

Dionysus and the Women of Elis:

PMG 871

Christopher Brown

THE RITES OF DIONYSUS at Elis were known as the Thyia, the high point of which was the miraculous gift of wine.¹ Three empty jars were sealed and set out over night, only to be found filled with wine the following morning. The author of this deed was none other than Dionysus himself, summoned to Elis by the sacred college of sixteen women.² Their hymn of invocation is preserved by Plutarch.³

ἐλθεῖν †ἦρω† Διόνυσε
Ἄλειων ἐς ναὸν
ἀγνὸν σὺν Χαρίτεσσιν,
Ἄλειων ἐς ναὸν
τῷ βοέῳ ποδὶ θύων,
ἄξιε ταῦρε,
ἄξιε ταῦρε.

Although it is impossible to date a piece like this with any certainty, scholars have generally considered it to be of great antiquity, and it may well be the earliest Greek lyric that we possess.⁴

¹ Paus. 6.26.1; cf. M. P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste* (Stuttgart 1906) 291–93, and W. R. Halliday, *The Greek Questions of Plutarch* (Oxford 1928) 153–59. On the cult of Dionysus at Elis see L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* V (Oxford 1909) 329.

² Plut. *Mor.* 251E; cf. C. Calame, *Les chœurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque* I (Rome 1977) 152–53, 210–14.

³ *Mor.* 299B (PMG 871). The text printed here is based on that of Page. To avoid being forced to analyse line 4 and, by implication, line 2 as molossi (the molossus is not an independent unit of movement), it has seemed preferable to follow E. von Leutsch, *Philologus* 11 (1856) 730, and read line 4 as exact repetition of line 2; accordingly the lines can be seen as spondaic. On repetition in ritual contexts see E. Norden, *Vergilius Aeneis VI* (Leipzig 1903) 136–37, and on the effect of such repetition W. Headlam and A. D. Knox, *Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments* (Cambridge 1922) 201f; cf. also the remarks of R. Merkelbach, *Philologus* 101 (1957) 24f, and A. Henrichs, *ZPE* 39 (1980) 12 n.9. In line 5 I have printed θύων with earlier editors: cf. W. Burkert, *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Stuttgart 1977: hereafter ‘Burkert’) 341, who translates “mit Stierfuss rasend.”

⁴ Nilsson (*supra* n.1) 292 comments: “Das hohe Alter des eleischen Kultliedes ist unstreitig.” See also R. Wünsch, *RE* 9 (1914) 146 s.v. “Hymnos”; O. Kern, *Die Religion der Griechen* I (Berlin 1926) 154; E. R. Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*² (Oxford 1960)

The hymn is an example of the ὕμνος κλητικός, the function of which is to invoke the presence or power of a god.⁵ The appeal most commonly takes the form of an attempt to establish the credentials of the worshipper either by enumerating acts of piety (sacrifices, temples constructed, etc.) or by recounting occasions in the past when the deity answered similar prayers.⁶ The hymn of the Elean women exemplifies a less common form, one in which the epiphany of the god is anticipated to ensure that his presence will be propitious. Dionysus is envisaged coming to his temple in bull-form (particularized by the bull's foot)⁷ accompanied by the Charites, who form the god's retinue and are emblematic of the grace that Dionysus will bring to his rites.⁸ A close parallel is to be found in Sappho fr.2 Voigt, in which Aphrodite is summoned to her ναός: the setting and the goddess's presence as wine-pourer are vividly described.⁹

Plutarch's interest in the hymn centres on the bovine foot of line 5, but for the modern reader the most interesting question is that posed by the initial address. In no other extant passage of Greek literature is Dionysus, or any other god, called a ἥρως. With this appellation the hymn challenges our conception of the divinity of Dionysus. How then can we account for the text?

In the context of cult a hero was a dead man worshipped at his grave, from which he was thought to exert his influence for good or ill.¹⁰ The difficulty of fitting Dionysus into this framework is obvious,

xviii; H. Lloyd-Jones, *Females of the Species* (London 1975) 12 n.6. Against the *communis opinio* U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin 1921) 384f, held that the hymn was the composition of a first- or second-generation Peripatetic, but adduced no decisive arguments to substantiate this.

⁵ See Men. Rhet. 334.25–336.4; E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Berlin 1913) 157ff; A. Cameron, *HThR* 32 (1939) 1–17; P. Fedeli, *Il carne 61 di Catullo* (Freiburg 1972) 21ff.

⁶ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 1.37–42; Sapph. fr.1 Voigt; Emped. fr.3 Wright (DK 31B131); Soph. *OT* 151–67. On the *θυσιῶν ἀνάμνησις*, see R. Kannicht, *Euripides Helena* (Heidelberg 1969) ad 969–74.

⁷ Emphasis on the foot or footwear of a divinity is a persistent feature of epiphanies: cf. *Hymn.Hom.Dem.* 188–89; Soph. *Ant.* 1144; Ar. *Ran.* 330–31; Callim. *Ap.* 3; Catull. 61.9–10; Verg. *Georg.* 2.7–8; also pertinent are Aesch. *Pers.* 659–60 and Catull. 68.70–71. See E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 204 n.4, and Fedeli (*supra* n.5) 24.

⁸ Dionysus is invoked with a divine retinue in Anacr. fr.14 Gentili = *PMG* 357: cf. R. G. M. Nisbet/M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes I* (Oxford 1970) 346. On the Charites in general see Farnell (*supra* n.1) 427ff; for their association with Dionysus see J. Roux, *Euripide les Bacchantes II* (Paris 1972) 391.

⁹ Timoth. *Pers.* 237–38 (*PMG* 791) provides a formal parallel, ἀλλ' ἑκαταβόλε Πύθι' ἀγνάν / ἔλθοις τάνδε πόλιν σὺν ὄλβῳ.

¹⁰ See M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*³ I (Munich 1967) 189, 715–16, and Burkert 312–19 (with literature). On the importance of the hero's grave see F.

and accordingly some scholars have sought to avoid the usual implications of the term.

Wide argued that 'chthonian' was the radical meaning of ἥρως and of Ἥρα, which he saw as its feminine counterpart, and that the women of Elis call upon Dionysus in his chthonian aspect.¹¹ Although seemingly supported by the cult-connection between Dionysus and Hera at Elis,¹² this theory relies on a doubtful understanding of Hera's name and does not account for the Homeric usage of ἥρως.¹³ Moreover, the appeal to the chthonian aspect of the god can shed no light on the cult at Elis, for the evidence suggests that the chthonian Dionysus was not the god of conventional Greek religion, but the Orphic Dionysus-Zagreus, the son of Zeus and Persephone.¹⁴ In regular cult Dionysus does not seem to have been seen in close connection with the dead.¹⁵ It is noteworthy that in the Anthesteria at Athens, a rite similar to the Thyia at Elis, the offering of πανσπερμία was made to chthonian Hermes, not to Dionysus.¹⁶

A more convincing, though by no means compelling, attempt is that of Pfister who held that ἥρως was originally an honorific title; on

Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum* (Giessen 1909) 401–09, and E. Rohde, *Psyche* I (Tübingen 1925) 159–66.

¹¹ S. Wide, *ArchRW* 10 (1907) 262f.

¹² The sixteen women were also closely associated with the worship of Hera: cf. Burkert 341 and Calame (*supra* n.2) 211ff.

¹³ See L. R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford 1921) 15f. The etymological relation of ἥρως to Ἥρα, though possible, is unlikely: see Chantraine, *Dict.étym.* II 416; Frisk, *GEW* I 642; the formation of the two words is quite different, cf. E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*² (Berlin/New York 1974) 68–71, 160–61. Also against Wide's view is the semantic history of the term ἥρως. It seems unlikely that it originally possessed religious significance; in the Homeric poems the reference of the word is strictly secular. The word was probably introduced into the religious sphere under the pervasive influence of epic: see Burkert 313. The earliest attestations of ἥρως as a religious term are a Draconian law (*ap.* Porph. *Abst.* 4.22) and Mimn. fr.16 Gentili/Prato = 18 West.

¹⁴ See Burkert 442, and *infra* 309f. Often adduced as evidence for the chthonian Dionysus is Heracl. fr.50 Marcovich (DK 22B15), cf. M. Marcovich, *Heraclitus* (Merida 1967) 253ff. If this view of the fragment were correct, it would suggest a chthonian aspect for the more conventional Dionysus, since the passage refers to ritual maenadism: cf. A. Henrichs, *HSCP* 82 (1978) 144 n.72. But it is more plausible to interpret the fragment as a criticism of cult-practice; this view finds support in other fragments that are critical of conventional religion: cf. fr.86 and 87 Marcovich (DK 5 and 14). See A. Lesky, *WS* 54 (1936) 24–32 = *Ges.Schr.* 461–67, for a detailed exposition of this interpretation; cf. also G. Zuntz, *Persephone* (Oxford 1971) 407–11.

¹⁵ Although the second element of Dionysus' name is uncertain, the first points in a rather different direction, suggesting associations with the sky and light. The δ- root is clearly the same as that of the oblique cases of Ζεύς and is derived from the Indo-European word for sky: see Burkert 200 and 253.

¹⁶ Theopomp. *FGrHist* 115F347b.

this interpretation, then, the first line of the hymn would mean something like "Come, lord Dionysus."¹⁷ This view suits the Homeric evidence, but its correctness as far as the present passage is concerned is, as Nock remarks, "open to doubt,"¹⁸ since there is no parallel for the usage alleged in the hymn. Jeanmaire attempted to relieve Dionysus from bearing the burden of the epithet by suggesting that 'hero Dionysus' referred not to the god but to a local ἦρως (in the Homeric sense of a warrior or prince) who acted as ritual substitute for the god.¹⁹ This suggestion, however, is difficult to reconcile with the evidence of the hymn: Dionysus' appearance in bull-form along with the Charites indicates the divinity.

It has proved more profitable to attempt in some way to reconcile the address of the hymn with the more conventional concept of a ἦρως. Dionysus' similarity to Heracles has been appealed to as grounds for seeing him as a ἦρως.²⁰ Both share similar parentage (Zeus and a mortal woman), death at the hands of enemies in some versions, and late admission to Olympus; in addition they are often depicted together on vases.²¹ Yet this similarity does not allow us to postulate a heroic origin for Dionysus.

For Heracles there is abundant evidence to illustrate his dual nature, for he is truly the ἦρως θεός, as Pindar so strikingly calls him.²² The original form of worship paid him was almost certainly heroic, his deification being a later development.²³ Heracles' divinity seems unknown to the poets of the *Iliad* and the Hesiodic *Shield*;²⁴ the first certain references to it are found in the *Nekuia* of the *Odyssey* and the Hesiodic *Theogony* and *Catalogue*.²⁵ For Dionysus, however, there is no indication that he ever received heroic worship. The only extended reference to him in the *Iliad* recounts his conflict with Lycurgus and is told to illustrate why Diomedes refuses to fight

¹⁷ Pfister (*supra* n.10) 547f, *cf.* *RE* 11 (1922) 2131. This view of ἦρως was applied to the address of the hymn by Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*² II (Basel 1956) 9.

¹⁸ A. D. Nock, *HThR* 37 (1944) 164f = *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* II (Oxford 1972) 595.

¹⁹ H. Jeanmaire, *Dionysos* (Paris 1951) 46.

²⁰ Burkert 315 and A. Brelich, *Gli eroi greci* (Rome 1958) 362–72. On the basis of the address of the hymn and Heracles' dual nature Brelich (362) finds in these figures a "convergenza quasi totale tra la forma divina e la forma eroica."

²¹ *Cf.* Brelich (*supra* n.20) 362 n.131.

²² *Nem.* 3.22. The phrase was striking enough to prompt P. Maas, *MusHelv* 11 (1954) 199, to emend unnecessarily to ἦρως θεός.

²³ See M. L. West, *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford 1966) 417.

²⁴ *Cf.* especially *Il.* 18.117ff.

²⁵ *Od.* 11.602–04 (possibly an interpolation: *cf.* F. Solmsen, *AJP* 102 [1981] 355); *Hes. Theog.* 950–55, *fr.* 25.26–33 and 229.6–13 M-W; *Hymn.Hom.* 15.

against ἐπουράνιοι θεοί.²⁶ That Dionysus' mother was considered mortal does not seem to have been taken as an indication of hero-status.²⁷ This is clear from the Hesiodic account of his birth:²⁸

Καδμηὶς δ' ἄρα οἱ Σεμέλη τέκε φαίδιμον υἱὸν
 μυχθεῖσ' ἐν φιλότῃτι, Διώνυσον πολυγηθέα,
 ἀθάνατον θνητῆ· νῦν δ' ἀμφότεροι θεοί εἰσιν.

The juxtaposed formulation ἀθάνατον θνητῆ effectively underlines the paradox of Dionysus' birth.²⁹ Here the difficulty is overcome by according Semele divine status; she was either deified by the lightning that destroyed her or brought to Olympus from the Underworld by the fully grown Dionysus.³⁰ In other versions the myth of the double birth, constructed on analogy with the birth of Athena from Zeus' head, gives Dionysus in effect a single divine parent.³¹

It is the death of Dionysus and his grave that place him in the closest approximation to the condition of a ἥρως. His death is found in the Orphic myth of anthropogony.³² Dionysus-Zagreus is slaughtered by the Titans, who then boil, roast, and eat his flesh. For their crime the Titans are killed by the lightning-stroke of Zeus, and from their ashes the race of men arises. In some versions the remains of

²⁶ *Il.* 6.130–39; cf. G. A. Privitera, *Dioniso in Omero e nella poesia greca arcaica* (Rome 1970) 53–81.

²⁷ Although recognized, as early as the Διὸς ἀπάτη (*Il.* 14.323ff) as a Theban princess, she was probably in origin a Lydian goddess: see Dodds (*supra* n.4) 63. Her true identity was divined in antiquity: cf. Apollod. *FGHist* 244F131 and Diod. 3.62. It is far from certain, however, that she was an Earth-goddess: see Burkert 253.

²⁸ *Theog.* 940–42. Cf. also Eur. *Bacch.* 42 (of Semele), δαίμον' ὃν τίκτει Διί.

²⁹ A similar juxtaposition was used by Heracl. fr.47 Marcovich (= DK 62) to express an even more overwhelming paradox.

³⁰ See West on Hes. *Theog.* 942. The *katabasis* of Dionysus was probably a later invention: see Lesky (*supra* n.14) 31 = 466. It is unlikely that Dionysus' trip to the Underworld in *Frogs* owes anything to the *katabasis* myth, since Aristophanes fashioned his play after a traditional epic version of Heracles' descent: see H. Lloyd-Jones, *Maia* 19 (1967) 219–21, and N. Robertson, *Hermes* 108 (1980) 274–300.

³¹ Burkert 257. The earliest attestations are Hdt. 2.146.2 and Eur. *Bacch.* 94ff (see Dodds *ad loc.* for artistic representations). On the birth of Athena see Hes. *Theog.* 924–26 (cf. fr.343 M-W); West (*supra* n.23) 401–03.

³² The evidence is set out and thoroughly discussed by I. M. Linforth, *The Arts of Orpheus* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1941) 307–64; cf. also A. Henrichs, *Die Phoinikika des Lollianus* (Bonn 1972) 63–73, and M. Detienne, *Dionysos mis à mort* (Paris 1977) 170–90. Linforth's conclusions are largely negative, supporting Wilamowitz's view (*supra* n.17) 182–204 that the myth is a Hellenistic construct (the earliest explicit references are Callim. fr.643 P. and Euphor. fr.13 Powell). But more recent scholarship has accepted oblique references as early as Pindar, fr.133 Snell/Maehler: see H. J. Rose in C. Bailey, *Greek Poetry and Life* (Oxford 1936) 79–96, and *HThR* 36 (1943) 247–50 (replying to Linforth's criticism). Further references are collected by W. Burkert, *Homo Necans* (Berlin/New York 1972) 249 n.43.

Dionysus are taken to Delphi by Apollo and kept by his tripod.³³ If there were evidence to show that Dionysus received some form of worship in death or that honours were paid to his resting place, then we might find grounds for understanding the use of ἥρωσ in the hymn. Yet there is no such evidence.³⁴ The violence of the Titans does not leave Dionysus a permanent occupant of a grave but only a temporary one, for the myth concludes with his return to life.³⁵ In death the ἥρωσ achieves a degree of potency which is denied to mortals in life, but for Dionysus in the Orphic myth death represents a temporary cessation of power.³⁶

³³ The main authorities are Callim. fr.643 P., Euphor. fr.13 Powell, Philochor. *FGrHist* 328F7, Plut. *Mor.* 365. For a full collection of *testimonia* see Pfister (*supra* n.10) 387f.

³⁴ Plut. *Mor.* 365A mentions a secret sacrifice in the precinct of Apollo “whenever the Thyiades wake Liknites” (ὅταν αἱ Θυιάδες ἐγείρωσι τὸν Λικνίτην). This rite, however, cannot be seen as hero worship, since it appears to mark Dionysus’ return to life.

³⁵ Linforth (*supra* n.32) 314 remarks: “Generally the culmination of the fortune of Dionysus after the tragedy of his dismemberment is the reunion of his severed limbs and his restoration to life.” The only source to suggest that Dionysus did not return to life is Firm. Mat. *Err.prof.rel.* 6 (Kern *Orph.fr.* 214).

³⁶ This is the most probable explanation of gods with graves. In addition to Dionysus, Zeus was said to have a grave in Crete (*cf.* Callim. *Jov.* 8–9; the tradition is rejected because of the implications of death: σὺ δ’ οὐ θάνες, ἐσσι γὰρ αἰεῖ); and there is some evidence to suggest a tradition in which Apollo had a grave at Delphi: see J. Fontenrose, *Python* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1959) 381ff. In late antiquity, under the influence of Euhemerus, graves are recorded for Uranus, Cronus, Poseidon, Aphrodite, Ares, Hades, Helios, and Hermes: the relevant passages are set out by Pfister (*supra* n.10) 385–93. It is highly unlikely that before Euhemerus those who believed in such graves conceived of their occupants as dead; at least in the cases of Dionysus and Apollo their occupancy was only temporary. I suggest that these gods were thought to be affected by κῶμα, which in its earliest occurrences refers to a magical sleep that produces a state of complete inactivity: *cf.* E. Risch, *MusHelv* 19 (1962) 197–201. More recently P. Wiesmann, *MusHelv* 29 (1972) 1–11, has argued that it is more accurate to interpret the word as “die Wirkung eines Zaubers” or “Benommensein”; and, though this may suit post-Homeric passages like Sappho fr.2.8 Voigt and Pind. *Pyth.* 1.12, in earlier passages the word refers to a death-like sleep. Hesiod describes the god who breaks a Stygian oath as covered by κῶμα (*Theog.* 793–98): this condition approximates death closely; the god lies νήνυμος for a full year and is ἀνάπνευστος καὶ ἀνανδος (*cf.* *Od.* 18.201ff, where κῶμα is equated with death). Moreover, the verb (καλύπτειν: *Il.* 14.359, *Od.* 18.201, *Hes. Theog.* 798) used of the working of κῶμα is often used of death: see R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought*² (Cambridge 1954) 421ff. That this death-like sleep is common to deities in graves is suggested by a passage of Alrman, *PMG* 7.2f (curiously overlooked by Wiesmann), which seems to speak of the Dioscuri held by κῶμα σῶν during the periods in their grave at Therapne (Page aptly quotes schol. Eur. *Trö.* 210 [II 353 Schwartz]: οἰκτῆριόν φασι τὰς Θεράπνας τῶν Διοσκούρων παρόσον ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν τῆς Θεράπνης εἶναι λέγονται ζῶντες, ὡς Ἄλκμάν φησι). Underlying this is the close connection between sleep and death: in myth they are brothers (*cf.* *Hes. Theog.* 212, and E. Vermeule, *Aspects of Death* [Berkeley/Los Angeles 1979] 147–54); sleep is used metaphorically for death at *Il.* 11.241; death could be viewed as a sleep without dreams (*cf.* Pl. *Ap.* 40C); more rationally sleep could be seen as an intermediate state between life and death (Arist. *Gen.An.* 778b20ff).

Dionysus seems to be associated strikingly with a hero in a passage of Herodotus concerning the anti-Argive policies of Cleisthenes at Sicyon.³⁷ The historian records that the Sicyonians accorded Adrastus singular honour and celebrated him with tragic choruses; in attempting to expel the Argive hero Cleisthenes gave the choruses to Dionysus. It would be tempting to suppose that there existed a continuity of cult, the transfer of worship suggesting an equation of the two figures. It would follow that Dionysus was regarded as a hero or, at least, that his cult was compatible with heroic worship. Yet it seems decisive against such a view that it was only the choruses which were given to Dionysus; the rest of the cult was transferred to the Theban hero Melanippus. Cleisthenes seems merely to have brought the tragic choruses into conformity with the practice common elsewhere in the Greek world.³⁸

A further obstacle to our understanding of the address of the hymn lies in the site of the epiphany: the women of Elis summon hero Dionysus to a *ναός*. A god was worshipped at a *ναός*, but a hero received worship at a *τύμβος* or *ἥρωον*.³⁹ Underlying this is a basic distinction of Greek religious practice, namely that between chthonian and Olympian worship.⁴⁰ This distinction is clearly evidenced in the terminology employed for sacrifice: for an Olympian god *θύειν* is used, for a hero the verb is *ἐναγίζειν*.⁴¹ The mode of sacrifice implied by these terms is appropriate to the site of worship. Generally at the hero's shrine sacrifice was conducted at night; the victim was slaughtered with its throat held downwards, either over a low altar (*ἔσχαρα*) or the blood was allowed to flow directly into a trench (*βόθ-*

³⁷ Hdt. 5.67; see A. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb Tragedy and Comedy*² (Oxford 1962) 101–07. On the cult of Adrastus see Farnell (*supra* n.13) 334–36.

³⁸ This seems to be the implication of *ἀπέδωκε*. According to LSJ s.v. 1 the verb usually means 'render what is due', and so here it means "assigned to Dionysus, to whom they of right belonged" (W. W. How/J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus II* [Oxford 1912] 35): cf. Ar. *Av.* 480 for a similar usage.

³⁹ In general, see Burkert 307 and Farnell (*supra* n.13) 95ff. Cf. Pind. *Ol.* 1.93, where we find the antithesis between the *τύμβος* of Pelops and the *βωμός* of Zeus: see Burkert (*supra* n.32) 112, who points out that the difference between hero and god at Olympia is like that between day and night. In Hellenistic times, doubtless under the influence of the cults of the heroized rulers, the terms were employed with less precision: e.g. Drocles of Syracuse was said to have a *ναός* (Diod. 13.35.2), and the shrine of Ajax at Salamis is termed a *ναός* by Pausanias (1.35.3).

⁴⁰ See Burkert 306ff and W. K. C. Guthrie, *The Greeks and Their Gods* (London 1950) 221f.

⁴¹ See Pfister (*supra* n.10) 466ff, Rohde (*supra* n.10) 148ff, and P. Stengel, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*³ (Munich 1920) 105ff. The distinction is well illustrated by Herodotus in his discussion of Heracles (2.44): *τῷ μὲν ὡς ἀθανάτῳ, Ὀλυμπίῳ δὲ ἐπιουμήνῳ θύουσι, τῷ δὲ ἐτέρῳ ὡς ἥρωι ἐναγίζουσι.*

πος). At an Olympian's temple morning was the proper time for sacrifice; the victim was killed at a high-built altar with throat turned upwards. Such exceptions to these practices as we know of take the form of Olympian worship infringing on heroic.⁴² The hymn of the Elean women, however, suggests the reverse situation: heroic worship at a ναός. Worship in this manner is unparalleled and would likely have been considered an act of profanation.⁴³

The difficulties posed by the address of the hymn seem insurmountable; no satisfactory way of understanding Dionysus as ἦρως has been found. Consequently, we are left with two possible positions to adopt. One is to accept it as an anomaly;⁴⁴ the other is to suspect the text. The latter is made more attractive by considering the transmitted form of ἦρως. The vocative ἦρω is read unanimously by the paradosis, but is elsewhere unattested.⁴⁵ In all other early occurrences the vocative singular is ἦρως and in none of these cases do the MSS. offer any variant.⁴⁶ The hymn is quoted by Plutarch without any trace of local dialect, and even if ἦρω were a local form, one would expect it to have been regularized to ἦρως. Moreover, if ἦρω stood in the text as Plutarch quoted it, he would certainly have remarked on it.⁴⁷ It seems reasonable to conclude that the text is defective.

A. B. Cook sought to remove ἦρω by reading ἐλθεῖν ἦρ' ὦ Διόνυσσε, which is said to mean "Come in springtime, O Dionysus."⁴⁸

⁴² Cf. the honours paid to Philippos the son of Butacides: Hdt. 5.47.2 (cited as an exceptional case). See Pfister (*supra* n.10) 478 and Nock (*supra* n.18) 141ff = II 575ff. At Pind. *Pyth.* 5.86 and *Nem.* 7.46f θυσίαι are referred to in relation to the worship of heroes; the poet, however, may be placing the hero-worship within the larger context of a religious festival to the gods (the scholiast to *Nem.* 7.46f [III 125 Drachmann] remarks λέγεται γὰρ, ὅτι μετὰ τὸ θύσαι ἐναγισμοῦς ἐπέσπενδον): cf. L. Woodbury, *Phoenix* 33 (1979) 130 n.158.

⁴³ We have no evidence to prove that this would be the case, but it seems a reasonable inference. We may note that those who ate of the sacrifice to Pelops at Olympia were not permitted into the precinct of Zeus (Paus. 5.13.3). Behind this rule there seems to lie the notion that Olympian rites could be profaned by the intrusion of chthonian elements. In this connection it is interesting to remark Xenophanes' objection to the rites of Ino-Leucothea at Elis, which combined lamentation (appropriate to chthonian worship) with Olympian sacrifice; the basis of his objection seems to be that lamentation is incompatible with Olympian worship (Arist. *Rh.* 1400b5 = DK 21A13).

⁴⁴ As Nilsson (*supra* n.10) 571 n.3 does: "Da keine Emendation überzeugend ist, muss man es jedoch hinnehmen, dass die archaisierende Anrede in einem Kulthymnus gebraucht wird."

⁴⁵ The reading of the paradosis is accepted as a vocative in an addendum to Schwyzer, *Gr. Gramm.* I 838, but no justification for the form is offered.

⁴⁶ *Il.* 10.416, 11.819, 838, 20.104; *Od.* 4.423, 7.303, 10.516; [Hes.] *Scut.* 78, 118; *Bacchyl.* 17.22; *Pind. Ol.* 8.42.

⁴⁷ This point was made by A. D. Nock *apud* Halliday (*supra* n.1) 157.

⁴⁸ J. J. Hartman, *Mnemosyne* 41 (1913) 217 n.1, suggests ἐλθεῖν ὦ Διόνυσσε. But the intrusion of ἦρ- is difficult to explain. Similarly Schneidewin's ἦρως ("too easy a cor-

Palaeographically his emendation is very easy; it won the approval of Jane Harrison⁴⁹ and was printed by Halliday and Titchner in their texts of Plutarch. It is, however, impossible and has rightly been ignored by Page: the elision of the *iota* would render the form meaningless. Harrison attempted to support it by referring to instances of elided *iota* in the dative singular of third declension nouns in Homer,⁵⁰ but these examples serve only to underline the difficulty of the proposed emendation, since in the Homeric passages the force of the word is never left in doubt. There is always some element in the sentence that clarifies the meaning of the word; usually it is governed by a verb or preposition requiring the dative case or is modified by an adjective. If the women of Elis had wished to summon Dionysus in springtime, ἦρι would have been emphasized sufficiently to make its meaning clear, as in the famous passage of Ibycus.⁵¹

It is unlikely that the problem can be convincingly solved by emendation; the passage must stand obelized. The reading ἦρω may represent an attempt to make sense of the line after it had been obscured by some accident of transmission. Such an accident must have befallen the text late enough that the strangeness of the usage and form did not trouble the scribes, but early enough to be read in the archetype of the tradition. It is possible that ἦρω conceals a more conventional element of the cletic hymn, such as ἦμῖν, and that the line may originally have read ἔλθ' ἦμῖν, ᾧ Διόνυσσε. The formula consisting in a form of ἔρχεσθαι governing a dative pronoun is attested in other cletic hymns.⁵² If this reconstruction were correct, the parallel with Sappho fr.2 would be striking:⁵³ δεῦρὺ μ', αἰ Κρήτεσ<σ>ί

rection," H. W. Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets* [London 1900] 500) fails to explain the unanimous transmission of ἦρω.

⁴⁹ *Themis*² (Cambridge 1927) 205 n.1.

⁵⁰ The passages are conveniently catalogued by P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique*³ I (Paris 1958) 86.

⁵¹ *PMG* 286.1, ἦρι μὲν αἶ τε Κυδώνιαι κτλ.; cf. Soph. fr.581.4 Radt and Anan. fr. 5.1 West.

⁵² Sappho fr.1.25, 2.1 Voigt; Anac. fr.14.7 Gentili = *PMG* 357.7; Pl. *Leg.* 712B. Cf. also Aesch. *Eum.* 287ff; Ar. *Thesm.* 1146, *Eccl.* 952f.

⁵³ The text printed is essentially that established by G. Lanata, *SItal* 32 (1960) 64–90, after a fresh examination of the sherd. She, however, accepts Pfeiffer's ἔναυλον at the end of 1; I have printed ναῶν with Lobel/Page and Voigt. The reference to Cretans or Crete is somewhat puzzling. The existence of a cult of Aphrodite Ἄνθεια at Cnossus (cf. Farnell [*supra* n.1] II 632) does not explain the reference; Crete does not figure among the cult-sites listed in fr.35 Voigt. Perhaps the traces on the sherd conceal an address to Κύπρις balancing that of line 13: cf. fr.5.1/18. As it stands the hymn is unusual in withholding the name of the deity until line 13. This problem, however, may not be real, if line 1a belongs to an earlier stanza in which Aphrodite was named: on this question see D. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford 1955) 35f, and M. L. West,

π[ερ, ἔλθ]ε ναῦον / ἄγνον . . . This passage exhibits all the elements of invocation found in the hymn of the Elean women: the imperative, the dative pronoun, and the site of the epiphany, a temple described as ἄγνός.⁵⁴

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

October, 1982

Maia 22 (1970) 316.

⁵⁴ For comment and advice I am indebted to Professor L. Woodbury and, especially, Professor E. Robbins.