 (588C, 3.546.8 Radt); Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀκτιον (p. 65.8 Meineke). Cf. W. Burkert, *Homo Necans*, trs. P. Bing (Berkeley, 1983), 113, n. 23.

<sup>21</sup> Thus e.g. O. Crusius, *Philologus* 53 (*Ergänzungsheft*, 1894), 1–166 (here 16, n. 24): 'der Hafen könnte nach den Leuchtfedern benannt sein'; also, R. Herbst, *RE* 19.2 (1938), 1758.

<sup>22</sup> It is precisely Zeus φαναῖος that Graf (n. 5), 51 disregards when he asserts: '... gehört die Epiklese [sc. Φαναῖος] allein dem chiotischen Apollon'.

φαναῖος, whether applied to Apollo or to Zeus, may be traced back to a single etymology—unless of course there is palpable evidence to the contrary, which is plainly not the case here.

Somewhat closer to the mark are those interpretations which associate φαναῖος with the light-imagery so often used to illustrate joyful deliverance from the darkness of evil.<sup>23</sup> Thus the latest commentator on *Rhesus*, Arne Feickert, translates lines 355–6 as ‘du kommst zu mir als der lichtbringende Zeus’; he then goes on to explain: ‘Wie beim Erscheinen der Sonne das Dunkel weicht und der Nebel zerreißt, so wird Rhesus (Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος) allein durch seine Erscheinung den Feind verflüchtigen.’<sup>24</sup> This may appear to explain the cult epithet in a way that suits both Zeus and Apollo: both gods can be, one presumes, ‘bringers of light’ both literally and figuratively. However, although we shall see that the idea of light as a symbol of (mystic) deliverance probably has a bearing here, it is linguistically impossible to interpret φαναῖος as meaning ‘resplendent’ or ‘light-bearing’ or the like. For φαναῖος cannot be directly derived from a root φαν- (‘shine’, ‘reveal’, ‘appear’): as pointed out above (p. 384, cf. p. 389 below), the -αῖος suffix must denote either provenance from a locality named Φάναι or relation to φαναί, ‘torches’.

A more economical and, no doubt, more pertinent way to account for φαναῖος, ‘of the torches’, as an epithet of both Apollo and Zeus is to associate it with the specifically religious use of φαναί, ‘torches’, at nocturnal rites, often (though not always) in mystic contexts. The usage is sufficiently documented. For instance, in Euripides’ *Ion* 550, Dionysiac rites in which torches were brandished are referred to as ‘Bacchic torches’ (φανάς . . . Βακχίου). Similarly, in Aristonous’ *Paeon* (37) Dionysus’ trieteric festival is described as τριετέσιν φαναῖς.<sup>25</sup> The word is found also in *Rhesus* itself, in a passage where it is pointed out that Orpheus, the very cousin of Rhesus (944), was the one to reveal ‘the torches of unspeakable mysteries’ to the Athenians (943 μυστηρίων τε τῶν ἀπορρήτων φανάς)—in all likelihood an allusion to Eleusinian mysteries.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, the cognate φαίνω appears in a context of (mock-)mystic torch-lighting in Aristophanes’ *Frogs* (1524–5), where Pluto orders that ‘Aeschylus’ be escorted to the Upperworld under the light of ‘sacred torches’, in a scene designed to evoke the mystically celebrated *anodos* of the Kore from the Underworld: φαίνετε τοῖνυν ὑμεῖς τούτῳ / λαμπάδας ἱεράς κτλ. Likewise, in *Thesmophoriazusae*, where torch-light is

<sup>23</sup> For the well-known association between light and salvation see e.g. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 522.

<sup>24</sup> Quotations from A. Feickert (ed.), *Euripidis Rhesus* (Frankfurt am Main, 2005), 196, 203–4 respectively. Along similar lines, D. Kovacs translates ‘To me you have come as Zeus the Lightbearer’, although in a note he points out that the title can also mean ‘Zeus the Revealer’: see D. Kovacs (ed.), *Euripides VI: Bacchae, Iphigenia at Aulis, Rhesus*, Loeb Classical Library 495 (Cambridge, MA, 2002), 391 with n. 10.

<sup>25</sup> See J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford, 1925), 163; cf. Crusius (n. 21), 15–16. For torches brandished in nocturnal Dionysiac rites cf. also Eur. *Ion* 716–18, 1125–6; *Bacch.* 144–50, 306–8 (with Dodds ad locc.); *Phoen.* 226–8; *Soph. Ant.* 1126.

<sup>26</sup> For Orpheus as the expounder of Eleusinian rites see below, pp. 00–00 with nn. 93–96. For torches in the Eleusinian mysteries see G. E. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton, 1961), 211–12, 216, 250; F. Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Berlin–New York, 1974), 29–30 with n. 37; C. Bérard, *Anodoi* (Neuchâtel, 1974), 92, 98, 100–1, 130; N. J. Richardson (ed.), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford, 1974), on *h. Dem.* 40ff. and 47ff.; cf. esp. Ar. *Ran.* 340–44 ἐγείρ’ ὃ φλογέας λαμπάδας [. . .] | ‘Ταχ’ ὃ ‘Ταχ’, | νυκτέρου τελετῆς φωσφόρος ἀστήρ. | φλογὶ φέγγεται δὲ λειμών. To Richardson’s list of sources add *Soph. OC* 1049 λαμπάδες ἀκταί (of Eleusis) with Jebb ad loc.; also, Paus. 1.2.4 δαῖδα ἔχων ‘Ταχός (on Iacchus as a principal divinity in the Eleusinian mysteries and on his iconography see K. Clinton, *Myth and Cult* [Stockholm, 1992], 64–71).



often mentioned as a standard feature of the nocturnal mystic Thesmophoria (280–1, 726–7), Demeter and Persephone are asked to attend the ‘solemn mysteries’ (1151 ὄργια σεμνά, cf. 948) which they illumine with torches: ἵνα λαμπάσιν φαίνετον. Torches are also attributes of such Underworld figures as the Erinyes, especially in Underworld scenes,<sup>27</sup> and Hecate the ‘Torch-bearer’.<sup>28</sup>

We are faced, then, with the possibility that Apollo Φαναῖος was worshipped, at least on the island of Chios, by means of nocturnal rites in which torch-bearing played an important part; hence the name of ‘torches’ attached to the promontory and harbour in whose vicinity those rituals were presumably held. It is also conceivable that such rites might have included chthonic or mystic elements, as indeed is the case in many of the instances cited in the preceding paragraph. Entertaining such a possibility would, of course, fly in the face of the deep-seated view that Apolline cult consisted entirely of open and public ceremonies, with no hint of secret or nocturnal ritual activity.<sup>29</sup> However, the evidence to the contrary is anything but negligible. In Apollo’s precinct at Argos, oracles were delivered once every month by prophetess who would go into a trance after tasting the blood of a female lamb sacrificed, significantly, by night (see Paus. 2.24.1). Consultation in Apollo’s oracle at Claros (Colophon) was also held by night, and even featured mystic hints; after all, Claros was also the site of mystic rites (explicitly termed *μυστήρια* in inscriptions) as early as the second century A.D. and probably even earlier.<sup>30</sup> According to Iamblichus, the priest would deliver the god’s prophecies only on certain prescribed nights. The nocturnal ritual was preceded by a twenty-four-hour fast, which unmistakably recalls that of several mystery cults;<sup>31</sup> most importantly, the priest fell into a mantic trance at a secret subterranean location (*ἄβατον*), inaccessible to the crowd of pilgrims awaiting the oracular response.<sup>32</sup> The scenery, especially the subterranean cavern (*specus* in Pliny’s and Tacitus’ accounts, cf. n. 32), is evocative of the Netherworld, and brings to mind those local cults in which Apollo was worshipped as

<sup>27</sup> See H. Sarian, *LIMC* 3.1 (1986), nos. 10, 11, 19 (pp. 828–9).

<sup>28</sup> Hecate φωσφόρος: Eur. *Hel.* 569; fr. 62h Kannicht; Ar. *Thesm.* 858; *Lys.* 443; fr. 608.2 KA; δαῖδοφόρος: Bacchyl. *Hymn.* 1B (= fr. 31.1) Maehler. Cf. further Ar. *Ran.* 1361–2 διπύρους ἀνέχουσα λαμπάδας . . . Ἑκάτα; S. fr. 535 Radt πῦρ ἱερόν, / τῆς εἰνοδίας Ἑκάτης ἔγχος; h. *Dem.* 52 Ἑκάτη σέλας ἐν χεῖρεσσιν ἔχουσα. On torch-bearing Hecate cf. also I. R. von Rudloff, *Hecate in Ancient Greek Religion* (Victoria, B.C., 1998) 102–6; in Underworld settings: see H. Sarian, ‘Hecate’, *LIMC* 6.1 (1992) 985, 986, 989–96 (nos 1–94).

<sup>29</sup> The traditional view is perhaps most eloquently presented by L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford, 1907), 4.253.

<sup>30</sup> For evidence and discussion on the mysteries at Claros see L. Robert, *Éphèse et Claros* (Paris, 1922), 303–11.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. e.g. the σύνθημα (watchword) of the Eleusinian Mysteries as reported by Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.21.2 (p. 30.9–11 Marcovich) ἐνήστευσα, ἔπιον τὸν κυκεῶνα κτλ. (see further Richardson [n. 26], 165–6); also at the Thesmophoria: νηστεύομεν δὲ πάντως (Ar. *Thesm.* 984). For a concise exposition with essential bibliography see A. Henrichs in *OCD*<sup>3</sup> 588–9.

<sup>32</sup> Iambl. *Myst.* 3.11 (pp. 112–13 Des Places): οἱ δὲ ὕδαρ πίνοντες καθάπερ ὁ ἐν Κολοφῶνι ἱερεὺς τοῦ Κλαρίου . . . τὸ δὴ ἐν Κολοφῶνι μαντεῖον ὁμολογεῖται παρὰ πᾶσι δι’ ὕδατος χρηματίζειν. εἶναι γὰρ πηγὴν ἐν οἴκῳ καταγείωι καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς πίνειν τὸν προφῆτην ἐν τισὶ τακταῖς νυξίν, ἱερουργιών πολλῶν γενομένων πρότερον, πίνοντα δὲ χρησμοιδεῖν οὐκέθ’ ὀρώμενον τοῖς παροῦσι θεωροῖς . . . καὶ πρὸ τοῦ πίνειν δὲ οὕτως ἀσιτεῖ τὴν ἡμέραν ὅλην καὶ νύκτα, καὶ ἐν ἱεροῖς τισιν ἀβάτοις τῷ πλήθει καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ἀνακεχώρηκεν ἀρχόμενος ἐνθουσιᾶν . . . On the consultation at the oracle of Apollo Clarius see also (with explicit mention of the subterranean location of the central act) Plin. *HN* 2.232 in *Apollinis Clarii specu*; Tac. *Ann.* 2.54.3 *sacerdos . . . in specum degressus*; Farnell (n. 29), 128, 224–5, 253, 393 n. 141, 403 n. 199e. The most thorough study is still Robert (n. 30), esp. 6–10, 107–26, 197–220, 385–92.

Cave-Dweller, that is, as an inhabitant of the earth's entrails.<sup>33</sup> As for Apollo's mystic aspects, apart from a number of coins depicting the god in connection with torches which could conceivably be mystic (although there are, of course, other possibilities),<sup>34</sup> Artemidorus reports that in his home-town of Daldis in Lydia the god had the traditional appellation *Μύστης*, 'Initiate'.<sup>35</sup> This probably means that in Daldis Apollo was envisaged as the archetypal *μύστης*, the initiate *par excellence*, who functioned as a prototype for the human initiates of his mystic cult. The analogue of Dionysus comes instantly to mind, who also bore the epithet *Μύστης* in Tegea, and who was imagined in myth as having been initiated into his own mysteries.<sup>36</sup> After all,

<sup>33</sup> Farnell (n. 29), 112–13. These chthonic aspects of Apollo's cult must surely underlie *Ion* 17, 887ff., 892, where Euripides describes with subtle irony Apollo's rape of Creusa in a cave in terms clearly alluding to *Pluto's* rape of Persephone (*h. Dem.* 2ff., 425–32).

<sup>34</sup> Admittedly, representations of Apollo holding a torch are extremely sparse: for a late exception (Apollo Leukatas, Trajan's reign [A.D. 98–117]) see W. Lambrinoudakis in *LIMC* 2.1 (1984), no. 470 (p. 243). Nonetheless, in e.g. a series of coins struck in Amphipolis between c. 424 and 358 B.C. (some even later), Apollo is depicted on the obverse, and a torch on the reverse: W. Baege, *De Macedonum sacris* (Diss. Halle, 1913), 47–8; B. V. Head, *A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum: Macedonia, etc.*, ed. R. S. Poole (London, 1879), 43–5. These torches have been interpreted (cf. Head, above, xlii) as allusions to Amphipolitan torch-races in honour of Artemis Tauropolos. However, whereas Artemis is of course known to have received cult in Amphipolis (Diod. Sic. 18.4.5; Livy 44.44; *Anth. Pal.* 7.705), I know of no evidence for torch-races held there in her honour. After all, such fusion of Apolline and Artemisian elements on the same coin would be unique at least as far as Amphipolitan coinage is concerned. What is more, torches, far from being peculiar to Artemis, occur on Amphipolitan coins in connection with other gods too, notably Poseidon (Head, above, 47, no. 28), Zeus (mint uncertain, but nonetheless Head, 15, no. 63 speaks again of a torch-race), and Heracles (Head, 97, no. 18). More importantly perhaps, on one Amphipolitan coin (Head, 44, no. 3), the torch is depicted together with a cicada on the reverse, an insect associated with the Muses, Apollo's companions (Pl. *Phdr.* 259B–D; *Anth. Pal.* 12.98 [Posidippus] = 3074–77 Gow–Page; see further M. Davies and J. Kathirithamby, *Greek Insects* [London, 1986], 118, 122), but not with Artemis. Remarkably, the cicada also appears in a Dionysiac context on coins of Mende (Head, 83, no. 9) and of Thasos (B. V. Head and P. Gardner, *A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum: The Tauric Chersonese, Sarmatia, Dacia, Moesia, Thrace, &c.*, ed. R. S. Poole [London, 1877], 220, no. 43); and Euboean Histiaea has yielded a number of coins in which the head of a Maenad on the obverse is combined with a torch on the reverse (here again B. V. Head, *A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum: Central Greece (Locris, Phocis, Boeotia and Euboea)*, ed. R. S. Poole [London, 1884], 125, nos. 2–6 speaks of a 'torch-race'!). Sometimes, indeed, torches on Macedonian (although not Amphipolitan) coinage occur in explicitly mystic contexts, as on a Thessalonian piece issued under Tiberius, where Demeter is depicted holding in each hand a torch and standing in a car drawn by two serpents (Head, *A Catalogue of the Greek Coins . . . Macedonia* [see above], 117, no. 76). Coins depicting Demeter in association with torches occur all over the Greek world: Attica and the Megarid (B.V. Head, *A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum: Attica–Megaris–Aegina*, ed. R.S. Poole [London, 1888], 82, 122, 124); Peloponnesian Hermione (P. Gardner, *A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum: Peloponnesus (excluding Corinth)*, ed. R.S. Poole [London, 1887], 160–1); Thracian Lysimachia (Head and Gardner, above, 238, no. 6a); for the iconographic record outside of coinage see L. Breschi, *LIMC* 4.1 (1988), 850, no. 23; 855, nos. 83–4; 856, nos. 97–9, 102–3; 857, nos. 107–8, 100; 858, no. 121; 864, nos. 220, 226; 870, no. 307; etc.

<sup>35</sup> Artem. *Oniocr.* 2.70, p. 203 Pack: τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα, ᾧ πειθόμενος ἐγὼ πατρώϊω ὄντι θεῷ . . . <τὸν> Δαλδιαῖον Ἀπόλλωνα, ὃν Μύστην καλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς πατρώϊω ὀνόματι. Farnell (n. 29), 128, n. b hypothesized that the Daldian Apollo Mystes was the result of syncretist influence from Mithraic religion. Nonetheless, one should note how Artemidorus, this *connoisseur* of Lydian antiquities (L. Robert, *Documents d'Asie Mineure* [Athens–Paris, 1987], 236 with n. 15), insists on the *traditional* (πατρώϊος) character of the cult. More insightfully, Cook (n. 9), 250–1 with n. 1 treats Apollo's appellation *Mystes* as an indication of his *rapprochement* with Dionysus (see below).

<sup>36</sup> Dionysus *Μύστης*: Pausanias (8.54.5), specifying that his sanctuary was off the road that led

close association between Apollo and Bacchus is attested in early sources. Apart from a number of vase paintings depicting Apollo in the company of maenads,<sup>37</sup> a fragment from an unidentified Aeschylean play attributes to Apollo epithets associating him both with the ivy and with Bacchus himself (fr. 341 Radt *ὁ κισσεὺς Ἀπόλλων, ὁ βακχειόμαντις*, interestingly cast in bacchiacs).<sup>38</sup> Presumably in the same vein, Euripides (fr. 477 Kannicht) addresses Bacchus and Apollo in the same breath: *δέσποτα φιλόδαφνε Βάκχε, παιὰν Ἀπολλων εὐλυρε*.<sup>39</sup> Last but far from least, Apollo and Dionysus shared, as is well known, a common locus of worship in Delphi.<sup>40</sup> Remarkably, according to a later source, the first prophet in Apollo's Pythian oracle was none other than Dionysus himself: *Πύθωνος δὲ τότε κυριεύσαντος τοῦ προφητικῆς τρίποδος, ἐν ᾧ πρῶτος Διόνυσος ἐθεμίστευσε*. . .<sup>41</sup> Evidently, Apolline cult was not cut off from the kind of mystic and ecstatic practices we tend to associate more readily with Dionysism.

from Tegea to Argos, near Mt Parthenion; M. Jost, *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie* (Paris, 1985), 435–6; for the area's topography see J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece* (London, 1898, repr. New York, 1965), 4. 445–7; cf. also pl. A in Jost (above, after p. 594). Dionysus initiated into his own mysteries: Nonnus 9.111–31; Oppian, *Cyneg.* 4.244–9; Apollod. 3.5.1; see further R. Seaford, *Reciprocity and Ritual* (Oxford, 1994), 283 with n. 14, with ample documentation; also, Jost, above, 435–6, with doxography and discussion (she thinks rather that Dionysus *Μύστης* has Eleusinian associations).

<sup>37</sup> As early as the late sixth century B.C.: see G. Kokkorou-Alewrass, *LIMC* 2.1 (1984), nos. 717–22 (p. 273).

<sup>38</sup> For a different interpretation see, however, M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart, 1990), 45–6, who argues that *ὁ κισσεὺς ἀπόλλων* (with small *α*) is said of Bacchus, *ἀπόλλων* meaning 'destroyer'. This is unlikely, for it is with Apollo that popular etymology regularly associated *ἀπόλλυμι*: cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1081–2 (with Fraenkel ad loc.), Eur. *Phaeth.* 224–5 (with Diggle ad loc.); perhaps also Archil. fr. 26.5–6 West. As Fraenkel (l.c.) points out, Pl. *Crat.* 404D, 405E suggest that the derivation of Apollo from *ἀπόλλυμι* was a widespread one. For the bacchiac rhythm as suggesting a Dionysiac context cf. Xen. *Symp.* 9.3.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Macrobi. *Sat.* 1.18.6 (our source for both the Aeschylean and the Euripidean fragments): *et nequis opinetur diuersis dis Parnassum montem dicatum, idem Euripides in Licymnio, Apollinem Liberumque unum eundemque deum esse significatus, scribit* [E. fr. 477 Kannicht]. *ad eandem sententiam Aeschylus* [fr. 341 Radt]. See further Cook (n. 9), 243–67, esp. 252–3, and C. Kerényi, *Dionysos*, trs. R. Manheim (Princeton, 1976), 233. Cf., on the subject of Dionysus' associations with Apollo, the bibliography cited below, n. 40. The fact that Macrobius makes Apollo into an all-encompassing symbol of universal unity (cf. Syska [n. 10], 189–94) does not in any way undermine the strong evidence suggesting a symbiosis of the Apolline and the Dionysiac.

<sup>40</sup> After Dionysus was torn apart by the Titans, his remains were buried by Apollo near the Delphic tripod or on Mt Parnassus: Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 365A; Tzetzes on Lycophr. 207 (2.98 Scheer), citing Callim. fr. 643 Pfeiffer and Euphorion fr. 13 Powell; *Orph. frag.* 35 Kern ~ 312F Bernabé. Cf. also Dinarchus of Delus, *FGrH* 399 F1b = *Suppl. Hell.* fr. 379Bb; Philochor. *FGrH* 328 F7. See further N. Robertson in M. B. Cosmopoulos (ed.), *Greek Mysteries* (London–New York, 2003), 218–40 (here 222–4 with n. 23); cf. also Kerényi (n. 39), 261; Burkert (n. 20), 123–6. In Aristonous' *Paeon* (33–7), Dionysus welcomes Apollo at Delphi by presenting him with his own trieteric festival: see Powell (n. 25), 163, and cf. Crusius (n. 21), 15–16. Philodamus composed a *paian* in honour (not of Apollo but) of Dionysus: see again Powell (n. 25), 165–71, and cf. H. Weil, *BCH* 19 (1895), 393–418 (here 397): 'en prenant le nom de Péan, Dionysos devient un autre Apollon'. Cf. P. Perdrizet, *Cultes et mythes du Pangée* (Paris–Nancy, 1910), 68–70 for further points of contact between Dionysus and the Delphic god, especially the society of *Hosioi* (Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 365A) who sacrificed at the temple of Apollo during a festival in honour of Dionysus (Perdrizet, above, 69 with nn. 1–2). See also, for different perspectives, J. E. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*<sup>3</sup> (Cambridge, 1922), 500–6; H. Jeanmaire, *Dionysos* (Paris, 1951), 187–98; W. K. C. Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion* (London, 1952), 41–3.

<sup>41</sup> Quotation from the first ancient Hypothesis to Pindar's Pythian Odes (2.2.6–8 Drachmann).



Let us recapitulate. Elimination of alternative possibilities has led us to conclude that Apollo's cult title of *Φαναῖος* derives from *φαναί* 'torches' (rather than e.g. from *φᾶνός* < *φαεινός*), and that these *φαναί* were probably ritual torches illuminating nocturnal rites (rather than, for example, beacons used to guide ships into the harbour of Phanai). We have also established that it is perfectly possible, though of course by no means provable, that such nocturnal rituals could be part of Apolline worship. It is even conceivable that such rituals may have had chthonic or mystic aspects, both because the use of torches in mystery cults is well documented and because Apolline cult is not alien to the secret and even the infernal. There is no denying that our conclusions so far are largely speculative, insofar as they are not supported by rock-solid evidence. Still, it is legitimate to use them as a working hypothesis in our discussion of Zeus *φαναῖος* in *Rhesus* 355, which triggered our investigation in the first place. If the association of *φαναῖος* with ritual torches turns out to be workable in the case of Zeus too, if it proves compatible with what we know of his cult, then we will have gained a significant argument in favour of our working hypothesis.

## II. ZEUS AND THE MYSTERIES

The first to intimate a connection between Zeus *φαναῖος* and ritual torches was, it seems, Samuel Musgrave, who also pointed out that *φαναί* indubitably refers to mystery torches in the context of the same play, namely *Rhesus* 943: *μυστηρίων τε τῶν ἀπορρήτων φανός*.<sup>42</sup> However, his suggestion was subsequently ignored. Thus, for example, both Cook and Wilamowitz suggested that *φαναῖος* comes from *φανῆναι*, like the later formation *ἐπιφανής*, and must mean something like 'He that Appareth'.<sup>43</sup> But this is a linguistic improbability: as pointed out on p. 384, the suffix *-aios* must here denote relation to, or provenance from, *φαναί* or *Φάναι*. And since Zeus *φαναῖος* can have nothing to do with Chian *Φάναι* (cf. pp. 384–5), we are left with only one option, namely to explore possible associations between Zeus *φαναῖος* and *φαναί* 'torches' as utilized in religious contexts.

Torch-lit processions for Zeus (Serapis) and mystic cult in honour of Zeus (Kasios) are attested for Alexandria in a fairly late but helpfully explicit text. This is Achilles Tatius' novel *Leucippe and Clitopho*, written probably in the first/second century of

<sup>42</sup> Musgrave as reported in the Glasgow edition of Euripides (*ad Eur. Rhes.* 351): 'Quam hic emphasin habeat *φαναῖος*, nemo interpretum docet, nec quidquam suppeditant veteres grammatici. Videtur vox a *φάναυ* [*sic*] fluere, quo nomine auctor infra v. 940 [=943] mysteria designat'.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. A. B. Cook, *Zeus* (Cambridge, 1914), 1.7, n. 6, whence also the translation I quote; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin, 1921), 585; this interpretation seems to go back to Vater (n. 9), xciv–xcvi who associates Zeus *φαναῖος* with 370 *ἐλθέ, φάνηθι*; cf. his n. *ad* 345 [=355]: 'Est Iupiter, qui subito apparet et votorum compotem facit'. On *ἐπιφανής* as an epiklesis of heroes see L. Robert, *RPhil* 19 (1939), 200–1 with nn. 6–11. Cook was also willing to entertain the possibility that 'as applied to the Chian Apollon, and presumably also to Zeus, the epithet was at first a mere *ἐθνικόν*, "the god of Phanai"'; but there is no evidence that Zeus had anything to do with Chian Phanai. A third interpretation of *φαναῖος* has been recently proposed by A. Markantonatos, *Ariadne* 10 (2004), 15–48 (here 28–9), in the context of his hypothesis that Orphic and mystic (Eleusinian, Dionysiac) ideas provide a filter through which *Rhes.* is to be interpreted. For Markantonatos, *Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος* is to be associated with *Φάνης*, the primordial god of some Orphic theogonies. But (1) *φαναῖος* as a derivative of *Φάνης* is unparalleled; and (2) an identification (cf. Markantonatos, above, 29 with n. 46) of Zeus with the primordial deity of Orphic theogonies—a deity for whom *Φάνης* is but one among many appellations—could not have taken place before the Hellenistic period: see M. L. West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford, 1983), 203–5.

our era,<sup>44</sup> and the passages that concern us are 5.2.1–2 and 3.6.1–2, given immediately below:

<sup>τ</sup>ῆν δὲ πως καὶ κατὰ δαίμονα ἱερομηνία τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ, ὃν Δία μὲν Ἕλληνες, Σέραπιν δὲ καλοῦσιν Αἰγύπτιοι. ἦν δὲ καὶ πυρὸς δαιδουχία· καὶ τοῦτο μέγιστον ἐθεασάμην. (2) ἐσπέρα μὴν γάρ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἥλιος κατεδύετο καὶ νύξ ἦν οὐδαμοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἄλλος ἀνέτελλεν ἥλιος κατακερματίζων· τότε γὰρ εἶδον πόλιν ἐρρίζουσαν περὶ κάλλους οὐρανῶν. ἐθεασάμην δὲ καὶ τὸν Μειλίχιον Δία καὶ τὸν Διὸς Οὐράνιου νεῶν. (Ach. Tat. 5.2.1–2)

It so happened that, by some chance, there was a festival in honour of the great god whom the Greeks call Zeus, while the Egyptians Serapis. There was also a torch-lit procession, which was the greatest spectacle I have ever seen. For although it was late in the evening and the sun was setting, nightfall did not ensue, but another sun rose, split up into smaller parts;<sup>45</sup> then I saw a city vying for beauty with the sky. I saw also Zeus Meilichios and the temple of Celestial Zeus.

Ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῷ Πηλουσιῷ Διὸς ἱερὸν ἄγαλμα Κασίου. τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα νεανίσκος, Ἀπόλλωνι μᾶλλον ὁμοῦς· οὕτω γὰρ ἡλικίας εἶχε. προβέβληται δὲ τὴν χεῖρα καὶ ἔχει ροιὰν ἐπ’ αὐτῇ· τῆς δὲ ροιᾶς ὁ λόγος μυστικός. (2) προσευξάμενοι δὲ τῷ θεῷ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Κλεινίου καὶ τοῦ Σατύρου σύμβολον ἐξαίτησαντες (καὶ γὰρ ἔλεγον μαντικὸν εἶναι τὸν θεόν) περιήμιμεν τὸν νεῶν. (Ach. Tat. 3.6.1–2)

At Pelusium there is a sacred statue of Zeus Kasios. This statue represents a youth, who looks more like Apollo; for such was his age. His hand is extended, and he holds a pomegranate in it; the explanation for the pomegranate pertains to mystery rites. And so, after praying to the god and asking for a sign with regard to Clinias and Satyrus (for they said that the god had prophetic powers), we walked about in the temple.

A number of remarkable features in these two passages merit discussion. In the cult of Zeus/Serapis in Alexandria,<sup>46</sup> *πυρὸς δαιδουχία* (5.2.1) designates most assuredly a massive civic procession by torchlight, as may be deduced from the hyperbolic ‘another sun rose, split up into smaller parts’ (5.2.2). It is interesting that Zeus Meilichios and Celestial Zeus are also mentioned in the context of this torch-lit festival: Zeus is celebrated here not only as the celestial father of gods and men (*Ζεὺς Οὐράνιος*) but also in his chthonic capacity as Zeus Meilichios.<sup>47</sup> It is possibly this

<sup>44</sup> The oldest papyrus preserving scraps of Tatius’ text (*POxy.* 56 [1989], 3836) has been dated to the second century, or even to its first half; for bibliography see Mertens–Pack<sup>3</sup> no. 2.11 (<http://promethee.philo.ulg.ac.be/cedopal/getPackAuteur.asp>).

<sup>45</sup> *κατακερματίζω* here must be taken as intransitive, cf. J. N. O’Sullivan, *A Lexicon to Achilles Tatius* (Berlin, 1980) s.v. The idea of human-made festive lights vying with celestial light has an interesting modern parallel in Mikhail Bulgakoff’s *The Master and Margarita*, trs. D. Burgin and K. Tiernan O’Connor (New York, 1996), ch. 26, 268: ‘he saw that two gigantic five-branched candelabra had been lit above the temple . . . and it seemed to him that ten immense lamps had been hung up over the city and were competing with the light of the single lamp rising higher and higher over Yershalaim—the moon’.

<sup>46</sup> On the well-known syncretist identification of Zeus with Serapis see e.g. *POxy.* 11 (1915), 1382.20–22 (A.D. second century); Cook (n. 43) 188–90; L. Vidman, *Isis und Sarapis bei den Griechen und Römern* (Berlin, 1970), 116, 147, 172; W. Hornbostel, *Sarapis* (Leiden, 1973), 22, n. 1, 23, nn. 2–3, 28, 190, 220, 310, 318, 343, 353–4, 370; G. J. F. Kater-Sibbes, *Preliminary Catalogue of Sarapis Monuments* (Leiden, 1973), index s.v. Sarapis/Zeus-Sarapis; M. Totti, *Ausgewählte Texte der Isis- und Sarapis-Religion* (Hildesheim, 1985), 32/no.13.

<sup>47</sup> On the association of Zeus Meilichios with underworld powers see *imprimis* A. B. Cook, *Zeus* (Cambridge, 1940), 3.1091–1160, and (with major updates) M. H. Jameson, D. R. Jordan and R. D. Kotansky, *A lex sacra from Selinous* (Durham, 1993), 81–103; cf. also E. Rohde, *Psyche*, trs. W. B. Hillis (London, 1925), 214, n. 168; Robertson (n. 40), 221 with n. 16. On the universality of the festival of Zeus/Serapis, honouring the god in all his capacities and all his aspects, cf. Cook (n. 9), 1158. On representations of Serapis in connection with the mystic *kiste* see Kater-Sibbes (n. 46), 167, nos. 857–8.

all-encompassing nature of the festival that is suggested by the ‘beauty contest’ between heaven and earth enacted in the torch-lit procession (5.2.2). As regards the cult of Zeus Kasios at Pelusium,<sup>48</sup> we are explicitly told that he had mystery rites established in his honour, and also apparently a *hieros logos* providing an *aition* for the details of the rite (cf. 3.6.1 τῆς δὲ ροιᾶς ὁ λόγος μυστικός).<sup>49</sup> Unsurprisingly for a divinity in whose honour mysteries are performed, Zeus Kasios seems also to have had associations with the Underworld, if the pomegranate is anything to go by; after all, Zeus’ chthonic counterpart, ‘Zeus of the Underworld’, is amply attested in mainland Greece too.<sup>50</sup> It is intriguing that the narrator compares this manifestly chthonic and mystic Zeus with Apollo (explicitly, on account of his youthfulness; but also perhaps because of their prophetic powers?). We cannot help recalling that both Apollo and Zeus are also connected through their shared title of *φαναίος*, possibly in a context of torch-lit nocturnal rites which, as we saw, typically carried chthonic and mystic associations.

Mystery rites for Zeus are not limited to Pelusium only. Admittedly, our evidence is predominantly late, but we are fortunate enough to possess a fifth-century B.C. inscription from the island of Paros, specifying that entrance into the precinct of Zeus ‘Υπατος (the Supreme) was prohibited, among else, to the uninitiated, who must surely be those uninitiated to Zeus’ own mysteries.<sup>51</sup> Much later literary testimonia speak of mysteries in honour of Zeus Sabazios in Pergamon under Attalus III (c. 170–133 B.C.).<sup>52</sup> And Eusebius of Caesarea (*Hist. Eccl.* 9.3) mentions τελεταί and μυσεῖς established in honour of Zeus Philios in Antioch-on-the-Orontes during the reign of C. Galerius Valerius Maximinus (c. A.D. 270–313).<sup>53</sup>

<sup>48</sup> For discussion and bibliography on Zeus Kasios see Totti (n. 46), 149/no. 63; also Y. Hajjar, *ANRW* 2.18.4 (1990), 2236–320 (here 2264–6), with helpful remarks on Zeus Kasios’ origins in Syria, whence his cult was transplanted to Pelusium; cf. also M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*<sup>3</sup> (Munich, 1974), 2.130 with n. 5. C. Bonner, *Hesperia* 15 (1946), 51–9 adduces archaeological evidence (depictions of youthful males holding pomegranates) in favour of syncretism between the postulated Syrian (Semitic) deity and Harpocrates, the young Horus.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Cook (n. 9), 987n. For another instance in which the statue of a god—significantly holding again a pomegranate—is associated with the ‘unspeakable’ *aition* of mystic ritual cf. Paus. 2.17.4 τὰ μὲν οὖν ἐς τὴν ροιάν—ἀπορρητότερος γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ λόγος—ἀφείσθω μοι.

<sup>50</sup> *Il.* 9.457 Ζεὺς καταχθόνιος; Hes. *Op.* 465; Aesch. *Supp.* 231 Ζεὺς ἄλλος ἐν καμοῦσιν; Ag. 1386–7 τοῦ κατὰ χθονὸς | Διὸς (Enger: *Ἰδου* codd.); fr. \*\*273a Radt χθόνιον Δία; Eur. fr. 912.2–3 Kannicht Ζεὺς εἴθ’ Ἀιδης | ὀνομαζόμενος στέργεις; further sources in West on Hes. *Op.* 465; cf. also W. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, trs. J. Raffan (Cambridge, MA, 1985), 200 with 426, n. 14; Clinton (n. 26), 59–60 on Zeus Eubouleus of the Mysteries as a hypostasis of Zeus Chthonios. The *locus classicus* for the pomegranate’s chthonic associations is of course *h. Dem.* 371–4, where Persephone’s eating of a pomegranate grain commits her eternally to the Underworld; cf. Richardson (n. 26), on *h. Dem.* 372; H. P. Foley (ed.), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Princeton, 1994), 56–7.

<sup>51</sup> *IG* 12.5.1 no. 183 ([ῥ]ος Ὑπάτο· ἀ[τε]-[λ]ῆστοι οὐ θέμ-ις οὐδὲ γυναι-[κ]ί [sc. εἰσελεῖν]); cf. Cook (n. 9), 875, n. 1 (5). There can be no doubt that mysteries of Zeus are meant here; cf. e.g. comparable epigraphic evidence from Samothrace to the effect that entrance into the Anaktoron of the Samothracian sanctuary was prohibited to those uninitiated in the *local* mysteries: see S. G. Cole, *ANRW* 2.18.2 (1989) 1564–98 (here 1574–5).

<sup>52</sup> Cook (n. 9), 287–8, n. 2.

<sup>53</sup> See Cook (n. 47), 1186 with n. 6; the information goes unmentioned, surprisingly, in F. W. Norris, *ANRW* 2.18.4 (1990), 2322–79 (here 2329–35). Mysteries in honour of Zeus Philios square nicely with the chthonic associations claimed for this god by Cook (n. 9), 260, 723, 727, n. 3(1) and (2), 728, 1141, esp. 1160–210. Cook lays particular emphasis on Zeus Philios as god of deceased ancestors (real or postulated). On Zeus Philios ‘as a bringer of prosperity to the *philoī* united under one roof’ see R. Parker, *Athenian Religion* (Oxford, 1996), 241–2, who remains non-committal as to the origins (chthonic or not) of this god.

By far the most solid, oldest and richest evidence for Zeus mysteries in the Greek world—or rather, in its fringe—comes from Crete. Cretan mystic rites (τελεταί, ὄργια) in Zeus' honour are attested not only by as late a source as Strabo but also, famously, in a fragment of Euripides' *Cretans*.<sup>54</sup>

ἐν δὲ τῇ Κρήτῃ . . . καὶ τὰ τοῦ Διὸς ἱερά ἰδίως ἐπετελεῖτο μετ' ὄργιασμοῦ καὶ τοιούτων προπόλων οἳ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσόν εἰσιν οἱ Σάτυροι. τούτους δ' ὀνόμαζον Κουρήτας . . .  
(Strabo 10.3.11 (468C, 3.222.21–3 Radt))

'In Crete . . . in particular those [rites] sacred to Zeus were performed along with orgiastic worship and with the kind of ministers who were in the service of Dionysus, I mean the Satyri. These ministers they called "Curetes" . . .'  
(trsl. H. L. Jones, Loeb Classical Library)

ἀγνὸν δὲ βίον τείνομεν, ἐξ οὗ  
Διὸς Ἰδαίου μύστης γενόμεν  
καὶ νυκτιπόλου Ζαγρέως βούτης  
τὰς ὀμοφάγους δαίτας τελέσας  
Μητρί τ' ὀρεῖαι δαΐδας ἀνασχών  
†καὶ Κουρήτων  
βάκχος ἐκλήθην ὀσιωθεῖς.  
10  
15

(Euripides' *Cretans* (fr. 472.9–15 Kannicht))

Pure is the life I have maintained since I became an initiate of Idean Zeus and a herdsman of nocturnal Zagreus, after performing feasts of raw flesh; and holding aloft torches to the mountain mother among the Curetes I was named a celebrant after consecration.<sup>55</sup>

It is worth going into some detail about the Euripidean fragment, visibly the meatier of the two passages. Not only does it speak explicitly of initiation into the cult of Zeus of Ida (line 10), it also describes this cult's ritual details in a manner evoking rites known to us from Bacchic cult: omophagy (line 12);<sup>56</sup> brandishing of torches (line 13); presence of Zagreus/Dionysus (line 11);<sup>57</sup> and the title of βάκχος assumed

<sup>54</sup> Cf. L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford, 1896), 1.36, 140 with nn. 3, 4; on Zeus' Cretan mysteries see Cook (n. 9), 345, and especially the thorough and (largely) up-to-date discussion by H. Verbruggen, *Le Zeus crétois* (Paris, 1981), 71–99.

<sup>55</sup> Translation according to C. Collard (in C. Collard, M. J. Cropp and K. H. Lee [eds.], *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays* [Warminster, 1995] 1.58–61), who reads μετὰ Κουρήτων in 14 after Blaydes and Wilamowitz. The text of the fragment, transmitted in Porph. *Abst.* 4.19, p. 261 Nauck, is beset with problems. I record here Kannicht's major deviations from the tradition: (a) 11 βούτης Wilamowitz (-as Diels) : βροντᾶς Porph.; cf. below, n. 59; (b) 12 τὰς Bergk : τὰς τ' Porph.; (c) 12 δαίτας Hartung : δαίτας Porph., Hsch. ω 218, δ 110. Especially on the Diels/Wilamowitz βούτης see A.-T. Cozzoli in A. Masarrachia (ed.), *Orfeo e l'orfismo* (Rome, 1993), 155–72 (here 160–8); on Hartung's δαίτας (from δαῖς) as an inevitable emendation of the traditional δαίτας (from δαίτης) see again Cozzoli, above, 168–72.

<sup>56</sup> On (bovine) omophagy in the cult of the Cretan Zeus see Cook (n. 43), 659–65; Harrison (n. 40), 482–91; on omophagy in Bacchic cult see e.g. Jeanmaire (n. 40), 254–76; E. R. Dodds (ed.), *Euripides, Bacchae*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1960), xvi–xviii; R. Seaford, *CQ* n.s. 31 (1981), 252–75 (here 263–6, esp. 266); id. *Euripides, Bacchae* (Warminster, 1996), 37. On ritual cannibalism see M. Halm-Tisserant, *Cannibalisme et immortalité* (Paris, 1993), esp. 114, 133, 166.

<sup>57</sup> Regardless of the actual religious background to the assimilation of Zagreus and Dionysus (on which see V. Macchiore, *Zagreus* [Florence, 1930], 132–4), Euripides' text leaves little doubt of their equation (cf. West [n. 43], 154, and cf. 170). On Dionysus Zagreus cf. also Callim. *Aet.* 2, fr. 43.117 Pfeiffer; Plut. *Mor.* 389A; Nonnus 6.165–206, 31.46–8, 38.209–10 etc.; full list of sources in Pfeiffer ad loc.; discussion in Rohde (n. 47), 340–1, 353, n. 27; M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*<sup>3</sup> (Munich, 1967), 1.686, n. 1. For a recent reconsideration of the evidence regarding the Zagreus myth (a reconsideration that does not assail the equation Zagreus = Dionysus) see R. Edmonds, *ClAnt* 18 (1999), 35–73; on the use of the Zagreus myth in Neoplatonic thought see V. Yates, *GRBS* 44 (2004), 183–98, esp. 191–8.

by *mystai* upon completion of their initiation.<sup>58</sup> In addition, the title βούτης ('oxherd'), if Wilamowitz's emendation is correct,<sup>59</sup> affords scope for comparison with the associations of Dionysiac worshippers called βουκόλοι.<sup>60</sup> A comparable intrusion of Bacchic elements into a seemingly alien mystic cult is to be found in the Eleusinian ritual, where Iacchus, who seems to have Dionysiac associations, occupies a cardinal position in the rite.<sup>61</sup> The close association between Zeus and Dionysus in the Cretan cult seems to have parallels, again in the fringe of the Hellenic world, in such intriguing fusions as 'Zeus Dionysos' in north-east Thrace<sup>62</sup> or 'Zeus Bakkhos' in Pergamum in Mysia.<sup>63</sup> Still, this association, at least to the extent evinced in the *Cretans* fragment, was cast into doubt by the foremost authority on Cretan Zeus, namely H. Verbruggen, who dismissed it as artificial and a mere instance of poetic fancy.<sup>64</sup> None the less, ten years after the publication of Verbruggen's monograph,

<sup>58</sup> Collard (n. 55), *ad* E. fr. 472.9–15 points out that 'the word celebrant, βάκχος, denotes primarily an ecstatic devotee of Dionysus-Bacchus, but Euripides associates the word in its fem. form "Bacchant" with the Curetes and Cretan Rhea in the worship of Dionysus at *Bacc.* 120–9 and with that of Cybele in Asia Minor at *Bacc.* 78–88, 131–4.' Cf. Dodds *ad* Eur. *Bacch.* 78–9.

<sup>59</sup> See n. 55. Cozzoli (n. 55), 162–3 with nn. 37–8 objects that in all of its attestations βούτης means literally 'ox-herd', and cannot simply substitute a technical term consecrated by usage, such as βουκόλος; she would rather retain the traditional βροντάς in the sense of the noise produced by the τύπανα (large drums) used during initiation rites. But it is conceivable that Euripides is taking poetic liberties with his use of ritual language here. What is more, for the use of βούτης with reference to Cretan ecstatic cult, it may be significant that the Attic hero Βούτης had unmistakable associations both with the chthonic realm (son of Poseidon, brother of Erechtheus, husband of Chthonia; E. Kearns, *The Heroes of Attica* [London, 1989], 152–3; Wernicke, *RE* 3.1 [1897], 1080–2) and with Crete (he helped Aeacus in his war against Minos on Crete, Ov. *Met.* 7.500).

<sup>60</sup> The standard work on the βουκόλοι is now A.-F. Jaccottet, *Choisir Dionysos*, 2 vols. (Zurich, 2003), who offers a full list of inscriptions and a thorough-going discussion; concise exposition in F. Graf, *ZPE* 62 (1986), 43–4; see also Kannicht's app. crit. *ad* Eur. fr. 472.11–12. By way of literary sources, one may compare e.g. Eur. fr. 203 Kannicht, and Cratinus' comedy *Βουκόλοι* (fr. 17–22 KA), which must have had a Dionysiac theme, to judge from fr. 20 KA (= Hsch. π 4455 Schmidt) Κρατίνος ἀπὸ <δι>θυράμβου ἐν Βουκόλοις ἀρξάμενος (ἀρπαξάμενος Rutherford). Also, the building known as Βουκολεῖον in Athens was the focus of a Dionysiac rite according to the Aristotelian *Ath. Pol.* 3.5; cf. also Collard (n. 55), *ad* Eur. fr. 472.9–15; doxography in Cozzoli (n. 55), 161, n. 35. Βουκόλος and βουκολέω are sometimes applied to ecstatic religions (e.g. that of Sabazios or the Corybantes), which bear distinct similarities with Dionysiac cult: cf. e.g. Ar. *Vesp.* 9–10 βουκολεῖς δαίμονα (sc. Σαβάζιον); Luc. *De salt.* 79, where βουκόλοι keep company with Κορύβαντες and Σάτυροι.

<sup>61</sup> See Clinton (n. 26), 64–71, and cf. Harrison (n. 40), 539–71, albeit with excessive emphasis on what she misguidedly perceived as an 'Orphic' reworking of Dionysiac ritual. On Iacchus' associations with Dionysus see (with due warnings) G. E. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton, 1961), 308–9 and Graf (n. 26), 51–8. In the sanctuary of Demeter *Eleusinia* in Thelpousa (Arcadia), which was self-evidently influenced by Eleusinian cult, a statue of Dionysus was displayed alongside those of Demeter and Kore (Paus. 8.25.3); discussion in M. Jost, *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie* (Paris, 1985), 434–5, who rightly points out that, at least by the second century A.D., Dionysus 'avait acquis un rôle suffisamment important à Eleusis pour être considéré comme un élément caractéristique et adapté à ce titre dans le petit sanctuaire arcadien'.

<sup>62</sup> For the evidence see Cook (n. 9), 282 with n. 1, and especially V. Velkov and V. Gerassimova-Tomova, *ANRW* 2.18.2 (1989), 1317–61 (here 1341, 1349), with bibliography on the tell-tale altar inscription θεῶι Διὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ, found in the Bulgarian village of Brasljan, north-west of Malko Tarnovo, in the Burgas region.

<sup>63</sup> See *CIG* 2, no. 3538.32 = G. Kaibel (ed.), *Epigrammata graeca ex lapidibus conlecta* (Berlin, 1878, repr. Hildesheim, 2001), no. 1035.22 (A.D. 166): Διὶ καὶ Διὶ Βάκχῳ; cf. Cook (n. 9), 287 with n. 2.

<sup>64</sup> Verbruggen (n. 54), 77. We need not be detained by Harrison's (n. 40), 479–80 wholly unfounded hypothesis, à propos of the *Cretans* fragment, that Zeus was a latecomer who supplanted Zagreus and thus was, in a sense, identified with him.



the historical accuracy of the Euripidean account, at least with regard to the cultic association of Zeus with Dionysus, was significantly reinforced, when the Linear B tablet KH Gh3 from Chania, Crete, was published:<sup>65</sup>

.1 <i>di-wi-jo-de di-we</i>	ME+RI 2	(Δίφιόνδε Διφεῖ MEAI 2)
.2 <i>di-wo-mu-so</i>	ME+RI 2	(Διφονύσωι MEAI 2)

.1 Towards the precinct of Zeus : to Zeus : two units of honey

.2 To Dionysus : two units of honey

This tablet confirms that close association between Zeus and Dionysus as recipients of joint cult was possible as early as the Late Bronze Age: Zeus and Dionysus receive honey offerings in the same cultic space, namely the precinct of Zeus (*Diwijon*, Δίφιον).<sup>66</sup> It is even possible that the cult had chthonic aspects, in view of how often honey is included in offerings to the nether realm.<sup>67</sup>

### III. RHESUS AND THE MYSTERIES

This close association, in the context of mystic cult, of Zeus and Bacchus will be of the essence in our examination of the meaning and function of *Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος* in *Rhesus*. For later in the play the same Rhesus who is addressed as *Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος* in *Rhesus* 355 is associated with, precisely, Bacchus by his own mother, an unnamed Muse, when she describes her son's posthumous fate (*Rhesus* 962–73). The Muse declares that she has come to an arrangement with Persephone, to the effect that Rhesus will not 'go under the black earth' (962) but rather continue his existence by assuming a new identity as *ἀνθρῶποδαίμων*, 'man-god', an entity betwixt and between man and deity (971).<sup>68</sup> In this new interstitial capacity Rhesus will inhabit

<sup>65</sup> Ed. pr. by L. Godart and Y. Tzedakis, *RFIC* 119 (1991), 129–49, esp. 129 and 143–7. Cf. A.-T. Cozzoli (ed.), *Euripide Cretesi* (Pisa–Rome, 2001), 19 and 85.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. E. F. Bloedow, *Kernos* 4 (1991), 139–77, who argues that a Cretan cult of Zeus on Mt Youktas may date from as early as the Middle Minoan IA period. As regards Zeus' cult in the Idaean Cave, M. Prent, *Cretan Sanctuaries and Cults* (Leiden, 2005), 594–600 discusses evidence pointing to an origin at least in the Early Iron Age, if not the Bronze Age.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. *Il.* 23.170; *Od.* 10.518–19; *Aesch. Pers.* 610–12; *Eum.* 106–7; *Soph. OC* 481; *Eur. IT* 165–6; *Or.* 115; *Ap. Rhod.* 3.1035–6; *Verg. Aen.* 6.419–21; *Porph. De antr. nymph.* 28 (p. 75–6 Nauck); see further C. Daremberg, E. Saglio and E. Pottier (eds.), *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines* (Paris, 1904), 3.2.1705–6; P. Stengel, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*<sup>3</sup> (Munich, 1920), 100, 126, 144, 149; Rohde (n. 47), 45, n. 13, 244, n. 6; D. Ogden, *Greek and Roman Necromancy* (Princeton, NJ, 2001), 7–8, 169–70 (speculation on the significance of honey); P. Bonnechere, *Trophonios de Lébadée* (Leiden, 2003), 135–8 (honeycakes as chthonic offerings). Honey was thought to protect lifeless bodies from decay: Ogden, above, 58–9, to whose list of sources add *Porph. De antr. nymph.* 15–17, p. 67–8 Nauck. The dead are sometimes imagined as a swarm of bees (Ogden, above, 223–4), and bees are otherwise associated with the realm of the dead: for a comprehensive treatment see Bonnechere, above, 228–31. By way of further speculation, it may be added here that honey (or at least some kinds thereof, such as fresh or Pontic honey) was thought to be an intoxicant like wine, or to induce 'madness', or even to throw those consuming it into a death-like state (*Porph. De antr. nymph.* 16 (p. 67 Nauck) = *Orph. frag.* 154 Kern ~ 222F Bernabé; *Longus* 1.25.2; esp. *Xen. An.* 4.8.20; *Verg. Aen.* 4.486 couples *umida mella* with *soporiferum papaver*). Given that honey is also associated with prophecy (*h. Merc.* 558–63 with Allen–Sikes–Halliday ad loc.; *West on Hes. Theog.* 83), one is tempted to wonder whether honey could have been instrumental in inducing trances, and thus to experiences associated with the Beyond.

<sup>68</sup> On Rhesus' intermediate state, betwixt and between mortality and immortality, see also C. Plichon, *Kernos* 14 (2001), 11–21 (here 19–20).

forever a subterranean cavern somewhere in Mt Pangaeum, and will act as ‘*prophet of Bacchus*’ (970–3):

οὐκ εἰσι γαίᾳς ἐς μελάγχμιον πέδον·  
 τοσόνδε νύμφην τὴν ἔνερθ’ αἰτήσομαι,  
 τῆς καρποποιοῦ παῖδα Δήμητρος θεᾶς,  
 ψυχὴν ἀνεῖναι τοῦδ’ ὀφειλέτις δέ μοι 965  
 τοὺς Ὀρφῆως τιμῶσα φαίνεσθαι φίλους.  
 καὶ μοι μὲν ὡς θανόν τε κοῦ λεύσσω φάος  
 ἔσται τὸ λοιπόν· οὐ γὰρ ἐς ταῦτόν ποτε  
 ἔτ’ εἶσιν οὐδὲ μητρὸς ὄψεται δέμας·  
 κρυπτὸς δ’ ἐν ἄντροις τῆς ὑπαργύρου χθονὸς 970  
 ἀνθρωποδαίμων κείσεται βλέπων φάος,  
 Βάκχου προφήτης, ὃς γε<sup>69</sup> Παγγαίου πέτρᾳ  
 ὠικησε, σεμνὸς τοῖσιν εἰδόσιν θεός.

He [Rhesus] will not enter the ground of black earth. This much I shall ask of the underground bride, the daughter of the corn-bearing goddess Demeter: to release his soul onto the Upperworld. She is after all indebted to me, and must openly honour Orpheus’ kin. So, as far as I am concerned, he will be from now on as good as dead and as one who does not behold the light; for we shall never meet again, nor will he ever see his mother’s figure. Still, he shall lie hidden in the caverns of the silver-veined land, seeing the light, a man-god, a prophet of Bacchus who dwells on rocky Pangaeum as a revered god amongst those who have knowledge.

Although we do know of Dionysus’ being an oracular god in Thrace, and although his oracular site is sometimes located at Mt Pangaeum,<sup>70</sup> the reference to Bacchus here does not fail to startle. Mythologically, it is scarcely explicable as a piece of received tradition, since in no other source is Rhesus associated with Bacchus. Dramatically, there seems to be little point in associating Rhesus, in the play’s finale, with a divinity that has had no role whatsoever in the play. Might this unprepared-for mention of Bacchus be a concession to local lore, tacked on to a play that stays otherwise close to the *Doloneia* and other identifiable mythical traditions?<sup>71</sup>

The question is, in all probability, to be answered in the affirmative. That Rhesus did receive cult in Thrace is known to us on the authority of Philostratus (probably L. Flavius Philostratus) who reports details of Rhesus’ cult as it obtained in his own era (A.D. third century).<sup>72</sup> A hunter, a warrior and a horse-breeder, Rhesus had an altar on Mt Rhodope, frequented by wild animals that offered themselves willingly to

<sup>69</sup> Reading ὃς γε (A. Matthiae [ed.], *Euripidis tragoediae et fragmenta* [Leipzig, 1824], 8.42) instead of the transmitted ὃς τε or ὥστε makes Rhesus himself the Βάκχου προφήτης, with the ‘dweller of the Pangaeian rock’ being of course Bacchus: see J. Diggle, *Euripidea* (Oxford, 1994), 320–6. Matthiae’s emendation had already been admitted as a possibility by Perdrizet (n. 40), 27. For an account of earlier disputes as to the identity of the ‘prophet of Bacchus’ (disputes largely generated by the reading ὥστε in 972) see J. Rempe, *De Rheso Thracum heroe* (Diss., Münster, 1927), 28–32; Pichon (n. 68) 17 with nn. 23–31.

<sup>70</sup> General mention of ‘Dionysus the Thracian seer’: Eur. *Hec.* 1267. Dionysus’ oracle situated either on Mt Pangaeum or on Mt Haemus: ΣEur. *Hec.* 1267 (1.89 Schwartz); ΣEur. *Alc.* 968 (2.239 Schwartz). See further Baegel (n. 34), 97–8; Perdrizet (n. 40), 37–43.

<sup>71</sup> For a concise but helpful overview of *Rhesus*’ mythological background see Kovacs (n. 24), 347–9. With the unprepared-for mention of Bacchus we may compare e.g. the way Athene unexpectedly appears at the end of Eur. *IT* (1435ff.) with the sole purpose of providing a link with current cultic realities (*pace* S. Scullion, *ICS* 24–5 [1999–2000], 217–33, esp. 225–9, who casts doubt on the actuality of such cultic references).

<sup>72</sup> That Philostratus’ account pertains to contemporary Rhesus-cult is demonstrated by G. Seure, *RPh* 53 (1928), 106–39 (here 118, n. 1).

be sacrificed to him; as a local deity, he was also thought to ward off pestilence.<sup>73</sup> The figure of Rhesus was evidently familiar in Thrace and the adjoining regions. Hippoanax (fr. 72 West) calls him *Αἰνείων πάλμυς*, which may mean either 'king of Aenus' (modern *Enez*) in the mouth of the Thracian river Hebrus or, less probably, 'king of Aenia' in the Thermaic Gulf, south of modern-day Thessalonike. Strabo seems to place Rhesus' kingdom somewhere east of the river Strymon, among the Thracian tribes of the Odomantes, the Edonians and the Bisaltae.<sup>74</sup> Indeed, Bisaltic coins depict a naked warrior, holding two spears and standing beside a horse—perhaps a figure of cult, who has been identified with Rhesus by at least one specialist,<sup>75</sup> although this of course must remain purely conjectural. Intimations of a possible Rhesus-cult in eastern Thrace are given by the *Suda*,<sup>76</sup> which states that Rhesus, a *στρατηγὸς τῶν Βυζαντίων* who had assisted the Greeks at Troy, had his 'dwellings' (*τὰς οἰκήσεις*) just outside 'the city', in an area called Rhesion (*ἐν τόπω ἐπιλεγομένῳ 'Ρησίῳ*). The 'city' is of course Constantinople, and the significantly named '*Ρήσιον*' is indeed known as one of the city's gates.<sup>77</sup> The reference to Rhesus' 'dwellings' may imply hero cult: a hero's *οἴκησις* would of course be his shrine, and 'outside Constantinople' would not be too far either from the Trojan plain where Rhesus was killed or from Cius on the Bithynian coast (between Cyzicus and Nicomedeia) where Parthenius locates a major turning-point in Rhesus' life.<sup>78</sup> Significantly, the *Suda* adds that 'now' the place of Rhesus' 'dwellings' (*οἴκησεις*) is occupied by the 'house' (*οἶκος*), that is the church, of St Theodore. This could be either Theodore Stratelates or Theodore Teron (the *Suda*'s *τοῦ μεγάλου μάρτυρος Θεοδώρου* would suit either of them), military saints who are credited with fantastic feats, and are often represented as mounted warriors,<sup>79</sup> just like Rhesus.<sup>80</sup> It would appear that

<sup>73</sup> Our source here is Philostr. *Her.* 17.3–6 (p. 18 de Lannoy). See also Seure's (n. 72), 117–19 minute analysis of the passage. Cf. further below p. 405 with n. 139.

<sup>74</sup> Strabo 7 fr. 16a (2.366.5–7 Radt): 'the country beyond the Strymon is partly near the sea and in the region around Datum: Odomantes and Edonians and Bisaltae, both those who are indigenous and those who crossed over from Macedonia, among whom Rhesus was king' (I follow Radt's German trsl. of the passage, 2.367.6–8).

<sup>75</sup> N. G. L. Hammond in W. Moon (ed.), *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography* (Madison, WI, 1983), 245–58 (here 248–9) = Hammond, *Collected Studies* (Amsterdam, 1993), 2.120–1; for depictions of the horseman figure on Macedonian coins see Head (n. 34, 1879), 13, 138, 142, 158–9, 161, 163, 173.

<sup>76</sup> *Suda* ρ 146 (4.292 Adler).

<sup>77</sup> See Theophanes Confessor, *Chronogr.* pp. 230.2–3, 231.20 De Boor.

<sup>78</sup> Parth. '*Ἐρωτ. Παθῆμ.* 36 (pp. 362–4 Lightfoot). According to a marginal annotation on the MS, the same story was also narrated by Asclepiades of Myrlea (*FGrH* 697 F2); see J. L. Lightfoot (ed.), *Parthenius of Nicaea* (Oxford, 1999), 552, n. 414. See further P. Borgeaud in P. Borgeaud (ed.), *Orphisme et Orphée en l'honneur de Jean Rudhardt* (Geneva, 1991), 51–9.

<sup>79</sup> See A. P. Kazhdan and N. P. Ševčenko s.vv. 'Theodore Stratelates' and 'Theodore Teron', *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (1991), 3.2047, 2048–9. On Sts Theodori (Stratelates and Teron) see also H. Delehaye, *Les légendes grecques des saints militaires* (Paris, 1909), 11–43, 127–201. There is however a difficulty, in that both Theodore Stratelates and Theodore Teron seem to have been associated with Euchaita, west of Amaseia in Pontus, rather than with Constantinople. The iconography of the Thracian Hero may also have seeped through to that of yet another mounted warrior, namely St. George: see R. F. Hodkinson, *The Thracians* (London, 1981), 167–8.

<sup>80</sup> True, in our version of the *Doloneia* Rhesus achieves nothing by way of military feats, but it is certain that in an alternative mythic tradition Rhesus wrought havoc among the Greeks on a single day (presumably the day of his arrival); cf. Pind. fr. 262 Snell–Maehler; *ΣbT II*. 10.435, 3.93 Erbse; *ΣA II*. 10.435 (1.364.3–11 Dindorf). In *Rhes.* 447–50, Rhesus' boast that a single day will suffice for him to crush the Greeks is likely to be a reflection of this version; cf. B. Fenik, '*Iliad X' and the 'Rhesus'*' (Brussels, 1964), 26.

the imagery of Rhesus, the master of famous horses, survived the cult itself, at least in eastern Thrace.

According to a plausible theory, propounded by Perdrizet and endorsed with further insights by Diggle, it is precisely Rhesus' Thracian cult that is hinted at in the *Rhesus* passage cited above (p. 395): the special role Rhesus will assume in Bacchus' Thracian cult (*Rhesus* 972 *προφήτης*) seems to be an allusion to his status as mythical ancestor of the Thracian Bessoί, who acted as prophets in the oracular shrine of Dionysus located in all likelihood on Mt Pangaeum.<sup>81</sup> The allusions to local lore seem to continue with the Muse's remark that Bacchus is locally worshipped on Mt Pangaeum by 'those who have knowledge' (973 *σεμνὸς τοῖσιν εἰδόσιν θεός*).<sup>82</sup> The latter phrase is doubtless an allusion to mystic cult: 'the mystery cults offered their adepts a supposedly potent kind of knowledge, from which the profane were excluded'.<sup>83</sup> That Rhesus is assigned a privileged role in the local mysteries of Bacchus means, no doubt, that he is somehow involved in the mystic cult himself. Indeed, the *Rhesus* text itself intimates as much by making Rhesus a cousin of Orpheus, famously an expounder of mystic lore and rites (see below pp. 398–401), and by turning him into a posthumous denizen of the caves of Mt Pangaeum (*Rhesus* 970), which is also where Orpheus' dwelling was located (see below, n. 92). Rhesus' association with Bacchus and Orpheus in a mystic context most likely reflects local cultic realities: Plutarch famously asserts that 'Orphic' and Bacchic mystery rites were energetically practised since time immemorial in Macedon, and that they closely resembled their Thracian counterparts.<sup>84</sup> Plutarch's statement is bolstered by independent evidence suggesting that Bacchic cult was, indeed, indigenous in Macedon: Macedonian maenads were referred to by the obviously local cult titles *Μιμαλλόνες* and *Κλώδωνες*, while late sources speak of a Macedonian cult of Dionysus *Ψευδάνωρ* ('False-Male', presumably a reflection of ritual transvestism in the god's

<sup>81</sup> See Perdrizet (n. 40), 28; Diggle (n. 69), 325. Cf. Hdt. 7.111 *οἱ προφητεύοντες τοῦ ἱεροῦ*. I have argued elsewhere that Rhesus' prophetic function may be alluded to in Epich. fr. 206 KA and in Asclep. *FGrH* 12 F5: see V. Liapis, *ZPE* 143 (2003), 19–22.

<sup>82</sup> Having *σεμνὸς τοῖσιν εἰδόσιν θεός* refer to Bacchus is, of course, concomitant with reading *ὅς γε* in 972; see again my n. 69.

<sup>83</sup> Quotation from Dodds (n. 56), *ad Eur. Bacch.* 72–5. Perdrizet (n. 40), 16 even argued that Rhesus is here envisaged as a prototypical *mystes* himself, whose soul will be released by Persephone, as in the case of the 'Bacchic/Orphic' lamellae where initiates ask the Queen of the Underworld to let their souls enter the realm of the blessed; he adduces the famous Thurii tablet 2A1 Pugliese–Carratelli *ἐρχομαι ἐκ καθαρῶν καθάρᾳ, χθονίων βασιλείᾳ* . . . (cf. also 1B1 Pugliese–Carratelli); in the same vein, one might add 2B1.7 Pugliese–Carratelli, where the dead is imagined as immersing himself into the bosom of the 'chthonic queen' Persephone (*δεσφιστοῖνας δὲ ὑπὸ κόλπον ἔδυν χθονίας βασιλείας*). This is essentially the approach taken also by Markantonatos (n. 43), 33. However, Pichon (n. 68), 15 offers an important *caveat*, apparently without being aware of Perdrizet's speculations: 'ce n'est pas en raison de sa vertu qu'il [sc. Rhesus] bénéficie de ce statut privilégié, mais parce que Perséphone est liée à la Muse par une dette, ce qui est d'ailleurs l'inverse de ce que l'on attendrait, à savoir que ce soit le défunt qui ait à s'acquitter de la sorte'; also *ibid.*, p. 18–19: 'la Muse n'indique pas les liens existant entre Bacchos et Perséphone, et [ . . . ] le rôle joué ici par les deux divinités n'est pas le même que celui dont témoignent par exemple les lamelles de Pélinna. Rien ne nous permet ici de reconstituer une eschatologie de type orphico-dionysiaque.' For criticism of Perdrizet's views cf. already Rempe (n. 69), 27–8.

<sup>84</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 2 *πάσαι μὲν αἱ τῇδε* (sc. in Macedonia) *γυναικες ἔνοχοι τοῖς Ὀρφικοῖς οὔσαι καὶ τοῖς περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ὀργιασμοῖς ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ παλαιοῦ* [ . . . ] *πολλὰ ταῖς Ἡδωνίσι καὶ ταῖς περὶ τὸν Αἴμον Θρήσσαις ὁμοία δρώσι*. Cf. Baege (n. 34), 82 with n. 1, 84; Perdrizet (n. 40), 42, n. 3.

mysteries).<sup>85</sup> If Rhesus is indeed envisaged as having a role in the local Bacchic mysteries which were performed in the Pangaeum area, this might perhaps explain, partly at least, his posthumous identity as *ἀνθρωποδαίμων*. For as an entity betwixt and between man and god, Rhesus would be well suited to function as an archetypal *mystes*: being neither dead nor alive, he would appear to hover in the interstices between the temporary death of the initiate and the life eternal promised to accomplished *mystai*.

#### IV. RHESUS AND HIS COLLEAGUES

As an *ἀνθρωποδαίμων* enjoying immortality and a special place in mystic practices, dwelling in subterranean caverns (*Rhesus* ), and possessing the gift of prophecy (*Rhesus* 972), Rhesus is also brought into close contact with what appears to be a distinct group of divinized mortals, which includes Orpheus, Trophonius, Amphiaraus, Zamolxis, and Aristaeus, among others. These figures are, like Rhesus, neither dead nor alive, but enjoy a continued existence beyond the grave; they inhabit subterranean chambers, and deliver prophecies; their cult also seems to have included mystic elements. A brief and selective overview of the beliefs pertaining to some of these figures will help us better integrate Rhesus into this religious context.<sup>86</sup>

The figure most obviously parallel to Rhesus is, of course, Orpheus. Indeed, as we saw, he is twice invoked explicitly by Rhesus' mother (*Rhesus* 944, 966) as an actual blood-relative of her son. Orpheus was, according to some versions, the offspring of a Muse and the river-god Oeagrus,<sup>87</sup> just as Rhesus was the son of a Muse and the river Strymon. Also like Rhesus, the posthumous dweller of a cave (*Rhesus* 970), Orpheus is variously associated with caves: he was conceived in a cave, which he then made into his abode,<sup>88</sup> after his dismemberment, his head floated to Lesbos and slithered into a cavernous cleft, described in one of our sources as *ἄδωντον*, whence it delivered oracles (we recall Apollo's mantic *ἄβατον* at Claros),<sup>89</sup> achieving such fame for divination that he even overshadowed Apollo, who found himself obliged to command the head

<sup>85</sup> Plut. (cited in n. 84): (Macedonian maenads) *Κλώδωνες καὶ Μιμαλλόνες ἐπωνυμίαν ἔχουσαι*. *Μιμαλλόνες*: *Etym. Magn.* s.v. (p. 587, 53–6 Gaisford); cf. also s.v. *Ἀπόλλων* (p. 130, 31 G). *Κλώδωνες*: Hsch. κ3062 Latte; *Sud.* κ1829 (3.137 Adler); *Etym. Magn.* s.v. *Κλώδωνας* (p. 521, 48–51 G). *Διόνυσος Ψευδάνωρ*: Polyaen. 4.1. See further Baege (n. 34), 81–5; J. Kallérís, *Les anciens Macédoniens* (Athens, 1954, repr. with addenda, 1988) 1.210–17. Transvestite or effeminate Dionysus: Aesch. fr. 61 Radt; Eur. *Bacch.* 235–6, 453–9 (with Dodds ad loc.); Ar. *Ran.* 46; cf. Seaford (n. 56, 1981), 259. On Bacchic cult in Macedon see again Baege (n. 34), 77–106, who reports (p. 87) Sittig's calculation that out of c. 330 Macedonian theophoric names, an impressive forty-nine derive from Dionysus (as opposed to only twenty-three deriving from Zeus, twenty-nine from Apollo, and twenty-three from Hermes). For Maenads depicted on Macedonian coins see Head (n. 34, 1879), 10–11. On Dionysiac mysteries in Pella see most recently M. W. Dickie, *ZPE* 109 (1995), 81–6, with epigraphic evidence. For recent archaeological reports on Macedonian mystery cults (Mother of Gods, Demeter *Thesmophoros* and *Eleusinia*) see M. Lilimbaki-Akamati, *Το Θεσμοφόριο της Πέλλας* (Athens, 1996); ead. in *Ancient Macedonia* (1999), 6.1.691–704; S. Pinyiatoglou, in *Ancient Macedonia* (1999), 6.2.911–19.

<sup>86</sup> To my knowledge, the first to draw attention to the common cultic pattern underlying such figures was Y. Ustinova, *Kernos* 15 (2002), 267–88. In much of what follows, I am indebted to her insights. For an early inkling of the association between Rhesus, Bacchus, and Zamolxis cf. however A. D. Nock, *CR* 40 (1926), 184–6 (here 186).

<sup>87</sup> For a selective list of sources see K. Ziegler, *RE* 18.1 (1939), 1217.

<sup>88</sup> Orph. *Argon.* 75, 1375–6.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. above, p. 386 with n. 32.



to stop prophesying.<sup>90</sup> Like Rhesus, Orpheus is traditionally, and standardly, associated with Thrace and, more rarely, with Macedonia;<sup>91</sup> sometimes, he is even made to dwell on Mt Pangaeum, which provides of course yet another point of contact with Rhesus.<sup>92</sup> Orpheus is also the founder or expounder of mystic rites. An orator of Demosthenes' time or later ([Dem.] 25.11)<sup>93</sup> associates him with the establishment of the 'holiest of rites' (ὁ τὰς ἁγιωτάτας ἡμῖν τελετὰς καταδείξας Ὀρφεύς), which are in all probability the Mysteries of Eleusis.<sup>94</sup> Already in the late fifth century, the Aristophanic 'Aeschylus' could name Orpheus as the originator of, generally, 'rites' (Ar. *Ran.* 1032 Ὀρφεὺς μὲν γὰρ τελετὰς θ' ἡμῖν κατέδειξε), which *could* be mystery rites, if one chooses so to interpret τελεταί.<sup>95</sup> And as we have already seen (p. 385), *Rhesus* itself makes Orpheus the 'expounder' (*Rhesus* 943 κατέδειξεν) of, most probably, the Eleusinian rites.<sup>96</sup> More explicitly, Hecataeus of Abdera saw Orpheus as the initiator of the mysteries of Dionysus and Demeter in Greece,<sup>97</sup> as the epigrammatist Damagetus was later to pronounce him the founder of Bacchic mysteries—and one scarcely needs to be reminded once more that Rhesus is envisaged

<sup>90</sup> Cavernous crevice on Lesbos: Flav. Philostr. *Heroic.* 28.9 (p. 37 De Lannoy) κατασχούσα ῥήγμα τῆς Λέσβου ὥκησε καὶ ἐν κοίλῃ τῇ γῇ ἐχρησμάδιει. Crevice as ἄδυστον: Philostr. *VA* 4.14. Orpheus as μάντις: Strabo 16.2.39 (762C, 4.344.24–32 Radt), a most interesting passage which groups Orpheus the 'seer' together with such mantic figures as Amphiaraus, Trophonius, Musaeus, Zalmoxis etc. (see further below). Apollo commands Orpheus to stop: Philostr. *VA* 4.14 (cf. also Photius' summary, *Bibl.* 241, 333a). Cf. Guthrie (n. 40), 35–9, with discussion of iconographic evidence; Harrison (n. 40), 464–9; Bonnechere (n. 67), 97–8. According to Lucian (*Ind.* [31] 11), at the place where Orpheus' head was buried the inhabitants of Lesbos erected a temple of Bacchus (Βακχεῖον).

<sup>91</sup> Orpheus' association with Thrace is widely attested, and needs no special comment: see e.g. *Orph. test.* 30–7 Kern. For his association with Macedonia (on which Kern, *Orph. test.* 38–41, leaves a lot to be desired) cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 560ff.; Strabo 7 fr. 10a–b (2.352–4 Radt); Plut. *Alex.* 14.8; Paus. 9.30.7–9; Apollod. 1.15. In Phot. *Bibl.* 186.140a, reporting Conon, *FGrH* 26 F1 (xlv) = Conon, *Narr.* 45, p. 301 Brown, Orpheus is king both of the Macedonians and of the Odrysians (see M. K. Brown [ed.], *The Narratives of Konon* [Munich–Leipzig, 2002], 303–4). Cf. further Baege (n. 34), 182–4.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. also Iambl. *VP* 28.146 (p. 107.3 Nauck); Max. Tyr. *Dialex.* 37.6 (p. 300 Trapp = 440 Koniaris); Himer. *Declam.* 46.3 (pp. 185–6 Colonna).

<sup>93</sup> For bibliography on the dating of the speech (*Against Aristogeiton* 1) see e.g. Graf (n. 26), 31, n. 42.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Graf (n. 26), 33: ἀγιώταται τελεταί can only be the mysteries of Eleusis, because 'derselbe superlativische Ausdruck findet sich für Eleusis auch sonst belegt, und nahe kommen die σεμνὰ τέλη des Sophokles [*OC* 1050] und die ἄγιοι τελεταί bei Aristophanes [*Nub.* 304]'; cf. also Graf's nn. 56–7.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Dover ad loc. See however Graf (n. 26), 31–3, who warns against interpreting too readily the Aristophanic passage as referring to *mystery* rites, but concludes that, in all likelihood, Aristophanes does allude to the Eleusinian mysteries.

<sup>96</sup> *Rhes.* 943 μυστηρίων τε τῶν ἀπορρήτων φανὰς must refer to the Eleusinian mysteries rather than e.g. to mysteries in general, or to the Lesser Mysteries at Agra. For as I. M. Linforth, *The Arts of Orpheus* (Berkeley, 1941) 64 points out, 'the mysteries which Orpheus is said to have established were an honored Athenian cult, neither a cult which was undistinguished in Athens [like the Lesser Mysteries] nor one which meant no more to Athens than to other cities' (his italics). See also Graf (n. 26), 22–39, esp. 28–31, who points out, *à propos* of *Rhes.* 943, that 'allein schon das Wort μυστήρια weist im Athen des vierten Jahrhunderts auf Eleusis' (p. 29 with n. 36); cf. also West (n. 43), 23–4, Pichon (n. 68), 14. Interestingly, *P. Berol.* 13044 (first century B.C.) contains lengthy quotations from the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*, some of which it treats as the work of 'Orpheus'; cf. Richardson (n. 26), 66–7. In the same connection, Pausanias (9.30.12) says that the priestly *genos* of the Lycomidae chanted Orphic hymns during δρώμενα, which are presumably rites related to the Eleusinia.

<sup>97</sup> *FGrH* 264 F25 (96.4–6) = *Orph. frag.* 293 Kern.

as a prophet of, precisely, Bacchus in *Rhesus* 972.<sup>98</sup> That Orphic cult was perceived as having Bacchic associations is clear enough from early literature: Herodotus (2.81.2) could mention in the same breath 'the observances called Orphic and Bacchic' in connection with religious taboos.<sup>99</sup> The Euripidean Hippolytus is taunted for indulging in Bacchic practices 'with Orpheus as his leader' (*Hipp.* 953–4).<sup>100</sup> Finally, in Aeschylus' *Bassarai*, Orpheus, having won 'fame' (δεδοξασμένος) thanks to Dionysus, is said to have neglected his duty to the god, turning instead to Apollo, whom he worshipped each dawn from the top of Mt Pangaeum.<sup>101</sup> Orpheus' association with the Dionysiac mysteries was independently confirmed by the discovery, in 1951, of the famous Olbia bone tablets (fifth century B.C.), which associate Dionysus with Orpheus in a context that seems to imply a (mystic) 'truth' regarding the essential identity of life and death: βίος θάνατος βίος ἀλήθεια Διό 'Ορφικ.<sup>102</sup> At a much later date (first century A.D.), Athenian Dionysia are said to have featured maenadic dances performed μετὰ τῆς 'Ορφείως ἐποποιίας τε καὶ θεολογίας.<sup>103</sup> Nonetheless, Orpheus, unlike Rhesus, does

<sup>98</sup> *Anth. Pal.* 7.9.5. For the association of Orpheus with mystic rites see also Pl. *Prot.* 316D; *Resp.* 364E–365A; Plut. fr. 212 Sandbach (Orpheus as the initiator of all mystery cults in Athens); Paus. 2.30.2, 9.30.4–5, 10.7.2; Diod. Sic. 1.23.2–7, 1.92.3, 1.96.4–6, 3.65.6, 4.25.3–4, 5.64.4 (= Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F104), 5.77.3; Luc. *Astrol.* (48) 10; Apollod. 1.15; Orph. *Argon.* 11; Dionys. Scytob. *FGrH* 32 F14 (43.1); Iambl. *VP* 28.146; Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.21.1, 7.74.3; Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 1.6.4, 2.1.23, 2.3.23, 2.3.34, 10.8.4; Nonn. 41.375; Procl. *In R.* 398 (1.174–5 Kroll); id. *In Ti.* 5 (3.168 Diehl); cf. also for exhaustive evidence and discussion Linforth (n. 96), 27, 38–104, 169–71, 189–232, 264; succinct treatment in Borgeaud (n. 78), 54; arguments from comparative anthropology in J. Bremmer (in P. Borgeaud, n. 78), 13–30 (here 17–20).

<sup>99</sup> Linforth (n. 96), 38–50, in a long discussion, found grounds for an athetesis that would nullify the association between the Orphic and the Bacchic: τοῖσι 'Ορφικοῖσι καλεομένοισι {καὶ Βακχικοῖσι, εὐοῖσι δὲ Αἰγυπτίοισι} καὶ Πυθαγορείοισι. For arguments against Linforth see W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, trs. E. L. Minar, jr (Cambridge, MA, 1972), 127–8, who still holds to his preference for the longer version of the Herodotean passage cited above (see W. Burkert, *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis* [Cambridge, MA, 2004], 165, n. 118), despite the objections raised meanwhile by L. Zhmud', *Hermes* 120 (1992), 159–68 (here 164).

<sup>100</sup> Linforth (n. 96), 53–4 tries, as he would, to downplay the association between Bacchus and Orpheus suggested by the Euripidean passage.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. West (n. 43), 15–16. Our main source for the *Bassarai* plot is [Eratosth.] *Cat.* 24 (p. 29 Olivieri = p. 577 Maass), conveniently quoted by Radt (*ante* Aesch. fr. 23). For the problems associated with the ps.-Eratosthenic passage, and for a working text thereof, see West (n. 38), 32–5. West also points out (n. 38, 38) that Orpheus' worshipping Apollo on Mt Pangaeum must certainly come from Aeschylus rather than being a later admixture that somehow found its way into the ps.-Eratosthenes.

<sup>102</sup> Text: *SEG* 28.659; see now L. Dubois, *Inscriptions grecques dialectales d'Olbia du Pont* (Geneva, 1996), no. 94, who comments (p. 155) that 'la formule Βίος–Θάνατος–Βίος [. . .] pourrait etre la schématisation abstraite de la croyance en une nouvelle vie après la mort.' Cf. West (n. 43), 18; (n. 38), 21–2. West suggests several analyses for these ambiguous abbreviations (i.e. Διόνυσος or Διόνυσου; 'Ορφικοί or 'Ορφικῶν or 'Ορφικῶν), but insists that, whether 'Ορφικ is being applied to Dionysus, to the votaries, or to the rites, it all comes down to the same thing as far as the association between Orpheus and Dionysus is concerned. Objections against West were voiced by Zhmud' (n. 99), 159–60, 163–8, who offered palaeographical grounds for rejecting both 'Ορφικῶν and 'Ορφικῶν, and pointed out that the only remaining option, namely 'Ορφικοί, which can only be applied to the votaries, provides for the first time solid evidence for the existence of a group of devotees calling themselves 'Orphics'. As is well known, this has been a pivotal point of an ongoing dispute, the outlines of which are given by Zhmud' (n. 99, 160–2). On the affinities between Dionysiac and 'Orphic' practices cf. also H. D. Betz in F. Graf (ed.), *Ansichten griechischer Rituale* (Stuttgart–Leipzig, 1998), 399–419 (here 409).

<sup>103</sup> See Philostr. *VA* 4.21. For the association of Orpheus with Bacchic mysteries see West (n. 43), 15–18 (archaic and classical eras), 24–6 (fourth and third centuries); Linforth (n. 96), 206–32 (texts later than 300 B.C.). Harrison's (n. 40), 454–77 speculations that Orphism was a 'protestant' movement intent on expurgating Dionysism from its gruesome aspects have deservedly been

not seem ever to be envisaged as perennially continuing his existence beyond death (his prophetic head invariably stops singing or prophesying after a while), and is never given divine honours.

As regards Trophonius, we find reliable sources, principally Plutarch (*Mor.* 590A–592E) and Pausanias (9.39.5–14), suggesting that the rites surrounding the consultation of his oracle were modelled on, or structured as reproductions of, images of the Underworld and experiences of mystic initiates.<sup>104</sup> In Plutarch's account, which is partly modelled on the famous eschatological narrative of Er in Plato's *Republic* (614B–621B), we hear the story of a certain Timarchus of Chaeronea who, upon entering Trophonius' grotto, had a near-death experience. Feeling his soul quit his body, he found himself in an Underworld-like landscape, where he saw a number of miraculous sights, and was taught by a chthonic deity the doctrine of reincarnation and the ethico-religious rules that govern soul transmigration (including the chastening of the souls in Hades); he was even initiated into the mechanism of extra-corporeal experiences that produce mantic trances. Timarchus ascended from the Trophonius grotto two nights later, to the great relief of his folk who feared him dead; he died at any rate soon after. On a more realistic note now, Pausanias gives a detailed picture of the rituals preceding descent into Trophonius' cave. Anyone who wished to consult the oracle had to undergo an experience structured in such a way as to simulate the descent of the soul into Hades. He had first to be purified, then sacrifice, among other offerings, a ram into a sacrificial pit (*βόθρος*) at night-time. After being bathed in the Herkyna river by two boys suggestively called Hermai (for their name can hardly be anything but an allusion to Hermes' function as psychopomp),<sup>105</sup> he drank from the fountains of Lethe and of Mnemosyne. One inevitably recalls here the so-called 'Orphic' tablets instructing the newly deceased initiate to avoid the spring of Lethe and to drink from the pool of Mnemosyne:<sup>106</sup> the Trophonius pilgrim is thus presumably assimilated to the state of the dead.<sup>107</sup> This simulated death was presumably perceived as analogous to death-like experiences during initiation, and this is probably why late sources refer to the rites surrounding Trophonian consultation by using the mystically laden terms *ὄργια* and *τελεταί*.<sup>108</sup> After the preliminaries had been completed, the Trophonius pilgrim went to the oracle and descended into a gorge; but he had first to make sure he was carrying honey cakes with him, in order to appease the menacing snakes which lurked

committed to oblivion. Along somewhat comparable lines, M. Detienne, *Dionysos Slain*, trs. M. and L. Muellner (Baltimore, 1979), 68–94 famously argued that the Orphic myth of Dionysus' dismemberment is a critique of sacrificial ritual as practised in the Greek world. But 'Orphism', far from distancing itself from Bacchic myth and ritual, actually appropriated it: see most recently Robertson (n. 40), 218–40.

<sup>104</sup> For the connection between the two realms, cf. the celebrated Plut. fr. 178 Sandbach, which draws a parallel between the experiences of the soul *in articulo mortis* and those of mystic initiates; cf. further below, p. 407 with n. 143.

<sup>105</sup> So A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia* (London, 1994), 3.82.

<sup>106</sup> See e.g. the Hipponium tablet (IA1 Pugliese-Carratelli), and cf. Pl. *Resp.* 621A. Cf. also Harrison (n. 40), 574–83; A. Dieterich, *Nekyia*<sup>2</sup> (Leipzig, 1913), 90–4.

<sup>107</sup> See in this connection Ustinova (n. 86), 270: 'the symbolism of the Trophonion was that of the underworld'; Bonnechere (n. 67), 98 with n. 11, 135–8, 282–91; cf. also the much briefer exposition of M. Detienne, *The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece*, trs. J. Lloyd (New York, 1996), 64. Schachter (n. 105), 89 discusses the possibility of Trophonius being represented, in local iconography, as Zeus Chthonios, or even Pluto.

<sup>108</sup> For a full list of the sources, and discussion thereof, see Bonnechere (n. 67), 121–5.

underground.<sup>109</sup> Upon his descent into the gorge, he was suddenly and violently sucked in by the earth. This seems to have been a re-enactment of the fate of Trophonius himself, who (like Rhesus) was an inhabitant of the earth's entrails: he was said to have been swallowed by the earth, or to have disappeared into a subterranean chamber (*κατωρυχή*) he had constructed himself in Lebadeia.<sup>110</sup> Pausanias leaves us largely in the dark about the ensuing experience, but clearly states that the pilgrim, after ascending on earth, was in a state of shock and terror, unconscious both of himself and of the others around him.<sup>111</sup> Most importantly for the question of Rhesus' being addressed as Zeus *φαναίος*, there is ample, if late, evidence that Trophonius was likewise assimilated in cult with Zeus, as is suggested by the widely attested title of *Ζεὺς Τροφώνιος*.<sup>112</sup> This assimilation cannot be explained away by conjecturing, as Albert Schachter did, that at some point in the second century B.C. the sanctuary of Trophonius was moved in the vicinity of the temple of Zeus Basileus.<sup>113</sup> Apart from the fact that we simply do not know whether the two sanctuaries were ever in physical proximity,<sup>114</sup> mere physical collocation cannot be used as a tool to interpret ritual affinities. Let one (glaring) counter-example suffice. On the Acropolis of Athens, Erechtheus was the recipient of cult in what is usually taken to have been part of the temple of Athena Polias.<sup>115</sup> Physical collocation is undeniable here, but we never hear of a cult of \**Ἀθηνᾶ Ἐρεχθίῳ*. On the contrary, we do know that a cult of *Ποσειδῶν Ἐρεχθεύς* existed in the Erechtheum, and we also hear that Poseidon and Erechtheus received offerings at the same altar;<sup>116</sup> however, there is no temple of Poseidon in the vicinity. The 'physical collocation' argument simply will not do.

Much like Trophonius, Amphiaraus was an oracular figure inhabiting the entrails of the earth, which had swallowed him during the ill-fated siege of Thebes, thus saving

<sup>109</sup> Underworld snakes: cf. esp. *ΣAr. Nub.* 508a, b, c (pp. 115–16 Holwerda). Further on Trophonius' honey-cakes see Schachter (n. 105), 81 with n. 2; Ustinova (n. 86), 271 with n. 46; on the chthonic associations of honey see again n. 67.

<sup>110</sup> Swallowed by the earth: Paus. 9.37.7. Subterranean chamber: Charax, *FGrH* 103 F5.

<sup>111</sup> See further Schachter (n. 105), 80–4; Ustinova (n. 86), 270–2; and especially Bonnechere (n. 67), 121–5, 183–202.

<sup>112</sup> See Rohde (n. 47), 107, n. 18, 108, n. 19; Schachter (n. 105), 78, 88–9; Bonnechere (n. 67), 92. Here is a sample of relevant sources: Strabo 9.2.38 (414C, 3.70.8 Radt) *Λεβάδεια δ' ἐστὶν ὅπου Διὸς Τροφωνίου μαντεῖον ἵδρται* . . . ; Livy 45.27.8 (167 B.C.) *Lebadae quoque templum Iouis Trophonii adit* (sc. *L. Aemilius Paulus*): *ibi cum uidisset os specus, per quod oraculo utentes sciscitatum deos descendunt, sacrificio Ioui Hercynnaeque facto, quorum ibi templum est* . . . ; Ampelius 8.3 *ibi* (sc. *in Epiro*) *Iouis templum Trophonii* (Duker : *†hyphonis†* codd.) *unde est ad inferos descensus ad tollendas sortes; in quo loco dicuntur ii qui descenderunt Iouem ipsum uidere*; *IG* 7.3090 (c. 200 B.C.) *Ἱππων Ἐπινίκαν Νικίαι / Διὶ Τρεφώνιου*; *IG* 7.3098 (second–first century B.C.) *Διονύσῳ Εὐσταφύλῳ / κατὰ χρησμόν Διὸς / Τροφωνίου*; *IG* 7.3077.3 (c. A.D. 50–120) *ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Τροφωνίου Τροφωνιανός*; *SEG* 32.475.2–4 (after A.D. 213) *ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Τροφωνίου*.

<sup>113</sup> Schachter (n. 105), 78, cf. 88–9. It was the *CQ* reader who drew my attention to this particular argument of Schachter's.

<sup>114</sup> Note that the latest and most thorough study of Trophonius' cult, Bonnechere (n. 67), 21, shows great awareness of the uncertainty regarding the topographical arrangement of Trophonius' grove, and takes a much more circumspect stance regarding the position of the Trophonion.

<sup>115</sup> Erechtheus worshipped in close connection with Athena Polias: Hdt. 8.82.3; the close vicinity (if not actual overlapping) of their cult sites is suggested by the somewhat ambiguous Paus. 1.26.5–27.3. There was also a bronze statue of Erechtheus at the site: Paus. 1.27.4.

<sup>116</sup> Poseidon Erechtheus: Eur. fr. 370.90–4 Kannicht; *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 873; Kearns (n. 59), 160, 210–11; offerings at the same altar: Paus. 1.26.5.

him from Periclymenus' persecution.<sup>117</sup> His sanctuary was located in the region of Oropus, a disputed borderline zone between north-eastern Attica and Boeotia. Oropus came under Athenian domination probably some time in the fifth century (until 411); it then passed over to the Thebans (until between *ca.* 374 and 371,<sup>118</sup> and again from 366 to 338 or later),<sup>119</sup> then went back to the Athenians, only to be lost again in 322.<sup>120</sup> Regardless of Oropus' status as Boeotian or Athenian territory, we have good evidence suggesting that Amphiaraus had an earlier oracle near Thebes which went subsequently into decline, possibly as a consequence of the foundation of the Oropian shrine.<sup>121</sup> In other words, Amphiaraus' cult, like Trophonius', was probably originally a Theban one. Although consultation of his oracle involved only incubation (i.e. not, as in the case of Trophonius, a subterranean sojourn), the chthonic aspect of Amphiaraus' cult is confirmed by his association with snakes.<sup>122</sup> Amphiaraus was not only worshipped as a god,<sup>123</sup> but is also on a single occasion identified with, again, Zeus: in the late third century B.C. Heraclides Criticus (fr. 1.6 Pfister)<sup>124</sup> could refer to the sanctuary of Amphiaraus in the Oropus area as *Ἀμφιαράου Διὸς ἱερόν*.

Moving now to beliefs surrounding Zamolxis, we shall be mainly relying on Herodotus 4.94–96.2.<sup>125</sup> According to his report, Zamolxis was the first expounder of mystic initiations (*τελεταί*) among the Thracian Getae, promising his followers

<sup>117</sup> The earliest attestations of the myth are to be found in Pind. *Nem.* 9.24–27, 10.8–9; *Ol.* 6.13–14; it was perhaps already present in the cyclic *Thebaid* (cf. fr. 9 Davies), see literature in T. K. Hubbard, *HSPH* 94 (1992), 77–111 (here 102, n. 68). On the Amphiaraus legend down to Pindar's time see B. K. Braswell (ed.), *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine* (Berlin–New York, 1998), 27–39; on Pindar's Amphiaraus as a chthonian hero 'on a level between the human and the divine' see Hubbard, above, 102. For a full exploration of the similarities between Amphiaraus and Trophonius see A. Schachter, *BICS* 14 (1967), 1–16 (here 9); id. *Cults of Boiotia* (London, 1981), 1.21; cf. also Bonnechere (n. 67), 96–7, who points out (his n. 3) that the two figures are mentioned together in a number of (late) sources; also of interest is Ustinova (n. 86), 268–9, 274.

<sup>118</sup> See the excellent discussion by D. Knoepfler, *Chiron* 16 (1986), 71–98 (here 90–4).

<sup>119</sup> See Knoepfler (n. 118), 74 with n. 8 for a dating in 335.

<sup>120</sup> Schachter (n. 117), 22–3; Hubbard (n. 117), 106; Parker (n. 53), 146 with n. 99 with reference to Oropus' early stages as an Eretrian settlement. On Oropus as disputed territory cf. esp. Paus. 1.34.1.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Strabo 9.2.10, 9.1.22 (3.40.1–7, 26.13–14 Radt); Paus. 9.8.3; Hdt. 8.134, 1.52; possibly also Aesch. *Sept.* 587–8 with Parker (n. 53), 147, n. 103, 149, n. 110. On the Theban and the Oropian Amphiaraea see the all-important discussions by Hubbard (n. 117), 103–7, including earlier doxography, and by Parker (n. 53), 146–9.

<sup>122</sup> Incubation: Paus. 1.34.5. Snakes: E. Küster, *Die Schlange in der griechischen Kunst und Religion* (Gießen, 1913), 107; V. Petrakos, 'Ο Ὀρωπὸς καὶ τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου' (Athens, 1968), 53, no. 1, 122, no. 18, 123, no. 23; for the effigy of a snake dedicated to Amphiaraus cf. *IG* 7.303.71 (202–199 B.C.); Ar. fr. 28 KA; Schachter (n. 117), 23 with n. 3. Amphiaraus' snakes are often due to assimilation with the iconography of Asclepius: see M. E. Gorrini and M. Melfi, *Kernos* 15 (2002), 247–65 (here 249). On snakes as belonging to the chthonic realm see Nilsson (n. 57), 198–9; Küster, above, 62–119; discussion and plentiful bibliography in S. M. Bock, *Hermes* 71 (1936), 230–6, 476 (esp. 231 with nn. 1–2), who draws attention to Spartan hero-reliefs depicting the dead as snakes. For comparative perspectives see O. Waser, *ARW* 16 (1913), 336–88 (here 354–6); W. Wundt, *Elements of Folk Psychology*, trs. E. L. Schaub (London, 1916), 190–1, 214, 368. Ovid (*Met.* 15.389–90) and Aelian (*NA* 1.51) report the notion that the backbones of the wicked turn into snakes after their death; a similar belief seems to underlie Plut. *Cleom.* 39.3: οἱ παλαιοὶ μάλιστα τῶν ζώων τὸν δράκοντα τοῖς ἥρωσι συνωικεύσαν.

<sup>123</sup> Testimonia in Schachter (n. 117, 1981), 25 n. 4.

<sup>124</sup> F. Pfister, *Die Reisebilder des Herakleides*, *SAWW* philos.-hist. Klasse 227.2 (Vienna, 1951), 76 (text), 130 (commentary).

<sup>125</sup> For later sources with discussion see Bonnechere (n. 67), 99–100.



immortality and a posthumous life of plenty. In support of his teaching, he disappeared all of a sudden into a subterranean chamber (*οἶκημα κατάγειον*), or according to another version, into a cavernous location that was hard of access (Strabo 7.3.5 [298C, 2.256.2 Radt] *ἀντρώδες τι χωρίον ἄβατον τοῖς ἄλλοις*), whence he reappeared after three years, claiming that he had died and come back to life. Evidently, Zamolxis' presumed immortality served as a prototype for the eventual immortalization of his followers; for a number of Thracian tribes (Terizoi and Krobyzoi, as well as Getae) were said to 'practise immortality' (*ἀθανατίζουσι*) in the belief that the deceased do not really suffer death, but simply go to Zamolxis, whence they will return in due time.<sup>126</sup> Herodotus further reports that the Getae customarily send an envoy to Zamolxis (or Beleïzis, as is his local eponymy) in order to make petitions; before dispatching him, they impale him upon spears so that he may all the quicker establish contact with the Beyond. Especially interesting is Herodotus' hesitation whether he should call Zamolxis—the initiator of mystic lore amongst the Getae—a god (*δαίμων*), or a merely human disciple of Pythagoras (*ἄνθρωπος*).<sup>127</sup> One cannot fail to be reminded here of the Muse's lament for her defunct son, where she designates Rhesus as a being betwixt and between human and god (*ἀνθρωποδαίμων*, *Rhesus* 971).<sup>128</sup> And if Rhesus can be compared with Zeus in *Rhesus* 355, later sources explicitly mention an identification of Zamolxis, not with Zeus, but with Cronus.<sup>129</sup>

Perhaps the closest similarities with Rhesus are afforded by the figure of Aristaeus. According to Diodorus Siculus 4.81.1–82.6, Aristaeus, son of Apollo and the nymph Cyrene, visited Thrace, where he met Dionysus and was initiated into his mysteries, 'learning many useful things from him' (4.82.6): one is inevitably reminded once more of Rhesus becoming a 'prophet of Bacchus' in Thrace (*Rhesus* 972). Moreover, just as Rhesus inhabited Mt Pangaeum of Thrace in his capacity as a 'man-god', so Aristaeus made his dwelling on a Thracian mountain, namely Mt Haemus. He subsequently disappeared, whereupon he became the recipient of divine honours both locally (like Rhesus) and throughout Greece.<sup>130</sup> In Apollonius of Rhodes (2.510), Aristaeus is raised in Chiron's cave (*Χείρωνος ὑπ' ἄντροισιν*), while Oppian (*Cynegetica* 4.265–85) makes him the dweller of a cave (*ὑπ' ἄντρωι*, 267) high up on a

<sup>126</sup> Cf. Hellan. *FGrH* 4 F73, a garbled lexicographical notice which largely repeats Hdt.; it may well be that the only genuine quotation from Hellanicus is the mention of the *τελευταί* introduced by Zamolxis among the Getae. On the Getae as a tribe of (*ἀπ*)*ἀθανατίζοντες* cf. also Pl. *Charm.* 156D; Diod. Sic. 1.94.2 = Posidon. fr. 134 Theiler; Luc. *Scyth.* (68) 1; cf. Iambl. *VP* 30.173 (p. 127.1–5 Nauck). Cf. Ustinova (n. 86), 278 with nn. 120–1 with bibliography; on the translation of *ἀθανατίζουσι* cf. again Ustinova (n. 86), 278, n. 119.

<sup>127</sup> Hdt. 4.96.2 *εἶτε δὲ ἐγένετό τις Σάλμοξις ἄνθρωπος εἴτ' ἔστι δαίμων τις Γέτησι οὗτος ἐπιχώριος, χαίρετω*. Strabo (7.3.5 [297C, 2 256.1 Radt]) states plainly that Zamolxis was considered a god, *θεός*, among the Getae.

<sup>128</sup> For a comparison between Zamolxis and Rhesus see also Ustinova (n. 86), 283. On Rhesus' and Zamolxis' hovering between the human and the superhuman (as well as on that of other comparable figures) cf. again Ustinova (n. 86), 286. Thracian beliefs in immortality have been associated with what may have been ritual activity ('heroic' cult?) at Thracian tumular tombs: see N. Theodossiev in V. Pirenne-Delforge and E. Suárez de la Torre (edd.), *Héros et héroïnes dans les mythes et les cultes grecs* (Liège, 2000), 435–47.

<sup>129</sup> Diog. Laert. 8.2 (1.173 Marcovich) *Ζάμολξιν, ὃν Γέται θύουσι, Κρόνον νομίζοντες* (cf. also *SPi. Resp.* 600Bb s.v. *Πυθαγόρας*, p. 273 Greene); Mnaseas fr. 23 Muller (*FGH* 3.153) *Μνασέας δὲ παρὰ Γέταις τὸν Κρόνον τιμᾶσθαι καὶ καλεῖσθαι Ζάμολξιν* (Κρόνον Photius ζ 11 [2.240 Theodoridis]: *χρόνον Etym. Magn.* s.v. *Ζάμολξις*, p. 407, 47–8 Gaisford).

<sup>130</sup> See Diod. Sic. 4.82.6. On the 'immortal honour' (*ἀθανάτου τιμῆς*) bestowed on Aristaeus cf. also Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 2.2.53 (1.76.12 Mras/Des Places) = Diod. Sic. 6.1.2 (2.121.18–20 Vogel). On Aristaeus see in general Burkert (n. 20), 109–16; Ustinova (n. 86), 277–8.

Euboean mountain, where he receives and raises the baby Dionysus (in the self-same cave, ὑπ' ἄνθρωπῳ, 273). Likewise, it is as a 'prophet of Bacchus' that Rhesus resides ἐν ἄνθρωποις (*Rhesus* 970). Also like Rhesus, Aristaeus is a prophesying figure: he was taught the art of divination by the Muses (Ap. Rhod. 2.512). Finally, he too became identified with Zeus: as early as 474 B.C., Pindar knew him as one of the immortals and could associate him specifically with Zeus and Apollo (Agraïos and Nomios).<sup>131</sup> Surely, such specificity implies actual cultic affinity, and indeed two centuries later, Callimachus explicitly refers to a cult of Ζεὺς Ἀρισταῖος Ἰγκμιος on Ceos.<sup>132</sup>

Interestingly, legends surrounding Aristaeus also make him a prominent healer and purifier: he was instructed in medicine by the Muses, and was able to once cleanse Ceos of pestilence.<sup>133</sup> This combination of healing properties and prophetic powers (one particularly common, it seems, in Greek society before the 'Hippocratic' era),<sup>134</sup> is also found in a number of other cave-dwelling deities. Orpheus was said to have been the originator of therapeutic prescriptions (φάρμακα) recorded on 'Thracian wooden tablets',<sup>135</sup> as well as being the founder of purificatory rites.<sup>136</sup> Likewise, Amphiarus' Oropian sanctuary was assigned, from at least as early as the late fifth century, an iatromantic function.<sup>137</sup> Zamolxis, also a founder of mystic cult, was likewise a healing deity, as already Plato informs us.<sup>138</sup> Closer to the subject at hand, Rhesus' Thracian cult seems to have conformed to this pattern: Rhesus was worshipped as, among else, a healing god, for as we have already seen he was believed to keep pestilence off the land's borders.<sup>139</sup>

<sup>131</sup> Pind. *Pyth.* 9.63–65 θήσονται τέ νιν ἀθάνατον, / Ζῆνα καὶ ἀγνὸν Ἀπόλλων', ἀνδράσι χάρμα φίλοις / . . . Ἀγρέα καὶ Νόμιον, τοῖς δ' Ἀρισταῖον καλεῖν; cf. also the ancient scholiast ad loc. (115a, 2.231.10–12 Drachmann) τὸν Ἀρισταῖον διὰ τὸ τὴν κτηνοτροφίαν καὶ κυνηγεσίαν εὐρηκέναι Ἀγρέα καὶ Νόμιον, Δία καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα προσηγόρευον; also, Ap. Rhod. 2.507 Ἀγρέα καὶ Νόμιον. The identification of Aristaeus with Apollo Nomios seems to have occurred already in the Hesiodic *Ehoiai*, fr. 216–17 MW. Cf. also Athenagoras, *Leg.* 14.1 (p. 48.6–7 Marcovich) Κεῖοι Ἀρισταῖον [sc. ἔδρυνται θεόν], τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ Δία καὶ <Ἄ>πόλλω νομίζοντες; Cook (n. 47), 267–8.

<sup>132</sup> Callim. *Aet.* 3, fr. 75.33 Pfeiffer. On Zeus Ἰγκμιος or Ἰγκμαῖος (Zeus, Lord 'of the Damp') see Cook (n. 47), 266–7. For other comparable figures, such as Amphilochus, Asclepius, Empedotimus etc., see Bonnechere (n. 67), 101–15, who also explores their, so to speak, 'shamanic' aspects.

<sup>133</sup> Ap. Rhod. 2.506–27, esp. 512, 519 λοιμοῦ ἀλεξητήρα; cf. Diod. Sic. 4.82.2, who gives a Panhellenic dimension to the story: λοιμοῦ δὲ τὴν Ἑλλάδα κατασχόντος ποιήσασθαι τὴν θυσίαν ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων. On Aristaeus as a medical expert see also Nonn. 17.357–7.

<sup>134</sup> See esp. W. Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution*, trs. M. E. Pinder and W. Burkert (Cambridge, MA, 1992), 41–87.

<sup>135</sup> See Eur. *Alc.* 966–9 with Σ ad 968, and also Σ Hec. 1267, both cited in n. 70. Cf. Bonnechere (n. 67), 97.

<sup>136</sup> For the association between Orpheus and purification cf. West (n. 43), 21, 27.

<sup>137</sup> See Schachter (n. 117), 23 with n. 7, 24 with n. 1 for literary, epigraphic and archeological evidence. Amphiarus co-existed in his Oropian sanctuary with healing deities like Apollo, or with personified figures bearing the transparent names Hygieia, Iaso, and Panakeia; on at least two occasions he is depicted in the guise of Asclepius: see again Schachter (n. 117), 26, and cf. my n. 122 above.

<sup>138</sup> Pl. *Charm.* 156D (an early specimen of 'holistic' medicine). On Zamolxis' iatric aspects and their affinities with those of Rhesus cf. Perdrizet (n. 40), 29; Ustinova (n. 86), 278–80.

<sup>139</sup> See p. 396 with n. 73 above. Cf. esp. Philostr. *Her.* 17.5 (p. 18 de Lannoy) λοιμοῦ ἐρύκειν τοὺς ὄρους (discussion of textual difficulties in Seure [n. 72], 118, n. 5); on the Thracian cult of Rhesus as a 'fétiche prophylactique' see G. Seure, *REA* 14 (1912), 137–66, 239–61, 382–90 (here 382–90); id. (n. 72), 121–2. On Rhesus' cult in Thrace see further above, pp. 397–8.

We may now summarize, in table form, the similarities between Rhesus and such figures as Orpheus, Trophonius, Amphiarus, Zamolxis and Aristaeus:

	Subterranean dwelling/chthonic aspects	Divinatory power	Healing power	Association with mysteries/Bacchus	Assimilation with Zeus	Posthumous existence/divinization
Rhesus	+	+	+	+	+	+
Orpheus	+	+	+	+	—	—
Trophonius	+	+	—	—	+	+
Amphiarus	+	+	+	—	+	+
Zamolxis	+	—	+	+	(Cronus)	+
Aristaeus	+	+	+	+	+	+

## V. DECIPHERING THE MEANING OF *RHESUS* 355

Let us recapitulate our findings so far. We have discussed what appears to be a distinct group of legendary figures, dwellers of subterranean caverns, who are associated with mystic lore and divinatory activity. Through the combined study of their features and functions, we may now attempt to identify a general pattern, a typical scheme to which these figures would seem to conform—although not all of its details will necessarily apply to each and every individual figure. A human being, sometimes of semi-divine origin (Rhesus, Orpheus, Trophonius<sup>140</sup>), meets his end but is thought nonetheless to continue his existence beyond the grave, thereby assuming a supra-human, sometimes *quasi*-divine identity (cf. Aristaeus, or Rhesus ἀνθρωποδαίμων). In this capacity, he dwells in a cave or subterranean chamber, and becomes a deliverer of prophecies, a steward of supernatural knowledge. He is associated with mystery rites, in which the immortality of the honorand seems to serve as a prototype for the fate of the human initiate (cf. especially the case of Zamolxis). Sometimes, one of these figures is himself initiated into the mysteries (cf. Aristaeus and the Bacchic mysteries). Likewise, Rhesus is posthumously assigned a prominent function in the local mysteries of Bacchus (see again pp. 397–8).

Most interestingly for our initial question concerning Rhesus' approximation to *Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος*, some of these prophetic cave-dwellers (Trophonius, Amphiarus, Aristaeus) are closely associated, if not actually assimilated, with Zeus. One is tempted, then, to conjecture that, when Rhesus is addressed as *Ζεὺς ὁ φαναῖος* (most likely, 'Zeus of the Torches')<sup>141</sup> in *Rhesus* 355, this is made possible by the combination of two factors: (1) the fact that the cult of Zeus, with whom Rhesus and some of his 'colleagues' are associated, could and did involve mystery rites, typically celebrated by *torch-light*,<sup>142</sup> and (2) the fact that both Rhesus himself and many of the figures with whom he shares a number of features are themselves possessed of strong

<sup>140</sup> In some accounts, Trophonius is a son not of Erginus but of Apollo: apart from the late Paus. 9.37.5, Philostr. *VA* 8.19, and *ΣAr. Nub.* 508a (p. 115 Holwerda), cf. now *P.Herc.* 243 3.26–8, probably from the ps.-Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*: see M. L. West, *ZPE* 61 (1985), 1–7 (here 1–2, 6). See also Schachter (n. 105), 72, n. 3.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. above, pp. 383–6 (esp. 385–6).

<sup>142</sup> As we have seen (above, pp. 389–94), such rites are widely attested in the Greek world or its fringe: the outskirts of Attica (Oropus), Boeotia, Paros, Crete, Thrace, Egyptian Alexandria and its environs, Antioch-on-the-Orontes, Pergamum.

chthonic and/or *mystic* qualities. That the chorus should attach to Rhesus a mystically laden eponymy, such as ‘Zeus of the Torches’, is entirely appropriate in this context of crisis and tension. The Trojans and their allies have undergone hardship, pain and tribulations; their desire to see the end of the war is given expression in the very ode in which they evoke Rhesus as ‘Zeus of the Torches’ (*Rhesus* 360–9). Likewise, a new initiate would face (or be imagined as facing) similar trials: Plutarch, in the well-known fragment in which he compares the experiences of the soul at the moment of death with those of people initiated into ‘great mysteries’, speaks of ‘straying and wandering, the weariness of running this way and that, and nervous journeys through darkness that reach no goal, and then immediately before the consummation every possible terror, shivering and trembling and sweating and amazement’.<sup>143</sup> Not only in the Plutarchean fragment but also in earlier accounts of the mysteries the initiates in the next world enjoy, *inter alia*, the presence of a holy and wondrous light.<sup>144</sup> Likewise, it seems that in actual mystery rites a sudden lighting of many torches symbolized the initiates’ final salvation. Hippolytus<sup>145</sup> tells us that the Hierophant in the Eleusinian mysteries announced the good news of the birth of a divine child under a flood of light (ὕπὸ πολλῶι πυρὶ), and calls the ultimate revelation of the mysteries (an ear of corn) a ‘perfect and great light’ (φωστήρ τέλειος μέγας).<sup>146</sup> The clearest account of the lighting of torches and the relief felt by the terrified *mystai* is perhaps given by Firmicus Maternus, who reports that a preliminary phase of ‘false lamentation’ (*ficta lamentatione*) is followed by the priest’s (*sacerdos*) announcement: ‘Have courage, ye initiates, now that the god has been saved; for you will gain salvation following your toils’.<sup>147</sup> Light- and torch-imagery in relation to the mysteries is attested elsewhere too.<sup>148</sup> One is thus naturally led to interpret the chorus’ invocation of ‘Zeus of the Torches’ in *Rhesus* 355 as a metaphor for their unexpected passage from suffering to relief: their toils now past, they are relieved to behold the light of Rhesus’ quasi-divine epiphany, which signals their salvation, much as the intense light of torches would have signalled the initiates’ salvation in mystery rites. Towards the end of the play, this metaphor will, of course, turn out to correspond to an actual cultic reality, for Rhesus

<sup>143</sup> Plut. fr. 178 Sandbach (cited already in n. 104): πλάναι τὰ πρῶτα καὶ περιδρομαὶ κοπῶδεις καὶ διὰ σκότους τινὲς ὕποπτοι πορείαι καὶ ἀτέλειστοι, εἴτα πρὸ τοῦ τέλους αὐτοῦ τὰ δεινὰ πάντα, φρίκη καὶ τρόμος καὶ ἰδρὼς καὶ θάμβος (trsl. quoted from F. H. Sandbach [ed.], *Plutarch's Moralia XV: Fragments*, Loeb Classical Library [Cambridge, MA, 1969], 319).

<sup>144</sup> Cf. again Plut. fr. 178 Sandbach: ἐκ δὲ τούτου φῶς τι θαυμάσιον ἀπήντησεν . . . ; cf. also Pind. fr. 129.1–7 Snell–Maehler τοῖσι λάμπει μὲν μένος ἀελίου / τὰν ἐνθένδε νύκτα κάτω; Ar. *Ran.* 155 ὅφει τε φῶς κάλλιστον ὥσπερ ἐνθάδε; Plut. *Mor.* 1105B.

<sup>145</sup> *Ref. omn. haer.* 5.8.40, p. 163.214 Marcovich. As is well known, the only unambiguous information we have about what actually happened in the mysteries comes from Christian apologists, but it is no less reliable for this (cf. Seaford [n. 56, 1981], 260).

<sup>146</sup> Cf. Richardson (n. 26), 26–7.

<sup>147</sup> Firm. Mat. *Err. prof. rel.* 22.1 (p. 129 Turcan) *deinde, cum se ficta lamentatione satiauerint, lumen infertur. tunc a sacerdote omnium qui flebant fauces unguentur, quibus perunctis sacerdos hoc lento murmure susurrat: θαρρεῖτε μύσται τοῦ θεοῦ σεσωσμένον / ἔσται γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐκ πόνων σωτηρία*. This may well be related to the concept of divine radiance as an epiphany sign: cf. *h.Dem.* 189, with Richardson (n. 26), on *h.Dem.* 188–90.

<sup>148</sup> Cf. above, pp. 385–6, and add e.g. Clem. Al. *Protr.* 120 (p. 173.1–5 Marcovich), who juxtaposes the ‘true mysteries’ of Christian religion to the mystic rites of paganism: ὁ τῶν ἁγίων ὡς ἀληθῶς μυστηρίων, ὃ φωτός ἀκηράτου. δαιδουχοῦμαι τοὺς οὐρανούς . . . ἱεροφαντεῖ δὲ ὁ κύριος καὶ τὸν μύστην σφραγίζεται φωταγωγῶν. ταῦτα τῶν ἐμῶν μυστηρίων τὰ βακχεύματα, ‘O verily sacred mysteries, O light immaculate, I am a torch-bearer in the heavens [ . . . ] It is the Lord who is my Hierophant and as a light-bearer sets his mark on the initiate. These are the Bacchic rites of my own mysteries.’

will indeed acquire an important function in Bacchus' mystery rites in the Pangaeum area (*Rhesus* 970–4, cf. p. 398).

## VI. EPILOGUE: THRACIAN AND ATHENIAN RHESUS

The Rhesus we have been looking at is a Thracian one: he reigns over Aenus on the mouth of Hebrus, or Aenia in the Thermaic Gulf, or among the Bisaltae and other Thracian tribes around the Strymon area; he receives animal sacrifices at the Rhodope mountains,<sup>149</sup> and is worshipped on Mt Pangaeum as *ἀνθρωποδαίμων*, a 'man-god' inhabiting caves, possessed of divinatory powers, and closely associated with Bacchic mysteries. This is of course a far cry from hero cult as we know it in Athens: indeed, the figures who, as we saw, share a number of features and functions with Rhesus (Orpheus, Trophonius, Amphiarus, Aristaeus, Zamolxis) exemplify cultic patterns that do not generally occur in Athens—with the partial exception of Amphiarus, whose cult is nonetheless likely to have originated outside Attica, in Boeotia (above, p. 403 with n. 121).

But an 'Athenian' Rhesus does exist, or rather a Rhesus whose cult has been adapted to fit Athenian matrices of heroic cult. The particulars of this 'Atticized' Rhesus are given by Polyaeus' *Strategemata* (6.53). Hagnon, the founder of Amphipolis (437 B.C.), was aware of an oracle (*λόγιον*) to the effect that the Athenians would never succeed in colonizing Ennea Hodoi (Amphipolis' ancient name) unless they fetched Rhesus' remains from Troy and gave them proper burial 'in his fatherland'. Predictably, Hagnon's envoys discovered Rhesus' tomb in the Troad, unearthed his remains by night and, wrapping them in a 'purple *chlamys*', brought them to Ennea Hodoi. Employing a stratagem against the 'barbarians' who prevented him from crossing the Strymon, Hagnon managed to bury the sacred bones by night on the eastern bank of the river. Having thus assured the dead hero's protection, he proceeded with the foundation of Amphipolis.<sup>150</sup>

Similar narratives abound in the Greek world. The Spartans had to transfer Orestes' bones from their burial place in Tegea to the agora of Sparta in order to enlist his military assistance.<sup>151</sup> Likewise, Cimon could only assure Theseus' aid in capturing Scyros by transferring his relics from Scyros to Athens.<sup>152</sup> And in Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* Thebes and Athens compete for the possession of Oedipus' talismanic body. It is evident that Hagnon conceived of Rhesus exclusively in terms of a typical

<sup>149</sup> See above, p. 395–6 with n. 73.

<sup>150</sup> On Rhesus' remains and the foundation of Amphipolis cf. also Rohde (n. 47), 143, n. 36; Perdrizet (n. 40), 13; I. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (Leiden, 1987), 81–4; R. Parker in R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (edd.), *Ritual, Finance, Politics* (Oxford, 1994), 339–46 (340). On Rhesus' native Thracian cult cf. again above, pp. 395–8. Despite W. Leaf, *JHS* 35 (1915), 1–11 (here 4), Cicero's statement (*Nat. D.* 3.45) that there was no cult of Rhesus anywhere can at best be valid only for Cicero's own time; cf. e.g. Rohde (n. 47), 143; Perdrizet (n. 40), 20; Malkin, above, 82. There is, moreover, no evidence that Cicero founded his statement on serious Alexandrian scholarship, as Leaf thought; cf. Rempe (n. 69), 33. On the contrary, the *Natura Deorum* is not devoid of misunderstandings or false assumptions, and Cicero does sometimes seem to have given himself a free hand in the treatment of his sources: cf. now A. R. Dyck (ed.), *Cicero: De Natura Deorum Book I* (Cambridge, 2003), 9, 129 (*ad* 50a), esp. 143 (*ad* 62), etc. At any rate, Philostratus, *Her.* 17.5 (p. 18 de Lannoy) explicitly mentions a *βωμός* (i.e. sacrificial cult) for Rhesus on the Rhodope mountains; cf. Seure (n. 72), 120, n. 2.

<sup>151</sup> Hdt. 1.67–8; Paus. 3.3.6, 3.11.10. Cf. further D. Boedeker in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (edd.), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece* (Cambridge, 1993), 164–77 with speculation on the political background of the translation of Orestes' bones.

<sup>152</sup> Plut. *Thes.* 36, *Cim.* 8; Paus. 3.3.7.



Greek hero, or even more specifically an Athenian hero, who is *dead*, has most often a *tomb* (indeed, a specialist of Macedonian lore, Marsyas of Philippi, states that Rhesus had a monument, *μνημεῖον*, in Amphipolis, conceivably one erected by Athenian colonists),<sup>153</sup> is in constant need of *propitiation*, and the physical presence of his *relics* ensures the well-being of the community that possesses them. By contrast, Rhesus in our play is anything but a *ἥρωας* in the common Greek (Athenian) sense of the term: he has no visible resting-place (his posthumous dwelling remains unspecified, *Rhesus* 970–3), because he is after all not dead (the Muse asks Persephone to release his soul from Hades, *Rhesus* 962–6), and presumably there is no need for him to be propitiated or for his relic to be taken possession of (it is rather his prophetic and mystic functions that are brought out).

One is thus led to assume that the image of Rhesus as a cult figure in the play must have been informed by a spectrum of religious knowledge and, perhaps, experience that goes beyond anything one would have been familiar with in the context of exclusively Athenian cult.<sup>154</sup> How the author obtained this information is, of course, a matter of speculation: he may have had first-hand knowledge of Thracian cultic realities (perhaps from a sojourn in the area), or he may have been working from reliable information, since Athenian contacts with Thrace were both early and extensive. Either way, it seems certain that he did have genuine knowledge of Rhesus' Thracian cult, rather than, for example, constructing an image modelled on Athenian cultic patterns: what he has to say about Rhesus' cult in the Pangaeum area is both reconcilable with Philostratus' information thereon (pp. 395–6 above) and fully compatible with non-Athenian cultic patterns evidenced by such figures as Aristaeus, Trophonius, Zamolxis and others.

The significance of these points becomes clear as soon as one is confronted with a striking feature of *Rhesus* which seems to have escaped the attention of scholars so far. Greek tragedies, especially Euripidean ones, are known often to provide

<sup>153</sup> *FGrHist* 136 F7: *ἔστιν ἱερὸν τῆς Κλειοῦς ἐν Ἀμφιπόλει ἰδρυθὲν ἀπέναντι τοῦ Ῥήσου μνημεῖον ἐπὶ λόφου τινός*. On the probable identity of this monument with the one erected by Hagnon cf. Perdrizet (n. 40), 15 with n. 2, Leaf (n. 150), 6–7; differently Rempe (n. 69), 13–15, who advocates, improbably, the existence of an originally Thracian monument (cf. also *ibid.* 32–3). Malkin (n. 150), 82 argues persuasively that 'this monument probably dates to the time of Hagnon because the cult seems to have ceased after the citizens of Amphipolis transferred the title of oikist to Brasidas in 422 B.C., and turned against the 'Hagnoneia' in anger'; on Amphipolis in the time between Hagnon and Brasidas cf. further Malkin (n. 150), 228–32. Interestingly, Amphipolis has yielded a *bas-relief* showing Rhesus' possible *alter ego*, the Thracian Horseman: see D. C. Samsaris, in *Dritter Internationaler Thrakologischer Kongress zu Ehren W. Tomascheks* (Sofia, 1984), 2.284–9 (here 285), with further references on Rhesus' Amphipolitan cult in his nn. 4–11.

<sup>154</sup> This escapes Perdrizet (n. 40), 27–8, when he asserts that the author of *Rhes.* is an Athenian, *tout court*, who had somehow been aware 'que Rhésos était vénéré dans Amphipolis': the details of the Rhesus cult as evinced in the play suggest a knowledge much deeper than this. So also Borgeaud (n. 78), 53 who thinks that Rhesus is in our play 're-sacralis[é], à la grecque [...] dans une optique athénienne'. On a more extreme note, Leaf (n. 150), 5–10 denied Rhesus any Thracian cultic background whatsoever, and pronounced him a hero invented by the Athenians for the special purpose of bringing under his tutelage the newly founded colony of Amphipolis in 437. Such fancies have been put to rest by Rempe (n. 69), 6–26. Rohde (n. 47), 143, n. 36 is closer to the truth when he remarks that 'the restoration of [Rhesus'] bones to the neighbourhood of the lower Strymon [...] and the heroic cult which was undoubtedly paid to him in connexion therewith, may have been a kind of official recognition by the Greeks of the worship of Rhesus discovered in that neighbourhood by the Athenian colonists'; cf. also Malkin (n. 150), 83.

aetiological narratives for Athenian cults:<sup>155</sup> a human figure dies in the course of the play, and hero cult in his honour is either explicitly promised, or otherwise hinted at in the play's exodos. Such is the case of, for example, Oedipus (Sophocles, *Oedipus Coloneus* 576–628, 1522–35),<sup>156</sup> Ajax (*Ajax* 1166–7, 1171–81 etc.),<sup>157</sup> Hippolytus (Euripides, *Hippolytus* 1423–30),<sup>158</sup> Eurystheus (*Heraclidae* 1026–44),<sup>159</sup> and Erechtheus (*Erechtheus* fr. 370.90–7 Kannicht), to name but a few. In all of these cases, the cult announced or hinted at is immediately relevant to the Athenian audience's religious practices: Oedipus, Eurystheus and Erechtheus had tombs in Attica, Ajax in Salamis; even Hippolytus, who is associated with Troezenian cult in the play's *aition*, had a sanctuary in Athens (and Troezen is not far from Attica).<sup>160</sup> The case of *Rhesus* is unique in that it provides an *aition* not for a religious institution relevant to the Athenian *polis* but rather for a distant Thracian cult which very few Athenians (if any) could have participated in or cared about. True, since 437 B.C. Athens had a neuralgic colony, Amphipolis, in the Strymon area; but contrary to what one might have expected, Athenian presence is never as much as hinted at in the play—on the contrary, Athens and her poliad goddess are severely repudiated in *Rhesus* 938–49. Most importantly, as we saw above, the cult *aition* we find in the *Rhesus* points to a fundamentally non-Attic conception of Rhesus' features and functions, and is thus highly unlikely to have been related to the Amphipolitan cult established by an Athenian such as Hagnon. We are thus compelled to entertain the possibility that *Rhesus* was written not for an Athenian audience, for which Rhesus' Thracian cult would have been largely irrelevant, but for an audience which would readily relate to a play dramatizing the cult legend of a local, familiar figure of cult. It is hard to imagine

<sup>155</sup> As noted above, the validity of such cultic *aitia* was recently cast into doubt by Scullion (n. 71). I offer some counter-arguments in V. Liapis, '“Ghosts, wand'ring here and there”: Orestes the revenant in Athens', in D. L. Cairns and V. Liapis (edd.), *Dionysalexandros: Studies on Aeschylus and his Fellow Tragedians in Honour of Alexander F. Garvie* (Swansea, 2007), 214–5.

<sup>156</sup> The tomb of Oedipus is, of course, to remain secret, but this is no reason to doubt its historicity: secret tombs are attested elsewhere in Greece (see Kearns [n. 59], 51–2; Burkert [n. 20], 188 with n. 14, 203 with n. 38, 204 with n. 39), and we know on the authority of Dinarchus (1.9) that the Areopagus Council safeguarded, and thus presumably knew the location of, the 'secret deposits' (or, according to a plausible conjecture, 'secret tombs'), 'on which the safety of the city depends': φυλάττει τὰς ἀπορρήτους θήκας (Wolff: διαθήκας vel ἀποθήκας codd.), ἐν αἷς τὰ τῆς πόλεως σωτήρια κείται. See Parker (n. 53), 130.

<sup>157</sup> In 1166–7, τὸν ἀείμνηστον τάφον may allude to the perpetuity of Ajax's cult (see further A. Henrichs, *ClAnt* 12 [1993], 165–80). With regard to 1171–81, P. Burian *GRBS* 13 (1972), 151–6 (here 154–5) has argued that Eurysaces' supplication symbolically enacts his father's transformation into a cult hero. The funeral procession at the end of the play, with Ajax being carried to his tomb in full panoply (1408 τὸν ὑπασπιδιον κόσμον), may recall the κλίνη μετὰ πανοπλίας of the Aiantea festival: ΣΠind. *Nem.* 2.19 (3, p. 37 Drachmann); cf. L. R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford, 1921), 308; P. von der Mühl, *Der grosse Aias* (Basel, 1930), 23. On the Aiantea see Toepffer, *RE* 1 (1894), 925–9; L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin, 1932), 228.

<sup>158</sup> On Hippolytus' cult see W. S. Barrett (ed.), *Euripides Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964), 3–6.

<sup>159</sup> With J. Wilkins, *Euripides: Heraclidae* (Oxford, 1993), ad 1026–44, 1040–2, 1052 (textual problems).

<sup>160</sup> Another case in point is Spartan Helen, whose deification and cult is predicted in Eur. *Hel.* 1667–75; even here however Euripides has gone out of his way to introduce a topical reference to 'the long island standing guard off the coast of Akte', i.e. Attica (an allusion to what is nowadays Makronissos); cf. A. M. Dale, *Euripides: Helen* (Oxford, 1967), ad 1673. The *Andromache*'s non-Athenian aetiology (Eur. *Andr.* 1253–62) is presumably due to the play's having been produced outside of Athens (cf. ΣEur. *Andr.* 445, 2.284 Schw.); for a judicious discussion of the possible place of production see P. T. Stevens (ed.), *Euripides, Andromache* (Oxford, 1971), 19–21.

an audience more apt to be interested by such a play than the people and the court of Macedon, where a number of Greek dramatists were entertained in the late fifth and fourth centuries.<sup>161</sup>

*Université de Montréal*

VAYOS J. LIAPIS  
vayos.liapis@umontreal.ca

<sup>161</sup> I have suggested elsewhere, on a wholly different rationale, that *Rhesus* was produced in Macedon at the time of, perhaps, Philip II: for the argument, which is too complex even to summarize here, see V. Liapis in D. I. Jacob and E. Papazoglou (edd.), *Θυμέλη: Μελέτες χαρισμένες στον Καθηγητή Ν. Χ. Χουρμουζιάδη* (Heraklion, 2004), 159–88.