# THE ASIATIC DIONYSOS

# THE ASIATIC DIONYSOS

BY

GLADYS M. N. DAVIS, M.A.

CLASSICAL SCHOLAR LATE ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND

LONDON

G. BELL AND SONS, LTD.

1914

CHISWICK PRESS: CHARLES WHITTINGHAM AND CO.
TOOKS COURT, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

# PREFACE

THE subject-matter of this book, whose main thesis relates to the origin of the Dionysiac cult, first suggested itself to me some years ago when examining the references to the Dithyrambic School in Aristophanes. Hence the chapter on the Dithyramb is earlier in point of conception than the rest of the book. In fact, this chapter was completed in 1912, and, therefore, I have referred in it to Miss Harrison's *Themis* as "newly published," though now, perhaps, that term is hardly appropriate.

As regards the chapters on Asianism in Greek Philosophy and in Greek Music and Art, I must beg the reader's indulgence for the omission of some important authorities to which I have not had access—notably for my inability to consult Havell on Indian Art and Tagore on Indian Music. The chapter on Music and Art was, however, intended to be merely subsidiary.

In transliteration from the Sanskrit I have followed throughout the system employed by Monier-Williams in his *Dictionary*, except for the fact that I have adopted Whitney's c for ć.

In regard to the spelling of Greek proper names appearing in this book, there are, I fear, one or two inconsistencies, as I have had to consult many writers who differed among themselves in their systems of trans-

literation, and in referring to their views I may have unconsciously admitted variant forms of the same word into the text.

To Doctor L. C. Purser of Trinity College, Dublin, I owe much gratitude for his kindness in looking over a considerable part of the MS., and also for the loan of many of the Classical works mentioned in the bibliography.

G. M. N. Davis.

Clondarragh,
Foxrock, co. Dublin
*October* 1914.

# CONTENTS

## BOOK I

### ASIANISM IN ANCIENT GREECE

## BOOK II

### SOMA-DIONYSOS AND OSIRIS

## CORRIGENDA

*For* "sloka" *read* "śloka" throughout Book I.
Page 14. *For* "κλυτὰν" *read* "κλυτὰν."
Page 122, note 1. *For* "ἔρσαις" *read* "ἕρσαις."
Page 224. *For* "Lenean" *read* "Lenaean."

# BOOK I

## ASIANISM IN ANCIENT GREECE

# CHAPTER I

## THE DIONYSIAC CULT

Leading modern views as to the origin of the cult—Langlois, Maury and Monier-Williams—A. W. Curtius—Miss Harrison and Dr. Farnell—Sir G. Cox—O. Ribbeck—Hardly any mention of Dionysos in Homer—Period of arrival of the cult in Greece—Lobeck and Rohde and the Thracian origin—Theory of Egyptian origin—Frazer—Chief features of the Dionysiac myth—Dionysos in Greek poetry.

THE origin of the Dionysiac cult has long been a problem. Even the ancient writers on mythology were conscious of features in this worship that presented incongruities and evaded explanation. Thus, for example, Cicero in the *De Natura Deorum* regards Dionysos as representing really five distinct deities whose cults were fused in one. Modern scholars take different views on this subject, some deriving the cult from Egypt, others from Asia, and others again from Thrace. Of these views the last is undoubtedly the most popular at the present day.

The view of the Egyptian origin, first put forward by Herodotus, and later supported by Plutarch, has in modern times found its ablest exponent in M. Foucart in his *Culte de Dionysos en Attique.*

The theory in favour of the Asiatic origin, which was promoted by M. Langlois in 1852 in his *Mémoire sur la Divinité Védique appelée Soma*, and upheld by M. Maury and Max Duncker in their histories written a few years later, has practically little or no credence at the present day.[1] All three writers

[1] Professor Gilbert Murray, however, upholds the theory that Dionysos is of Asiatic origin, at least in part.

regarded Dionysos as identical with Haoma or Soma, the Aryan god of intoxication.

Besides these, Monier-Williams, in his *Sanskrit Dictionary* (edit. in 1888), says that the "worship of Soma by the Hindus of the Vedic Age is thought to possess great community of character with that of Dionysos and Bacchus by the Greeks and Romans." Adolf Holm, in his *History of Greece* (1906), very briefly mentions the Soma-cult as having been suggested as the origin of the legend of Dionysos, but does not declare his own opinion on this question. Jebb, in his edition of Sophocles' *Antigone* (1891), refers to the cult of Dionysos as "coming from Asia Minor by way of Thrace to Thebes"; but, as he goes on to point out that Phrygia was its Asiatic home, and that the Phrygians were a Thracian stock, this would merely amount to a statement of its ultimate Thracian origin. Moreover, he says nothing whatever of the Soma-cult. Jevons, in his *Manual of Greek Antiquities* (1895), alludes to the worship of the vine among the Indians in the time of Alexander the Great; but he, too, says nothing of Soma, and identifies the god of intoxication in this case with Śiva. So, also, A. W. Curtius, in his *Der Stier des Dionysos*,[1] regarding Indra, the Indian War God, as a form of Śiva, though he does not himself actually identify Dionysos and Indra-Śiva, tells us that the similarity of the Greek and Indian cults was so great that "we cannot wonder that the Greeks who penetrated the Panjâb in the victorious marches of Alexander, and learned to know the cult of Indra-Śiva, thought that they recognized in this god their own Dionysos, just as Herodotus and other Greeks regarded the Osiris of the Egyptians as their own Dionysos."

Other writers referring to the Soma cult as the prototype of the Dionysiac worship are Miss Harrison, in her *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (2nd edition 1908), and Farnell, in his *Cult of the Greek States* (1909). Both these, however, mention the possible identification of the Greek and Indian cults only to dismiss the idea. That the theory of the Asiatic origin of the myth of Dionysos does not necessarily imply a connection

[1] Published at Jena in 1882. Cp. also L. de Milloué as follows: "Soma, le dieu de la libation, est le prototype de Dionysos et de Bacchus."



with the Soma-cult can be seen from the references given already to the views of A. W. Curtius and Jevons.

This is still further noticeable in the theories of Sir George Cox as set forth in his *Mythology of the Aryan Nations*.[1] Here, though the Soma-cult is distinctly mentioned in different parts of the work, there is not the slightest hint to show that it is regarded as in any way connected with Dionysos. On the other hand, Dionysos appears to be considered as partly of Assyrian origin, chiefly owing to the orgiastic elements in the cult, and to a fanciful derivation[2] from an Assyrian or Semitic form, Daian-Nisi or Dian-Nisi, "The Judge of Men." Few, however, will be disposed at the present day to regard Dionysos as an Assyrian.

Cox, indeed, seems to look upon Dionysos, whether as an Aryan or an Assyrian god, as an example of a nature-myth; in fact, as "the manifestation of that power which ripens the fruits of the earth, and more especially the vine"; and he evidently thinks that the introduction of Dionysos into Greece was contemporary with the worship of the older Olympian deities such as Zeus, *i.e.*, according to the views of the old school of comparative mythology, coaeval with the dawn of Greek religion.

On the other hand, the writers of what may be called, for the sake of brevity, the Thracian school maintain that Dionysos was a late comer into the Greek Pantheon, and point out in proof of this contention that he is hardly mentioned in Homer. For example, Prof. Bury in his *History of Greece* speaks of the worship of Dionysos as introduced into northern Greece "perhaps as early as the eighth century," and this would correspond to Miss Harrison's view that it came in some time in the period between the age of Homer and that of Pheidias.

Otto Ribbeck, however, in his *Dionysos-Cultus in Attika*, quotes Apollodorus, iii, 4-7, as his authority for placing the introduction of the cult into Attica in the reign of Pandion, and alludes to the legend of the assistance given to Pandion by the Thracian king, Tereus, as evidence of the connection of the cult with Thrace. So, too, he mentions the legend, narrated in

[1] Published in 1870.

[2] Adopted by Cox from Brown's *Great Dionysiak Myth*. See p. 507 of the *Mythology of the Aryan Nations*.

Pausanias, IX. 16. 6, of the liberation by Dionysos of the Theban prisoners taken by the Thracians as a further sign of Thracian influence at this remote period. He also points to the legendary connection of Dionysos with Theseus and Ariadne as showing the early arrival of the cult in Attica.

Similarly, Dr. Farnell quotes this as evidence of its introduction during the period of the monarchy, and says that "there are reasons for thinking that the god had entered Attica before the date of the Ionic Settlement in Asia Minor," assigning the celebration of the Lenaean festival of the god as a reason for this statement. He, too, regards the god as of Thracian origin, "carried by a Phrygian migration from Thrace into Asia Minor, and spreading his influence and name from the Balkan district into Macedonia and certain communities of Greece at an early period." Yet he tells us that Dionysos is mentioned only four times in the Homeric poems, and only in those portions that are supposed to belong to the latest stratum, and speaks of the fact that he played "no ancestral part in the early genealogies," and that certain communities preserved a tradition of his late arrival.

Hence, while at the outset we are confronted with a serious difficulty in dealing with the problem of the date of the coming of Dionysos into Greece, we must pause before endorsing the view given by F. A. Voigt in Roscher's Lexicon, that the non-mention by Homer of the Soma-sacrifice is "quite incomprehensible" if we attempt to trace Dionysos to Soma. For, whatever point of view we adopt, the same difficulty presents itself. Later on a possible explanation will be essayed which will adopt as its basis a second coming of Dionysos about the eighth century B.C., his original arrival being dated somewhere about the thirteenth century.

In the article by Kern in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real Encyclopaedie* we are told that the cult starts from Thrace, and spreads by land and sea over Boeotia, Thessaly, the Islands, and Asia Minor; that we can follow its extension from the eight century onward, and that from the sixth century B.C. there is hardly any Greek town in which honour is not paid to Dionysos.

Long previous, however, to any of the modern writers who



maintain the Thracian origin, the famous scholar Lobeck (*flourished* 1781-1860) upheld the same view in his *Aglaophamus*.[1]

K. O. Müller, we are told,[2] in supporting the same theory in his *Orchomenos and the Minyae*, held that "there were two distinct Thracian peoples, one a rough, barbaric race in the North, the other which settled in the centre of Greece, and was especially devoted to the cults of Dionysos and the Muses."

Similar views[3] were held by Welcker in his *Griechische Götterlehre* (1857-62), and also by Rapp in his *Beziehungen des Dionysoskultes zu Thrakien* (1882).

Of more recent writers, Whibley, in his *Companion to Greek Studies* (1895), holds that the official recognition of the god is later than Homer, but that, though his arrival from abroad is a common feature of the myth, and some of the orgies connected with the worship "may be traceable to Thrace or Phrygia, yet his worship is not entirely of foreign origin, and even his name appears to be Greek, and must probably be connected with Nysa."

Contrary to this, such eminent scholars as Lobeck, Kretschmer, and Rohde in his *Psyche* (1891-4), all regard the name Dionysos as derived from a Thracian word, and the original home of the god as Thrace.

It will be seen from the above sketch of the prevailing views of modern writers on the cult, that, while they differ in point of detail among themselves, by far the largest number uphold the Thracian theory. The divergence of opinion on the origin of Dionysos is due to the ambiguous references in the ancient writers themselves. On the whole it may be said that while the first mention of the god, namely, in Homer, sets before us his connection with Thrace, yet at the same time we see that his presence there was clearly regarded in the legend of Lycurgus as an intrusion from without.[4]

[1] Cp. page 290 of *Aglaophamus*: "perspicuum est, oram maritimam, quae ab Hebri ostiis ad Pindum protenditur, quasi pro domestico sacrorum Bacchicorum solo habitam esse."

[2] See article on Dionysos by Kern in Pauly.

[3] See article on Dionysos by F. A. Voigt in Roscher's Lexicon.

[4] Rohde, however, regards Lycurgus' opposition to Dionysos as on a different footing from that of Pentheus in Thebes. He does not give his

In the time of Euripides the connection with Asia is strongly insisted on, and from this date onwards the character of Dionysos is almost completely Asiatic, though the Roman poets, *e.g.* Ovid and Horace, show his association with Thrace.[1]

The chief supporters of the theory of Egyptian origin in ancient times were, as has already been stated, Herodotus and Plutarch. Tibullus also mentions the cultivation of the vine in Egypt as an art taught by Osiris, with whom he apparently identifies the wine-god of Greece and Rome.[2] He is, indeed, as far as I know, our only ancient authority for this identification, and it would seem from the context that it was simply owing to the general character of vegetation-deity, attached to both gods, that Tibullus assumes the connection of Osiris with the vine and with Bacchus.[3]

Before proceeding to discuss the respective merits of the different theories regarding the origin of the cult, and more especially the question of its Asiatic origin, it may be well to give a short sketch of the leading features of the worship.

It is now generally held, *e.g.* by Frazer in his *Adonis, Attis, and Osiris* (1907), that Dionysos was originally a vegetation-deity or plant-god, subsequently identified with the vine in Hellas, and then considered as a wine-god. He next appears as the source of inspiration and prophecy. According to Kern, in his article on Dionysos in Pauly, this was part of his original character, and he speaks of him as a great god "to whom the whole of nature, but above all man, is subject." E. Rohde even wishes to deduce from this enthusiastic cult in which the votary of Dionysos in the ecstasy of inspiration believes himself the equal of the god, the Greek belief in the immortality of the

reason for this statement, merely saying that the fable of Lycurgus' resistance was—later than the time of Homer—brought into line with the legend of Pentheus and that of the Minyan women.

[1] Cp. Ovid, *Metam.*, IX. 642.

[2] Cp. Tibullus, I. vii, ll. 334:

> "Hic docuit teneram palis adjungere vitem,
> Hic viridem dura caedere falce comam."

[3] Note, however, Hellanicus (*apud* Athenaeus, I. 34a) on the Egyptian origin of the vine



soul. Apparently akin to this orgiastic phase of the god's worship is his aspect as a god of the underworld, in which character he is known as Zagreus. According to Kern, Zagreus was originally a god of the chase, a "wild huntsman," who pursued men's souls and hence became a god of the underworld, being at first rather akin to Pluto than to Dionysos. This association of the god with the underworld is supposed to have already existed in Thrace before it became part of the Hellenic cult; but the above-mentioned writer doubts this, saying that "we must not forget that we know extraordinarily little about the oldest Thracian cult of Dionysos," and warning us against accepting the evidence of the late Thracian inscriptions as equivalent to the testimony of early writers.

In the Theban legend of Dionysos the god appears as the son of Zeus and Semele, a princess of Thebes ostensibly, but in reality the representative of an old Phrygian earth-goddess, who was taken into the Theban saga. The rationalistic explanation of the myth is that Dionysos, as the plant-god, is the son of Zeus the sky-god and the Earth, *i.e.* he is the plant that grows in the earth and is watered by the rain of heaven. In this connection we note his friendship with the Muses, originally fountain-nymphs, and his adoption after birth by the Hyades or Nymphs of the Misty Clouds. The story of the destruction of his mother by lightning at the moment of his birth, and the reception of the infant by Zeus in his thigh, whence it was again born, are familiar features of the myth. The infant has assigned to him several birth-places or hiding-places, where he dealt with the nymphs in order to escape the wrath of his stepmother Hera. Chief among these is a mythical mountain called Nysa, variously situated in Asia and Europe, and even in Africa. The islands of the Aegean also include several of the birth-places allotted to him. When he grows up he is said to wander throughout Asia, introducing his worship and teaching men the use of the vine. He is now regarded as a conquering war-god, and is further endowed with the power of assuming various animal shapes, notably that of the Bull. He also appears as a Lion and a Snake, and is accompanied in his journeys by frenzied women-votaries, called Maenads, and by troops of shaggy, half human

male followers, known as Satyrs or Centaurs. The influence of the orgiastic cults of Asia Minor, particularly that of Cybele, is here supposed to be seen in that of Dionysos. His association with water is shown by his title Πελάγιος in Thessaly, where he is worshipped as a sea-god, and by the legend of his protection by Ino (the sister of Semele), who subsequently became a sea-goddess.

A Cretan legend tells us of his destruction as an infant by Titans or primitive men, and of his burial at Delphi. He now becomes closely linked with Apollo, and mantic or prophetic divination is evidently introduced by him at Delphi to replace the old form of divination by lots. His cult was introduced in early times into Attica from Icaria, and we hear of its supplanting the worship of Adrastus in the Peloponnese. In the fifth century at Athens he became the patron of all theatrical and musical feasts under the title of Dionysos Melpomenos (The Song-God).

With the orgiastic worship of the god is linked his name Nyctelios or God of Night, and we know that it was at night that he was especially worshipped on the mountains, where greater freedom for revelry would be given. This orgiastic cult was naturally strongly resisted at first, and the opposition first encountered was commemorated by various feasts, *e.g.* in the Agrionia on Mount Laphystion, near Orchomenos in Boetia, where the priest of Dionysos pursued Theban women with a drawn sword, to commemorate the punishment of the daughters of Minyas, who refused to acknowledge the god. The custom persisted till Plutarch's day, and has been considered as a survival representing an old human sacrifice. Other mountain-centres of the cult were Cithaeron and Parnassus. Here Dionysos was worshipped as λικνίτης or the new-born "god in the cradle," and the feasts were celebrated every other year, or trieterically. Various explanations of this trieteric custom have been given, one of which is connected with the birth of the infant every other year, and points to his character of a vegetation-god. These feasts were under the patronage of Delphi, which interested itself in spreading the cult into the Peloponnese and even into Asia.



At Delphi also Dionysos, who, as we have seen, was closely associated with Apollo, was regarded as a healing-god, and even, in virtue of this connection, as a sun-god, though the latter aspect of his character is not very familiar outside Delphi. At Delos they are similarly associated with each other, as is shown by the legend of the seer Anios (the son of Apollo), to whose three daughters Dionysos gives power to change everything that they touch into corn, wine, or oil. His cult further appears in Rhodes and Lesbos, and, in fact, almost everywhere throughout Hellas, *except on the west coast of Greece north of the Peloponnese.* This is a very significant fact in view of the theory of the Thracian origin, and shall be dealt with later.

One of the least familiar aspects of Dionysos, referred to by Plutarch and the Orphic writers, is that of a Moon-god. His chief attributes were the ivy, the pine-cone, and the rose, while, among animals, the bull and the goat were sacred to him. He is often represented as accompanied by leopards, and, in post-Alexandrian times, he is even shown as riding on a tiger.

As already stated, the Homeric references to Dionysos are scanty. In the fourteenth book of the *Iliad* he is spoken of as χάρμα βροτοῖσιν, and his mother's name is given as Semele. Besides this, in the eleventh book of the Odyssey we have a reference to the slaying of Ariadne by Artemis in Dia "at the bidding of Dionysos," and his name appears in the last book of the same poem. All the passages have, however, been regarded as interpolated.[1] The well-known passage in the sixth book of the *Iliad*—which is probably of late date—is therefore our only reliable Homeric reference to the cult. This tells how the Thracian king Lycurgus drove the "nurses of the raging Dionysos down along the goodly Nysa," and how "Dionysos in dismay fled to the sea and Thetis received him in her bosom." The reference is here to an early attempt to establish the cult in Thrace, and depicts the opposition encountered by the Maenads.

In Hesiod's *Theogony*,[2] Χρυσοκόμης Διώνυσος weds Ariadne, the daughter of Minos, and his birth from the union of Zeus

[1] See F. A. Voigt on Dionysos in Roscher's Lexicon.
[2] See l. 947.

with Semele, the daughter of Cadmus, is also mentioned; but nothing is said of the lightning that caused his mother's death. The mention of Minos and Cadmus in Hesiod—who is, perhaps, our oldest literary authority for the worship of Dionysos—points to Crete or the east of Greece as the place from which the worship arrived. At all events, it would seem as if the cult appeared to Hesiod to be derived from that quarter.

In the shorter fragmentary *Homeric Hymn* to Dionysos, which probably dates from the seventh century B.C.,[1] the various birth-places commonly assigned to the god are given as Drakonon (a promontory in Cos), "windy Icaros" (an island near Samos), and Naxos. It is significant that in this very early authority for the birth-places of Dionysos all the places mentioned are off the coast of Asia, and may point to his cult coming from Asia by way of the Aegean to Greece. In this hymn he is also called εἰραφιῶτα, a word of doubtful meaning, but generally interpreted as connected with the Bull-Dionysos. Other birth-places are given as the river Alpheios and Thebes.

Nysa is also mentioned as:

. . . ὕπατον ὄρος ἀνθέον ὕλῃ
τηλοῦ Φοινίκης, σχεδὸν Αἰγύπτοιο ῥοάων.

He is called here γυναιμάνες, and his mother's name is given as Θυώνη or the Raging One, both of which epithets point to the fact that his worship assumed an orgiastic shape in Greece from an early period. The longer hymn is of doubtful date. Allen and Sikes assign it to either the sixth or even the seventh century B.C.; but others regard it as quite a late work, dating it from Orphic times, *i.e.* from about the fourth century of our era, while some, again, assign it to the fifth or fourth century B.C. This hymn deals with his capture by Tyrrhenian pirates and his punishment of them by changing them into dolphins. Among the various animals that appear on the scene at the god's will is a bear. The animal in question is not usually associated with Dionysos, and hence, perhaps, its presence here indicates a late origin for this hymn.

There is a reference in Pindar[2] to the association of the

[1] See Messrs. Allen and Sikes' edition. [2] See *Olymp.*, XIII. ll. 8-19.



Hours with Dionysos, and also to the origin of the Dithyramb or Dionysos Song in Corinth. The death of Semele amid thunder is also alluded to by him;[1] while two of his dithyrambs[2] refer to the god. The Fourth, which is especially famous, and is probably our earliest extant specimen of this form of composition, names the god Bromios and Eriboas or Loudly-Sounding—a frequent epithet in later times of Dionysos. He is further here spoken of as κισσοδέταν or the "ivy-wreathed."

Aeschylus, as we know, wrote a tetralogy, no longer extant, dealing with the fate of Lycurgus. It consisted of the *Edonians*, *Bassarids*, and *Young Men*, and concluded with a satyr-play called *Lycurgus*. Besides this we have a reference in the prologue of the *Eumenides* to the arrival of Bacchus at Delphi with his army of Bacchanals and his[3] "contriving for Pentheus the death of a hunted hare." In the *Seven against Thebes*[4] one of the warriors is thus described:

. . . ἔνθεος δ' Ἄρει
βακχᾷ πρὸς ἀλκὴν Θυιὰς ὣς φόνον βλέπων,

which shows us at once the warlike nature of the god and of his followers, the Maenads. It also points to a close connection between the god and Ares. On the other hand, Sophocles, in the *Oedipus Rex*,[5] makes the chorus invoke the aid of Dionysos against the war-god, where the former is called χρυσομίτραν, "wearing the golden head-band," a title which suggests an Asiatic conception of the deity. Reference is also made to the torchlight processions in his honour in the above passage.

In the *Antigone* the poet tells of the imprisonment of Lycurgus by Dionysos in a rocky tomb because "he had taunted the god in his madness, and had sought to quell the god-possessed women and the Bacchanalian fire, and had angered the Muses that love the flute."[6] Here we see the close connection of Dionysos with the Muses, who were said to have been his nurses. In the hyporcheme near the end of the same play[7] he is

[1] *Olymp.*, II. 28 ff. [2] I and IV.
[3] See ll. 23-6. [4] See ll. 497-8.
[5] Lines 210 ff.
[6] Lines 955-65. The above quotation is from Professor Jebb's version.
[7] Lines 1115-1152.

called appropriately πολυώνυμος, or "the god of many names." He is especially invoked here as the patron of Thebes and Eleusis, and his worship in the South of Italy alluded to in the words κλυτὰν ὃς ἀμφέπεις Ἰταλίαν. The foundation of Thurii by Athenian colonists a few years before the date of the play is responsible for this reference. He is also invoked as a healer, and, apparently in connection with the Eleusinian Mysteries, is called "the leader of fire-breathing stars." This is one of the few indications in the classical writers of his character of a moon-god. Mention is also made of his home in the "ivy-wreathed slopes of Nysa's hills," which, seemingly, must be understood of a mountain in Euboea.

In the *Helena* of Euripides occurs a very difficult choral song in honour of Cybele, who is here clearly identified with Demeter, and closely associated with the worship of Dionysos, mention being made of the "Bromian castanets" employed in her orgies, and spoken of by Dionysos in the *Bacchae* as Ῥέας τε μητρὸς ἐμά θ' εὑρήματα.[1] In the *Ion*, in a passage describing the Eleusinian Mysteries,[2] he is called "the god of many hymns," and the nature-worship associated with his cult is shown in the allusions to the "starry-faced" sky, the moon and the sea-nymphs, all of which are supposed to rejoice in unison at the feast. In the *Iphigenia in Tauris*[3] the presence of Dionysos at Parnassus would almost seem to be regarded as prior to that of Apollo. The *Bacchae*, which is our only extant play on the subject of the cult, brings out strongly the Asiatic character of the god; and this is the more remarkable when we reflect that it was composed in Macedon, where we might have expected stress to have been laid on his Thracian affinities. Nowhere is the peculiar ἁβρότης or soft oriental nature of Dionysos more clearly put before us, while the prologue depicts his wanderings throughout Asia before coming back to Thebes, his birth city—the universal view of Thebes in the fifth century B.C. The story is familiar to all students of Greek literature, and deals with the opposition of Pentheus, the king of Thebes, to the Bacchic rites, and his punishment by Dionysos. An

[1] See l. 59. [2] See ll. 1074-86.
[3] See ll. 1239, etc.



interesting theory has been put forward by Norwood, in his *Riddle of the Bacchae*, that Dionysos himself is nowhere supposed to be present, but that a "bacchant" takes his place throughout. Norwood notes the allusions to Asiatic mysticism in the play, and concludes that Euripides wishes here to depict an Oriental mesmerist in the character of Dionysos, who hypnotizes his followers so as to make them believe that the Palace of Pentheus has been destroyed, while, in reality, it is left standing. This, however, may be an oversight on the part of the poet, and, in any case, is of no importance for the history of the myth. Here Dionysos appears as a great wonder-worker, showing his power to change into various animal forms. Thus in one of the choruses[1] he is bidden:

φάνηθι ταῦρος ἢ πολύκρανος ἰδεῖν (sc. δράκων)
ἢπου πυριφλέγων ὁρᾶσθαι λέων,

and he is also called βάκχε θὴρ by his followers. In the same play we are shown his power over fire, while in the allusion to the earthquake which is said to shatter the palace of Pentheus we note a reference to his Bromian aspect. The only allusion to Thrace or Macedon occurs in the mention of the Pierian heights and of the Lydias and Axios as rivers crossed by him on his way to Greece from Asia.[2] The fine chorus on Righteousness brings before us the higher aspect of the cult and its spiritual possibilities, of which the Orphics made such remarkable use.

Aristophanes in his *Frogs* shows us Dionysos in a somewhat comic aspect; but the play is useful for the history of the cult, owing to its allusions to the Eleusinian Mysteries. The god is here also depicted as the patron of the Drama, and the line,

νυκτέρου τελέτης φωσφόρος ἀστήρ,

reveals his character of Moon-god. In the *Wasps* there is a reference to the bull-form of Sabazios, a Phrygian name for the god, and in the *Birds* there is a passing allusion to the "Phrygian Sabazios."

[1] See ll. 1017-18.
[2] The reference to the Corycian heights and to Olympus may point just as well to the mountains in Cilicia and Phrygia as to the Thessalian and Phocian mountains so named.

When we come to the Alexandrian Age we find the death of Pentheus and the birth of Dionysos "on snowy Drakonon," narrated in the twenty-sixth Idyll of Theocritus. In the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius we have two allusions to the god—both in the fourth book. The first of these tells of the gift of a robe to Jason by Hypsipyle, queen of Lemnos, which had belonged to Dionysos, and had been wrought for the god by the Graces themselves "in sea-girt Dia" when he wedded Ariadne. The second thus tells of the rearing of Dionysos by Makris:[1]

> And she was the first that received and in sheltering bosom bore
> The child Nysaian of Zeus, on Euboea's Abantian shore.
> And with honey she moistened his lips, where the dew of life was dried
> When Hermes bare him out of the fire. But Hêrê espied,
> And from all the isle that Nymph in her fierceness of anger she drave,
> Wherefore she dwelt far thence in the holy Phaeacian cave,
> And blessing and weal beyond word to the folk of the land she gave.

The chief interest of this quotation lies in the fact that it contains, as far as I know, the only example of an association of the worship of Dionysos with the north-west region of Greece. Of course there is nothing in the lines to show that Dionysos was actually worshipped in Phaeacia—which is generally identified with Corcyra—but the flight of Makris thither affords a link with the cult. A fairly complete account has now been given of the chief attributes of Dionysos as revealed in Greek literature. In the following chapters we shall attempt an examination of the most significant signs of Asiatic influence on Greek culture which make their appearance just at the time when the cult of Dionysos attained its greatest popularity.

[1] See ll. 1134-40 of Way's version.

# CHAPTER II

## HELLAS AND THE MEDE

Close connection between Greece and Asia from remote antiquity—Date of Aryan immigrations—Farnell and Aryan influence among the Babylonians—Prašek and the evidence of inscriptions relating to the Mitani—Rise of the Persian power—History of the intercourse between Greek and Mede up to the time of Alexander.

THE connection between Hellas and the coast of Asia Minor must at all times have been very close. The numerous islands of the Aegean served as stepping-stones between the continents, so that intercommunication was easy, and the most recent archaeological researches have revealed a community of artistic culture between Greece and Western Asia from very remote times. In this book, however, we are only concerned with the influence exerted on Greece by the Aryan inhabitants of Asia.

The exact period at which the Aryans first made their appearance is still undecided. It is even doubtful whether they originally belonged to Central Europe or to the region about the Caucasus. Fifty years ago the prevalent view regarded the Aryans as passing from Asia into Europe. In more recent times the majority of scholars, and, among others, writers such as Professor Bury—relying on the testimony of Strabo and Herodotus, who conceived the Phrygians as originally a Thracian stock—have reversed the direction of the Phrygian migrations, and considered Europe as the first habitat of the race. Bury would place the first beginnings of the Aryan migrations in the middle of the third millenium B.C.

Of recent years, however, the theory of the Asiatic origin of

the Aryans has come to be regarded with some favour.[1] Farnell, who maintains the belief in their European origin, considers that the Aryan invaders poured down into Greece about 1500 B.C.,[2] and records the fact that the inscriptions found in 1907 at Boghaz-Keui, concerning treaties between the King of the Hittites and the King of the Mitani (1400 B.C.), showed that the dynasts of the latter people, although not themselves Aryan, had Aryan gods in their pantheon.[3] This is a most important testimony both for the early influence of the Aryans in Asia and also for the readiness with which their religion was spread among the other peoples. Prašek, in his *History of the Medes and Persians*, regards the title "Aryan" as more especially applied to the Medes and Persians in ancient literature and inscriptions.[4] He considers them as originally a Balto-Slavic people, and speaks of a great Aryan kingdom as existing about 1500 B.C., while telling us that Niederle puts the parting of the Aryan stocks about 2000 B.C.[5]

According to Maspero, the Aryans had got possession of the whole of Media some time between the death of Adad Nirar III and the date when Tiglat Pilesar III ascended the throne (745 B.C.); and we know from the evidence of inscriptions relating to the wars of the latter monarch in 745 B.C. and 735 B.C., that the names of certain chieftains of the Medes were of distinctly

[1] See H. R. Hall, *The Discoveries in Crete and their relation to the History of Egypt and Palestine* (1909), who refers for this to Meyer, *Gesch. des Alterthums*, i, 2 (second edition, 1909), p. 184 ff.

[2] See Farnell's *Greece and Babylon* (1911), p. 34.

[3] See p. 46.

[4] Prašek, *History of the Medes and Persians*: "In Keilinschriften, in griechischen Nachrichten und in der avestischen Literatur werden diese Einwanderer unterschiedslos *Arier* genannt, speziell aber wurde diese Bezeichnung auf die Bewohner von Persien, Medien und den inner-irânischen Gebieten bezogen." Cp. Herodot., vii, 62: οἱ δὲ Μῆδοι ἐκαλέοντο πάλαι πρὸς πάντων Ἄριοι.

[5] See Prašek: "aber während des zeitweiligen Verfalls der Assyrischen Macht, die bekanntermassen mit dem Ableben Adad Nirars III anhob und bis zur Thronbesteigung Tiglat Pilesars III fortgedauert, soll es den Ariern gelungen sein, ganz Medien in Besitz zu nehmen so dass sich bei dem ersten Angriffe Tiglat Pilesars III das arische Gebiet in Medien von Zagros bis zur Grossen Wüste und von der Nordgrenze Elams bis zur Küste des Kaspisees ausdehnte."



Aryan type.[1] Miss Ragozin also tells us that we have monumental proof that the Iranian branch, then already known as Medes (Madai), were dislodging the tribes along the Eastern ridges of Zagros, and were themselves attacked by the Assyrian arms as far back as the ninth century B.C., under Raman-Nirari III.[2]

About 700 B.C. Deioces founded the kingdom of Media, and, fifty years later, his successor, Phraortes, conquered the whole of Persia up to the Persian Gulf. In 606 B.C. the Median king, Cyaxares, brought about the downfall of the Assyrian Empire, annexing to Media Assyria and all the territory westwards up to Asia Minor. There can be hardly any doubt that the Greek settlers in Asia Minor must have been affected by the gradual expansion of the Median Empire, the more so seeing that its founders were closely akin to themselves. Hence the Asiatic Greek would readily absorb the influences of Median culture which must have presented themselves in an increasing degree from the eighth century B.C. onwards.

With the rise of Cyrus to power, and his capture of Sardis in 546 B.C., the sphere of Asiatic influence now becomes extended to the very coast of Asia Minor, and the Hellene more completely subjected to the impulse of Asiatic culture. Nor does the fact that the Persian Empire now takes the place of the Median make any real change in the nature of this influence. For the Persians were very closely related to the Medes, worshipping the same gods, and speaking the same tongue.

From this time on we shall see that Persia and the Medes played a very considerable part in the affairs of Hellas. A brief survey of the chief events linking the history of the two continents during the next few centuries will be not inappropriate here, as showing what grounds there are for supposing strong Oriental influence on Greek culture from the sixth century onwards.

With the victories of Harpagus on the sea-board of Asia Minor about 545 B.C., all the Greek settlers in Ionia would now become subject to Persia. Nor was this all. In the downfall of

[1] See Prašek.

[2] See p. 144 of *Media* (*Story of the Nations Series*).

Amasis and the conquest of Egypt in 525 B.C. by Cambyses, the son and successor of Cyrus, we have another instance of the Persian power coming into conflict with the Hellenes. For Amasis was supported by a body-guard of Ionian and Carian mercenaries. Coming nearer to Greece, we find that in 512 B.C. Darius, the new king of Persia, invaded Scythia, and that his commander Megabazus reduced Thrace and Scythia about this time, while a few years later the Persians penetrated even as far as the river Peneus in Thessaly. Next we hear of the Ionian revolt against Persia, and the burning of Sardis in 499 B.C. by Ionians assisted by Athenians and Eretrians, which led to the abortive invasion of Northern Greece by the Persian general Mardonius in 492 B.C., and the subsequent Persian invasion of Attica in 490 B.C. ending with the battle of Marathon. A significant fact in regard to this invasion is that it was suggested by Peisistratus, the exiled tyrant of Athens, who had found a home in Persia.

This shows how close must have been the connection between Persian and Athenian affairs at this time, and is, besides, interesting when we recall the fact that the worship of Dionysos was especially promoted by Peisistratus, the friend of Persia.

For the next few years the Persians were occupied in reducing Egypt, and then we hear of the Third Persian Invasion of Greece in 480 B.C. under Xerxes. No sooner is the invasion repelled than we learn of the Medism of the Spartan King, Pausanias, in 478 B.C. and its punishment, and the foundation of the Confederacy of Delos against the Persian power.

In 466 B.C. took place the great victory of Cimon over the Persian sea and land forces at the Eurymedon. A few years later occurs the ostracism of the great Athenian leader Themistocles, and his flight to Persian territory, where he subsequently carried on political intrigues. Soon after this, assistance is given to the Egyptian Inaros, in his revolt from Persia, by two hundred Athenian vessels. Thus we see that for nearly a whole century, from about 550-460 B.C., Greece and Persia are in constant intercourse, chiefly hostile; but, that there must have been a Medizing party in Hellas, we know from the history of Peisistratus, Pausanias, Themistocles and others. It is obvious



that the islands of the Aegean must have contained many adherents of Persia from the foundation of the Delian Confederacy down to the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War; and Persian influence must have been considerable even then. In 430 B.C. we are told that Sparta sent envoys to the Persian court for help against Athens, and in 412 B.C. Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus interfered to some purpose in Greek politics.

From this time on rival parties in Greece regularly applied to Persia for aid against each other, a striking result of this policy being the downfall of Athens, which was brought about by the alliance of the Spartan Lysander with the young Persian prince Cyrus.

We have seen that throughout the fifth century B.C. Greek and Mede were brought into the closest political contact. And as their intercourse during this period was for the most part hostile, we shall not be surprised to find that the Greeks for a time tended to suppress or minimize Persian influence on their culture, more especially in the first enthusiasm of their union against the Median invasions led by Xerxes and Darius. Hence we find that at this particular epoch the peculiar characteristics of Orientalism are less noticeable than subsequently in the various domains of Greek intellectual and artistic progress.

With the following century we enter on a different phase. Asiatic influence gradually increases till, after the death of Alexander the Great, Greece and Western Asia become merged as part of one great semi-Oriental Empire. The Expedition of the Ten Thousand in 401 B.C. into the heart of the Persian monarch's territory, its subsequent retreat, and the return of its survivors into Greece perhaps more than any other cause contributed to the spread of Persian ideas in Greece. In the following year Tissaphernes, the Persian Satrap, retaliated by attacking the Greek cities on the Asiatic sea-board, and this led to a Spartan relief force being sent under Thimbron. A desultory war was now waged between Persia and the leading Greek state. In 395 B.C. the Embassy of Timocrates of Rhodes to Argos and Corinth, sent from Persia to bribe Greek politicians, resulted in bringing to a head the prevailing Greek ill-feeling against Sparta, which produced the Corinthian War and the Battle of Cnidus.

The constant dissensions among the various Greek states during this century naturally increased the power of the Mede, whose typically Oriental policy of playing off one rival against another must inevitably have implied an extended interference in Greek politics. In 365 B.C. the Athenian leader Timotheos obtained the aid of Persia in his naval expedition against Samos and the Chersonese; but nearly ten years later the Great King successfully helped the Allies of Athens in the Aegean to break away from their allegiance. Previous to this in 380 B.C. a far-sighted Greek orator, Isocrates, had advocated a union of Hellas against Persia, but his dream was not destined to be fulfilled till 337 B.C., when, with the advent of the Macedonian Power, and the conquest of Greece by the latter, it became possible for all the Greek States, now united under their northern war-lord Philip, to march against the Great King.

The rapid and extended conquests of Philip's son Alexander are too well-known to be detailed here. As a result of these, and of Alexander's policy of intermarriage between Greek soldiers and Persian women, and of the foundation of Greek colonies throughout his newly-won Empire, as well as of his generally conciliatory attitude towards the conquered, Greece tended more than ever to assimilate Asiatic customs. It would be tedious here to dwell at length on the historical evidence for this fusion. Indeed it is hardly necessary to insist on the existence of Asiatic influence in every province of Greek life during the period subsequent to the death of Alexander. What has, perhaps, escaped attention is the historical proof of this influence during the earlier period of Greek history.

# CHAPTER III

## ASIATIC INFLUENCE ON GREEK PHILOSOPHY

Philosophy the first province of Greek culture in which Asiatic influence is clearly to be seen—Dogmas of the *Zend-Avesta*—Pre-Buddhistic philosophy in India—Sāṃkhya system and Heracleitus—*Upanishads*—Possibility of contact between Greece and India previous to the fourth century B.C.—Thales—Anaximander—Anaximenes—Orphic and Pythagorean teaching and their resemblance to Indian doctrines—Xenophanes—Heracleitus — Parmenides — Empedocles — Plato — *Phaedo* — *Sophistes*—*Politicus*—*Phaedrus*—*Philebus*—*Republic*—*Timaeus*.

THE province in which Asiatic influence on Greek culture first clearly appears is that of Philosophy. Greek Philosophy began in Asia Minor at Miletus about the sixth century B.C. with the Ionian cosmologist Thales. At the same time the semi-philosophic religious movement known as Orphism made its appearance in Greece and the South of Italy. Now both the Ionian philosophy and Orphism present many marked points of contact with Early Indian Philosophy as revealed in the *Upanishads*, the earlier portions of which represent the philosophy of the Indians between the ninth and sixth centuries before Christ.[1]

In the absence of documents which would show the philosophic side of Zoroastrianism, we must naturally turn to these semi-theological speculations of the kindred Indian race as evidence for what may have been the state of contemporary Persian metaphysics. The scanty remains of Old Persian literature fail to give us any idea of Persian philosophy, and it is doubtful if

[1] See Garbe, *The Philosophy of Ancient India*, p. 2. Also Gough's *Philosophy of the Upanishads*; and Weber's *History of Indian Literature*. Also Macdonell's *Sanskrit Literature*.

the native Persian of the sixth century possessed any developed system. Nearly all the extant Avesta literature deals with ritual, and practically all that we know of their cosmology or philosophy amounts to this; that they worshipped Fire which they called the Son of the Supreme Being, who was identified with Wisdom or the Good Mind. The principle of Evil was admitted as another side of the Supreme Being's character,[1] and these conflicting principles were identified with Reality and Non-Reality respectively, all of which features recall the beliefs of the Ionian School and of the philosophy of the *Upanishads*.

Our knowledge of the Orphism of the sixth century is derived from documents of the fifth and fourth century, *i.e.*, from the writings of Empedocles and Plato. The doctrines of the earlier *Upanishads*, though not written down till after the Christian era, are known to correspond closely with the early philosophical speculations of the later *Vedas*, and to have preceded Buddhism. Hence we are able to assign to them the early date above given, and also to show that they are an autochthonous Asiatic product. Of the extraordinary number of philosophical schools in India at this period we have evidence in the *Brahma-Gāla-Sutta*,[2] in which no less than sixty-two different schools are named by Buddha.

Accordingly, it is clear that Alexandrian influence on Indian culture cannot, as Niebuhr imagined, have been the source of much of the philosophical speculation of the Hindus. Max Müller would hold that the Greeks and Indians evolved their systems independently, and probably sees in their affinities a proof of his theory of the common origin of Greek and Indian mythology. When he says, however, that Greek philosophy bears the stamp of being autochthonous, he seems to lose sight of the fact that it arose, not in Greece, but in Asia Minor, and that the Greeks themselves regarded the Orphic doctrines as foreign.

Burnet, who rejects the theory of the Oriental origin of Greek philosophy, allows, notwithstanding, that "it would be quite

[1] See Haug's *Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsis*, especially pp. 303-4.

[2] See Max Müller, *The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*.



another thing to say that Greek philosophy originated quite independently of Oriental influences"; and he confesses that the *Upanishads* and Buddhism were a native growth and "profoundly influenced philosophy."

Here it may be well to draw attention to a mistake commonly made by writers on Hellenic subjects with regard to Buddhism. This was not, as is frequently stated, a system that in any way seriously modified Indian thought. We have already seen that sixty-two different philosophical schools existed in India before and during the lifetime of Buddha. The Buddhistic teaching was really a development of the philosophy of the *Upanishads* —themselves a continuation of the speculations of the *Vedas*— and was rather a well-organized revolt against the power of the Brahmans than the introduction of a new philosophical system.

Garbe[1] would trace to the *Upanishads* the philosophy of the Eleatic school; and, while noting the resemblances to Iranian ideas in the teaching of Heracleitus of Ephesus, he observes that the theory of constant change in the Universe, denoted by the formula πάντα ῥεῖ, and that of the innumerable annihilations of the Cosmos, also maintained by him, are among the best-known views of the Indian Sāṃkhya system. Now Max Müller[2] points out that this system goes back to the *Rig-Veda* in its essence, and both Weber and Garbe regard it as of the greatest antiquity of all the Indian systems, and as pre-Buddhistic in its origin, so that, chronologically, it is quite possible that Heracleitus may have derived some of his doctrines from this source. Burnet, however, will not allow that Heracleitus held the theory of an Ekpyrosis, which was one of the tenets of the Sāṃkhya philosophy, and is by some considered to have been also maintained by the Ephesian.

Our chief source of information as to the philosophy of the Indians at this period is to be found in the *Upanishads*, from which all the later systems are evolved. These *Upanishads* vary in point of date, the most ancient being one known as the

[1] In his *Philosophy of Ancient India*, p. 33.

[2] See his *Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*, p. 91, and also Macdonell's *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 235-6, and Garbe, chaps. I. and II.

*Bṛihadāraṇyaka*. A very late *Upanishad* is the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, composed early in the Christian era, and incorporated in the great Indian Epic known as the *Mahābhārata*. This *Bhagavad-Gītā* is valuable as an epitome of the later form of the Sāṃkhya doctrine, and may be quoted here along with the other *Upanishads*, as the points of difference do not in the main affect its evidence for the resemblances between Greek and Indian philosophy, and on the whole it corresponds very closely with the teaching of the earlier *Upanishads* in many important points. It should here be observed that while the Sāṃkhya is dualistic, we have more or less coeval with it another pre-Buddhistic system known as the Vedānta, which, also, is derived from the *Upanishads*, and is strictly monistic. In this chapter, then, we shall endeavour to examine the leading features of the philosophy of the Ionian School, the Orphics and Pythagoreans, and Plato, and to see, with the aid of the *Upanishads*, in what points the influence of Asiatic ideas may be suspected in these thinkers; and it is hoped that many of the apparent contradictions presented in the teaching of the earlier Greek philosophers may find their best explanation in the ambiguous doctrines of the *Upanishads*, from which both the monistic Vedānta and the dualistic Sāṃkhya systems could emerge.

The chief difficulty as to the possibility of Indian thought having affected Greek philosophy at this early period is a geographical one—India being too far distant from Greece for intercommunication to have been easy, before the conquests of Alexander opened up the route to the East. In spite of this, we read of legends, discredited it is true, of long voyages to the East undertaken by Pythagoras and others. Yet there would seem to be no difficulty in imagining the presence in Persia of Indian teachers from very early times; and, in such a case, it is not hard to see whence the Ionian School may have derived its speculations. As to the absence of any mention of such influence—except in the legends about Pythagoras and his travels—in classical writers, we should recall the fact that the convenient formula "someone" is usually employed by them, *e.g.*, by Plato, when quoting the opinion of some previous enquirer, and hence we need not expect to find a direct reference to Indian philosophy in



any early Greek writer. Moreover, the bitter prejudice of Hellas against the Mede during the fifth century would naturally cause Greek writers to shrink from directly quoting an Oriental source.

*Thales*, the earliest of the Ionian philosophers known to us, maintained that water was the first principle. In this, although we note a coincidence with Vedic cosmology, we have no proof of borrowing from Indian sources, as the idea is natural to most early cosmologies, and appears also among the Babylonians.[1] The Vedic parallel, which occurs in the famous *Nāsadiya Hymn*,[2] may be quoted as follows: "There was then neither what is, nor what is not, there was no sky, nor the heaven which is beyond. . . . Darkness there was, in the beginning all this was a sea without light."

*Anaximander* of Miletus, who was a contemporary of Thales, found the origin of existence in a substance called the ἄπειρον or Boundless,[3] from which the opposites of heat and cold, dry and moist, etc., were separated out in the process of the formation of the Universe. Controversy has arisen as to what exactly was meant by the Boundless. Burnet tells us that it must be regarded as a corporeal substance, and that we must guard against attributing the ideas of later times to Anaximander.

We read in Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*:[4] "Anaximandri

[1] For Thales' conception of an indwelling soul in the universe, see Aristotle, *De Anima*, I. 5. 411*a* 8: καὶ ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ δέ τινες αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν ψυχήν) μεμῖχθαί φασιν, ὅθεν ἴσως καὶ Θαλῆς ᾠήθη πάντα πλήρη θεῶν εἶναι. Compare with this the doctrine of the *Upanishads* which regarded the Supreme Soul as pervading all things or as being The All. Adam thinks that Strabo's reference to Thales as holding that "god is the νοῦς of the world and that the universe is at once alive and full of spirits," etc., is due to Stoic influence. For his idea that water was the first principle, cp. Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, A. 3. 983 b. 20: ἀλλὰ Θαλῆς μὲν ὁ τῆς τοιαύτης ἀρχηγὸς φιλοσοφίας ὕδωρ εἶναί φησιν. For a parallel notion among the Babylonians, see Farnell's *Greece and Babylon*.

[2] See *Rig-Veda*, Book X. The quotations given are taken from Max Müller's translation in his *Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*.

[3] Note that, according to Adam, the ἄπειρον of Anaximander is a physical indeterminate concept, possessed of eternal motion, immortal and eternal, "encompassing and steering all things." Adam agrees with Aristotle in holding that it was the Divine Being, and with Burnet in believing the "intervals" of the innumerable worlds to be intervals of *space*, and not of time. See Adam's *Religious Teachers of Greece* (1908).

[4] See Book I. § 25.

autem opinio est nativos esse deos longis intervallis orientis occidentisque, eosque innumerabilis esse mundos." Now, if we regard these long intervals, in which the countless divine worlds are said to come into being and pass away, as intervals of time, we are reminded of the theory of the periodic dissolutions and creations of the Universe, which belongs to the earliest period of Indian philosophy. The idea of natural opposites in pairs is also very usual in the philosophy of the *Upanishads*, these opposites being typical of the nature of plurality and semblance into which the One is differentiated. Burnet thinks that the absence of quality attaching to Anaximander's ἄπειρον is only apparent, and the product of a later philosophical age. Both he and Zeller reject the notion that it was a peculiarly subtle substance midway between air and fire, or between air and water: in fact, they regard it simply as the sum total of matter. Thus they would make it closely resemble the Indian notion of the World-Soul or the All, which is often compared in Vedāntic philosophy [1] to the aggregate of the number of trees in a forest, the sum of the waters in a lake, etc., while the apparent absence of determining characteristics in the ἄπειρον foreshadows the doctrines of Parmenides, and affords a parallel to the primitive Hindu Ātman, Self or World-Soul.[2]

*Anaximenes* was also a native of Miletus, but he lived somewhat later than Anaximander—probably before 494 B.C. He regarded ἀήρ or vapour as the primitive substance. He also said that "Just as our soul, being air (*i.e.* vapour), holds us together, so do breath and air encompass the whole world," showing that he recognized the same resemblance between the microcosm

[1] The Vedāntic philosophy, which arose about the beginning of the Christian era, is a system of idealistic monotheism based on the *Upanishads*. It maintains the identity of the individual soul with Brahma and the unreality of the empirical world. See Macdonell's *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 399-402.

[2] An exact parallel to Anaximander's ἄπειρον appears in the *Chāndogya Upanishad* (see Barnett's *Some Sayings from the Upanishads*, p. 11). Thus we read there: "In this thinness hath this All its essence." Barnett says: "The term 'thinness' (aṇimā, literally 'atomicity,' atomic or suprasensual fineness) shows that the author conceived the Absolute or Pure Being as essentially material substance, though without any attributes of materiality. Being, Thought, and Matter are ultimately one to him."



and the macrocosm that meets us in the *Chāndogya Upanishad*.

There we are told "Breath is the Thinness of Water," from which we can see that Breath was of the same nature as Anaximenes' ἀήρ or vapour. We are further told by Barnett that this Breath is "the chief and representative of all the senses, and signifies the activity of Brahma (*i.e.* the All or World-Soul) in maintaining the functional energies of life, working as bodily breath in the microcosm and as wind in the macrocosm." [1]

We know, moreover, that Anaximenes held that Earth arose from "felted" vapour; [2] and this is just the account given of the Creation in the above-named *Upanishad*, thus: "The Water thought in itself: 'I will be many, I will beget offspring.' It brought forth food." [3]

For Food is the Hindu representative of Earth as embodying the nutritive powers of Nature. Hence we learn from this *Upanishad* that Earth arises from Water, or, in other words, from a substance identical with the ἀήρ of Anaximenes.[4] We know, besides, that Anaximenes regarded Fire as rarefied ἀήρ, and this corresponds to the idea, expressed in the same *Upanishad*, that Water arose from Heat.[5]

We now come to the Orphic and Pythagorean schools, which, though scattered throughout Greece and the West, showed many marks of Oriental origin. In view of the doubt as to whether Orpheus was a native of Crete or of Greece, it may be well here to quote Burnet on the Orphic tablets found in South Italy. He says: [6] "What can be made out from them as to the doctrine has

[1] See *Some Sayings from the Upanishads*, p. 46.

[2] See (Plutarch), Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, I. 7, Extract 11 of Jackson's *Texts to Illustrate the History of Greek Philosophy*: πιλουμένου δὲ τοῦ ἀέρος πρώτην γεγενῆσθαι λέγει τὴν γῆν πλατεῖαν μάλα.

[3] See Barnett.

[4] Cp. v. 20, chap. xii, of the *Sarva-Siddhānta-Sangraha* of Śaṅkarācārya, in the account of the Vedānta system: ". . . vayor agni tato jalaṃ jalātpṛithivyabhūdbhūmervrīhyoshadhayo abhavan." "From air fire, from that water, from water earth arose; from earth the rice-plants came into being."

[5] Cp. Simplicius *In Physica*, 6 r, Extract 9 in Jackson: καὶ ἀραιούμενον μὲν πῦρ γίνεσθαι, κ.τ.λ.

[6] See his *Early Greek Philosophy*.

a startling resemblance to the beliefs which were prevalent in India about the same time, though it seems impossible that there should have been any actual contact between Greece and India at this date."

Garbe, who is very moderate in his estimate of Oriental influences on Greek philosophy, declares that the *historical possibility* of intercourse between Greece and India through the medium of Persia must be admitted. Moreover, while claiming merely probability in the case of the influence supposed to be exercised by Indian thought on the Eleatic School, he strongly insists on its certainty in the case of Pythagoras, whose doctrines so closely resembled the teaching of the Orphics. As regards the tenet of transmigration common to both Pythagoras and the Orphics, there is no longer any possibility of its having been derived from Egypt, in the light of our better knowledge of Egyptian beliefs at the present day. Burnet admits that this doctrine of Pythagoras is precisely the same as contemporary Indian ideas of the future life, and we know that these notions prevailed in India from the earliest times.[1] Adam thinks that the Greeks and Indians evolved the doctrine of deliverance from the body independently from each other, as "it is not possible to assume any actual borrowing of Indian ideas at this date." This view is probably based on the mistaken idea that Buddhism—to which he alludes in this connection—is responsible for the introduction of the doctrine of λύσις and the kindred tenet of transmigration into Indian religion, in which case these beliefs would only date from about the same time as the rise of Orphism itself, and might, in that case, have arisen first, or at least independently, in Greece.

But when we realize that long before Buddha—according to Max Müller from the earliest times—this doctrine of transmigration prevailed in India, whereas it was established in Greece, whether as innovation or revival,[2] not earlier than the sixth century B.C.,

[1] Adam here makes the common mistake of taking Buddhism as the first Indian doctrine which preached the immortality of the soul. As a matter of fact the Buddhist idea of the One, or the World-Soul, was practically Non-entity, so that the ultimate future of the soul, according to the Buddhist system, would be annihilation.

[2] Miss Harrison, in her *Themis*, pp. 271-5, regards the doctrine of "Re-



and was then regarded as something foreign, coming as it did from Thrace or Crete—and therefore no doubt ultimately from Asia Minor—it seems fairly natural to consider the belief as derived in the first instance from Indian teachers.

Further, the idea of the Orphics that the body is the prison of the soul, which is expressed by the riddling derivation σῶμα σῆμα given in Plato's *Cratylus*,[1] is also a familiar notion in early Indian religion. Thus, we are told in the *Kaṭha Upanishad* that . . . "the migrating soul that knows this Purusha (*i.e.* Brahman or the Supreme Being) is loosed from metempsychosis and passes into immortality."[2] In fact *bandha* or "bondage" is the Hindu equivalent for the state of embodiment. Similarly, from the Sanskrit root *dih*, which means "to pollute," "to cover," and is considered by Monier-Williams as akin to τεῖχος and *tingere*, we get the words *deha* "a body," and *dehi* "a rampart," "a fence," all of which goes to show that Hindu and Orphic ideas concerning the body were very closely related.

Again, the Orphic notion of the divinity of the soul and of man as a "child of earth and starry heaven" is identical with the doctrine of the *Upanishads*, according to which the Ātman or Self, or Supreme Being dwells in the heart of each of us as the "internal ruler, immortal," where it is spoken of as the Purusha or individual soul.[3] Also, when Empedocles speaks

incarnation" as primitive and natural. But when she speaks of it as "long held under by Nationalism and Olympianism," till it "re-emerged to blossom in Orphism," it is evident that some fresh impulse must have accounted for its prominence in the sixth century B.C. This impulse undoubtedly came from the East.

[1] See 400 *c.*: δοκοῦσι μέντοι μοι μάλιστα θέσθαι οἱ ἀμφὶ Ὀρφέα τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα, ὡς δίκην διδούσης τῆς ψυχῆς, ὧν δὴ ἕνεκα δίδωσιν· τοῦτον δὲ περίβολον ἔχειν, ἵνα σῴζηται, δεσμωτηρίου εἰκόνα.

[2] See Gough's *Philosophy of the Upanishads*.

[3] Cp. *Bhagavad-Gītā*, chap. II. sloka 20:

na jāyate mriyate vā kadāciṇ
nāyaṁ bhūtvā bhavitā va na bhūyaḥ/
ajo nityaḥ śāśvato ayaṁ purāṇo
na hanyate hanyamāne śarīre//.

"It is not born nor dies at any time. It has had no origin, nor will it ever have an origin. Unborn, changeless, eternal both as to future and past time, it is not slain when the body is killed."

See also the allegory of the honey or Madhuvidyā in the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka*

of himself as φυγὰς θεόθεν καὶ ἀλήτης (fr. 115), he alludes to the Orphic dogma that, before becoming incarnate, individual souls dwelt in the abode of the gods. This recalls the pre-Buddhistic idea of the gods, mentioned in the Buddhist canon,[1] according to which some held that certain gods through self-indulgence fell from heaven, and were, in consequence, born on earth; and we notice a close agreement between Orphic and Indian doctrines in the fact that, in each case, sin is adduced as the cause of embodiment in the flesh. Still more remarkable is the parallel between the Orphic τροχὸς τῆς γενέσεως[2] or "wheel of generation," with its duration for "thrice ten thousand seasons" and the wheel of Brahma, or of life and death, in which each day of Brahma is equivalent to a thousand Great Cycles or Mahāyugas.[3]

Besides this the notions of ὁσιότης and purification, and the abstinence from the flesh of animals[4] enjoined by Orphic doctrines are all essentially Indian customs and foreign to Hellenic practice. These customs, indeed, were not quite approved of by some of the Greeks in the fifth century, however popular the professional Orphic priest may have become in the fourth and third centuries.[5] Thus, Plato, in his *Republic*,[6] censures

*Upanishad* (see Gough, p. 154): "The body is the honey of all living things, and all living things are the honey of this body; and this same luminous immortal Purusha that is in the body and this same luminous immortal Self are one. Purusha is Self."

[1] See Max Müller's *Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*, pp. 10-11.

[2] See Adam's *Religious Teachers of Greece*, and cp. Empedocles, frg. 115. 6, and Plato's *Phaedrus*, 248 E.

[3] Cp. Gough's *Philosophy of the Upanishads*, p. 154: "All living things, all the gods, all the spheres, all the faculties, all souls are concentred in the Self, as the spokes of a wheel are fixed in the axle and the felly"; and also the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, chap. VIII. sloka 17:

sahasrayugaparyantaṃ ahaṛ ye brahmaṇo viduḥ/
rātriṁ yugasahasrāntāṁ te ahorātravido janāḥ.

"Those men who know the day of Brahma, which ends after a thousand ages; and the night which comes on at the end of those thousand ages, know day and night indeed."

[4] Cp. Plato, *Laws*, 782 C: ἀλλὰ Ὀρφικοί τινες λεγόμενοι βίοι κ.τ.λ.

[5] Cp. Theophrastus, *Characters*, xxviii (xvi): καὶ τελεσθησόμενος πρὸς τοὺς Ὀρφεοτελεστὰς κατὰ μῆνα κ.τ.λ. of the Superstitious Man.

[6] See *Republic*, II. 364 E. Also 363.



the Orphics for their use of liturgies as a means of purification, and for their attempt to "bind and charm" the gods, in his vivid account of the vulgar practice of this cult; while, at the same time, its higher and more spiritual side commanded his full approval. Similarly, the *Muṇḍaka Upanishad*, while telling us that sacrifices lead to the seven ascending worlds of recompense, warns those who would seek to attain the sacred sphere of Brahma against placing reliance on them, as follows: "But those sacrifices with their ritual and its eighteen parts are frail boats indeed; and they that rejoice in sacrifice as the best of things, in their infatuation shall pass on again to decay and death."[1]

So we see clearly that, in India as in Greece, side by side with the practice of liturgies and sacrifices, we have the consciousness that there is something higher in religion than material acts of worship.

As regards the future state of the soul in Greek and Indian eschatologies, we note that ten thousand years[2] represented the period during which metempsychosis prevailed in the Orphic "wheel of life and death," whereas, according to the Indian system, the period might be either infinitely longer or much shorter, according as the soul had attained knowledge of the Supreme Being or not. Now Adam holds that the Orphic life of the blessed was a state of far more tangible and positive happiness than the bliss obtained by the soul which has become one with Brahma. But, on the other hand, the Platonic ideal of a future happy state approaches more nearly to Indian views. To the terrible retribution exacted after death from guilty souls in the Orphic creed we have a parallel in the eschatology of the *Zend-Avesta*,[3] so that here we need not go so far afield as India to find a resemblance between Aryan and Greek doctrines. In fact,

[1] See Gough, p. 102.

[2] So in *Rep.* X. 615 A. But for a shorter period of three thousand years see *Phaedrus*, 248 E, and Herodotus, II. 123.

[3] Cp. Haug, pp. 222-3 in the Hadokht Nask, where "the soul of the wicked man appears passing through terrors and stenches." Cp. the "sea of mire" alluded to by Plato in his description of the future life according to the Orphics in *Rep.* II. See also L. de Milloué's *L'Existence de l'Âme chez les Indous, les Grecs, les Perses*, etc., p. 37.

belief in a future state is one of the cardinal articles of the *Zend-Avesta* teaching.

The Pythagorean doctrine is closely linked with the Orphic, the chief difference being the great importance assigned to science by Pythagoras as a means of winning a happy state after death. In this system, with its dualistic doctrine of the Limit and the Unlimited, we note a resemblance to the Aryan tenet of Brahma limited by Māyā (the principle of Illusion), or to the Good and Evil Spirit of the *Avesta*. *Brahma*, in fact, means "that which is infinitely extended," owing to its derivation from the root *bṛih* "to grow" or "increase," and so corresponds to the Unlimited. Yet its activity is in some sense limited by Māyā, which thus corresponds to the Pythagorean πέρας. Again, when Aristotle tells us (*Physica*, III. 4. 203 a 7) that the Unlimited was sometimes represented by the early Pythagoreans as the air or breath of the Universe, we have an exact agreement with the teaching of the *Upanishads*, in which, as we have seen, Ātman or the Breath of the Universe is identified with Brahma. Besides this the Pythagorean tenet that the Central Fire of the Universe, identified by Adam with their Unit, was the first object to come into existence on the formation of the Cosmos recalls the primary importance attached to Fire by the Zoroastrians. Also the importance attached to number by this philosophy is very characteristic of Indian thought in general; and we are told that Schröder[1] believed there was a connection between the Sāṃkhya philosophy and Pythagoreanism. This, however, cannot be proved; for although Sāṃkhya means "calculation" or "enumeration," there is no trace of number playing an important part in this system as we have it.

In conclusion, we may remark that if Pythagoras, like his successors, maintained the tenet of "restoration of all things," he was probably influenced by Indian thought.[2] And there is

[1] For a summary of views common to ancient Indian philosophy and the Pythagoreans, see Garbe, pp. 39-46.

[2] Cp. *Bhagavad-Gītā*, chap. VIII. slokas 18-9:

avyaktāḍ vyaktayaḥ sarvāḥ prabhavanty aharāgame
rātryāgame praliyante tatraivāvyaktasaṁajnake



no doubt that the Pythagorean categories of opposites are very like the Sāṃkhya "pairs of opposites,"[1] which meet us so often in the *Bhagavad-Gītā*. The distinction between the opposites of Pythagoras and those of Alcmaeon of Croton, alluded to by Aristotle, is interesting. From the *Metaphysics*[2] it would seem that Alcmaeon's opposites were identical with those of Kapila, inasmuch as they were unrestricted in number, and merely denoted any pair of chance opposites, such as "white and black," "sweet and bitter," etc.

The Eleatic School will be found, as has already been stated, to present many points of contact with the East. The earliest representative of this school is *Xenophanes* of Colophon, who lived about 540 B.C. According to the testimony of Aristotle,[3] he declared nothing clearly, although the first of this school to introduce the system of Unity. In this he resembled the "wriggling eels" of the *Brahma-Gāla-Sutta*, who held the theory called *Syādvāda*, by which they committed themselves to nothing.[4] Burnet,[5] however, regards Xenophanes as speaking

bhūtagrāmaḥ sa evāyaṁ bhutvā bhutvā pralīyate
rātryāgame avaśaḥ, Partha, prabhavaty aharāgame.

"At the approach of that day all developed things come forth from the indeterminate principle. At the approach of that night they are absorbed into that principle called the indeterminate. This collective mass itself of existing things, thus existing again and again, is dissolved at the approach of that night." Here we have the Sāṃkhya doctrine of Pralayas or dissolutions of the world at the end of every 432,000,000 years.

[1] Cp. in the *Sāṅkhya Aphorisms of Kapila*, the three qualities of which Nature consists, viz., Goodness, Passion, and Darkness, thus Aphorism 61, Book I says: sattvarajastamasāṁ sāmyāvasthā prakṛitiḥ, *i.e.*, "Nature is the state of equipoise of Goodness, Passion, and Darkness." The third term is something between the other two qualities which brings them into equipoise.

[2] See *Metaphysics*, A. 5. 986a 22: φησὶ (sc. Ἀλκμαίων) γὰρ εἶναι δυὸ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων, λέγων τὰς ἐναντιότητας οὐχ ὥσπερ οὗτοι (sc. οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι) διωρισμένας ἀλλὰ τὰς τυχούσας, οἷον λευκὸν μέλαν, γλυκὺ πικρόν, κ.τ.λ. οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἀδιορίστως ἀπέρριψε περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, οἱ δὲ Πυθαγόρειοι καὶ πόσαι καὶ τίνες αἱ ἐναντιώσεις ἀπεφήναντο.

[3] See *Metaph.*, A. 5. 986*b* 9: πρῶτος τούτων ἐνίσας . . . οὐδὲν διεσαφήνισεν.

[4] See *Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*, p. 19.

[5] See Burnet's *Greek Philosophy*. For absence of motion in connection with the Universe, cp. αἰεὶ δ' ἐν ταὐτῷ μίμνει κινούμενον οὐδέν, | οὐδὲ μετέρχεσθαί μιν ἐπιπρέπει ἄλλοτε ἄλλῃ. (frg. 4, Xenophanes).

satirically, and holds that he certainly did not believe in a plurality of gods. Now we are told that Xenophanes said that the world was neither finite nor infinite, and that it was neither in motion nor at rest.[1] In this he resembles the speculators, called Antānantikas in the Buddhist Canon, who maintain that it is finite or infinite, or neither finite nor infinite, or else that it is infinite in height and depth, but finite in lateral extension.[2] The following extracts from his teaching show his affinity with the thought of the *Upanishads*. Thus

εἷς θεὸς ἔν τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισι μέγιστος
οὔτε δέμας θνητοῖσιν ὁμοίιος οὔτε νόημα.
(Frg. 1 in Jackson.)

finds a parallel in the Self or Supreme Being, "invisible, impalpable, without kindred, without colour. . . . which has neither eyes nor ears, neither hands nor feet, . . . the changeless principle that the wise behold as the origin of all things."[3] On the other hand, Xenophanes contradicts himself when he attributes the power of seeing and hearing to his Supreme Being thus:

οὖλος ὁρᾷ οὖλος δὲ νοεῖ οὖλος δέ τ' ἀκούει,
(Frg. 2 in Jackson.)

Similarly the teaching of the *Upanishad* just quoted is contradicted in the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, where we are told of the Self that "It possesses hands and feet in all directions; eyes, heads, and faces in all directions; having ears in all directions he exists in the world comprehending all things."[4] As to Xeno-

[1] Compare for a similar contradiction as to motion and rest, or extension and rest, *Bhagavad-Gītā*, chap. XIII. sloka 16:

avibhaktaṁ ca bhūteshu vibhaktaṃ iva ca sthitaṁ,

*i.e.*, "not distributed among beings and yet existing as if distributed among them."

[2] See *Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*. Cp. Xenophanes, frg. 12:

γαίης μὲν τόδε πεῖρας ἄνω παρ' ποσσὶν ὁρᾶται
αἰθέρι προσπλάζων τὰ κάτω δ' ἐς ἄπειρον ἱκάνει.

[3] See *Philosophy of the Upan.*, p. 99, *Muṇḍaka Upan.*

[4] sarvataḥ pāṇipādaṁ taṭ sarvato akshiśiromukhaṁ
sarvataḥ śrutimaḷ loke sarvaṃ āvṛitya tishṭhati.



phanes' dictum[1] that we are all born of Earth and Water, this recalls the teaching of the *Chāndogya Upanishad*,[2] where we are told that Man is composed of Mind, Breath, and Speech, which represent respectively Food or Earth, Water, and Heat. And the intellectual nature of the Supreme Being of Xenophanes, and its supreme power, expressed by him in the line:

ἀλλ' ἀπάνευθε πόνοιο νόου φρενὶ πάντα κραδαίνει,
(Frg. 3 in Jackson.)

"But without toil he swayeth all things by the thought of his mind" is easily paralleled in the *Upanishads*. Thus, in the second section of the second *Muṇḍaka Upanishad*,[3] we read that "this Self knows all, it knows everything"; and again, in the *Chāndogya*, III. 14, that the individual soul "is made of thought," while "the Universal Soul is operative in the inward sense, . . . it is the pure light, the unfailing will, the ethereal essence, out of which all creations, all desires . . . proceed. It pervades all things, silent and unperturbed."

In *Heracleitus* of Ephesus (flourished 501 B.C.), perhaps more than in any other Greek philosopher, we see a resemblance to the thought of the *Upanishads*. What first strike us in this connection are the epithets **σκοτεινός** and **αἰνικτής** bestowed on him by reason of his self-contradictory and riddling style. Here we have a very characteristic feature of Asiatic expression, which is clearly marked in the language of the *Upanishads*. Thus the saying attributed to him that "Nature loves to hide," recalls a statement in the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad*, to the effect that "the gods love mystery and hate familiarity."[4] Again his saying that "God is day and night, winter and summer, war and peace, surfeit and hunger; but he takes various shapes, just as fire, when it is mingled with spices, is named according to the savour of each," shows the same contradictory manner of expression, and the same wide conception of the Deity as the

[1] Xenophanes, frg. 9: πάντες γὰρ γαίης τε καὶ ὕδατος ἐκγενόμεσθα.

[2] See Barnett, *Some Sayings from the Upanishads*, pp. 9-11, and cp. Book I Aphorism 139 of Kapila: Śarīrādivyatiriktaḥ pumāṇ, *i.e.*, "Soul is something else than the body, etc."

[3] See Gough, p. 107.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 176.

following quotations from the *Śvetāśvatara Upanishad* given in Gough's *Philosophy of the Upanishads*:[1] "Thou art male and thou art female; thou art youth and thou art maiden; thou art decrepit and totterest along with a staff; thou comest to the birth; thou hast faces everywhere." "It has neither hands nor feet, but moves rapidly and handles all things. It sees without eyes and hears without ears."[2] And the Heracleitean view of the essential sameness of the Deity, in spite of the variety of the forms in which it appears, and its comparison with fire mingled with spices and called after the different savour of each has a parallel in the *Chāndogya Upanishad*,[3] where we are told that, "As by one clod of clay, all things that are of clay may be understood, their several shapes being but an holdfast of speech, and their name being in truth clay," so is the knowledge of the Supreme Self which is variously manifested in different forms, but has one essential nature. So, too, when Heracleitus tells us that "Good and Ill are one," his thought is exactly that of the *Upanishads*, where we read[4] that "these two, the Good and the Evil . . . are only Self." In fact, the great discovery of Heracleitus that the Many is One and the One is Many is nothing else than the first principle of Early Indian Philosophy, according to which the Self is manifested in infinite variety in the Universe by the power of Māyā or Illusion—the latter providing the principle of difference technically called *Namarūpa*, or Name and Colour. And his sense of the constant change and motion of the universe,[5] described by him in the aphoristic phrase *πάντα ῥεῖ*, is all part of the same notion of the inherent Unity and Plurality of the All

[1] See Gough, p. 223: and *Śvet. Upan.*, IV. 3: "tvaṁ stṛī tvaṁ pumān asi, tvam kumāra uta vā kumārī, tvaṁ jīrṇo daṇḍena vañcayasi," etc.

[2] See Gough, p. 222; and *Śvet. Upan.*, III. 19: "apāṇipādo javano grahītā, paśyaty acakshuḥ sa, śrinoty akarṇaḥ."

[3] See Barnett, pp. 5-6.

[4] See Gough, p. 84.

[5] See Plato, *Theaetetus*, 152 D. And Aristotle, *De Caelo*, Γ, 1, 298*b*, 30: *οἱ δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα γενέσθαι φασὶ καὶ ῥεῖν, εἶναι δὲ παγίως οὐθέν, ἓν δέ τι μόνον ὑπομένειν, ἐξ οὗ ταῦτα πάντα μετασχηματίζεσθαι πέφυκεν· ὅπερ ἐοίκασι βούλεσθαι λέγειν ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ καὶ Ἡράκλειτος ὁ Ἐφέσιος.*

Also *Cratylus*, 402 A: *Λέγει που Ἡράκλειτος, ὅτι πάντα χωρεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν μένει, καὶ ποταμοῦ ῥοῇ ἀπεικάζων τὰ ὄντα λέγει, ὡς δὶς ἐς τὸν αὐτὸν ποταμὸν οὐκ ἂν ἐμβαίης.*



common to Greek and Indian thought. Even the very metaphors employed by Greek and Oriental to express this view are the same. Thus in the *Cratylus* we are told that the comparison of the world to a river by Heracleitus is nothing new, and that the Homeric and Hesiodic idea of Ocean as parent of all things pointed to a similar sense of the plurality and change of the Universe. So too in the *Kaṭha Upanishad*[1] we read of the One Supreme Being that "It is bodiless and in all bodies, unchanging and in all changing things"; and in the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka*,[2] that "The Self is that into which all things pass away even as the Ocean is the one thing into which all waters flow"; while the Self in Unity and Plurality is often compared respectively to a sheet of water and the drops of water which compose it. Heracleitus, however, though commonly spoken of as the great apostle of the Doctrine of Plurality, was also, like the early Indian Philosophers, firmly convinced of the Unity of Being or the Universe,[3] which was by him represented as Wisdom or Thought, just as Brahma represents Wisdom in the *Upanishads*. For example, he tells us:[4] "The wise is one only. It is unwilling and willing to be called Zeus"; and again: "Wisdom is one thing. It is to know the thought by which all things are steered through all things." Clearly, then, the Wisdom of Heracleitus was identical with the "Uncaused Omniscient Cause of All" of the early Hindus. Nor is it strange that one who lived among Fire-worshipping Persians should also speak of the Universe as Fire. Thus he tells us that "this world . . . no one of gods or men has made; but it was ever, is now, and ever shall be an everlasting Fire." Now in the *Kaṭha Upanishad*,[5] the "Sacred Fire that leads to Paradise," is called "the basis of the world," and is a figurative term for Purusha or the Divine Soul dwelling in all earthly bodies. Again we know that the reason of Heracleitus' choice of Fire as the Symbol or Principle of the Universe was that he regarded it as passing into all

[1] Gough, p. 125.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 152.

[3] See Campbell's *Theaetetus*, Appendix A, p. 243.

[4] *Ἓν τὸ σοφὸν μοῦνον λέγεσθαι οὐκ ἐθέλει καὶ ἐθέλει, Ζηνὸς οὔνομα*: frg. 65 (in Campbell's *Theaet.*, p. 244).

[5] See Gough, pp. 118-9.

things, and so as typifying Unity in Plurality.[1] This is just the idea of the *Upanishads*, as the following quotation from the *Kaṭha* will make clear:[2] "As one and the same fire pervades a house and shapes itself to the shape of everything, so the one self that it is in all living things shapes itself to all their several shapes, and is at the same time outside them." Moreover, his saying that "Fire lives the death of Air, and air lives the death of Fire; water lives the death of Earth, earth that of water," implies much the same order of creation as that in which the early Indians believed. Thus in the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka* we read:[3] "Out of this same Self the ether arose, from ether air, from air fire, from fire water, from water earth." Even more remarkable is the coincidence of his thought with Hindu doctrine shown in his notion that Man was composed of three things, viz. fire, water, and earth. This is precisely the teaching of the *Chāndogya Upanishad*, according to which the human microcosm is composed of Heat, Water, and Food (or Earth).[4] But Heracleitus, according to Aristotle,[5] regarded the soul of man as fire; so that here, again, he approaches the teaching of the *Upanishads*. For we have already seen that the mystic fire is a figurative appellation of the individual soul or Purusha. Finally, when he speaks in one of his fragments of "the thunderbolt that steers the course of all things," he is presumably referring to his Sacred Fire or Supreme Principle, and this is one of the epithets bestowed on the Self in the *Kaṭha Upanishad*, where it is spoken of as "the great awe, the uplifted thunderbolt." On the other hand, his ideas on the subject of sleeping and waking are exactly opposite to the Indian notion, according to which the state of sleep, whether dreaming or dreamless, was regarded as a higher state than the condition of the waking mind. The question as to whether Heracleitus believed in an ἐκπύρωσις[6] has been much debated. Burnet maintains that the doctrine was

[1] See Burnet, pp. 148-9 (1st ed.).
[2] See Gough, p. 134.
[3] See Gough, p. 75.
[4] See Barnett, *Notes on the Chāndogya Upan.*, p. 43.
[5] *De Anima*, A 2. 405*a*, 25: καὶ Ἡράκλειτος δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν εἶναί φησι ψυχήν, εἴπερ τὴν ἀναθυμίασιν, ἐξ ἧς τἆλλα συνίστησιν.
[6] See Burnet, p. 104 (1st ed.) and Aristotle, *Physics*, Γ, 205 *a*3; and *Metaph.* K. 1067*a*, 4: χωρὶς γὰρ τοῦ ἄπειρον εἶναί τι αὐτῶν, ἀδύνατον τὸ πᾶν, κἂν ᾖ



falsely attributed to him by the Stoics, who held that the Universe was capable of destruction, whereas Heracleitus declared that it was eternal. Zeller Diels and Gomperz, however, are all positive that this view was actually held by him. And we know that from very early times the Vedānta philosophy of the Hindus maintained the existence of Pralayas or successive dissolutions of the Universe; in fact, mention of this belief occurs in the *Bhagavad-Gītā*,[1] though not in what Max Müller considers as the Old *Upanishads*.[2] So that here again we may see another evidence of Oriental influence on the teaching of Heracleitus. It only remains to call attention to his theory of the harmony of opposites as exactly parallel to a leading principle of the Sāṃkhya philosophy. According to Müller this theory of the three qualities or *guṇas* is common to most Hindu philosophers, and consists of nothing more than thesis, antithesis, and something between the two, *e.g.*, good, bad, and neither good nor bad; bright, dark, and neither bright nor dark. Tension between these opposites produces activity and struggle, *i.e.* the Strife of Heracleitus, while equilibrium leads to rest. Last of all, in connection with the subject of Dionysos, it is particularly interesting to note that in one of his fragments Heracleitus couples "Magians, priests of Bakchos and priestesses of the wine-vat" together—which would tend to confirm the theory that the cult of Dionysos was closely associated with Persia. His other statement relating to Dionysos, viz. that he was "the same as Hades," is also noteworthy, and, when we learn that the Asiatic equivalent of Dionysos was largely a deity of the dead, it would seem not unlikely

πεπερασμένον, ἢ εἶναι ἢ γίγνεσθαι ἕν τι αὐτῶν, ὥσπερ Ἡράκλειτός φησιν ἅπαντα γίγνεσθαί ποτε πῦρ.

Also *De Caelo*, A. 279*b*, 16: γενόμενον μὲν οὖν ἅπαντες εἶναί φασιν (sc. τὸν κόσμον), ἀλλὰ γενόμενον οἱ μὲν ἀΐδιον, οἱ δὲ φθαρτὸν ὥσπερ ὑτιοῦν ἄλλο τῶν συνισταμένων, οἱ δ' ἐναλλὰξ ὅτε μὲν οὕτως ὅτε δὲ ἄλλως ἔχειν φθειρόμενον, καὶ τοῦτο ἀεὶ διατελεῖν οὕτως, ὥσπερ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς . . . καὶ Ἡράκλειτος.

Cp. Diog. Laert., ix § 8: καὶ (φησι) ἕνα εἶναι κόσμον. Γεννᾶσθαί τε αὐτὸν ἐκ πυρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐκπυροῦσθαι κατά τινας περιόδους ἐναλλὰξ τὸν σύμπαντα ἀιῶνα.

[1] See *Bhagavad-Gītā*, ix, 7, and *Six Systems of Ind. Phil.*
[2] Müller, however, seems to think that the belief was a very early one, even though it does not make its appearance in the sacred literature of India till a later date.

that in this fragment we have another example of Persian influence.

In the writings of *Parmenides* of Elea (flourished 504 B.C.) we find a Greek parallel to another side of the teaching of the *Upanishads*, namely, that which insists on the Unity of Being rather than on its manifestations in various forms. Thus Parmenides, in his *True Way of Belief* (fr. 26 Jackson),[1] tells us that Being alone is:

> Nor ever had It birth, nor may It die,
> Lonely, complete, unmoved and undecaying,
> Nor was It ever in the past, nor will be,
> Since now *It is*, continuous and One.

Compare this with the teaching of the *Chāndogya Upanishad*, where we are told:[2] "Being was This in the beginning, One with naught beside"; and with that of the *Kaṭha Upanishad*:[3] "It is,—only thus is the Self to be known . . . Its real nature reveals itself only when it is known as that which is." Indeed the characteristics of Being as given in the fragment of Parmenides, just quoted, are all to be found in this *Upanishad*. For the Self is there[4] called "undecaying, imperishable . . . without beginning and without end, . . . immutable." Moreover, both Parmenides and the *Chāndogya* feel the same prejudice against the possibility of Being arising out of Not-Being.[5] Again, Parmenides' distinction between True Belief and Opinion meets us also in the Vedānta philosophy. According to the Greek philosopher only Being *is*, other distinctions, such as "warm" and "cold," belonging to the realm of Opinion. So, too, the Brahman held that only Being exists. To him it is "the true, the infinite"; and it is due to Illusion that the World-Fiction presents itself, and is believed to be real by the many, who have not attained spiritual intuition.

[1] Jackson, frg. 26: . . . *ἀγένητον ἐὸν καὶ ἀνώλεθρόν ἐστιν, | οὖλον μουνογενές τε καὶ ἀτρεμὲς ἠδ' ἀτέλεστον, | οὐδέ ποτ' ἦν οὐδ' ἔσται ἐπεὶ νῦν ἔστιν, ὁμοῦ πᾶν, | ἕν, ξυνεχές.*

[2] Barnett, p. 6. [3] Gough, p. 137. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 128.

[5] Cp. Burnet, p. 186, and Barnett, p. 6: "Now some say that Not-Being was this in the beginning, One with naught beside, and from this Not-Being was born Being. But how in sooth may it be so? . . . How from Not-Being may Being be born?"



We may pass over Empedocles and Anaxagoras as being rather scientific than philosophical in their teaching, and so as less likely to be influenced by Oriental thought. In some points, however, we can trace their affinity to the Eleatic School, while the personality of Empedocles has been thought to be "almost as much Hindu as Greek."[1] Garbe recalls the fact that his theories of metempsychosis and evolution correspond with those of the Sāṃkhya philosophy, and that his statement that "Nothing can arise which has not existed before, and nothing existing can be annihilated," is the same as the *Sat-Kārya-Vāda* doctrine of the same system, or its belief in the eternity and indestructibility of matter. Garbe also would see a connection between the dualism of Anaxagoras and that of the Sāṃkhya philosophy, while it is obvious that his Nous represents the same idea as the Brahma of the *Upanishads*.

So far we have been dealing with Greek Philosophy in the sixth and fifth centuries. Let us now turn to examine the evidences of Asiatic thought to be found in this domain during the early part of the fourth century. In the writings of *Plato* we shall have no lack of coincidences of thought and expression with early Indian philosophy.[2] In the *Phaedo*, for example, there occurs the celebrated simile of the weaver and the soul which recalls an image in the *Bhagavad-Gītā*. In the latter work we are told that "as a man abandons worn-out clothes and takes other new ones, so does the soul quit worn-out bodies, and enter other new ones."[3] So, too, the hindrances placed by the body in the way of the soul's endeavour to attain truth, as

[1] See Garbe, pp. 34 and 35.

[2] Garbe, pp. 40-1, tells us that Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire in his *Premier Mémoire sur le Sâṅkhya* (Paris 1852) points out certain analogies to the Sâṅkhya doctrines in Plato's works; but I have not been able to consult this work.

[3] Plato, *Phaedo*, 87 C: *ὁ γὰρ ὑφάντης οὗτος πολλὰ κατατρίψας τοιαῦτα ἱμάτια κ. τ. λ.*, and *Bhagavad-Gītā*, chap. II. sloka 22:

> vāsaṅsi jīrṇāni yathā vihāya
> navāni grihṇāti naro aparnāni/
> tathā śarīrāṇi vihāya jīrṇāny
> anyāni saṁyāti navani dehī.

depicted in the *Phaedo*,[1] are the very same as those so frequently alluded to in the *Bhagavad-Gītā*. Again the ἀτραπός τις of *Phaedo* 66 B, which has caused so much controversy, recalls the frequent use of the metaphor of a path in the *Upanishads*, and more especially the "two ways of white and black," which "are eternally decreed to the world" in the eighth chapter of the *Bhagavad-Gītā*.[2] These two paths symbolize metempsychosis and the final escape from the body; and if we accept Olympiodorus' interpretation of the passage in the *Phaedo*, which takes the "path" as a "by-way," and sees a reference to the Pythagorean maxim φεύγειν τὰς λεωφόρους ("avoid the ordinary thoroughfares"), the parallel becomes still closer. For in chap. XII of the Sanskrit text we are told that "the path which is not manifest is with difficulty attained by mortals,"[3] in an allusion to the path of escape from metempsychosis. As regards the generally Orphic tone of the *Phaedo* and its contempt for bodily pleasures, we need only, among other passages, recall the eleventh chapter where Plato denies the possibility of "pure knowledge" as long as the soul is fettered by the body, and declares that it is only after death that the soul is capable of perfect intellectual attainment, "for then it will be alone by

[1] *Phaedo*, chaps. IX. and X. generally, and 65 C.: Λογίζεται δέ που τότε κάλλιστα (sc. ἡ ψυχὴ) ὅταν αὐτὴν τούτων μηδὲν παραλυπῇ, μήτε ἀκοὴ μήτε ὄψις μήτε ἀλγηδὼν μηδέ τις ἡδονή, ἀλλ' ὅ τι μάλιστα αὐτὴ καθ' αὑτὴν γίγνηται ἐῶσα χαίρειν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ καθ' ὅσον δύναται μὴ κοινωνοῦσα αὐτῷ μηδ' ἀπτομένη ὀρέγηται τοῦ ὄντος.

[2] Cp. *Bhag-Gītā*, chap. VIII. sloka 26:

śuklakṛishṇe gatī hy ete jagataḥ śāśvate mate
ekayā yātyanāvṛittim anyayāvartate punaḥ.

"For these two ways of white and black exist by an eternal ordinance; by the one a man goes without return, by the other he returns again."

[3] *Bhag.-Gītā*, chap. XII. sloka 5:

avyaktā hi gatir duḥkhaṁ dehavadbhiṛ avāpyate

Note that there is abundant evidence of Pythagorean influence in the *Phaedo*, and hence it is not surprising that Olympiodorus should so interpret the use of ἀτραπός. In connection with this metaphor we have yet another parallel to Greek phraseology in the *Upanishads*. Thus in the *Kaṭha Upan.* (3rd Vallī) the path of release is spoken of as "a sharp *razor's edge* hard to walk across, a difficult path." Now ἐπὶ ξυρῷ βαίνειν is a familiar idiom in the Greek poets for a difficult or critical task. Cp. Herodotus, VI. 11; Aesch., *Choephoroi*, l. 883; Soph., *Antig.*, 996.



itself without the body."[1] This very much resembles the Hindu notion of dreamless sleep in which the soul becomes, as it were, separated by the cessation of the functions of the faculties and organs,[2] while it is itself, in this condition, One with the Supreme Knowledge. Indeed the theme of this dialogue might well be summed up in the following quotation from the *Kaṭha Upanishad*: "The unwise follow after outward pleasures and enter into the net of wide-spread death; but the wise, who know what it is to be immortal, seek not for the imperishable amidst the things that perish."[3]

In the *Sophistes* the amplitude of classification, frequent metaphors, introduction of the idea of καθάρσεις, and the coupling of Vice and Ignorance as the two evils of the soul, are all very Oriental features. In this dialogue also we have references to the impossibility of Not-Being, and the remark of the Eleatic Stranger, τό τε δύο ὀνόματα ὁμολογεῖν εἶναι, μηδέν θέμενον πλὴν ἕν, καταγελαστόν που (p. 244), reminds us of the Vedānta doctrine that it is absurd to call anything by any name but the Self. So, too, the indivisible nature of the One in the *Sophistes*[4] finds a parallel in "The stainless, indivisible Self . . . in that last bright sheath the heart," etc.;[5] while the notion that Being partakes of Motion and Rest has already been mentioned as one of the chief tenets of the Vedānta School.[6] On the other hand, the view expressed by Plato in this dialogue that some things can enter into communication, while others cannot, is opposed to Oriental notions, and is an example of the superior

[1] *Phaedo*, 67 A: τότε γὰρ αὐτὴ καθ' αὑτὴν ἡ ψυχὴ ἔσται χωρὶς τοῦ σώματος, πρότερον δ' οὔ. καὶ ἐν ᾧ ἂν ζῶμεν, οὕτως, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐγγυτάτω ἐσόμεθα τοῦ εἰδέναι, ἐὰν ὅτι μάλιστα μηδὲν ὁμιλῶμεν τῷ σώματι μηδὲ κοινωνῶμεν κ. τ. λ.

[2] See Gough, p. 41.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 126. Note, too, the following Orphic notion in the *Phaedo*, chap. 57: οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο ἔχουσα εἰς Ἅιδου ἡ ψυχὴ ἔρχεται πλὴν τῆς παιδείας τε καὶ τροφῆς ἃ δὴ καὶ μέγιστα λέγεται ὠφελεῖν ἢ βλάπτειν κ. τ. λ.; and cp. (Gough, p. 62), the following from the Śāṇḍilyavidyā of the *Chāndogya Upan.*: "The soul is made of thought, and as its thought has been in this life, such shall its nature be when it departs out of this life."

[4] See *Sophistes*, p. 245: ἀμερὲς δὴ που δεῖ παντελῶς τό γε ἀληθῶς ἓν κατὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον εἰρῆσθαι.

[5] See Gough, p. 107; *Muṇḍaka Upan.*, 2. 2.

[6] *Sophistes*, p. 248. Cp. Gough, p. 125: "Motionless it moves afar," etc.

clarity of Greek metaphysics. Again, when Plato tells us (p. 254) that the philosopher who dwells in the region of Being is not easy to be seen, "on account of the brightness . . . of the place . . . for the mental vision of the multitude cannot endure to look towards the Divine," the thought of the passage is much the same as that of the *Upanishads*. Thus "The Good, the Self is not reached by many that they should hear it; and many hearing of it know it not" (*Kaṭha Upanishad*, 2nd. Vallī); and the Self is spoken of as "the one thing that gives light in all things that have no light"; and we are told that "All things shine after it as it shines, all this world is radiant with its light." In *Sophistes* (p. 226) dreams are spoken of as δαιμονίᾳ . . . μηχανῇ γεγονότα. So in the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka*[1] we read that "in the dreaming state there are no chariots, no horses, no roads; but the Self presents to itself chariots, horses, and roads" in sleep, where it is called the Hiraṇyagarbha, or spirit that permeates all dreaming souls; and in this we see that Plato approaches more nearly than Heracleitus to Oriental ideas concerning the dreaming state.

The *Politicus* is a most interesting dialogue on account of its markedly Oriental tone, especially as shown in the famous myth of the Ages of the World. Nearly all the examples of Orphic or Pythagorean influence in this dialogue present Oriental features. Thus the πρωτογενὲς εἶδος (p. 289), which is the same as the πρωτογένεια of the *Orphic Hymns*, is also identical with the *Pradhāna* or *Prakṛiti* or primaeval matter of the Sāṃkhya system. Similarly we see Oriental influence in the ideas of purification and abstinence from animal flesh in connection with the transmigration of souls, expressed in the phrase οὔτε ἀλλήλων ἐδωδαί[2] (p. 271), which is supposed to be a reference to the Orphic abstinence. Again the idea of the rotation of the Universe is just that of the Wheel of Brahma or Brahmacakra;

[1] Gough, p. 180.

[2] Cp. *Laws* of Plato, Book VI. 782 *c.*: σαρκῶν δ' ἀπείχοντο ὡς οὐχ ὅσιον ὂν ἐσθίειν οὐδὲ τοὺς τῶν θεῶν βωμοὺς αἵματι μιαίνειν, ἀλλὰ Ὀρφικοί τινες λεγόμενοι βίοι ἐγίγνοντο ἡμῶν τοῖς τότε, ἀψύχων μὲν ἐχόμενοι πάντων, ἐμψύχων δὲ τοὐναντίον πάντων ἀπεχόμενοι.

And Aristoph., *Frogs*, 1032: Ὀρφεὺς μὲν γὰρ τελετάς θ' ἡμῖν κατέδειξε φόνων τ' ἀπέχεσθαι.



while the Demiurgus of Plato is exactly the same as the Hindu *Īśvara* or Creator, also identified with the Wheel of Brahma in the following passage from the *Śvetāśvatara Upanishad*:[1] "We meditate upon that deity, the Demiurgus, as the wheel with one felly and three tires, with sixteen peripheries . . . a wheel that is multiform." A clear echo of the thought of the *Upanishads* in the same dialogue is also to be seen in the idea put forward by Plato that the body of the Universe,[2] having existed from some immemorial time before the commencement of the period of the earth's decline, is made responsible for the destruction of the world, but the Supreme Creator is responsible only for Good. This closely corresponds with the notion of the *Upanishads* that the Creator is not responsible for Evil, but that Māyā or the principle of Evil co-exists with him from immemorial time.[3]

But the really remarkable feature of the Myth in the *Politicus* is that of the alternating cycles of increase and decrease in the Universe, men being born gray-headed and all creatures being smaller than their wont in the cycle of decrease, while in the cycle of increase the contrary process takes place.[4] In this we note a striking coincidence of thought with the belief of the Jains of India. We have already met with the Sāṃkhya doctrine of Great Cycles in the teaching of Heracleitus; for, like him, the Sāṃkhya held that Mahāyugas, or Great Ages (of 4,320,000 years), occurred in the history of the Universe, succeeding one another to eternity and absolutely identical. According to the Jain form of this doctrine,[5] we have, as in the myth above quoted, a cycle

[1] Gough, p. 214. Cp. *Politicus*, p. 273: τὰ νοσήσαντα καὶ λυθέντα ἐν τῇ καθ' ἑαυτὸν προτέρᾳ περιόδῳ στρέψας κ. τ. λ.

[2] *Politicus*, p. 273.

[3] Cp. Gough, pp. 206-8.

[4] See *Politicus*, 273 E: στρεφθέντος γὰρ αὖ τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἐπὶ τὴν νῦν γένεσιν ὁδὸν τὸ τῆς ἡλικίας αὖ πάλιν ἵστατο καὶ καινὰ τἀναντία ἀπεδίδου τοῖς τότε. τὰ μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ σμικρότητος ὀλίγου δέοντα ἠφανίσθαι τῶν ζώων ηὐξάνετο, τὰ δ' ἐκ γῆς νεογενῆ σώματα πολιὰ φύντα πάλιν ἀποθνήσκοντα εἰς γῆν κατῄει.

[5] See *L'Origine du Monde d'après les livres sacrés de l'Inde et de la Perse*, pp. 73-4, by M. de Milloué in the *Annales du Musée Guimet* (1898-9): "De toute éternité, sans que jamais il y ait eu un commencement, cet univers se compose de trois mondes . . . et passe successivement par deux périodes, l'un de décroissance, l'Avasarpinî, l'autre de croissance, l'Outsarpinî, divisées, chacune, en six âges. Au commencement du premier âge de l'Avasarpinî, les hommes ont une stature gigantesque," etc.

of decrease (Avasarpinī) followed regularly by a cycle of increase (Ūtsarpinī) and each of six ages, and this process goes on for ever. During the first age of the period of increase men grow to a gigantic height and live for several hundred years, diminishing gradually in height and age in the remaining five ages of this period, till in the first age of the period of decrease they only attain a height of sixty centimetres and live only for ten years, but increase proportionately during the five remaining ages of the period till they again attain their period of increase. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that Plato was here borrowing from some Oriental source. We may conclude the mention of this dialogue by drawing attention to the metaphor derived from the weaver's art[1] which plays so large a part in it and appears to be a favourite both with Plato and the writers of the *Upanishads*. Thus, besides the image taken from weaving, already quoted from the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, we have frequent references in these writings to the Universe as "woven across Brahma warp and woof."

The famous passage[2] in the *Phaedrus* on the immortality of the soul (245 C) beginning **Ψυχὴ πᾶσα ἀθάνατος**, and showing that it has had no beginning and hence must have no end, should be compared with the following from the *Upanishads*:[3] "This Self of all souls, unchanging from before all time, present everywhere, and everywhere diffused, which the expositors of Brahman declare to have had no genesis, and which they say shall have no end," etc.; and with another passage[4] relating to the Self from the same source, viz.: "It is the actuator of all the world, of things that move and things that move not," should be compared the statement in the *Phaedrus* as to the self-moving properties of the soul.[5] Again, the well-known simile of the

[1] See *Politicus*, p. 281, etc.

[2] *Phaedr.*, 245 D: *ἀρχὴ δὲ ἀγένητον. ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ἀνάγκη πᾶν τὸ γιγνόμενον γίγνεσθαι, αὐτὴν δὲ μηδ' ἐξ ἑνός· εἰ γὰρ ἔκ του ἀρχὴ γίγνοιτο, οὐκ ἂν ἐξ ἀρχῆς γίγνοιτο. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀγένητόν ἐστι, καὶ ἀδιάφθορον αὐτὸ ἀνάγκη εἶναι.*

[3] See Gough, pp. 222-3. Cp. Strabo, Bk. XV. c. 1, concerning the Brahmans: *παραπλέκουσι δὲ καὶ μύθους, ὥσπερ καὶ Πλάτων περί τε ἀφθαρσίας ψυχῆς, κ. τ. λ.*

[4] Gough, p. 222.

[5] *Phaedr.*, 245 C: *ψυχὴ πᾶσα ἀθάνατος. τὸ γὰρ ἀεικίνητον ἀθάνατον· τὸ δ' ἄλλο κινοῦν καὶ ὑπ' ἄλλου κινούμενον, παῦλαν ἔχον κινήσεως, παῦλαν ἔχει ζωῆς. μόνον δὴ*



chariot[1] in 246 A-247 C, though greatly expanded from what appears to have been the original allegory, has its prototype in Indian philosophy. Thus in the *Kaṭha Upanishad* we read:[2]

"Know that the soul is seated in a chariot, and that the body is that chariot. Know that the mind is the charioteer, and that the will is the reins.

"They say that the senses are the horses, and that the things of sense are the road. The wise declare that the migrating soul is the Self fictitiously present in the body, senses, etc.

"Now if the charioteer, the mind, is unskilful, and the reins are always slack, his senses are ever unruly, like horses that will not obey the charioteer.

"But if the charioteer is skilful, and at all times firmly holds the reins, his senses are always manageable, like horses that obey, etc.

"If the mind, the charioteer, lacks knowledge, and does not firmly hold the will, and is always deficient in purity, the soul fails to reach the goal, and returns to further transmigration.

"But if the charioteer has knowledge, and firmly holds the will, and is at all times pure, the soul then arrives at the goal, and on reaching it is never born again."

It will be noticed that in the above quotations we have no reference to winged souls as in the *Phaedrus*; but, on the other hand, there is a Pythagorean element in the Platonic passage in the mention of the central position of Hestia[3]—one of the names given by the Pythagoreans to the Central Fire[4]—which recalls what we know of the doctrine of the *Avesta*. And Plato's description of the Divine Essence in 247 C as: **ἀχρώματός τε καὶ**

*τὸ αὐτὸ κινοῦν, ἅτε οὐκ ἀπολεῖπον ἑαυτό, οὔ ποτε λήγει κινούμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅσα κινεῖται τοῦτο πηγὴ καὶ ἀρχὴ κινήσεως.*

[1] See Garbe, p. 41, where we are told that E. Röer had already noticed the resemblance between the simile of the *Upanishads* and that in the *Phaedrus*.

[2] See Gough, pp. 127-8. Cp. *Śvetāśvatara Upanish.*, II. 9: dushṭhāśva-yuktam iva vāham enaṁ vidvāṇ mano dhārayet āpramattaḥ.

[3] See *Phaedr.*, 247 A: *μένει γὰρ Ἑστία ἐν θεῶν οἴκῳ μόνη*, and Thompson's note on this passage.

[4] Cp. Aristotle, *De Caelo*, c. 13: *ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ μέσου πῦρ εἶναί φασι*, (sc. *οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι*) *τὴν δὲ γῆν ἕν τῶν ἄστρων οὖσαν, κύκλῳ φερομένην περὶ τὸ μέσον νύκτα τε καὶ ἡμέραν ποιεῖν.*

ἀσχημάτιστος καὶ ἀναφὴς οὐσία, ὄντως οὖσα, suggests that of the Self in the same *Upanishad*[1] as "intangible and colourless," and a similar passage[2] in which it is said that: "Its form is not seen in anything visible; no man has seen this Self with his eyes: it is seen as revealed by the heart, the mind, the spiritual intuition" (cp. Plato's μόνῳ θεατὴ νῷ, περὶ ἣν τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἐπιστήμης γένος, in regard to the soul). We are further told that: "The Supreme Purusha is beyond the undeveloped principle, pervading all things, *characterless*;[3] and the migrating soul that knows this Purusha is loosed from metempsychosis and passes into immortality." The reference to the escape from death resembles the passage of the *Phaedrus* above referred to (248 B), where Plato speaks of a θεσμὸς Ἀδραστείας . . . ἥτις ἄν ψυχὴ θεῷ ξυνοπαδὸς γενομένη κατίδῃ τι τῶν ἀληθῶν . . . κἂν ἀεὶ τοῦτο δύνηται ποιεῖν, ἀεὶ ἀβλαβῆ εἶναι. So, too, the idea of the necessity of final perseverance in this quotation finds a parallel in the following dictum of the Ṛishi Yājñavalkya in the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka*:[4] "The Self is thought and bliss . . . the final goal of the sage that knows it, and perseveres in ecstatic union with it." And in ἄκραν ὑπὸ τὴν ὑπουράνιον ἀψῖδα πορεύονται πρὸς ἄναντες ἤδη (247 C) we perhaps have a parallel to the Hindu notion of the wheel of Brahma, *e.g.*, "The migrating soul wanders in this wheel or maze of Brahman, in which all things live and into which they shall return, so long as it thinks itself separate from the deity that actuates it from within; but it goes to immortality as soon as it is favoured by that deity" (*Śvetāśvatara Upanishad*).[5] Other features in this dialogue point to a strong probability of Asiatic influence, notably its Dithyrambic style.[6] It shows, moreover, a markedly Pythagorean tone, *e.g.*, in its reference to the body as the prison of the soul and to the need for purifications in καθαροὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀσήμαντοι τούτου ὃ νῦν σῶμα περιφέροντες ὀνομάζομεν, ὀστρέου τρόπον δεδεσμευμένοι (250 B). Compare with this the

[1] See Gough, p. 128. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 137.
[3] Cp. ἀσχημάτιστος in the passage from the *Phaedrus*.
[4] See Gough, p. 175.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 215. And *Śvet. Up.*, I. 6: "sarvvājīve sarvvasaṁsthe . . . haṁso bhrāmyate brahmacakre," etc.
[6] See chapter on the Dithyramb (VI).



following from the *Upanishads*: "If a man has been able to see this (*i.e.*, the Self) in this life before his body falls away from him, he is loosed from future embodiments. If not, he is fated to further embodiments in future ages,"[1] etc.. and also:

> Whoso shall find him the awaken'd Self,
> that lodgeth in this darkling patched up house,
> builder of all is he, the All he maketh.[2]

In the *Philebus*, which deals with the nature of pleasure, we notice a great resemblance to the ethics of early Indian philosophy. Thus, when Philebus gives it as his opinion that Pleasure rather than Wisdom makes men happy,[3] Socrates proceeds to contradict this view, and the general conclusions of the dialogue may be compared to the following extract from the *Kaṭha Upanishad*:[4] "The good is one thing, the pleasurable another. Both these engage a man, though the ends are diverse. Of these it is well with him that takes the good, and he that chooses the pleasurable fails of his purpose." And the following discussion in the same dialogue on the different kinds of Pleasure: τὴν δὲ ἡδονὴν οἶδα ὡς ἔστι ποίκιλον . . . ἥδεσθαι μέν φαμεν τὸν ἀκολασταίνοντα ἄνθρωπον, ἥδεσθαι δὲ καὶ τὸν σωφρονοῦντα αὐτῷ τῷ σωφρονεῖν[5] exhibits very much the same conception of the subject as we find in the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, where we read that: "He whose soul is not attached to the contact of external objects, and who finds pleasure within himself, whose soul is united, by means of devotion, to the Supreme Being, enjoys imperishable happiness. For those enjoyments which arise from external contacts are also the womb of pain. . . . The wise man does not take pleasure in them."[6] We should note also Socrates'[7] remark: Ἐν τῷ κοινῷ μοι γένει ἅμα φαίνεσθον λύπη τε καὶ ἡδονὴ

[1] See Gough, p. 135.
[2] See Barnett's version of chap. IV. § 3-5 of the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upan.*
[3] See *Philebus*, 12 A: ἐμοὶ μὲν πάντως νικᾶν ἡδονὴ δοκεῖ καὶ δόξει.
[4] See Gough, p. 122. [5] See *Philebus*, 12 C.
[6] See *Bhag.-Gītā*, chap. V. slokas 21-22:

> vāhyasparśeshv asaktātmā vindaty ātmani yaḥ sukhaṁ
> sa brahmayogayuktātmā sukhaṁ akshayaṁ aśnute;
> ye hi saṁsparśajā bhoga duḥkhayonaya(s) eva te
> ādyantavantaḥ, Kaunteya, na teshu ramate buddhaḥ.

[7] See *Philebus*, 31 B.

γίγνεσθαι κατὰ φύσιν, and compare it with the common notion of Indian philosophy by which Pleasure and Pain are spoken of as a "pair of opposites" (dvandva). Again the passage in the *Philebus*[1] that describes the life of wisdom as free from pleasure and pain alike, and as πάντων τῶν βίων . . . θειότατος recalls the idea of the *Upanishads* that the wise man who has recognized the Self "bids farewell to joy and sorrow" alike,[2] thus attaining immortality. In the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, especially, this notion is of frequent occurrence, *e.g.*, where the "disinterested man" is commended by the Supreme Being thus: "He from whom the world receives no emotion, and who receives no emotions from the world, who is free from the emotions of joy, envy, and fear, is dear to me."[3] So too he is called "the same in pleasure and in pain";[4] and we are told that mental error arises from "that delusion of natural opposites which springs from liking and disliking."[5] Similarly, in 44 B-D of the *Philebus*, the reference to those who deny the name of Pleasures to anything but relief from pain, and abhor the more intense pleasures, may contain an allusion to Oriental asceticism and the pursuit of apathy. In 46 B-C the "mixed" pleasures and the examples taken from "heat" and "cold" recall the familiar "pairs of opposites" of Sanskrit philosophy, *e.g.*, the pleasure and pain, heat and cold of the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, except that in Plato's view the opposites are present simultaneously. It is interesting to observe the far higher tone of Indian philosophy in contradistinction to Greek ethics, as exhibited in 49 D of this dialogue. There Socrates asks: οὐκοῦν ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς τῶν ἐχθρῶν κακοῖς οὔτ' ἄδικον οὔτε φθονερόν ἐστι τὸ χάιρειν; and Protarchus replies quite coolly τί μήν; "Of course not!" Contrast this with the Sāṃkhya doctrine which will not permit envy under any circumstances. So the

[1] See 33 A-B.
[2] See Gough, p. 124.
[3] See chap. XII. sloka 15:

yasmāṇ nodvijate loko lokāṇ nodvijate ca yaḥ
harshāmarshabhayodvegaiṛ mukto yaḥ sa ca me priyaḥ.

[4] Sloka 13: samaduḥkhasukhaḥ.
[5] See chap. VII. sloka 27:

icchādveshasamutthena dvandvamohena, Bharata,
sarvabhūtāni saṁmohaṁ sarge yānti paraṁtapa.



good man in the *Bhagavad-Gītā* is "without envy," *vimatsaraḥ*.[1]

On the other hand, we see a resemblance between the passage in the *Philebus* (52 B), in which the pure pleasures of science that are free from pain are said to belong not to the many, but to the few, and the following from the *Kaṭha Upanishad*:[2] "Here and there a wise man with the craving for immortality has closed his eyes and seen the Self." Finally, the identification of truth, and the pure intellect in the *Philebus* (65 D), where we read νοῦς δὲ ἤτοι ταὐτὸν καὶ ἀλήθειά ἐστιν ἢ πάντων ὁμοιότατόν τε καὶ ἀληθέστατον, is the same as the identification of the Supreme Mind or Brahma with the True in the *Upanishads*.[3] Moreover, the moderation which, according to Plato[4] in this dialogue, is characteristic of the intellect is exactly the means by which the "wise" man of the Sāṃkhya school continually strives to attain the Supreme knowledge.[5]

We have just had occasion to contrast the Sāṃkhya and Platonic notions on the subject of envy. It is interesting, therefore, to observe that the Socratic definition of Justice in the *Republic* as identical with Wisdom,[6] after it has been identified by Thrasymachus[7] with "another's good," finds a parallel in the

[1] See chap. IV. sloka 22.
[2] See Gough, p. 129.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 133: "It is the true, the infinite," and cp. the use of *Sat* or 'That Which Is," "The True," as a name for Brahma.
[4] Cp. 65 D *Philebus*: οἶμαι γὰρ ἡδονῆς μὲν καὶ περιχαρείας οὐδὲν τῶν ὄντων πεφυκὸς ἀμετρώτερον εὑρεῖν ἄν τινα, νοῦ δὲ καὶ ἐπιστήμης ἐμμετρώτερον οὐδ' ἂν ἕν ποτε.
[5] See *Bhag.-Gītā*, chap. VI. sloka 17:

yuktāhāravihārasya yuktaceshṭhasya karmasu
yuktasvapnāvabodhasya yogo bhavati duḥkhahā.

"Devotion, which destroys pain, is produced in one of moderate feeding and recreation, of moderate exertion in his actions, of moderate sleeping and waking." Note that "devotion" in the *Bhag.-Gītā* signifies the course pursued by the wise man in his quest of spiritual knowledge.
[6] See *Repub.*, 350 C: ὁ μὲν ἄρα δίκαιος ἡμῖν ἀναπέφανται ὢν ἀγαθός τε καὶ σοφός, ὁ δὲ ἄδικος ἀμαθής τε καὶ κακός.
[7] See 343 B-C: καὶ οὕτω πόῤῥω εἶ περί τε τοῦ δικαίου καὶ δικαιοσύνης . . . ὥστε ἀγνοεῖς, ὅτι ἡ μὲν δικαιοσύνη καὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἀλλότριον ἀγαθὸν τῷ ὄντι κ. τ. λ.

*Bhagavad-Gītā*, where we are told:[1] "As the unwise act, being self-interested in acting, so should the wise act, not being interested, from the wish to do good to mankind." In fact, throughout this latter work Self-interest is strongly condemned.

Similarly, the contempt shown by Plato in this dialogue towards Homer and Hesiod[2] because they promise sensual bliss to men in the next life as a reward for their justice, finds an echo in the following statement in the *Upanishads*:[3] "In their infatuation they think that the revealed rites and works for the public good are the best and highest thing, and fail to find the other thing that is better and higher still. When they have had their reward in the body in some upper mansion in paradise they return to a human embodiment or to a lower life than that of man." That is to say lower stages of merit in this world are, according to the doctrines of the *Upanishads*, rewarded by a temporary sojourn in the abodes of the Gandharvas and Pitris, where material enjoyments constitute the happiness of the inhabitants; but the highest state is that of complete absence of emotion or of physical pleasures.

In 373 D-376 C a discussion occurs as to what should be the nature of the rulers or guardians of the Ideal State. It is decided that they must be at once of a philosophic and a warlike disposition, and this forcibly reminds us of the early Indian Philosopher-Kings of the Warrior Caste.[4]

Again, when Plato declares[5] that God is not to be called the Cause of Evil, but of Good, and that evils are more numerous than blessings in this world, we observe that the train of thought is very Oriental, and the first statement may be compared to

[1] See *Bhag.-Gītā*, chap. III. sloka 25:

saktāḥ karmaṇy avidvaṁso yathā kurvanti
Bharata, kuryāḍ vidvāṁs tathāsaktaś cikīrshur lokasaṁgrahaṁ.

[2] See 363 A-D.

[3] See Gough, pp. 102-3, *Muṇḍaka Upan.*

[4] See *Repub.*, 376 C: *Φιλόσοφος δὴ καὶ θυμοειδὴς καὶ ταχὺς καὶ ἰσχυρὸς ἡμῖν τὴν φύσιν ἔσται ὁ μέλλων καλὸς κἀγαθὸς ἔσεσθαι φύλαξ πόλεως; Παντάπασι μὲν οὖν, ἔφη.*

[5] See 379 C: *οὐδ' ἄρα, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ὁ θεός, ἐπειδὴ ἀγαθός, πάντων ἂν εἴη αἴτιος, ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ ὀλίγων μὲν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις αἴτιος, πολλῶν δ' ἀναίτιος· πολὺ γὰρ ἐλάττω τἀγαθὰ τῶν κακῶν ἡμῖν· καὶ τῶν μὲν ἀγαθῶν οὐδένα ἄλλον αἰτεατέον, τῶνδὲ κακῶν ἄλλ' ἄττα δεῖ ζητεῖν τὰ αἴτια κ. τ. λ.*



the primitive Indian doctrine of Māyā, or the Principle of Illusion which, as we have already seen, is responsible for the Evil in the world, in contrast to Brahman,[1] who is identified with the Good. And, when it is said in 380 D that God never changes, and does not take many forms, we see a parallel to one side of the doctrine of the *Upanishads* of the immutability of the One, which only appears to change, inasmuch as it is itself all things. So, also, the identification of the Divine with what is true is the same theory that appears in the *Upanishads*. In the third book of the *Republic* Plato decides that the Guardians must be tested to see whether they possess the quality of firmness and perseverance.[2] This corresponds to the praise so often bestowed in the *Bhagavad-Gītā* on the man who is "firm," "immovable," the "same in pain and pleasure."[3] Still more remarkable is the coincidence of thought shown in the fact that the four classes[4] of Plato's Ideal State, viz. Rulers, Auxiliaries, Farmers, and Artisans are very nearly equivalent to the four Indian castes of Brahmans, Kshatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śudras. In the fifth book Plato introduces his famous theory of Ideas which has no parallel in Indian philosophy;[5] but, on the other hand, the Platonic distinction between

[1] See Gough, *Phil. of the Upan.*, chap. IX.

[2] See 412 E: *τηρητέον αὐτοὺς εἶναι ἐν ἀπάσαις ταῖς ἡλικίαις, εἰ φυλακικοί εἰσι τούτου τοῦ δόγματος καὶ μήτε γοητευόμενοι μήτε βιαζόμενοι ἐκβάλλουσιν ἐπιλανθανόμενοι δόξαν τὴν τοῦ ποιεῖν δεῖν ἃ τῇ πόλει βέλτιστα.*

[3] Cp. also *Bhag.-Gītā*, chap. VI. sloka 7:

jitātmanaḥ praśāntasya paraṃ ātmā samāhitaḥ
śītoshṇasukhaduḥkheshu tathā mānāpamānayoḥ.

"The soul of the self-subdued and passionless man is intent on the Supreme Being in cold and heat, pleasure and pain, and honour and ignominy."

So also we have the idea of perseverance in the definition of devotion (*yoga*) as "the separation from the connection of pain, in which thought ceases . . . and moreover, remaining in which he does not verge from the truth, and after receiving which he thinks no other acquisition superior to it, and during which he is not moved even by severe pain" (Book VI slokas 20-3).

[4] See 414 B-415 D. Compare Garbe's account in his *Philosophy of Ancient India*, p. 63, of the four Indian classes; but note that the Vaiśyas comprise both farmers and artisans, and the Śudras are little better than slaves.

[5] In Haug's *Essays* etc., p. 206, we are told that the ancient Persians'

Knowledge, Ignorance, and Opinion exactly corresponds to the Knowledge, Illusion, and Opinion of the multitude—for whom everyday semblances have an existence—in the *Upanishads*. In the sixth book the absorbing love of the philosophic nature for Being[1] reminds us of the following from the *Upanishads*: "Knowing him (*i.e.*, the Īśvara or Demiurgus), the sage ceases to speak of many things; his sport is in the Self, his joy is in the Self, his action is relative to the Self," etc.[2] And, just as in the *Upanishads*, we are told[3] that "this Self is to be reached by persevering truthfulness, self-coercion, precise intuition, and continence," so in 485 D of the *Republic* we find Plato insisting on the impossibility of pursuing philosophy and bodily pleasures.[4] The qualities here laid down as necessary for the philosopher are also much the same as those required of the devotee in the *Bhagavad-Gītā*. Thus Plato says his philosopher must be free from avarice, high-minded, courageous, just and gentle, quick to learn, retentive in memory, modest, and not given to extravagance. Now, in the *Bhagavad-Gītā* we read: "Modesty . . . patience, honesty . . . disinterestedness . . . constant equanimity, etc., this is called spiritual knowledge."[5] And elsewhere in the same work: "Fearlessness, purification of his nature . . . almsgiving . . . rectitude . . . freedom from anger, modesty, gentleness . . . stability, energy, etc.," are commended as virtues of one who is born to the lot of the gods.[6] It is also interesting to note that this work, like the *Republic*, strongly condemns covetousness. We should not insist, however, on these resemblances as containing clear proof of

notion of Fravashis or Guardian Angels existing from the beginning for every human being bears a resemblance to Plato's theory of ideas, in as much as they are eternal prototypes of those whom they guard. The parallel, however, seems rather far-fetched; for Plato imagined prototypes for other classes of objects besides human beings.

[1] See *Repub.*, 485 A-B: *τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τῶν φιλοσόφων φύσεων πέρι ὡμολογήσθω ἡμῖν, ὅτι μαθήματός γε ἀεὶ ἐρῶσιν ὅ ἂν αὐτοῖς δηλοῖ ἐκείνης τῆς οὐσίας τῆς ἀεὶ οὔσης κ. τ. λ.*

[2] See Gough, p. 109.

[3] See also p. 109 of Gough.

[4] See 485 D: *Ὧι δὴ πρὸς τὰ μαθήματα καὶ πᾶν τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐρρυήκασιν, περὶ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς, οἶμαι, ἡδονὴν αὐτῆς καθ' αὑτὴν εἶεν ἄν, τὰς δὲ διὰ τοῦ σώματος ἐκλείποιεν, εἰ μὴ πεπλασμένως ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς φιλόσοφός τις εἴη.*

[5] Chap. XIII.

[6] See chap. XVI. slokas 1-3.



borrowing on the part of Plato, for the reason that ethical standards would tend naturally to approximate among all civilized peoples.

On the other hand, the famous metaphor of the shipwreck of the Ideal City[1] and the revolt against the philosopher, shows unmistakable signs of Asiatic influence, inasmuch as Plato introduces it by a reference to Oriental art,[2] likening it to the strange blended animal forms in which the Eastern artist delighted.

And in the *Bhagavad-Gītā* we probably have the source of Plato's account of the disordered city and the revelry of the mutineers. Thus, the Indian work tells us that: "When a man's heart is disposed in accordance with his roaming senses, it snatches away his spiritual knowledge as the wind does a ship on the waves."[3] This is very much the same as the idea of the passage in the *Republic*, the roaming senses being the equivalent of the feasting mutineers who fail to guide the Ship of State.

In 508 A-509 Plato compares the Good to the Sun, which is itself compared to the human eye.[4] The same notion occurs in the following quotation from the *Upanishads*: "As the sun, eye of the whole world, is not fouled by the outward uncleannesses seen of the eyes, so the one Self within all born beings is not fouled by the world's grief and is without."[5] Similarly, the Self is called often "self-luminous," the "pure light of lights";[6] and, just as Plato compares the Good to the Sun as the maker of sight and knowledge, so the Self is: "That which dwells in the consciousness, inside the consciousness, which the consciousness

[1] See 488 A-489: *νόησον γὰρ τοιουτονὶ γενόμενον εἴτε πολλῶν νεῶν πέρι εἴτε μιᾶς· ναύκληρον μεγέθει μὲν καὶ ῥώμῃ κ. τ. λ.*

[2] See 488 A: *ἀλλὰ δεῖ ἐκ πολλῶν αὐτὸ ξυναγαγεῖν εἰκάζοντα καὶ ἀπολογούμενον ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, οἷον οἱ γραφεῖς τραγελάφους καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα μιγνύντες γράφουσιν.*

[3] See *Bhag.-Gītā*, chap. II. sloka 67:

indriyānāṁ hi caratāṁ yanmano 'nuvidhīyate
taḍ asya harati prajnāṁ vāyuṛ nāvaṃ ivāmbhasi.

[4] *Τὸν ἥλιον τοῖς ὁρωμένοις οὐ μόνον, οἶμαι, τὴν τοῦ ὁρᾶσθαι δύναμιν παρέχειν φήσεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν γένεσιν καὶ αὔξην κ. τ. λ.*

[5] See Barnett, p. 39.

[6] See Gough, pp. 178-9 and p. 107: cp. *Svet.-Up.*, III. 8: vedāham etaṁ purūshaṁ mahāntaṁ ādityavarshmaṁ tamasaḥ parastāṭ.

knows not, whose body the consciousness is, which actuates the consciousness from within . . . the internal ruler, immortal";[1] and again . . . "that other than which there is none that sees, none that hears, none that thinks, none that knows." Further, when Plato[2] speaks of the *ὑπερουσιότης* of the Good, and compares it to the Sun as the cause of *γένεσις*, and of all that is, we have to this parallels in the *Upanishads* where we read: "This is the all-permeating Self; it is the sun in the firmament, the air in the middle space. . . . It is the true, the infinite";[3] "the bliss above all bliss";[4] "supersensible *beyond the supersensible*";[5] "beyond the mind, ultimate, etc."[6]

And as in Plato's well-known proportional in 510 A images are said to bear the same relation to the objects represented by them as the lower *νοητά*, viz., mathematical figures, do to the higher *νοητά*, *i.e.* the Ideas, so in the philosophy of the Indians the waters of a mirage are said to bear the same relation to the sands of the desert—or the imaginary snake seen in a coil of rope to the coil of rope itself—as the fictitious emanations of this world and all in it bear to the Self.[7] In the seventh book the unreal nature of semblances is further illustrated by Plato in the simile of the Cave. In this allegory we are told that the person released from the cave, being dazzled by the light of day on escaping from his underground prison, would find it easier to view the reflections of objects in the water before looking at the objects themselves.[8] He also tells us that last of all would he be able to view the sun itself. Now to Plato these objects seen in water, etc., stand for the objects of everyday life, which in their turn are themselves the representatives or images of the

[1] See Gough, p. 168.

[2] See 509 B: *καὶ τοῖς γιγνωσκομένοις τοίνυν μὴ μόνον τὸ γιγνώσκεσθαι φάναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ παρεῖναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ εἶναί τε καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν ὑπ' ἐκείνου αὐτοῖς προσεῖναι, οὐκ οὐσίας ὄντος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, ἀλλ' ἔτι ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας πρεσβείᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ὑπερέχοντος.*

[3] See Gough, p. 132.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 109.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 128.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 71. Also *Sāṅkhya Aphorisms of Kapila*, Book III. Aph. 66.

[8] See 516 A: *Συνηθείας δή, οἶμαι, δέοιτ' ἄν, εἰ μέλλοι τὰ ἄνω ὄψεσθαι, καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τὰς σκιὰς ἂν ῥᾷστα καθορᾷ καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι τά τε τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων εἴδωλα, ὕστερον δὲ αὐτά.*



Ideas, the sun being the representative of the Supreme Good, of which the Ideas are the emanations. Similarly, in the *Upanishads* the Supreme Good, as we have seen, is likened to the sun, while the objects of everyday life are compared to pools that catch its reflection. Thus: "All living things are bubbles and foam that return to the water they issued from. All the bodies and minds of living things are like pools that reflect the sun; the pools disappear and the sun alone remains."[1] So also the confusion and dizziness[2] of the Platonic prisoner finds a parallel in the Hindu comparison of unphilosophic natures to "blind men led by the blind," who "are stricken with repeated plagues and go round and round."[3]

With reference to the phrase *τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς αὐγήν*, "the radiant light of the soul," in this very book of the *Republic*,[4] Adam remarks that the word *αὐγή* "is highly poetic in this sense," and that "there is more than a touch of mysticism in this and similar passages throughout Books VI and VII."

Now mysticism is exactly what we should expect to find as a result of Oriental influence, while it is obvious that Persian sources of inspiration might easily have prompted the frequent use of the similes concerning the sun and light, which meet us in these books.

In 532 B, where the allegory of the cave is again employed to illustrate the different steps in the process of attaining knowledge, the progress from *εἰκασία* to *πίστις* is likened to the prisoner's experience as he escapes from the darkness to the light and sees *φαντάσματα* or reflections in water of real things produced by natural lights, in contradistinction, on the one hand, to the shadows of images formerly seen which were thrown by an artificial light, and, on the other hand, to real objects themselves and to the light of the sun. So in the *Upanishads*[5] the Self or Supreme Knowledge is said to be revealed differently in different spheres. Thus: "This Self is seen in the heart as in a mirror, in the sphere of the forefathers as in a dream, in the sphere of the Gandharvas as on a watery surface, in the sphere of Brahma as in light and shade."

[1] See Gough, p. 153.

[2] See 515 E.

[3] See Gough, p. 102.

[4] See 540 A.

[5] See Gough, p. 136.

There are two other passages in the seventh book of the *Republic* which seem to point to Asiatic influence. In the first of these Plato satirizes the μουσικοί, who made the quarter-tone or διέσις their unit for the musical scale, and tried to overhear notes between the ordinary Greek intervals.[1] There can be little doubt that Asianism in music was at this time responsible for an increased number of notes in the scale as employed by many of the leading Athenian composers. For Indian music, as we shall see in a subsequent chapter,[2] permitted a far greater number in the scale than would have been allowed to Greek musicians of the fifth century B.C.; but during the fourth century certain natives of Asia Minor, who enjoyed unexampled popularity at the Athenian musical festivals, introduced an increase of notes and thus tended to alter the whole style of Greek music.

The other passage contains the famous metaphor of the ἱματίον ποικίλον (557 C), which is taken as the type of Democracy and of the principle of variety. This recalls the use of *Rūpa* or Colour in the *Upanishads* to denote one of the two principles of Diversity in the Universe, and it should further be noted that Plato and the Hindu alike regard this variety or colour as baneful.

In the ninth book we observe that Plato's views as to pure sleep and the power of the reasoning soul to see the future, while **αὐτὸ καθ' αὑτὸ μόνον καθαρόν** are the same as those of the *Upanishads*, where Īśvara is depicted as the sun of the sentiencies in pure, dreamless sleep.[3]

[1] See 531 A and Adam's note thereon.

[2] See chap. V.

[3] See 571 D-572 B: "Οταν δέ γε, οἶμαι, ὑγιεινῶς τις ἔχῃ αὐτὸς αὑτοῦ καὶ σωφρόνως καὶ εἰς τὸν ὕπνον ἴῃ τὸ λογιστικὸν μὲν ἐγείρας ἑαυτοῦ . . . τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν δὲ μήτε ἐνδείᾳ δοὺς μήτε πλησμονῇ, ὅπως ἂν κοιμηθῇ καὶ μὴ παρέχῃ θόρυβον τῷ βελτίστῳ χαῖρον ἢ λυπούμενον, ἀλλ' ἐᾷ αὐτὸ καθ' αὑτὸ μόνον καθαρὸν σκοπεῖν . . . οἶσθ' ὅτι τῆς τ'ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ μάλιστα ἅπτεται καὶ ἥκιστα παράνομοι τότε αἱ ὄψεις κ. τ. λ. Cp. also Gough, pp. 148-9. Even *dreaming* sleep is by the Hindu regarded as a higher state than waking experience (cp. Gough, pp. 180 and 181); for, "In dreaming the Self is its own light" (p. 181). This differs from Plato in part, but not wholly; for he considers *good* dreams as the work of the reason and as belonging to a higher state than that of waking experience, but makes the ἐπιθυμητικόν responsible for bad dreams, which the Hindu does not. See, however, Adam's note on this passage for the possibility that Plato merely holds pure sleep to be better than its contrary.



There is also a close resemblance between Plato's account of the Tyrant and the description of the passions characteristic of the Asuras or those of the infernal nature in the *Bhagavad-Gītā*.[1] But we need not draw any conclusions from this coincidence, inasmuch as the qualities here depicted are peculiar to the evil-doer in all ages and countries. On the other hand, we may note as interesting the verbal coincidence which appears when we compare Plato's metaphor of the many bad desires that make a *nest* in the person of the tyrannical man[2] with the Hindu simile of the body as "the vile nest" of the Supreme Soul.[3]

It is interesting also to observe that Plato's three varieties of the soul, as "knowledge-loving," "honour-loving," and gain-loving,"[4] correspond exactly with the different natures of the three Indian castes, viz., Brahmans, Kshatriyas, and Vaiśyas.

In 583 B, where all pleasures are declared to be more or less untrue and impure save those of Wisdom, Plato gives as his authority for this view "one of the philosophic," and this is taken, as usually, as referring to the Orphics and Pythagoreans. Now this is just one of those passages where Plato might equally well be supposed to allude to the teaching of some Ionian lecturer who had imbibed the doctrine of the *Upanishads*, either from his own sojourn among the Indians, or else by coming in contact with Hindu philosophers in the Persian Empire. The doctrine just stated is, in any case, in complete harmony with that of the *Upanishads*, and especially noticeable in this connection is Plato's category, immediately following, of Pleasure, Pain, and an intermediate neutral condition called ἡσυχία, which

[1] See *Bhag.-Gītā*, chap. XVI. slokas 7-16. Cp. *Repub.*, 573 C-576 B.

[2] 573 E: ἆρα οὐκ ἀνάγκη μὲν τὰς ἐπιθυμίας βοᾶν πυκνάς τε καὶ σφοδρὰς ἐννενεοττευμένας κ. τ. λ.

[3] See Gough, p. 180. Elsewhere (485 D) Plato compares the desires to a stream diverted from its channel and flowing in the direction of the truth (ὥσπερ ῥεῦμα ἐκεῖσε), *i.e.*, to Being. But in the *Upanishads* we read (see Gough, p. 152): "The Self is that into which all things pass away, even as the ocean is the one thing into which all waters flow," etc. So that here again we find the same metaphor applied by Greek and Indian alike to describe the Supreme Principle.

[4] See 580 B.

recalls the familiar three *guṇas* of the Hindu. Other points in this book which suggest Oriental influence are Plato's love of numbers shown in his proof that the King's happiness is seven hundred and twenty-nine times greater than that of the Tyrant, and the reference to the heavenly City,[1] which recalls the mention of Brahma as the eleven-gated City of the soul.

In the tenth book, when Plato identifies the Supreme Good with the "Great King,"[2] or King of Persia, as Supreme Ruler, it may be almost said that he goes out of his way to suggest Oriental influence, particularly when we recollect that in the *Upanishads* the name of the Supreme Good is Īśvara or Lord and Creator of all things. In this book also we have the myth of Er[3] the son of Armenius, who has been identified with Zoroaster by some of the ancients, and this together with the obviously Orphic provenance of the legend would point to Persian influence here at all events. In this myth we meet once more the "two ways" of the Orphics[4] which, as has already been stated, is a feature of the Sāṃkhya doctrine. And we may see in Plato's picture of the spindle[5] of Necessity, by means of which all the spheres revolve, a Hellenic version of the following tenet of the *Upanishads*: "The whole world issues out of that imperishable principle, like as a spider spins his thread out

[1] See 592 B: Ἀλλ', ἦν δ'ἐγώ, ἐν οὐρανῷ ἴσως παράδειγμα ἀνάκειται τῷ βουλομένῳ ὁρᾶν κ. τ. λ.

[2] 597 E: . . . τρίτος τις ἀπὸ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας κ. τ. λ.

[3] 614 B, etc., and see Adam's note.

[4] See Adam's *Repub.*, vol. ii, pp. 435-6.

[5] See Adam's edition, pp. 441-8: ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῖς ἐν τῷ λειμῶνι ἑκάστοις ἑπτὰ ἡμέραι γένοιντο, ἀναστάντας ἐντεῦθεν δεῖν τῇ ὁγδόῃ πορεύεσθαι, καὶ ἀφικνεῖσθαι τεταρταίους ὅθεν καθορᾶν ἄνωθεν διὰ παντὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς τεταμένον φῶς εὐθύ, οἷον κίονα, μάλιστα τῇ ἴριδι προσφερές, λαμπρότερον δὲ καὶ καθαρώτερον· εἰς ὃ ἀφικέσθαι . . . καὶ ἰδεῖν αὐτόθι κατὰ μέσον τὸ φῶς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὰ ἄκρα αὐτοῦ τῶν δεσμῶν τεταμένα . . . ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἄκρων τεταμένον Ἀνάγκης ἄτρακτον, δι' οὗ πάσας ἐπιστρέφεσθαι τὰς περιφοράς. Note also what Stewart says in his *Myths of Plato* (pp. 166-9) as to the position of Necessity in this myth and observe that the differences of opinion on this subject may be explained by reference to the *Upanishads* where Brahma is simultaneously depicted as at the centre of all things and embracing them. If, as Zeller holds, Necessity is to be identified with the Central Fire of the Pythagoreans, we have here a clear sign of Persian influence.



of himself and draws it back into himself again."[1] The parallel is complete when we learn that Brahma—the imperishable principle in question—is spoken of as "the upholder of the spheres," and that, as in Plato we have eight concentric whorls, so in the mythology of the Hindu there are in all eight spheres of which Brahma is the centre,[2] while the remaining seven are woven one on another around "the great centre of all things," the Divine Light, the base of the Universe. Surely the shaft of light in the myth in the *Republic* is the equivalent of Brahma as here shown, and the Platonic "chains" or "bonds" are the very same as the aerial cords of Purāṇic mythology.[3] In conclusion, the idea of the power of Necessity is intensely Oriental.

We may close this comparison of Greek and Indian philosophy with an examination of the points of resemblance between the *Timaeus* and the *Upanishads*. For it may almost be said that in this work Plato presents us with the few missing links of the chain which connects the philosophy of Hellas with that of early India.

The idea of the Demiurgus is very prominent in the *Timaeus*, which deals altogether with the creation of the Universe. This, according to Plato, is composed of Fire, Air, Water, and Earth,[4] and his teaching here coincides with that of the *Chāndogya Upanishad* in which Being first begets Heat or Fire, and this in turn Water, of which Breath or Air is the "thinnest" form, while from Water arises next Earth. Other points of likeness between the doctrine of the *Timaeus* and that of the *Upanishads*

[1] See Gough, p. 99.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 162-3.

[3] See Adam's edition, pp. 445, etc., and 616 C: εἶναι γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ φῶς ξύνδεσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οἷον τὰ ὑποζώματα τῶν τριήρων, οὕτω πᾶσαν συνέχον τὴν περιφοράν· And cp. Monier-Williams' edition of the *Śakuntalā*, p. 275: katarasmin marutāṁ pathi vartāmahe, *i.e.*, "In which path of the winds are we now moving?" M.-Williams here tells us that the Hindus divide the heavens into seven paths, assigning a particular wind to each. These are the orbits of different heavenly bodies, the seventh being that of the polar-star, to which, as Monier-Williams tells us, in a quotation from the *Vishṇu-Purāṇa*, "all the celestial luminaries are bound by aerial cords, and are made to travel in their proper orbits, being kept in their places by their respective bands of air."

[4] See chap. VII. *Timaeus*.

are those of the indissolubility of the Universe save by the will[1] of the Creator himself, and of the creation of its soul prior to that of its body;[2] and it is evident from Plato's construction of the World Soul that the circles of the Same and the Other placed therein respectively correspond with the two Hindu principles of Unity and Multiplicity in the Universe.[3] Again, the Pythagorean love of the number seven, shown in the division of the circle of the Other into seven concentric circles (36 D), is eminently characteristic of Oriental teaching and especially of that of the *Upanishads*. Thus we read there as follows: "The seven breaths proceed from him (*i.e.*, Brahma), the seven flames, the seven kinds of fuel, the seven oblations, the seven passages of the vital airs, the vital airs that reside in the cavity of the body, seven in each living thing."[4]

So also:[5] "Fire has seven wavy tongues—the black, the terrific, the thought-swift, the red, the purple, the scintillating, and the tongue of every shape, divine." While Vaiśvānara or Purusha, "the spirit that permeates all living bodies, is said to have seven members," viz., the sky, the sun, the air, the ethereal expanse, the food-grains, the earth, and the sacrificial fire.[6]

It has just been said that the circles of the Same and the Other in Plato are to be identified with Unity and Multiplicity respectively. It would be more accurate to say, in the case of the circle of the Same, that it typifies the principle of Being or

[1] 32 C: *ὥστ' εἰς ταὐτὸν αὐτῷ ξυνελθὸν ἄλυτον ὑπό του ἄλλου πλὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ ξυνδήσαντος γενέσθαι.* Cp. Gough, pp. 50-7, for the power of Īśvara.

[2] 34 C: *ὁ δὲ* (sc. *θεὸς*) *καὶ γενέσει καὶ ἀρετῇ προτέραν καὶ πρεσβυτέραν ψυχὴν σώματος ὡς δεσπότιν καὶ ἄρξουσαν ἀρξομένου ξυνιστήσατο ἐκ τῶνδέ τε καὶ τοιῶνδε τρόπῳ.* See Gough *passim* for the superiority of the soul to the body which it leaves behind at death, and especially pp. 132 and 133; and for the principle of Illusion as "the causal body" of Īśvara, the highest emanation of the Supreme Soul, see *Vedāntasāra*, p. 52 (Jacob's *Manual of Hindu Pantheism*). See also: yathā hi mahārājaḥ, etc., *i.e.*, "For as a king (among dependents)" of the Mind, in the commentary on *The Śaṅkhya Aphorisms of Kapila*, Book II, Aphor. 29, note *a*. Here it should be noted that the priority of the soul to the body is to be understood rather as one of conception than of actual creation.

[3] See Archer-Hind's note on pp. 106-7.

[4] See Gough, p. 105.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 102.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 69.



Unity in the form of its highest emanation, viz., that of the Demiurgus, and so corresponds with the Hindu Īśvara as the highest emanation of Brahman. This becomes clear when we read in 37 A that the World-Soul is framed of Same, Other, and Essence, *i.e.*, Pure Being.[1] These now coincide exactly with the three co-existent principles of the Universe in the *Upanishads*, viz., Īśvara, Māyā, and Brahman.[2]

And with Plato's soul permeating all things—*πάντῃ διαπλακεῖσα* in 36 E—we may compare the scholiastic explanation of Nṛisimhasarasvati of the presence of the Self in the Universe as quoted in Gough as follows: "The world-fiction, the Demiurgus or universal soul, and the characterless Self fictitiously present themselves in union; the universal soul and the fictitious universe being penetrated and permeated by the Self as a red-hot lump of iron is penetrated and permeated by fire."[3]

In 37 D the apparent inconsistency of Plato[4] in speaking of Time as an "*eternal* image (*αἰώνιον εἰκόνα*), moving according to number, of eternity that abides in unity," while at the same time we are told that there is no beginning of the *κόσμος* in time, finds a parallel in the *Upanishads* in the apparent contradiction involved in declaring Brahma to be the origin of all things, while also stating that the principle of Māyā is co-existent with it.

Similarly, the subordinate position of the gods to the Artificer in the *Timaeus* recalls that of the Hindu idea of the gods as fictitious emanations of the Self.[5] On the other hand, Plato's notion that the stars are the final goal of souls after they have passed through various transmigrations[6] bears only a partial

[1] *ἅτε οὖν ἐκ τῆς ταὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς θατέρου φύσεως ἐκ τε οὐσίας τριῶν τούτων συγκραθεῖσα μοιρῶν κ. τ. λ.*

[2] See Gough. Cp. *Śvet. Up.*, I. 7: "udgitam etat paraman tu Brahma; *tasmiṅs trayaṁ*; supratishṭhā," etc.

[3] See Gough, p. 93.

[4] For an explanation of this, see Archer-Hind's edition, pp. 119-20. Cp. also chap. XI: *Χρόνος δ' οὖν μετ' οὐρανοῦ γέγονεν, ἵνα ἅμα γεννηθέντες ἅμα καὶ λυθῶσιν, κ. τ. λ.*

[5] See Gough, pp. 172-3. Also *Timaeus*, chap. XI.

[6] C. XIV. 42 B: *καὶ ὁ μὲν εὖ τὸν προσήκοντα χρόνον βιούς, πάλιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ ξυννόμου πορευθεὶς οἴκησιν ἄστρου, βίον εὐδαίμονα καὶ συνήθη ἔξοι.*

resemblance to Hindu thought. For the latter, while acknowledging the existence of similar abodes to these, *i.e.*, those of the Gandharvas, as temporary resting-places for the dead, made unity with the Self their ultimate goal.[1]

In 42 D and E Plato virtually admits the Principle of Evil as co-existent with that of Good, and this, as we have seen, is one of the cardinal doctrines of the *Upanishads*. The objection in 49 D to calling "sensibles" "this" or "that"[2] recalls the constantly recurring phrase of the *Upanishads*, *Tat Tvam Asi*, *i.e.*, "*That* art Thou," applied to the Self, and signifying that the epithet "That" is only to be given to the Self. On the other hand, the transcendental nature of the One, though in many points resembling that of Brahma, differs from it in being described as οὔτε εἰς ἑαυτὸ εἰσδεχόμενον ἄλλο ἄλλοθεν οὔτε αὐτὸ εἰς ἄλλο ποι ἰόν.[3] For it should be observed that in this dialogue Plato rejects the doctrine of μέθεξις or participation of "sensibles" in the One. We may conclude the examination of the *Timaeus* by noting the similarity between Plato's idea of the head, or highest part of the soul, as a root planted in the heavens[4] and the following picture of Brahma: "This everlasting holy fig-tree stands with roots above, with branches downwards. Its root is that pure Self, the immortal principle. All the spheres of recompense have grown up upon it."[5]

Many of the above references from Plato and the earlier philosophers may appear trivial; while it may be urged, on the other hand, that the scope of this chapter is too restricted in failing, as it does, to treat of the later and more developed philosophy of Aristotle and the Neo-Pythagoreans, more especially as it is well known that the latter school was strongly tinged with Asianism. It must, however, be stated that here, as elsewhere in this book, the period before the Alexandrian Age has been chosen as affording the most valuable evidence for the problem of the origin of the Dionysiac cult, inasmuch as the worship

[1] See Gough, pp. 83-4, for the abodes of the Gandharvas.

[2] οὕτω δὴ τούτων οὐδέποτε τῶν αὐτῶν ἑκάστων φανταζομένων, ποῖον αὐτῶν ὡς ὂν ὀτιοῦν τοῦτο καὶ οὐκ ἄλλο παγίως διισχυριζόμενος οὐκ αἰσχυνεῖταί τις ἑαυτόν;

[3] 52 A.

[4] 90 A-B.

[5] Gough, p. 135.



had attained great popularity in Greece between the eighth and third centuries B.C.; while the early Ionian speculators have been selected for discussion on account of the strong probability of Asiatic influence in their case and the obvious link which they constitute between Hellenic and Oriental thought.

# CHAPTER IV

## ASIANISM IN THE GREEK HISTORIANS AND ORATORS

First Greek Historians nearly all natives of Asia Minor—Absence of historical writings among the early Indians—Asianism in the Greek historians of the fourth century—Biography—Romance—*Theopompus*—*Timaeus*—*Hegesias*—Rhythmical style of Sanskrit prose—Greek *Oratory*—Sicilian School of Rhetoric infected with Asianism—*Gorgias*—Compound words and love of metaphor very common in Sanskrit—Influence of Gorgias on Thucydides—*Isocrates*—"Gongorismo" and "Gorgiasm."

GREEK History, like Greek Philosophy, may be said to have arisen on the soil of Asia Minor. For the earliest Greek historians were natives of Asia, and, though themselves of Hellenic extraction, confined themselves to the study of the internal affairs of the Persian Empire. According to Bury[1] the first known Greek historian, *Hecataeus* of Miletus (born about the middle of the sixth century) introduced the Greeks to the history of Assyria, Media, and Persia in his *Map of the World.* Next after Hecataeus we hear of another citizen of Miletus, named Cadmus, who lived about the same time and wrote histories of the Ionian cities. It is interesting, as showing the importance of Miletus at this period, that the first Greek writers of history and philosophy alike should have been numbered among its citizens.

Other early Greek writers of history were: *Charon*[2] of Lampsacus, who wrote a history of Persia which came down to

[1] See his *Ancient Greek Historians.*

[2] For a sample of his style see Athenaeus XII. 19, p. 520 D: Τά ὅμοια ἱστόρησε καὶ περὶ Καρδιανῶν ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς Χάρων ἐν δευτέρῳ Ὥρων, γράφων οὕτως· „Βισάλται εἰς Καρδίην ἐστρατεύσαντο, κ. τ. λ., where we have the quaint legend about the Cardians and their dancing horses. For Charon's Oriental love of





492 B.C.; *Dionysius* of Miletus, who wrote, later than the foundation of the Confederacy of Delos, a sequel to the reign of Darius; *Scylax* of Caryanda, who surveyed the course of the Indus during the same reign, and left an account of his expedition; and *Xanthus*[1] of Lydia, who wrote a Lydian history.

In fact, before the age of Herodotus practically all the Greek writers of history were colonists in Asia, and concerned themselves chiefly with Oriental narrative. Accordingly, Bury tells us that "it was from the 'modern' history of the East that the Greeks went on to study the 'modern' history of Hellas."[2] If, however, their literary style presented what are usually reckoned Asiatic features, such as love of legend and fanciful diction,[3] this may be due in part to the fact that all early prose writings approximate naturally to poetry and the Epic style from which prose is ultimately evolved.[4] Indeed, the aim of these early Greek historians was to be scientific and accurate as far as their intellectual development and Asiatic environment permitted; and hence they must be judged by a very different standard from that applied to the writers of the fourth century, who consciously cultivated fables and indulged in florid Oriental descriptions.[5] Moreover, when reference is made to signs of Asianism

romance, see Frgs. 12 and 13 in Mueller, and note that both these extracts refer to the Nymphs, a subject, which, as we shall see in another chapter, was always a favourite of Indian poets.

[1] Xanthus would appear to have delighted in sensational narrative of an Oriental type, to judge by the fragment quoted in Athenaeus, X. 8, p. 415 C: Ξάνθος δὲ ἐν τοῖς Λυδιακοῖς Κάμβλητά φησι, τὸν βασιλεύσαντα Λυδῶν, πολυφάγον γενέσθαι καὶ πολυπότην ἔτι δὲ γαστρίμαργον. Τοῦτον οὖν ποτε νυκτὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα κ. τ. λ. There are besides some other equally lurid tales in the Asiatic manner to be found in his fragments.

[2] See *Ancient Greek Historians.*

[3] Cp. Diod. Sicul., I. 37: Οἱ μὲν γὰρ περὶ τὸν Ἑλλάνικον καὶ Κάδμον, ἔτι δ' Ἑκαταῖον, καὶ πάντες οἱ τοιοῦτοι, παλαιοὶ παντάπασιν ὄντες, εἰς τὰς μυθώδεις ἀποφάσεις ἀπέκλιναν.

[4] Cp. Strabo, Book I. c. 2: Ὡς δ' εἰπεῖν, ὁ πεζὸς λόγος, ὅ γε κατεσκευασμένος, μίμημα τοῦ ποιητικοῦ ἐστι. πρώτιστα γὰρ ἡ ποιητικὴ κατασκευὴ παρῆλθεν εἰς τὸ μέσον, . . . εἶτα ἐκείνην μιμούμενοι, λύσαντες τὸ μέτρον, τ' ἄλλα δὲ φυλάξαντες τὰ ποιητικά, συνέγραψαν οἱ περὶ Κάδμον, καὶ Φερεκύδην, καὶ Ἑκαταῖον.

[5] Cp. Strabo, Book I. c. 2, 35: φαίνεται γὰρ εὐθὺς, ὅτι μύθους παραπλέκουσιν ἑκόντες, οὐκ ἀγνοίᾳ τῶν ὄντων, ἀλλὰ πλάσει τῶν ἀδυνάτων, τερατείας καὶ τέρψεως χάριν.

in Greek historical literature we must not assume that we possess the means of instituting a comparison between the writings of these early Greek historians and those of Aryan rivals in this field. For the scanty remains of old Persian secular literature afford us only a few historical legends; and as regards Sanskrit[1] literature history is unknown. For the lack of early Indian historical writing different reasons have been assigned. One of these relates to the indifference to the present life brought about by the rise of Buddhism; the other concerns the peculiar circumstances of Indian history. It seems, however, probable that the temperament of the Aryan was alien to the study of history, and, indeed, this deficiency would appear to be reflected in those Greek historians who came most under Asiatic influence. In addition, it may be briefly stated that their shortcomings are exactly those which are most characteristic of ancient Indian literature in general; and it is accordingly for this reason that the term "Asianism" is applied in connection with their style.

With the downfall of Miletus and the commencement of the Persian Wars interest in the subject of Greek History may be said properly to begin. *Herodotus*,[2] though himself a native of an Asiatic city, is chiefly concerned with Persian history in so far as it affected Greece; while we now hear of Greek historians coming from Italy and Sicily, and no longer interested in Oriental affairs—such as *Antiochus* of Syracuse and *Hippys* of Rhegium. Later still the great historian of the Peloponnesian War shows this tendency even more clearly. In style as well as as in subject *Thucydides* is Hellenic and un-Oriental.[3]

[1] See Macdonell's *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 10: "History is the one weak spot in Indian literature. It is, in fact, non-existent."

[2] For the Asianism of Herodotus, cp. the sensationalism of the following: V. 92; IX. 108-112, and many other places. Cp. also the phrase, *ἀλγηδόνας ὀφθαλμῶν*, quoted in the treatise, *On the Sublime*, chap. IV, and note that what is there said as to the fact that it is merely a quotation by Herodotus of barbarian speech applies equally to the historian's accounts of the *deeds* of Asiatics, and hence we may consider his Asianism as accidental, and occasioned merely by the subject.

[3] Except, perhaps, in his speeches which show the influence of Gorgias. Contemporary with Thucydides we have Hellanicus of Lesbos, who wrote, among other works, treatises on the history of Persia and on the origins of the Greek cities in Asia. The fragments of these left do not show any particular signs of Asianism.



But with the beginning of the fourth century we note a reaction. In Greek History as in Greek Art a Medizing school now makes its appearance. The first signs of this are to be found in the rise of Biography. We cannot, however, maintain the existence of Biography any more than of History in ancient Persia or India. But works, such as the *Memorabilia* of *Xenophon* and the *Evagoras* of *Isocrates*, which were, according to Bury, among the "signs of the increasing love of anecdote and personalities akin to the spirit of romance," showed herein just those Oriental defects, from the standpoint of true historical capacity, which prevented the early Aryans from having any history of their own and made them preferably writers of fables. As regards Romance and its Asiatic origin, everyone will recall in this connection the Milesian tales of a later date.

But the first clear beginnings of Greek Romance date from the fourth century B.C. Thus in the sixth book of the *Cyropaedia*,[1] Xenophon gives us the love-story of Abradatas and Panthea, a tale of unmistakably Eastern provenance; and a similar tendency to dilate on romantic subjects is noticeable in *Duris* of Samos,[2] and in *Clitarchus*,[3] both writers of the Hellenistic era. Duris, moreover, affected pathetic scenes in historical narrative, another feature which shows affinity with Oriental taste.[4]

*Ctesias* of Cnidus, who lived at the court of Artaxerxes and wrote an account of Persian history, supplies us with romantic anecdotes in his narrative of the life of Semiramis and in certain

[1] See *Cyropaedia*, Books V, VI, and VII.

[2] See Bury's *Ancient Greek Historians*. For sensationalism in Duris, cp. fragments apud Athenaeus, XII. 529a (the fate of Sardanapalus), xii. 542b (the luxury of Demetrius of Phaleron) and XII, 546c (the drinking habits of famous rulers).

[3] Cp. his account of Harpalus and Glycera in his history of Alexander referred to by Athenaeus, Book XIII. 586 c. d. See, too, Bury, *Anc. Greek Hist.*, and note the following criticism of his style in the treatise, *On the Sublime*, c. 3: *φλοιώδης γὰρ ἀνὴρ καὶ φυσῶν κατὰ τὸν Σοφοκλέα, κ. τ. λ.*

[4] Cp. the trials of Sītā in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and of Damayantī in the *Mahābhārata*.

lurid tales of Oriental revenge.[1] These, it is true, are inseparable from the nature of his subject, and meet us also in Herodotus;[2] but Croiset considers that he tended to exaggeration and great prolixity,[3] both of which are undoubtedly Oriental mannerisms.

*Isocrates*, also, in his semi-historical sketches, displays distinctly Asiatic features, *e.g.*, a love of striking effects and a passion for rhythm.[4] His pupil, *Ephorus* of Cyme, reveals Asianism in his inclination to digressions and conventionality, and his weakness for panegyrics.[5] Strabo[6] censures him for giving credit to fables (in spite of his own declaration that he disapproved of this practice), and in this we note another Oriental trait. Similarly, the narrow personal motives attributed by him to Pericles and assigned as the cause of the Peloponnesian War, display a typically Asiatic lack of historical perspective. His habit of introducing detailed speeches at unsuitable times, noted by Croiset, reminds us of the incongruity perpetrated by later Indian writers in the insertion of the long philosophical dialogue, *Bhagavad-Gītā* in the *Mahābhārata*, where it is supposed to be spoken by Krishna in the midst of a battle.[7]

His fellow pupil *Theopompus*, who was notorious for his love of personality and scandal,[8] showing herein a truly Asiatic predilection for unpleasant details, was also a great lover of the fabulous.[9] He is censured in the Treatise *On the Sublime* for his

[1] See his tale of Parsondas and Nanaros. His Asiatic love of romance is shown in the story of Zarinaea and Stryangaeus (frg. 21 of Gilmore's edition).

[2] Cp. the passages mentioned in note 2, page 70.

[3] *E.g.*, in the tale of Parsondas.

[4] See Jebb's *Attic Orators*, vol. II.

[5] See Croiset's *Abridged History of Greek Literature.*

[6] Strabo, IX. p. 646: Ἔφορος δ', . . . δοκεῖ μοι πάναντία ποιεῖν ἐσθ' ὅτε τῇ προαιρέσει καὶ ταῖς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑποσχέσεσιν. Ἐπιτιμήσας γοῦν τοῖς φιλομυθοῦσιν ἐν τῇ τῆς ἱστορίας γραφῇ, καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπαινέσας, προστίθησι τῷ περὶ τοῦ μαντείου τούτου λόγῳ σεμνήν τινα ὑπόσχεσιν, κ. τ. λ.

[7] See Macdonell's *Sanskr. Liter.*, pp. 283-4.

[8] For example, in his abuse of Philip of Macedon (frg. apud Athenaeus, IV. 166 f-167 c, and elsewhere); of Cotys of Thrace (frg. ap. Athen. XII. 531 e-532 a); of the Illyrians (see Athen. X. 443 a-c).

[9] *E.g.*, his account of Pherecydes (see Diog. Laert., I. 11. 116); of Epimenides (Extract 69 of Grenfell and Hunt's edition); the narrative of Silenus (apud Aelian, *Var. Hist.*, III. 18).



frigidity in describing at excessive length the equipment of an embassy to the Persian king, and for his tendency to anti-climax in the same passage.[1] It will be shown in a subsequent chapter[2] that undue employment of detail in descriptive passages, frequently accompanied by anti-climax, is a very characteristic feature of Sanskrit poetry. Dionysius of Halicarnassus[3] compares Theopompus with Isocrates, and among other points of resemblance in their literary style notes a common inclination to pomp and grandeur of diction. This, surely, is of the very essence of Asianism. He blames Theopompus, however, for introducing inappropriate anecdotes, such as the Narrative of Silenus.[4] The passage, which is given at length in Aelian,[5] is an account of certain mythical cities and peoples, and in some respects recalls the myth of the *Politicus* concerning the recurring cycles of the universe. This, as we have already seen,[6] reveals clear marks of Oriental influence, and when we bear in mind that Theopompus was a native of Chios, an island just off the Asiatic coast, and that he himself records that the Magians[7] taught a doctrine of recurring cycles among gods and men not unlike the legend of the *Politicus*, it seems probable enough that the material for the Narrative of Silenus was largely derived from Oriental sources. We possess other fragments of this historian which display intimacy with the teaching of Zoroaster,[8] and hence tend to confirm the impression of Oriental influence in his case. Finally, as regards his love of marvels, we are told

[1] See c. 43: ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ Θεόπομπος ὑπερφυῶς σκευάσας τὴν τοῦ Πέρσου κατάβασιν ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον ὀνοματίοις τισὶ τὰ ὅλα διέβαλε. 'ποία γὰρ πόλις ἢ ποῖον ἔθνος τῶν κατὰ τὴν 'Ασίαν οὐκ ἐπρεσβεύετο πρὸς βασιλέα; τί δὲ τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς γεννωμένων κ. τ. λ.

[2] See chap. VI on "The Dithyramb."

[3] See *De Historicis*, 3: τὸ λεκτικὸν αὐτῷ τῷ 'Ισοκρατικῷ παραπλήσιον, πλὴν ὅσον μικρόν ἐστι καὶ σφόδρα εὔτονον τὰ δ' ἄλλα ὁμοία ἡ λέξις. καὶ γὰρ κοινὴ καὶ σαφὴς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπὴς, καὶ σεμνὴ, καὶ πομπικὴ, συνθέσεως τετυχηκυῖα τῆς πρὸς ἡδονήν.

[4] See *ibid.*: διήμαρτε δὲ καὶ ὅ μάλιστα ἐντὸς πρακτικῆς, κατὰ τὰς τῶν παρεκβάσεων ἐπεισαγωγάς· καὶ γὰρ ψυχρῶς ἔνιαι καὶ ἀκαίρως λέγονται· καθάπερ τὰ περὶ τὸν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ Σειληνὸν ἱστορηθέντα, κ. τ. λ.

[5] *Var. Hist.*, III. 18.

[6] See chap. III.

[7] See apud Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, c. 47, p. 370 b-c.

[8] In the eighth book of his *Philippica*; see apud Diog. Laert., I. Proem. 8-9.

by Strabo[1] that he declared he would surpass Herodotus, Ctesias, Hellanicus, and *οἱ τὰ Ἰνδικὰ συγγράψαντες* in his skill in relating myths. It is significant that at this time the Greeks themselves recognized the writers of Indian history as specially prone to legendary narrative; and the obvious inference is that closer contact with the East was responsible for this trait in the writers just mentioned.

*Timaeus* of Tauromenium properly belongs to the third century as much as the fourth, and it is therefore hardly surprising that his style should show many traces of Asianism, which by the time of the Alexandrian conquests had become universal throughout Greece. He wrote a history of the war with Pyrrhus, and was blamed by Polybius for superstition,[2] and regarded by Cicero and Longinus as a representative of Asianism.[3] The latter censures his "childishness" and love of strange conceits and frigidity.[4] Oriental fatalism, combined with a weakness for punning, is revealed in his observation that the mutilators of the Hermae were defeated by a general named Hermocrates.[5] His style was highly rhetorical, and dealt greatly with Isocratean commonplaces, fables, and wonders, as we can gather from the criticism of Polybius.[6] All these defects point

[1] See Strabo, I. 2. 35.

[2] See Mueller, *Extr.* 24 (Polyb. XII, 3, Exc. Vatic.): *Τὸν δὲ Τίμαιον εἶποι τις ἂν οὐ μόνον ἀνιστόρητον γεγονέναι περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην, ἀλλὰ καὶ παιδαριώδη, καὶ τελέως ἀσυλλόγιστον, καὶ ταῖς ἀρχαίαις φήμαις ἀκμὴν ἐνδεδεμένον, ἃς παρειλήφαμεν, κ. τ. λ.*

[3] See Treatise *On the Sublime*, c. 4; also Cicero, *Brutus*, chap. XCV: "Genera autem Asiaticae dictionis duo sunt: unum sententiosum et argutum, sententiis non tam gravibus et severis quam concinnis et venustis, qualis in historia Timaeus," etc. See also Bury, *Anc. Greek Historians.*

[4] See c. 4: *Θατέρου δὲ ὧν εἴπομεν, λέγω δὲ τοῦ ψυχροῦ, πλήρης ὁ Τίμαιος, ἀνὴρ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἱκανὸς καὶ . . . ἐπινοητικός, . . . ὑπὸ δὲ ἔρωτος τοῦ ξένας νοήσεις ἀεὶ κινεῖν πολλάκις ἐκπίπτων εἰς τὸ παιδαριωδέστατον.*

[5] *τοῖς δὲ Ἀθηναίοις ἀλοῦσι περὶ Σικελίαν τίνα τρόπον ἐπιφωνεῖ; ὅτι 'εἰς τὸν Ἑρμῆν ἀσεβήσαντες . . . διὰ τοῦτ' ἔδωκαν δίκην, οὐχ ἥκιστα δ' ἕνα ἄνδρα, ὃς ἀπὸ τοῦ παρανομηθέντος διὰ πατέρων ἦν, Ἑρμοκράτην τὸν Ἕρμωνος.'*

[6] See Polybius, XII. 25 (with reference to a speech which Timaeus puts into the mouth of Hermocrates, the Sicilian leader): *Θαυμάζω δὴ τίσι ποτ' ἂν ἄλλοις ἐχρήσατο λόγοις ἢ προφοραῖς μειράκιόν τι γενόμενον περὶ διατριβὰς καὶ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων πολυπραγμοσύνας, καὶ βουλόμενον παραγγελματικῶς ἐκ τῶν παριστα μένων τοῖς προσώποις ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἐπιχείρησιν.*



to Asiatic influence, and I would venture to suggest that the mysticism and want of sense of proportion ascribed to him by Bury are, above all, Oriental features.

This list of Greek historians who can be considered as exponents of Asianism in the fourth and third centuries may be concluded with the mention of *Hegesias* of Magnesia. He lived in the middle of the third century, and wrote a history of Alexander the Great, and is usually held to be the founder of Asianism proper. That his style tended towards bathos we learn from the Treatise *On the Sublime*,[1] and this is assuredly one of the most characteristic marks of Asiatic influence in literature. Bury[2] compares his language to a "bacchic revel of rhythms and verbal effects," a striking metaphor when we remember the Asiatic provenance of Hegesias and the theory which would make the Bacchic deity a native of Asia. Varied rhythms and verbal effects, indeed, as we shall see, were common features in Sanskrit literature. The somewhat frigid description in a fragment of Hegesias of Thebes and Athens as the Moon and Sun of Greece[3] recalls, moreover, the importance in Oriental worship of these heavenly bodies. Nor is it strange that an author of such noted Asianism should indulge in rhythmical prose. We find that in ancient India prose was little used, the earliest Sanskrit prose dating from about 800 B.C., and being confined to a somewhat narrow sphere. But, whereas in the earlier period of Indian literature, *i.e.*, before the age of Aśoka, who lived in the middle of the third century B.C., and was, accordingly, contemporary with Timaeus, we know that the Indians possessed a compact prose style; just about this time their prose became highly rhythmical and cumbrous, and tended to

[1] See c. 3: *παραθήσομαι δὲ τἀνδρὸς ἓν ἢ δύο, . . . ἐπαινῶν Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν μέγαν, 'ὃς τὴν Ἀσίαν ὅλην' φησίν 'ἐν ἐλάττοσι παρέλαβεν ἢ ὅσοις τὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ πρὸς Πέρσας πολέμου πανηγυρικὸν λόγον Ἰσοκράτης ἔγραψεν.'*

[2] Cp. the passage of Hegesias describing the siege of Gaza and the atrocious murder of its king by the orders of Alexander. This passage is quoted by Dionysius in his *De Compositione Verborum* as an instance at once of unseemly rhythms and extremely bad taste in narrative. For rhythmic prose as a sign of Asianism, see Norden's *Antike Kunstprosa*, vol. I. p. 147.

[3] See Bury, *Ancient Greek Historians.*

fall into almost complete disuse, except in works on grammar and philosophy.[1]

Hitherto we have been considering Hegesias as an historian only. It is, however, as an orator that he is usually mentioned as an apostle of "Asianism." Indeed most writers confine the use of this word to Oriental influence in Greek Oratory to the exclusion of every other branch of culture in Hellas. Cicero[2] and Quintilian[3] have left on record the leading features of the Asiatic School of Rhetoric. Properly speaking, there were two styles of "Asianism" which exhibited somewhat opposite faults. The one was turgid, bombastic, and exuberant; the other, epigrammatic and jerky, aimed chiefly at prettiness of diction. Cicero himself, as we are told by Quintilian (XII. 10. 12), was censured by his contemporaries as being "too inflated and Asiatic and redundant, too fond of repetition and sometimes given to frigid jesting, loose in the structure of his sentences," etc.[4] This may be taken as a list of the faults commonly ascribed to the followers of Asianism. It certainly contains some of the most characteristic defects of Sanskrit literature, which will be dealt with at greater length in a subsequent chapter, viz. that on the Dithyramb. The reason for postponing their consideration in detail is that the Dithyramb appears to have been more completely subject to Asiatic influence than any other form of Greek literature, and therefore, to avoid repetition, the proofs and examples which would suggest themselves from Sanskrit grammar and poetry are best reserved till we come to treat of the Dithyramb, a subject which forms a fitting conclusion to the whole discussion of Orientalism in ancient Greece. At present we need merely briefly state, as the occasion arises, the points in which the different Greek orators reveal their affinity

[1] See Weber's *History of Indian Literature*, pp. 179 ff.

[2] Cp. *Brutus*, § 51: "Hinc Asiatici oratores non contemnendi quidem nec celeritate nec copia, sed parum pressi et nimis redundantes."

[3] See *Institutio Oratoria*, XII. 10. 16: "Et antiqua quidem illa divisio inter Atticos atque Asianos fuit, cum hi pressi et integri: contra inflati illi et inanes haberentur; in his nihil superflueret: illis iudicium maxime ac modus deesset."

[4] "Quem tamen et suorum homines temporum incessere audebant ut tumidiorem et Asianum et redundantem," etc.



with Asiatic thought and diction, while it may be sometimes necessary to anticipate a little of the evidence to be later adduced.

Now it should be premised that "Asianism" in Greek oratory is not supposed to have made its appearance before the Alexandrian Age. In its appearance at this time there is, indeed, nothing strange, when we realize that the contact between Greece and Asia was very close from this time onwards, and that it so happened that most of the rhetoricians of the Hellenistic Age were natives of Asia Minor. But here again, as in dealing with the other provinces of Hellenic culture, we are only concerned with the period leading up to and including the fourth century B.C.

It is interesting to note, however, that this "Asiatic" school of oratory was not restricted to Asia, but was especially noticeable in Sicily,[1] where, at first sight, Asiatic influence might least be expected. Indeed, Greek oratory may be said to have arisen on Sicilian soil in the person of Gorgias of Leontini, who, long before the term Asianism was employed to designate florid and turgid declamatory style, exemplified its most striking characteristics. We do not generally find, however, that Gorgias and the Sicilian school were spoken of as affected by Asianism. It is, perhaps, natural to regard an island situated so far west of Greece as Sicily, as beyond the range of this influence. As it happens, however, colonies from Asia Minor and its adjoining islands were being sent out to Italy and Sicily from about 1000 B.C. to the fifth century B.C. Thus the Aeolians of Cyme founded Cumae as far back as 1000 B.C. In 735 B.C. Naxos in Sicily was colonized in part by natives of the island of Naxos. In 690 B.C. Gela was founded by Rhodians and Cretans; while about forty years later Phocaeans founded Zancle, which was seized in 492 B.C. by Samian exiles—the city thus getting another infusion of Asiatic influence. But the Asianism of Gorgias is probably derived from the same sources as the Asianism which we have already observed in his fellow countryman, Empedocles, *i.e.*, from the teaching of Pythagoras and his disciples. These had been driven from their Italian home about

[1] See Jebb's *Attic Orators*, vol. II. p. 440.

440-430 B.C., and dispersed throughout the Greek world. Sicily must have been one of the first places where the exiles would attempt to settle; nor is it unlikely that their presence was already known there even before the burning of their meeting-place at Croton.

One of the commonest features of the ancient languages of Persia and India was the use of excessively long and complicated compound words.[1] Gorgias also, we are told, was addicted to the employment of compounds. Aristotle informs us that this habit was one of the marks of the "frigid" style, and cites as illustrations the phrase *πτωχόμουσος κόλαξ* from Gorgias, and the words *τελεσφόρον* and *κυανόχρων* from his follower, Alcidamas.[2] The typically Sanskrit compound *indulagnormihastā*, which occurs in the lyric poem *Meghadūta* or *Cloud-Messenger*,[3] and means "clinging to the moon with her wave-hands," being used as an epithet of the nymph Ganges, will give some notion of the extent to which the Oriental employs this device. Here there are really four different words fused into one which forms in itself one complete sentence. Again, Gorgias and Alcidamas are further censured by Aristotle[4] for their obscure and far-fetched poetical language, and for their too great love of metaphors. Here too we note the Asianism of this school. For the Sanskrit word just quoted illustrates the Indian love of abstruse mythological references and personification, picturing the descent of the River Ganges with its waves on the head of Śiva, who was represented as wearing the moon on his crest. Indeed the whole of the *Meghadūta* teems with similar obscure allusions and fantastic metaphors, constituting in this no exception to the general style of Sanskrit poetry.

Among the startling metaphors of Gorgias, Longinus[5] cites the phrases, "Xerxes, the Zeus of the Persians," and "vultures, living tombs." The latter conveys a distinctly Persian note to anyone

[1] See chapter on the Dithyramb.

[2] *Rhet.*, III. 3.

[3] Verse 52 of Ouvry's version.

[4] *Rhet.* III. 3: *διὸ ποιητικῶς λέγοντες τῇ ἀπρεπείᾳ τὸ γελοῖον καὶ τὸ ψυχρὸν ἐμποιοῦσι, καὶ τὸ ἀσαφὲς διὰ τὴν ἀδολεσχίαν· ὅταν γὰρ γιγνώσκοντι ἐπεμβάλλῃ, διαλύει τὸ σαφὲς τῷ ἐπισκοτεῖν.*

[5] See chap. III.: *ταύτῃ καὶ τὰ τοῦ Λεοντίνου Γοργίου γελᾶται γράφοντος κ. τ. λ.*



who recalls the Parsi mode of disposing of dead bodies, and it is tempting, though perhaps somewhat far-fetched, to see in it a reference to this practice. Again the sentence, *ὥσπερ δὲ ἐκ σαπροῦ καὶ ῥέοντος συνοικίου ἀσμένως ἀπαλλάττομαι*, quoted as his in a passage of Arsenius,[1] and applied by him to the body, reveals the characteristically Asiatic contempt for the flesh which we have already seen to be a feature of Indian philosophy. The same love of metaphor is ascribed to the followers of Licymnius and Polus, the contemporaries of Gorgias, by Dionysius of Halicarnassus,[2] who speaks of their style as highly poetic, pompous, and full of strange words, and of Gorgias' writings as hardly removed from the language of the Dithyramb. His fragmentary epitaph on the Athenian warriors, preserved to us by Planudes, is full of conceits and strained phrases and abounds in figures such as assonance and antithesis.[3] These are all clearly marked features of Indian poetry, as will be shown in a subsequent chapter. At present it may suffice to say that in regard to the Indian partiality for assonance, we possess a well-known Sanskrit poem which affords copious examples of this figure,[4] while an equally famous Sanskrit prose romance of the early Christian era teems with fantastic metaphor and antithesis.[5]

It is commonly held that Gorgias exercised a strong influence on Thucydides' style, more especially in the case of his speeches; so much so, indeed, that Thompson believes that the Funeral Oration which the historian puts into the mouth of Pericles was

[1] See Appendix to Thompson's edition of Plato's *Gorgias*.

[2] Cp. *De Lysia Iudicium*, 3: *ἀλλ' οἱ βουλόμενοι κόσμον τινὰ προσεῖναι τοῖς ὅλοις ἐξήλλαττον ἰδιώτην, καὶ κατέφευγον εἰς τὴν ποιητικὴν φράσιν, μεταβολαῖς τε πολλαῖς χρώμενοι, κ. τ. λ. δηλοῖ δὲ τοῦτο Γοργίας τε ὁ Λεοντῖνος, ἐν πολλοῖς πάνυ φορτικήν τε καὶ ὑπέρογκον ποιῶν τὴν κατασκευήν, καὶ οὐ πόρρω διθυράμβων ἔνια φθεγγόμενος, καὶ τῶν ἐκείνου συνουσιαστῶν οἱ περὶ Λικύμνιόν τε καὶ Πῶλον.*

[3] Cp. Dionysius Halicarn., Ep. II, *Ad Ammaeum*, c. 17: *Οἱ δὲ μειρακιώδεις σχηματισμοὶ τῶν ἀντιθέτων τε καὶ παρομοίων καὶ παρισώσεων, ἐν οἷς οἱ περὶ τὸν Γοργίαν μάλιστα ἐπλεόνασαν, κ. τ. λ.*

Cp. also the foll. from the *Epitaph*: *Τί γὰρ ἀπῆν τοῖς ἀνδράσι τούτοις ὧν δεῖ ἀνδράσι προσεῖναι; τί δὲ καὶ προσῆν ὧν οὐ δεῖ προσεῖναι; κ. τ. λ.* Also: *τῷ φρονίμῳ τῆς γνώμης παύοντες τὸ ἄφρον τῆς ῥώμης, ὑβρισταὶ εἰς ὑβριστάς, κόσμιοι εἰς τοὺς κοσμίους, κ. τ. λ.*

[4] See Macdonell's *Sansk. Liter.*, p. 345.

[5] See Macdonell, p. 333.

inspired by the fragment just referred to. There is no doubt that the excessive use of antithesis shown by Thucydides in many passages (*e.g.*, in the speech of the Athenian envoys at Sparta in Book I, and the speeches of Cleon and Diodotus concerning the fate of the people of Mytilene in Book III), recalls the practice of Gorgias, and this resemblance to the Sicilian has been noted by Dionysius in his criticism of the historian.[1]

Thucydides, however, is generally chosen as a representative of the "austere" style, and hence is not usually associated with the subject of Asianism. Not that indeed this style is altogether incompatible with Oriental influence, as will be shown in the chapter on the Dithyramb when we come to deal with its great poetic representative, Aeschylus. Similarly, the early Attic orator Antiphon, who is one of the most typical exponents of the "austere" school, has a certain tinge of Asianism of the sort revealed in Aeschylus. Thus, he displayed a kind of pompous artificiality and stiffness which are not perhaps inconsistent with Orientalism.[2]

But it is in Isocrates and his followers that we are to see the real and conscious imitators of Gorgias;[3] and here again the period during which they wrote, *i.e.*, the fourth century and afterwards, warns us to expect the presence of Asiatic influence. We know that Isocrates abounded in antitheses and parallelisms of sound, and that his style was highly rhythmical and periodic, and intended for purposes of display.[4] All these, as we already

[1] See *De Thucyd. Histor. Iudicium*, c. 46, where he quotes from Thuc., II, 52, with the remark: *τά τε γὰρ φρονήματα ψυχρότερά ἐστι, καὶ τῆς Γοργίου προαιρέσεως μᾶλλον οἰκειότερα.* He also thinks the passage "sophistic" and remarks that one of the sentences is more cryptic than the writings of Heracleitus. This is interesting in view of the strong evidence of Asianism in the latter.

See also Dionysius Hal., *De Lysia Iudicium*, c. 3: *ἤψατο δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἀθήνῃσι ῥητόρων ἡ ποιητική τε καὶ τροπικὴ φράσις, ὡς μὲν Τίμαιός φησι, Γοργίου ἄρξαντος,* κ. τ. λ. Note that in *Ep. II Ad Ammaeum*, c. 2, he ascribes *τὸ παθητικόν* to Thucydides, and this, it is interesting to observe, is a very Asiatic trait.

[2] See Jebb's *Attic Orators*, vol. I.

[3] See Dionysius, *De Isocrate Iudicium*, c. 20, and Jebb's *Attic Orators*, vol. II. p. 56, for the *σεμνολογία* of Isocrates.

[4] Cp. *De Isocrate Iudicium*, c. 13: *ἐξ αὐτῆς γὰρ ἔσται τῆς Ἰσοκράτους λέξεως τεθείσης καταφανὴς ὅ τε τῶν περιόδων ῥυθμὸς, ἐκ παντὸς διώκων τὸ γλαφυρὸν, καὶ τῶν σχημάτων τὸ μειρακιῶδες περὶ τὰς ἀντιθέσεις, καὶ παρισώσεις καὶ παρομοιώσεις κατατριβόμενον.*

Cp. also c. 3: *ἀλλ' ὡς ἐπὶ πολὺ τῷ ῥυθμῷ δουλεύοντος καὶ τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς περιόδου* κ. τ. λ.: and Aulus Gellius, XVIII, c. 8. See, too, Cicero, *De Oratore*, III, 44-173: idque princeps Isocrates instituisse fertur, ut inconditam antiquorum dicendi consuetudinem delectationis atque aurium causa, . . . numeris astringeret. Note that Isocrates was chosen by Dionysius as an example of the "flowery" style.



know, are clearly Asiatic features. Longinus[1] censures him, moreover, for his tendency to hyperbole. Now if there is one defect more than any other characteristic of Asiatic thought it is an inclination to exaggerate. This we shall see sufficiently plainly when we come to examine the peculiar qualities of Oriental Art and Literature. The periodic style of Isocrates was further responsible for the habit of "padding" attributed to him by Dionysius.[2] But, as has been stated in the case of Theopompus, excessive detail in descriptive passages was a distinctly marked trait in Sanskrit literature. It is true that Professor Jebb has declared of Isocrates that "his beauty and majesty are genuinely Greek";[3] but, in spite of this, we can hardly avoid the feeling that his oratory had much in common with the later and more florid school called "Asiatic." And Cicero's well-known phrase: "totum Isocratis *μυροθήκιον* atque omnes eius discipulorum arculas"[4] tends to confirm this impression.

In conclusion, it may be interesting to recall a parallel in our own era to this classical fashion of aping foreign extravagance of manner in literature in the imitation during the sixteenth century, under the influence of the Renaissance, of Italian affectations of literary expression by the greatest writers of Spain and England. In Spain this new school of writing, which attained enormous popularity, was known as "culteranismo."[5] The title denoted the claim of its adherents to be regarded as pre-eminently cultivated and witty, and was earned by their love of

[1] See Treatise *On the Sublime*, c. 38: *ὁ γοῦν Ἰσοκράτης οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως παιδὸς πρᾶγμα ἔπαθε διὰ τὴν τοῦ πάντα αὐξητικῶς ἐθέλειν λέγειν φιλοτιμίαν.*

[2] *De Isocrate Iudic.*, c. 3: *ὥστ' ἀνάγκη παραπληρώμασι λέξεων οὐδὲν ὠφελουσῶν χρῆσθαι, καὶ ἀπομηκύνειν πέρα τοῦ χρησίμου τὸν λόγον.*

[3] See Jebb's *Attic Orators*, vol. II.

[4] Cicero, *Letters to Atticus*, II. 1.

[5] See Fitzmaurice-Kelly's *History of Spanish Literature.*

strange "conceits" and metaphors. In England its chief representatives were Lyly and Sir Philip Sidney, of whom the latter finds his exact counterpart in Spain in the distinguished soldier and lyric poet, Garcilaso. But, as in Greece Isocrates was only the forerunner of Asianism proper, so in Spain the mild "culteranismo" of Garcilaso merely foreshadowed the wild fantasies of Gongora and Villamediana. Gongora, indeed, was to give his name to the word "gongorismo," which was henceforth destined to stand for all that was most extravagant in this outlandish type of poetry, just as we find the term "Gorgiasm" applied by the Greeks to florid writing of the kind familiarized by Gorgias. Again, when we learn that one of the imitators of Gongora describes fish as "swimming birds of the cerulean seat,"[1] we are at once reminded of the fantastic metaphors of Gorgias. Similarly, the galley-slave's address to the sea in Gongora's *El Cautivo*, commencing:

Oh sagrado mar de España
Famosa playa y serena, etc.[2]

with its rapidly changing and fanciful comparisons recalls the language of Callisthenes of Stageirus,[3] a pupil of Isocrates, who in his narrative of the campaigns of Alexander speaks of the Pamphylian Sea as lashing its shores for joy at the king's approach. Even more extravagant and obscure are the Spanish poet's *Soledades* or *Solitary Musings*. Of these the *Soledad Primera* described by Mesa y Lopez as one of the most "precious" compositions of Gongora, on account of its extra-

[1] See Fitzmaurice-Kelly, p. 296.

[2] See *Morceaux Choisis des Classiques Espagnols* by Hernandez and A. le Roy (Paris, 1903). Calderon, too, was not altogether free from this love of "conceptismo," *e.g.*, the following lines spoken by Segismundo in *La Vida es Sueño*, Act I, Scene 2:

"Ojos hidropicos creo
Que mis ojos deben ser;
Pues, cuando es muerte el beber,
Beben mas, y desta suerte,
Viendo que el ver me da muerte,
Estoy muriendo por ver."

[3] See Jebb's *Attic Orators*, vol. II.



ordinarily affected and learned style, at once suggests the manner of the Alexandrian Age in poetry owing to its frequent and elaborate mythological allusions. Of the Asianism of the Alexandrian Era there can be no doubt; and, inasmuch as Alexandrian poetry was especially cultivated by the Italians of the Renaissance, it is interesting to see that Gongorism is but the direct descendant of Asiatic influence on Classical literature. And, as in the case of Spain the immediate impulse to these tendencies came from a more intimate knowledge of the neighbouring country of Italy and its literature, so in Greece we may believe that they arose not from within, but from a closer intercourse with Asia Minor.

# CHAPTER V

## ASIANISM IN GREEK ART AND MUSIC

Asianism in the art of Praxiteles—Skill in representing animals a feature common to Greek art of the fourth century B.C. and to Asiatic art—Symbolism—Painting—Hindu sculpture—Miss Harrison and "naturism" in Greek art—*Music*—Evidence of Strabo as to Asiatic instruments employed by the Greeks—Innovations of Timotheos—A. C. Wild on the *magadis*—Accidentals not allowed by either Greeks or Hindus—Indian modes—the glide employed by Indians—Phrynis and the *καμπή*—Highly-coloured musical style of the Hindu.

IN the earlier representations of Dionysos, such as the *ξόανα* or statues of gilded wood, dating for the most part before the fifth century, and the Black-figure vases the god is usually shown in a standing posture, heavily draped and wearing a long beard and masses of hair falling down on his neck.[1] In the vase-paintings of this period he is generally accompanied by certain animals such as the goat, the bull, and the mule. When the Gigantomachy is depicted, lions, panthers, and snakes appear as his fellow-combatants. According to Thraemer, the panther is the oldest "clearly un-Hellenic" attribute of the god. He questions whether it is possible to regard this feature as originating from Thrace, since Aristotle maintains that the panther is only to be found in Asia Minor, and is therefore inclined to consider this animal as adopted into the Dionysiac myth from that region.

In the Red-figure vases of a little later date some new features are introduced, among these being a livelier movement of the thiasos. In general all these early representations of the god show him as a being of kindly and dignified mien, akin to the

[1] See article by Thraemer in Roscher's Lexicon on Dionysos in Art.





type of Zeus, as do also the coins of the sixth century and the statues of the fifth. With the approach of the fourth century a softer and more effeminate portrayal of Dionysos is noticeable, and he is usually depicted as a youthful deity. Although this tendency was especially to be observed in the case of Dionysos, the great artists of this time, such as Praxiteles and Scopas, showed these characteristics in other subjects besides. Now, among the most striking changes in this direction introduced by Praxiteles were the long half-closed eye and narrow bust of his ideal female types, which helped to suggest a softer and more feminine conception of the Greek goddesses than that of the great sculptors of the previous century. But both these features are characteristically Asiatic. The heroine of Sanskrit poetry, whether goddess or woman, is pre-eminently "long-eyed" (āyatekshaṇa), *e.g.*, Damayantī in the *Nalopākhyānam*, and Śakuntalā in Kālidāsa's famous drama of that name; while the narrow-chested Asiatic is as common to-day as he was in the fourth century B.C.[1]

Noteworthy too is the constant presence of wild animals in the art-representations of Dionysos and his train at this time. These animals, such as the panther, lion, tiger, dromedary, and elephant, are clearly of Asiatic provenance; while the general riot and extravagance of design shown in these scenes suggest affinity with Eastern art.

Yet even at a far earlier period we see Oriental influence in the human-headed quadrupeds and winged monsters of pre-classical Greek vases, though these, it is true, may be of Egyptian or Assyrian origin rather than Persian. The vase-painting on the early black-figured *lekythos* represented on p. 382 of the *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (Fig. 116), and dated by Miss Harrison not later than the beginning of the sixth century B.C., is of this style. It depicts a fight between Heracles

[1] For this characteristic of Asiatic physique see the illustrations in Vincent Smith's *History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*. As regards the length of the eye as depicted in Hindu poetry, cp. the word "śravaṇa-pathagatās," *i.e.*, "reaching to the ear," occurring in the *Hitopadeśa* as an epithet of the eyes and eyelashes of Hindu women. Here the eyes with their lashes are compared to arrows, where the eyebrow is the bow *at full stretch*.

and the Centaurs; and the grouping and poise of the figures and, above all, the introduction of the eagles and *svastikas* with their apparent lack of connection with the subject are very reminiscent of Hindu art.

But, as we learn from Gardner,[1] during the period of the Persian Wars Greek Art was peculiarly severe and idealistic, owing to the patriotic impulse given at this time to Hellenic culture. With the weakening of patriotic sentiment and the increasing Oriental influence of the fourth century we notice a tendency to floridity and exaggeration and a desire to express emotion which ultimately in Hellenistic times led to symbolism and the making of allegorical statues. A few examples taken from Indian mythological representations will illustrate the affinity between Hellenistic and Oriental art. The Hindu God of War (Sabrāmanmān) is depicted with six faces and twelve arms, riding on a peacock, and holding in his several hands a bow, an arrow, a conch, a discus, a sword, a rope, a trident, a dart, a drum, etc.[2] This reminds us of the tendency of later Greek art to increase the number of the attributes of Dionysos; while the exaggeration and overloading of characteristics displayed in this Indian conception of the War-God recall the crowded figures on the well-known Pergamene Altar. Now we learn that symbolism is the very essence of Indian art, and that much of what seems crudest and most exaggerated to European eyes in Hindu painting and sculpture is due to the Oriental desire of expressing character symbolically.[3] Thus we know that the Indian Fire-God, Agni, was usually depicted as a

[1] See Ernest A. Gardner's *Religion and Art in Ancient Greece.*

[2] See Small's *Handbook of Sanskrit Lit.* (Appendix I, p. 147).

[3] See V. Smith, chap. VII, on Mediaeval Sculpture in Ancient India, where he says: "the artists undertake to produce literally in stone or bronze the descriptions of the deities as given in the books, with little regard to aesthetic considerations, and no form is regarded as too monstrous for plastic representation. The result too often is merely grotesque . . . when looked at by anybody who is not steeped in the notions of Hindu symbolism, but occasionally is horrible. Additional limbs or heads are put on as prescribed, whether or not they disturb the balance of the composition or excite a feeling of disgust at monstrous growths." He refers for examples of this style to the sculptures in the "Ten Incarnations" Temple at Ellora, *circa* 700 A.D.



red man with tawny eyes and hair, from whose body flowed seven streams of glory, while he held a spear in his right hand.[1]

In this case the symbolism is obvious. In others the meaning, though plain enough to the Indian, is not so evident to us. But in every instance the purpose of these details is the same, viz., to set before the onlooker at once the whole life and nature of the beings represented. Other examples of this style of art are to be found in the representations of the Indian Sun-God, Sūrya, as a man with three eyes and four hands. With two of the latter he holds the lotus, while the third is shown in the act of blessing. In an image of Mahādeva on an embossed shield[2] the god is shown with four arms, holding in three of them an arrow, bow, and dagger. He has a pine-cone above each ear, while the female figure on his left also holds a pine-cone. Similarly, we find the god Bhairava[3] depicted as seated on an expanded lotus placed amid the coils of a gigantic cobra, while in three of his hands he holds an axe, a human head, and a trident. But perhaps the most famous examples of the use of symbolism in Indian art are to be seen in the highly complicated representations of the myth of The Churning of the Ocean, which display the same overcrowding of figures that we have seen to be a feature of Hellenistic art.[4]

In many cases the Hindu symbols are unintelligible at first to European eyes. Thus the special symbol of Śiva is the triangle with the upward-pointing apex denoting fire; while the inverted triangle which signifies water is Vishṇu's symbol. The symbol of Candra, the Moon-God, is an antelope, and this, as will be shown in another chapter, is very interesting in connection with the subject of Dionysos.

[1] See Small's *Handbook.*

[2] See Moor's *Plates Illustrating the Hindu Pantheon.*

[3] See Moor, Plate XLVII.

[4] See V. Smith's *Hist. of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*, chap. V, where, speaking of the Amarāvatī School, he quotes Mr. Havell in praise of the skill shown by the Indians in the delineation of conventionalized ornament and the most varied movements of the human figure, but says that "the obvious overcrowding of the composition unfortunately is a defect common in Indian art."

Manifestly in this tendency we have a parallel to the allegorical statues of cities which make their appearance in Hellenistic times, and to the representations of river-gods such as that of the Nile with its sixteen cubits playing around it as babies, and its various accessories in the shape of the crocodile, hippopotamus, sphinx, and horn of plenty.

It may also be remarked that Apelles, the greatest of all ancient painters, was an Asiatic Greek of the fourth century, and that painting in general received its greatest development at this time. Now this shows an increased love of colour among Greek artists corresponding to what we should expect as a result of Oriental influence. Indeed, Mr. Vincent Smith considers that "in India painting may be an older art than sculpture," and bases this conjecture on "the marked pictorial character of the ancient Indian bas-relief sculptures" which he compares with the Alexandrian work of the same kind. Among the best-known examples of this class of Indian sculpture are the reliefs on the *stūpa* or temple at Amarāvatī, the earlier portions of which, he tells us, date from about 200 B.C., while the construction of its great railing he thinks may be assigned to about A.D. 150-200. The chief features of these Amarāvatī sculptures are: (i) great elaboration and a tendency to overcrowding in the design; (ii) extreme skill in the portrayal of the animal life and in the delicately wrought floral devices; (iii) and an inclination to humorous treatment in the case of the boys and animals depicted on the frieze of the plinth. These are exactly the features which are most characteristic of Alexandrian art, in which the love of *genre* and skill in the treatment of animal representation and of natural scenery are conspicuous. But it may be thought that in the case of the Indian artists we are dealing rather with borrowers than with the originators of the Alexandrian School. In point of date the monuments of Indian art described are subsequent to the Alexandrian sculptures, and it is well known that the earliest remains of Indian sculpture, viz., those of the Aśokan Age are strongly influenced by Greek workmanship. But the traits just mentioned are precisely those which, according to Mr. Smith, are typical of Indian art at all times. He maintains that the skill of the Hindu in the portrayal of animals, particularly of lions and elephants, quite surpassed that of the Greeks. He is inclined to think that the strange blended animal forms of the Aśokan sculptures came from Western Asia. The same sculptures show an even greater love of *genre* than do any of the subjects of the Hellenistic era in Greece. Thus on the Sānchī gateways there are, as we learn from the same authority, panels in bas-relief depicting scenes in the life of Buddha, domestic and forest scenes, processions and sieges, and groups of extraordinary animals, among which are winged bulls and lions of a Persepolitan type and horned animals with human faces, while all sorts of weird winged figures are to be seen. In the Bharhut sculptures he tells us that "the representations of animals and trees are very numerous and some of them are particularly spirited and characteristic. There are also flowered ornaments of singular beauty and delicacy of execution." Elsewhere he says that "no nation has surpassed the Indians in the variety and delicacy of the floral designs enriching their sculpture and pictures." In these sculptures there are highly comic animal-scenes, which, it may be allowed, go far beyond the Alexandrian subjects of the same sort in point of humorous effect. Thus Fig. 41 of *A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon* shows a tooth being extracted from a man's jaws by an elephant pulling a huge forceps.



It is evident, then, that even in dealing with the remains of Indian art most affected by the Hellenic genius certain national peculiarities of style meet us, which, while resembling the tendencies of Hellenistic art, are so characteristic of Hindu culture and thought in general as to preclude the possibility of their having been adopted from Greece. Nothing can show more plainly that the love of intimate and realistic treatment of artistic subjects, which has been considered so typical of the Alexandrian era, is an indigenous feature of Indian sculpture than the fact that the Mediaeval Indian sculptures show this inclination to realism in a far greater degree than those of the semi-Greek Aśokan monuments. One of the dominant notes of this Mediaeval Indian School is the effort of the artists to show violent passion and emotion, with the result that grotesque effects are only too often produced. Thus the strivings of

Mārīchī and of Rāvana, or the whirling dances of Śiva, which are among the favourite subjects of this School,[1] far surpass in point of horror and violence any of the compositions of the Alexandrian artists such as the Laocoon and the Farnese Bull.

As regards the Hindu skill in reproducing flowers and trees nobody who has any knowledge of Sanskrit poetry can fail to be struck by the intense intimacy with and love of nature displayed by the Oriental. In a subsequent chapter[2] it is hoped to show that Greek literary interest in this subject during the fourth century was largely due to contact with the East.

In conclusion it should be remarked that though Persepolitan art is to a large extent the precursor and basis of Indian art, and, on account of the close connection of the Persian Empire with Hellenic affairs, might naturally have been selected for comparison with the Greek schools in preference to any Hindu monuments, nevertheless the strong Assyrian element in Persian art tends to conceal from our view the Aryan features which it must have contained. Assyrian art in general being of a severer and more Hellenic type than that of the Hindu would not be so useful for purposes of comparison. For it is only by seeing the full extent of the difference between Greek and Asiatic art that we can detect the non-Hellenic elements in later Greek art; and this is best achieved by setting the extreme Aryan, *i.e.* Hindu, type of art side by side with the Hellenic during its various stages.

To sum up, in Greek painting as in Greek sculpture the period of more or less united hostility to Persia, *i.e.* the fifth century B.C., is also the period for which Oriental influence cannot be claimed; while from this date onwards we observe a steady increase in the traits which are typical of Asiatic style. It is therefore interesting to note that Miss Harrison in her *Themis*[3] attributes the new energy and life of Greek art after the Persian Wars to Persian influence, and sees in the Persian Nature-worship the origin of the new tendency to "Naturism" in Greek art as in Greek philosophy.

[1] See V. Smith.

[2] See chap. VI of this book on the Dithyramb.

[3] Pp. 461-2.



In the kindred art of *Music* Oriental influence may also be seen, though not so clearly. In fact we are confronted with many difficulties in examining this subject. Nothing appears to be known about early Persian music, except what we may gather from the references in Classical authors. Here again Ancient India must furnish us with analogies. But when Strabo supplies us with the information that "those who have consecrated to Dionysos the whole of Asia as far as India, transfer thence (ἐκεῖθεν) a great part of the art of music," we must be on our guard against taking the word ἐκεῖθεν as referring to India.[1] Possibly the ancient Indians may have influenced their kindred the Medes in this respect during the fourth century or earlier, when we know that they were in contact; but so far as Strabo's language is concerned we have only to deal with the Asiatic territory, which extended up to the western frontier of India. It is not without significance that the art of music is mentioned here in connection with Dionysos and Asia; while in the same chapter we are told: *ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μέλους καὶ τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ καὶ τῶν ὀργάνων καὶ ἡ μουσικὴ πᾶσα Θρᾳκία καὶ Ἀσιᾶτις νενόμισται*, and he further speaks of the "Asiatic lyre" and "Phrygian and Berecyntian pipes." He also mentions the following instruments as having "barbarian" names, viz., the *νάβλας*, *σαμβύκη*, *βάρβιτος* and *μάγαδις*. Of these the first two are known to be Syriac words; but of the magadis we are told that it "may be identical with an Indian wind-instrument called *magoudi* or *poongi*."[2] The *magoudi* is used for snake-charming, and like the magadis (alluded to by Athenaeus[3] XIV. 35), is able to sound a high and a low note at the same time. Wild tells us that "it is formed from a gourd in which two pipes are inserted at opposite

[1] See Strabo, Book X. chap. 3: *καὶ οἱ τῷ Διονύσῳ τὴν Ἀσίαν ὅλην καθιερώσαντες μέχρι τῆς Ἰνδικῆς, ἐκεῖθεν καὶ τὴν πολλὴν μουσικὴν μεταφέρουσι.*

See A. C. Wild's *The Indian Origin of Greek Music* (published in the Proceedings of the Bombay Classical Association, 1910), from which article most of the information in this chapter concerning Indian music is derived.

[2] See A. C. Wild.

[3] See Book XIV. chap. 35: *Τρύφων δ' ἐν δευτέρῳ περὶ ὀνομασιῶν λέγει οὕτως· "Ὁ δὲ μάγαδις καλούμενος αὐλός." Καὶ πάλιν. "Μάγαδις ἐν ταὐτῷ ὀξὺν καὶ βαρὺν φθόγγον ἐπιδείκνυται, ὡς Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Ὁπλομάχῳ φησί·*

*Μάγαδιν λαλήσω μικρὸν ἅμα σοι καὶ μέγαν."*

ends, and, on the upper one, which has finger-holes, the melody is played, while the lower one sounds the key-note as an accompaniment." A difficulty arises, however, as regards the derivation of "magadis." Wild states that he is unable to find the word "magoudi" in any of the Indian languages, including Sanskrit. He suggests a possible derivation which would connect it with an imaginary word *magadhī*, meaning "the instrument of Bahar."

It is true that Indian music is of great antiquity.[1] In the *Rig-Veda* mention is made of the drum, the flute, and the lute (*vīṇā*), which proves that the ancient Indians possessed representatives of percussion, wind, and stringed instruments. The *vīṇā* was the favourite. There is no doubt that the music of Assyria was well developed from an early period, and hence the Classical references to Asiatic influence in music might easily point to that country and not to Persia. But when we recall the fact that the early Aryans were, as we see from the *Vedas*, devoted to the art, and further that at the time to which most of our Classical information on Greek music refers, *i.e.* the fourth century B.C., the Persian power was paramount in Asia, it seems probable that Aryan influences are those to which allusion is made—more especially as in the passage above quoted from Strabo Asia is coupled with Thrace, a country whose people were of Aryan stock and closely akin to the Iranians. In any case Aryan or Iranian influences on Greek music might only appear in a few points and still be significant. Greek music, for example, we might suppose to have arisen spontaneously in Europe—though the names of the modes and the testimony of the ancients point to its derivation from Asia Minor—or to be derived originally from Assyria, without thereby affecting the conclusion to be drawn from its possessing certain points of similarity with Indian music, and particularly if these resemblances were regarded as innovations of the fourth century.

One of the most important of these changes was the addition of a number of strings to the harp. We hear that Timotheos[2] of Miletus, who was remarkable for the number of his musical innova-

[1] See Macdonell's *Sanskr. Lit.*, p. 169.

[2] See Smyth's *Greek Melic Poets* (Introduction, p. lxvii).



tions, used a kithara of no less than twelve strings, thus adding five to the original number; while even as early as the beginning of the fifth century Phrynis used nine strings,[1] and we are told that in late times the Greeks used a *stringed* instrument called the magadis with as many as twenty.[2] Now, long before the discovery of the early heptachord of Greece the Hindu *vīṇā* had a compass of more than three octaves, and hence the addition of strings to the kithara, which was so greatly reprehended by the conservative artists of the fourth century, may be regarded as a Medizing tendency. On the other hand, the Hindus resembled the early Greeks in not allowing the use of accidentals; and, therefore, when Timotheos is accused of setting the fashion of confusing modes[3] it would seem, at first, as if the trend of fourth century music was against Asiatic influence in this case. But when we hear that ancient Indian music possessed no less than seventy-two modes, owing to the minute subdivisions of its scale of seven, which was divided into twenty-two intervals, and that any pitch could be selected for the key-note, we can see that freedom and variety were among the chief characteristics of Oriental poetry. Consequently, a Greek imitator of this Asiatic variety and extravagance in music might attain the desired result by innovations such as those employed by Timotheos. A further example of Oriental extravagance in this department is afforded by the Indian system of time, which permitted ninety-two different measures, some of these having five and seven beats in the bar.

Wild tells us that the use of the glide was regarded as an ornament by the Indians, and that prolongation of the key-note among them took the place of an accompaniment. This at once

[1] See Smyth's *Greek Melic Poets* (Introduction, p. lxvi).

[2] See Whibley's *Companion to Greek Studies*, article on Greek Music. Note that in a fragment quoted by Plutarch in his *De Musica*, chap. xxx, from the comic poet Pherecrates, the dithyrambic writer, Melanippides, is accused by Music thus:

> . . . λαβὼν ἀνῆκέ με,
> χαλαρωτέραν τ' ἐποίησε χορδαῖς δώδεκα.

[3] See Dionysius of Halicarnassus *De Compositione Verborum*, c. 19: οἱ δέ γε Διθυραμβοποιοὶ καὶ τοὺς τρόπους μετέβαλλον, Δωρίους τε καὶ Φρυγίους καὶ Λυδίους ἐν τῷ ᾄσματι ποιοῦντες· καὶ τὰς μελῳδίας ἐξήλλαττον κ. τ. λ.

reminds us of the "shake" introduced by the innovator, Euripides, and ridiculed by Aristophanes in the *Frogs* thus:

αἳ θ' ὑπωρόφιοι κατὰ γωνίας
εἰ ει ει ει ει ειλίσσετε δακτύλοις φάλαγγες.[1]

Still more striking is the fact that the Sanskrit word for a "trill," or "shake" in pronunciation, is *kampa*, obviously the same as the Greek καμπή[2] both in its primary and derived senses, and recalling the indictment of Phrynis in the *Clouds* as follows:[3]

εἰ δέ τις αὐτῶν βωμολοχεύσαιτ' ἢ κάμψειέν τινα καμπήν,
οἵας οἱ νῦν τὰς κατὰ Φρῦνιν ταύτας τὰς δυσκολοκάμπτους,
ἐπετρίβετο τυπτόμενος πολλὰς ὡς τὰς Μούσας ἀφανίζων.

Add to this the fact that Phrynis was a native of Lesbos, an island just off the coast of Asia Minor, and we may suspect the ultimate source of his καμπαί or flourishes, and the real reason why they proved so distasteful to the fifth-century Athenian. Indeed, only a few lines before the quotation just given, Aristophanes reveals his anti-Persian bias against the new school of music when he speaks of the songs of old, songs such as "*Pallas Dread Sacker of Cities* . . . handed down by our fathers who kept up the same key throughout." Here we have the tone of one who recollected the martial spirit of Marathon and Plataea, and regretted the new indifference to the hereditary foe of Greece.

Another interesting point in connection with the Greek prejudice against Asianism in music is concerned with the different modes. The Sanskrit word *rāga*, denoting a musical mode, meant, primarily, "colour," and then "passion," and each of the six principal Indian modes was supposed to represent some strong emotion.[4] The supposition of Asiatic influence on Greek music in the fourth century would thus account for the highly-coloured style of Timotheos and Phrynis, and would help to explain the intense prejudice entertained by Plato and other Classical writers against the new musical school, and their vigorous denunciation of certain modes as immoral.

[1] See l. 1314.
[2] See Monier-Williams' *Sanskr. Dict.*
[3] See ll. 970-2.
[4] See A. C. Wild, and article on *rāga* in Monier-Williams' *Sanskr. Dict.*

# CHAPTER VI

## THE DITHYRAMB

The Dithyramb or Song of Dionysos—Derivation—Early history of the Dithyramb—Earliest composers Asiatic Greeks—Metrical features of the Dithyramb and Sanskrit poetry—Grammatical peculiarities—Long compound words—Participial construction—Frequent mention of the clouds—Evi[illegible]e of Aristophanes—The Centaurs—Mention of the heavenly bodies—Ion and the future life—Alliteration and obscurity—the *Persae* of Timotheos—Aeschylus and Asianism—Repetition—Grotesque similes—Frequent mention of flowers and natural scenery in Hellenistic poetry, a sign of Asianism—Anthologies—Mythological references in the Dithyramb—Conclusion.

PREVIOUS to the publication of Professor Ridgeway's *Origin of Greek Tragedy*, it was universally held that the Dithyramb was closely connected with Dionysos from the earliest times.[1] The writer of this work, however, seeks to prove, incidentally to his main thesis, that, originally, there was no special association between the wine-god and this form of composition. His view has been controverted in Miss Harrison's recent *Themis*. In any case, there is no doubt that, from the fifth century at least, the Dithyramb was regarded as especially the Song of Dionysos. As to the derivation of the word, various suggestions have been made, and we know that in Pindar, Euripides, and the fragment called the Delphic Paean, the god

[1] Cp. Crusius in Pauly: "Ursprünglich gehört Lied und Text durchaus in die orgiastische Opferfeier der Dionysosfeste." So, too, Jebb's *Bacchylides*, p. 38: "The dithyramb, which in the time of Archilochus had been distinctively a song to Dionysos, was afterwards applied to themes unconnected with that god. This enlargement of its scope must have taken place before the days of Simonides; but he is the earliest poet for whom it is attested."

himself bore the name of δῖθύραμβος.[1] O. Crusius thinks the ancient etymology from δῖ and θύρα, which would connect the word with the familiar birth-legend, "naive" and absurd on account of the quantity δῖ. Yet this has always been the most popular derivation, and Miss Harrison (*Themis*, p. 204), who regards the word as διθόραμβος, also connects it with the birth from Zeus, and associates it with the Bull-Dionysos. Other etymologies would make it equivalent to δῖος θρίαμβος, or "divine triumph," or to τίτυραμβος=(τι)τυρ(υ)βασία=τραγῳδία, and thus make the word refer to a kind of wild dance-step. Crusius declares that only one thing is clear, viz., that it originally denoted a dance-song. As far back as the age of Pindar we see that the Dithyramb was associated with the Paean, and we know from the evidence of Simonides and Bacchylides that dithyrambs were connected with the worship of Apollo.[2] Another ancient view, which had been discounted by Ridgeway in the above-mentioned work, is that of the Dorian origin of the Dithyramb. He maintains that there are no Doric forms in this species of composition, and that its earliest known composers were non-Dorians, viz., Archilochus of Paros and Arion of Lesbos. Now both these were natives of islands off the coast of Asia Minor, an interesting fact in connection with the Asiatic origin of Dionysos. Wilamowitz, also, considers the Dithyramb as coming to Greece by way of the islands of the Aegean Sea, and thinks that it had a specially close connection with Dionysos πελάγιος.[3] Naxos was another important centre for the Dithyramb, and so also was Corinth,[4] which counted as its

[1] See Pindar, frg. 86 and 85 with metaplastic accusative Διθύραμβα; also the *Bacchae* of Euripides, l. 526, and Pauly sub *Dithyramb*.

[2] Cp. Pindar, frg. 139, a,[4]b.: ἔντι μὲν τεκέων Λατοῦς ἀοιδαί . . . παιανίδες· ἔντι ⟨δὲ καὶ⟩ θάλλοντος ἐκ κισσοῦ στεφάνων Διονύσου ⟨διθύραμβον μ⟩αινόμεναι κ. τ. λ., and *Bacchylides*, frg. 17. See also Crusius' art. in Pauly for the Dithyramb, and especially for its derivation, and see, too, Smyth's *Melic Poets*, Introduction, xliii-lviii.

[3] For the view that the contents of the oldest dithyrambs were Διονύσου γένεσις, see Plato, *Leges*, III. 700, and Harrison, *Themis*. According to some, myths connected with a fixed circle of gods associated with Dionysos, such as Hephaestus, Hermes, and the Pleiades, were originally represented.

[4] For Corinth as the original home of the Dithyramb, see Pindar, Ol. XIII. 19, with Schol. For the connection, on the other hand, of the Dithyramb



original home, and both these places were very much in touch with Asia. Schmidt, however, regards Magna Graecia as its place of inception, and we know that Stesichorus of Rhegium wrote heroic sagas very much in the style of the early Dithyramb. The epithet βοηλάτης, applied to it by Pindar, points to the fact that it was accompanied by the sacrifice of a bull, and had to do with the worship of Dionysos Omestes, as we see from the epithet βακχεῖα . . . τοῦ ταυροφάγου applied to it in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes (l. 351). Hence orgiastic excitement was a feature of dithyrambic performances.[1] The sacred season for these was the Spring,[2] when they were performed at the City Dionysia, and this fact, according to Ridgeway, was the reason of the old view that the Dithyramb was the origin of Tragedy. For the fact that both tragic and dithyrambic performances occurred at the same festival, produced a belief that these two different classes of drama had some common connection, and that one was evolved from the other. Crusius doubts if Dithyrambs were performed at the Anthesteria; but, as this was a specially Ionian feast of Dionysos as lord of souls and protector of ancestors, and, as we know now that the earliest Dithyrambs were composed by Ionians in honour of the same god, it should seem probable that they had a place at this feast.[3] The

with Phrygia, see Aristotle, *Politics*, VIII. 7. 335, where it is especially associated with the music of the flute: πᾶσα βακχεία μάλιστα τῶν ὀργάνων ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς αὐλοῖς· τῶν δὲ ἁρμονιῶν ἐν τοῖς φρυγιστὶ μέλεσι λαμβάνει ταῦτα τὸ πρέπον· οἷον ὁ Διθύραμβος ὁμολογουμένως εἶναι δοκεῖ Φρύγιον.

[1] Cp. Athenaeus, XIV, 628: Ἀρχίλοχος γοῦν φησιν·

Ὡς Διωνύσοιο ἄνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος
οἶδα διθύραμβον, οἴνῳ συγκεραυνωθεὶς φρένας.

καὶ Ἐπίχαρμος δ' ἐν Φιλοκτήτῃ ἔφη·

Οὐκ ἔστι διθύραμβος, ὄκχ' ὕδωρ πίῃς.

[2] Aristophanes, *Clouds*, ll. 311-3:

ἦρι τ' ἐπερχομένῳ Βρομία χάρις κ. τ. λ.

[3] Cp. Crusius in Pauly: "Es ist von vornherein wahrscheinlich dass hier die tiefsten Wurzeln für den Stil und Character des Dithyrambus—oder wenigstens der später zur Herrschaft gelangten wichtigsten Art des Dithyrambus—und der mit ihm verwandten Gattungen Dionysischer Kunst zu suchen sind, deren σεμνότης man schwerlich (mit Aristoteles und den Peripatetikern) als etwas secundäres wird ansehen dürfen."

Dithyrambs of Bacchylides were in the style of heroic Saga, and Crusius considers that this type manifestly arose on Doric ground, comparing them to the poems of Stesichorus and Alkman's Saga of the Hippokoontidae.[1] The music was Phrygian, a fact which is especially interesting in connection with the theory of the Asiatic origin of Dionysos. That Dionysos was himself called ἥρως in the ὕμνος κλητικός in Elis, makes it not unnatural that the heroic saga should appear in the Song of Dionysos, and we are told that a feast of his in Delphi was called Ἡρωΐς. The Peisistratids,[2] in particular, fostered the cult of Dionysos, which was closely associated by them with the worship of deceased ancestors, and with dithyrambic performances. This fact is very suggestive in connection with the theory of the Asiatic origin of the cult, inasmuch as the house of Peisistratus was bound by ties of friendship to Persia. Lasos of Hermione[3] (fl. circa 350 B.C. -475) was one of the chief representatives of the older dithyrambic style, but, according to Plutarch, was supposed to have introduced certain innovations akin to those criticized by Aristophanes in his attacks on the new florid dithyrambs of the end of the fifth century and beginning of the fourth. The only dithyrambic fragment of Pindar of any extent (frag. 75) relates to a Dionysiac subject, viz., Semele, and shows the new tendency to greater metrical freedom in contrast to the strong strophic formation of Stesichorus. Some of the other fragments are lively and restless, and employ the cretic-paeonic rhythm, together with baccheuses, which are considered by Eustathius as typical of the Dithyramb.

This points to Asiatic influence, as we know that Sanskrit poetry is generally scanned by trisyllabic feet, and has always exhibited the greatest metrical variety and freedom, often per-

[1] For the rule as to the narration of adventure in Dithyramb: *δι' ἀπαγγελίας αὐτοῦ τοῦ ποιητοῦ*, see Plato, *Republic*, Bk. III, 394 A.

[2] See Crusius as follows: "Schwerlich hat erst die Tyrranis in dieser Zeit den Heroencult und den Heldenmythus in die Dionysische Religion hineingezogen, sogern sie deren seelenzwingende Macht in ihren Dienst stellte."

[3] Cp. Plutarch, *De Musica*, chap. XXIX.: *Λάσος δὲ ὁ Ἑρμιονεὺς εἰς τὴν διθυραμβικὴν ἀγωγὴν μεταστήσας τοὺς ῥυθμούς, καὶ τῇ τῶν αὐλῶν πολυφωνίᾳ κατακολουθήσας, πλείοσί τε φθόγγοις καὶ διερριμένοις χρησάμενος, εἰς μετάθεσιν τὴν προϋπάρχουσαν ἤγαγε μουσικήν.*



mitting several changes of metre within the same canto. Thus in the *Raghavapāndavīya* every canto shows variety of metre; and in one class of compound metre every verse in the stanza is in a different metre.[1] The metre is also to a large extent regulated by the number of syllables in the stanza, and in some cases the variety is so great that from 27 to 999 syllables may be permitted in each strophe, or from about 7 to about 250 in each verse. The tendency to free verses or ἀπολελυμένα is also seen in the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus, a writer whose general linguistic style has marked Asiatic affinities in its love of bombast and far-fetched metaphor.[2] Nor is the Asianism of Aeschylus unnatural. For we must remember how great was the influence exercised by Persia over Greek politics in his day—so great that even the most loyal Hellene might well, unconsciously, adopt Persian diction and ideas. We know also, on the authority of Aristotle, that the flute, an essentially Asiatic instrument, became very popular after the Persian wars; while we should not forget that this instrument was specially characteristic of dithyrambic performances.

As we have already touched on the musical innovations of the fourth century, which were chiefly introduced by the dithyrambic writers, the subject need not be dealt with further here. It is, therefore, rather with their poetical diction and far-fetched metaphors that we shall be concerned in this chapter. The chief representatives of the new school were Timotheus of Miletus—a city which, as we have seen already, was an important centre for Asiatic influence on Greek literature—and Melanippides and Philoxenus, both natives of islands in the southern Aegean, and consequently in close contact with Asia Minor.

In default of any extant dithyrambs composed by Timotheus, it will be necessary to refer, for examples of the peculiar literary characteristics of this style of composition, to his *Persae*, a

[1] See Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, vol. III., *On Sanskrit and Prakrit Poetry*.

[2] Cp. Aristophanes, *Clouds*, ll. 1366-7:

*ἐγὼ γὰρ Αἰσχύλον νομίζω πρῶτον ἐν ποιηταῖς,*
*ψόφου πλέων, ἀξύστατον, στόμφακα, κρημνοποιόν.*

nome which presents most of the features popularly attributed to the dithyrambic writers of his day. We know, besides, that in his hands the nome was closely assimilated to the Dithyramb. The *Persae*, accordingly, will serve admirably to illustrate its defects. Once more, it should be noted that the title and subject-matter of this piece, as well as the birthplace of its author, forewarn us to expect Asiatic influence in its composition. The language of the *Persae*, as of this school in general, is highly fantastic and long-winded, empty and bombastic, recalling the gibes of the Comic Poets against Cinesias and other writers of the Dithyramb. This was due in part to the over-importance of the musical accompaniment, which aimed at representing the action of the piece to be performed by the variety of the instrumentation, so that the poem itself became of little consequence.

According to Crusius, the chief grammatical peculiarities of this style of composition are (1) a great sparingness in the use of the article and of certain conjunctions; (2) a love of long compound nouns of a peculiar syntactical species;[1] (3) a strong tendency to use relative copulae and participial forms. Now it is a remarkable fact that, not merely one, but all of these features are characteristic of classical Sanskrit. Aristotle, who gives us some interesting information on the Dithyramb in his *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*, affords a striking confirmation of the theory of Asiatic influence being responsible for these compound forms. Thus he tells us that "a word may likewise be triple, quadruple, or multiple in form, like so many Massilian expressions, *e.g.* 'Hermocaico-xanthus.'"[2] Now Massilia, as we know, was a colony of Phocaea in Aeolis, and the word in question relates to the

[1] *E.g.*, *Cratylus*, 409 C. where Plato gives jestingly a mock derivation of σελαναια = σελήνη from σελαενονεοάεια, and Hermogenes replies Διθυραμβῶδές γε τοῦτο τοὔνομα. Smyth, in his *Melic Poets*, p. lvi, tells us that these compounds were first used by Antheas of Lindos (a contemporary of Cleobulus, one of the Seven Sages) ὃς πάντα τὸν βίον ἐδιονυσίαζεν. Owing to his birthplace, he would naturally be exposed to Asiatic influence, and his devotion to Dionysos is interesting in this connection.

[2] *Poetics*, 1457*a*, 35: εἴη δ' ἂν καὶ τριπλοῦν καὶ τετραπλοῦν ὄνομα καὶ πολλαπλοῦν, οἷον τὰ πολλὰ τῶν Μασσαλιωτῶν· Ἑρμοκαϊκόξανθος κ. τ. λ. Haug (*Sacred Language . . . of the Parsis*, p. 68) says, speaking of the character of the language of *The Avesta*, "we find, besides, a multitude of compound words of various kinds and the sentences are joined together in an easy way," etc.



geography of the mother-country; for all three words in the compound are the names of local rivers. Hence we may conclude that the Massilian settlers brought with them from their original home in Asia Minor a tendency to employ long compounds in their ordinary speech.

But it is in Aristophanes that we get the best examples of dithyrambic forms of this sort. One of these, which occurs in the *Clouds*, actually points to the Asiatic appearance and garb of the dithyrambic poets.[1] Thus in one word, σφραγιδονυχαργοκομήτας, the fifth century Sophists are described as "lazy and long-haired and wearing seal-rings on their fingers," and are further described as "quacks" and "prophets from Thurii," "cheats and idlers," and "song-twisters of dithyrambic choruses who are kept in idleness by the Clouds, because they celebrate them in song." When we recall the fact that this comedy is especially directed against the new school of Sophists, and further recollect that philosophy and medicine came to Greece from Asia, there seems to be a particular applicability in references to Asianism in this play.[2] Indeed, Aristophanes entertained much the same feeling towards Asiatic, as the Early Victorian Englishman to Continental, culture. Hence we find references to the various kinds of Asiatic influence all jumbled together in his plays, and all regarded as equally reprehensible. In any case the allusion to "prophets from Thurii" and "quacks" must be directed against Asianism, as both these classes were derived from Ionia; while the idleness which Aristophanes denounces might be taken as identical with the abstention from activity recommended in the philosophy of the *Upanishads*. Again the word "song-twisters" (ᾀσματοκάμπτας),

[1] *Clouds*, ll. 331 ff. where Socrates says:

> οὐ γὰρ μὰ Δί' οἶσθ' ὅτιὴ πλείστους αὗται βόσκουσι σοφιστάς,
> θουριομάντεις, ἰατροτέχνας, σφραγιδονυχαργοκομήτας,
> κυκλίων τε χορῶν ᾀσματοκάμπτας, ἄνδρας μετεωροφένακας,
> οὐδὲν δρῶντας βόσκουσ' ἀργούς, ὅτι ταύτας μουσοποιοῦσιν.

[2] Since writing the above, I find Miss Harrison, in her newly published *Themis*, takes the same view as to the attitude of Aristophanes to the Persians in this particular play, where she says (p. 461): "Socrates in his basket contemplating τὰ μετέωρα is not only, or chiefly, the fantastic philosopher, he is the pilloried Persian."

applied to the dithyrambic poets, clearly points to the word κάμπη or "trill," which, as we know already, was an Asiatic term.

As to the long compound σφραγιδονυχαργοκομήτας, we have here, quite apart from its length, an extraordinary and un-Hellenic formation. Strictly speaking it should mean "seal-ring-finger-nail-lazy-longhaired." But this makes nonsense.

Now in Sanskrit and Persian[1] such forms were quite natural and had a very distinct meaning. A series of examples will make this plain. First let us take the latter half merely of the Aristophanic compound, -ἀργοκομήτας. This is what is called in Sanskrit a *Dvandva*, or copulative compound, and may be compounded in that language of any number of nouns, or, less often, of adjectives;[2] *e.g. śuklakṛshṇa*, "light and dark"; *sv-asitāyata-locanā*, "having beautiful black and long eyes," an epithet of Damayantī, the heroine of the *Story of Nala* (Bk. XII. v. 66). This latter word is compounded of an adverb *su* (equivalent to the Greek εὐ), an adjective *asita*, "black," a participle *āyata* meaning "extended" or "long," and used adjectivally, and a derivative from *locana*, "an eye." Generally speaking, a Greek would shrink from combining so many adjectives together in a single compound, yet this is a comparatively brief formation for a Sanskrit *Dvandva*.

Now if we take the first half of the Aristophanic compound, σφραγιδονυχ-, we have the stem of a compound in which one part is in a case relation dependent on the other. In Sanskrit this species is especially frequent when, as here, the case is a locative; but Aristophanes, to ridicule the type, has deliberately placed the word in the locative relation second, instead of first, as it should be naturally, and as it would appear in Sanskrit; *e.g. divi-kshit*, "dwelling in the sky" (*i.e. divi*, "in the sky," *kshit*, "dwelling"), and *apsu-ja*, "born in the waters."[3] Moreover, it is reserved to Sanskrit and Persian alone of the Aryan languages to combine these different types of compounds into one single form of the copulative or *dvandva* class, such as

[1] See Haug, chapter on *The Avesta Language*, p. 68.
[2] See Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1252 and § 1257*a*.
[3] Whitney, *Sansk. Gramm.*, § 1250*d*.



σφραγιδονυχαργοκομήτας, so that the first half now appears as what is called in Sanskrit a possessive compound, without any additional suffix to denote possession, *e.g. sūryatejas or* "(possessing) the brightness of the sun"; while the second half retains its original independent copulative construction. The whole word σφραγιδονυχαργοκομήτας, may now be compared with a Sanskrit compound of the type *hṛshita-rag-rajohīna* "(wearing) fresh garlands and free from dust"; from *hṛshita*, "fresh," *raj*, "a garland," *rajo* (or *rajas*), "dust," and *hīna*, "free from."[1]

As to the excessive length of the dithyrambic compound, this peculiarity is often parodied by Aristophanes, and even introduced where there is no immediate reference to the Dithyramb, *e.g.* κωδωνοφαλαροπώλους, "driving horses with bells on their trappings" (*Frogs*, l. 963), in an allusion to the lost *Memnon* of Aeschylus. There is little room for doubt that the comic poet here makes a hit at the Asianism of Aeschylus' style, as also in σαλπιγγολογχυπηνάδαι, "sons of trumpet, lance, and moustache," in line 966 of the same play; and hence Aristophanes has appropriately introduced these long mouth-filling compounds of Sanskrit type. So too in the ludicrously long compound which occupies six lines at the end of the *Ecclesiazusae* we have a capital parody of such *dvandva* forms as siṅha-dvipi-ruru-vyāghra-mahisharkshā-*ganair*, occurring in the twelfth canto of the *Nalopākhyānam*, and meaning "with troops of lions, panthers, deer, tigers, buffaloes, and bears."

Two more grammatical peculiarities of the Dithyramb remain. Of these the tendency to heap up participles and to employ relative copulae finds a parallel in Sanskrit.[2] There the participle plays a very important part, especially in the long compounds, where it often represents a long relative clause. The relative, however, is also very freely and somewhat redundantly employed

[1] Whitney, *Sansk. Gramm.*, § 1257*a*. Compare also the compounds found in Pratinas, I. (p. 71, Smyth's *Melic Poets*), such as ὀλεσισιαλοκάλαμον and παραμελορυθμοβάταν. These are interesting, as Pratinas was inveighing against a typical exponent of the new school of dithyrambic composition, and these compounds are intended as examples of the new tendency.
[2] See Smyth's *Melic Poets*, p. lvii, and also article on *Dithyramb* in Pauly by Crusius.

in Sanskrit.[1] The following examples will show this. The first, which is taken from the *Naishadhīya* of Śrīharsha—esteemed, as we are told, by many the most beautiful poem in the language—is as follows: vaneshu . . . mṛiga-dvijā-hīna-śikeshu,[2] *i.e.* "in forests where the tips (of sharp grass) are cropped by the teeth of stags." Here the participle *hīna*, "cropped," or "removed," combined with the nouns in the compound adjective, constitutes a whole relative clause. Better still is the following instance from the *Śakuntalā*:[3] "where stands yon stage, facing the sun's orb, immovable as the trunk of a tree, his body half-buried in an ant-hill, with (his) breast closely-encircled by a snake's-skin, round the throat excessively pinched by a necklace of the tendril of a withered creeper wearing a circular mass of matted hair enveloping his shoulders and filled with birds' nests."

Here we have a string of participles, some of them in the middle or at the end of long compound forms, and of the former, some have actually lost their participial force in the language altogether, and are used as ordinary adjectives, e.g., *jīrṇa* and *pratāna*; others again, are used independently, as *bibhraj*, "bearing," and *sthitaḥ*, the perfect participle passive, used as a neuter present form, meaning "standing." Again, the relative form *yatra*, "where," used in conjunction with the perf. partic. pass. *sthitaḥ*, without any substantive verb here, as very commonly in Sanskrit, represents an ordinary adverbial clause with the relative and the verb in the indicative mood. Indeed, Whitney[4] tells us that the language has a decided predilection for the use of the passive participle, generally without a copula, to express ordinary tenses both present or past; and also that in the later Sanskrit, in some styles "the prevailing expression of past time is by means of the passive participle." This is probably due to the fact that Sanskrit in general, has a tendency to cast its sentences in a passive form, and the past participle passive is in

[1] See Whitney, *Sansk. Gramm.*, § 512 (*b*).
[2] See Colebrooke's *Essays*.
[3] Act VII. verse 175: valmīkārdhanimagnamūrtir urasā sandashṭa-sarpatvacā kaṇṭhe jīrṇa-latā-pratāna-valayenātyardha-sampīḍitaḥ aṇsavyāpi śakuntanīḍanicitaṁ bibhrajjaṭāmaṇḍalaṁ yatra sthāṇur ivācalo munir asāvabhyarkavimbaṁ sthitaḥ.
[4] *Sansk. Gramm.*, § 999.



most languages a convenient form to use where this is the case. We also meet with periphrastic sentences, containing the present and future participles, very often with certain modal verbs; and, in fact, the participle is of more frequent occurrence in Sanskrit than any other part of the verb.[1]

As to the absence of the article and of conjunctions, which has been noted as a feature of dithyrambic poetry, it should be observed that in Sanskrit we have no definite article, while for the indefinite article the numeral *eka* "one" is substituted in the later language. The conjunction *ca* (καὶ) is, also, frequently omitted.

Apart from these grammatical idiosyncrasies the Dithyrambists showed other tendencies of style which excited the ridicule of contemporary Greece. One of these was their excessive interest in the subject of the Clouds, about which, according to Socrates in the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, they were continually writing. Now this constant mention of the Clouds is one of the most striking traits of Hindu literature from the earliest times. The very religion of the ancient Indian was evolved from the observation of cloud-phenomena, and, hence, cloud-imagery plays a very important part in the Vedic writings. But even in the later period of Sanskrit literature this subject enjoys the greatest popularity. One of the most famous poems of Kālidāsa, the greatest Hindu dramatist, is, for example, called *Meghadūta*[2] or *The Cloud Messenger*. In this a Cloud is invoked by an exiled *Yaksha*, or attendant on the Hindu God of Riches, to send a message to his wife. Great detail is given as to the movements of the Cloud, and there is much beauty of scenic description. So, too, in the *Vikramorvaśī*, attributed to the same poet, we have abundant references to the clouds. In this play the action begins in mid-air, the hero appearing in a cloud-car, and the heroine being one of the Apsarasas or Nymphs of the Watery Clouds.

Now in the *Birds* of Aristophanes the Dithyrambic poet Cinesias is asked by Peithetairos:[3] "Why come you circling

[1] *Sansk. Gramm.*, § 1075.
[2] See Macdonell's *Sanskr. Literature*, chapter XII. p. 335.
[3] See *Birds*, ll. 1383-5.

hither with limping foot?"—an allusion at once to the cyclic chorus of the Dithyramb, and to the disconnected style of this kind of composition. Cinesias makes answer that he has come in order that he may get wings from Peithetairos, and "flying up into the air may get hold of new air-tossed and snow-beaten preludes from the Clouds."[1] "Can one then fashion preludes from the clouds?" replies Peithetairos. To which the other makes answer:

> *κρέμαται μὲν οὖν ἐντεῦθεν ἡμῶν ἡ τέχνη·*
> *τῶν διθυράμβων γὰρ τὰ λαμπρὰ γίγνεται*
> *ἀέριά τινα καὶ σκότια καὶ κυαναυγέα*
> *καὶ πτεροδόνητα.*[2]

"All the most brilliant dithyrambic inspirations are misty, murky, dark-gleaming, high-flown things from the Clouds." This exactly describes the style of only too many Sanskrit poems, full as they are of turgid and confused imagery. It is also appropriate to both Sanskrit and Dithyrambic poetry in a more literal sense, inasmuch as air, mist, and clouds were the favourite themes in both classes of poems.

In the *Peace*[3] also we have a very interesting reference to these air-worshipping poets. Trygaeus' servant asks him on his return from his heavenward flight: "Did you see anyone else wandering about in the air except yourself?" To this Trygaeus replies: "No, unless perhaps two or three souls of dithyrambic poets." Clearly, according to Aristophanes, who is never wearied of jesting at their expense, all "good" dithyrambists go to their beloved sky after death. Then the servant wants to know what they were doing. Trygaeus tells him: "They were trying to collect preludes as they soared—I mean those floating things compounded of calm sky, mist, and clear air" (*ἀναβολὰς . . . τὰς εὐδιαεριαιθερινηχέτους τινάς*). Here Aristophanes clearly hits off the subject-matter and grammatical style of the dithyrambic prelude in a single long compound of characteristic quality.

[1] See *Birds*, ll. 1383-5:

> *ἀπὸ σοῦ πτερωθεὶς βούλομαι μετάρσιος*
> *ἀναπτόμενος ἐκ τῶν νεφελῶν καινὰς λαβεῖν*
> *ἀεροδονήτους καὶ νιφοβόλους ἀναβολάς.*

[2] See ll. 1387-90.

[3] Cp. *Peace*, ll. 827 ff.



Now we know from the *Rhetoric*[1] of Aristotle that these preludes were loosely constructed. He also tells us that they resembled epideictic exordia. Here again we have further evidence of Asiatic affinities in the Dithyramb. For the testimony of Aristotle points to a grammatical construction akin to the loose structure of the Sanskrit sentence, such as we have already dealt with, in which long compounds composed of nouns and adjectives loosely strung together play the part of subordinate clauses. Also his remark about the epideictic style of the Dithyramb hints at the floridity and exuberance characteristic of Asianism.

It may not be amiss here to give some illustrations of the treatment of the subject of the clouds in Sanskrit lyric poetry. In the *Śakuntalā*, in the seventh act, the Rajah enters in his cloud-car, and, surveying the scene beneath him, describes the gradual unfolding to view of the earth with its rivers and trees in language which recalls the beautiful description in the *Clouds* of Aristophanes of the ascent of the chorus of personified clouds.[2]

The difference between the Greek and Sanskrit passages is characteristic—the Hindu poet giving a semi-scientific and detailed account of the scenery.[3] In the same passage occurs a very fine picture of the range in which is situated the mythological abode of Kuvera, the Hindu god of Wealth. Here the golden stream that, according to legend, flows down the

[1] *Rhetoric*, Book III. c. 9, § 1: . . . *εἰρομένην καὶ τῷ συνδέσμῳ μίαν, ὥσπερ αἱ ἐν τοῖς διθυράμβοις ἀναβολαί.* Also III. 14. 5: *τὰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν διθυράμβων* (sc. *προοίμια*) *ὅμοια τοῖς ἐπιδεικτικοῖς.*

[2] See *Clouds*, ll. 279 ff.:

> *ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων κορυφὰς ἔπι*
> *δενδροκόμους, ἵνα*
> *τηλεφανεῖς σκοπιὰς ἀφορώμεθα,*
> *καρπούς τ'ἀρδομέναν ἱερὰν χθόνα, κ. τ. λ.*

[3] See p. 278 of Monier-Williams' edition: vegāvataraṇād āścaryadarśanaḥ saṁlakshyate manushyalokaḥ tathā hi śailānām avarohatīva śikharād unmajjatāṁ medinī, etc. "Through (my) quick descent the world seems wonderful. The earth descends as it were from the summit of the emergent mountains. The trees as their trunks come into view cease to be enveloped in their foliage. The rivers whose waters were lost in narrowness become visible," etc.

mountain is compared to a "bar of evening clouds" (megha-parighaḥ).[1] In this we see a good example of the way in which cloud-scenery appeals to the Indian. The natives of Northern India are naturally familiar with the beautiful effects produced by sunrise and sunset on the shifting clouds that appear on the lofty ranges in that quarter, and their daily observation of these phenomena has doubtless inspired much of their poetical fancy in regard to the clouds.

The following lines from Wilson's version[2] of the *Mudrā Rākshasa* will show how varied are the images employed in Sanskrit poetry to illustrate the subject:

> How beauteous are the skies at this soft season!
> 'Midst fleecy clouds, like scattered isles of sand,
> Upon whose breast the white heron hovers, flows
> In dark blue tides the many-channelled stream;
> And like the lotus blossoms, that unfold
> Their petals to the night, the stars expand.

Again, in the *Vikramorvaśī*, which teems with allusions to the clouds, we have a comparison between them and the noise of rapidly advancing chariots;[3] and once in the *Śakuntalā*[4] we even find evil spirits likened to them. In the fifth act of the drama *Mṛicchakati* occurs the following very picturesque account of the rainy season, which is peculiarly interesting in connection with a passage in the *Clouds* of Aristophanes:

> Through the air,
> A rival Keśava,[5] the purple cloud
> Rolls stately on, girt by the golden lightning,
> As by his yellow garb, and bears on high

[1] See p. 279 of Monier-Williams' edition.

[2] See Wilson's *Hindu Theatre*, Vol. II, Act III, p. 191.

[3] See Act I, Charioteer's Speech to the King: āyushmaṇ mahatā ratha-vaṅśeno 'ddarśitaṃ, etc.

[4] See end of Act III, where reference is made to the "shadows of Rākshasas, brown as evening clouds."

[5] The cloud is called a rival to the swan and peafowl mentioned in the lines preceding this quotation because it floats in the air; and, because like these it appears to have feathers or hair, it is called Keśava, an epithet derived from "keśa" or "hair," often applied to Vishnu. This comparison of clouds to storks is exceedingly common in Hindu poetry, and references to the lightning are also very frequent.



> The long white line of storks, . . .
> From the dark womb, in rapid fall descend
> The silvery drops, and glittering in the gleam,
> Shot from the lightning, bright and fitful, sparkle
> Like a rich fringe rent from the robe of heaven.
> The firmament is filled with scattered clouds,
> And, as they fly before the wind, their forms
> As in a picture, image various shapes,
> The semblances of storks and soaring swans,
> Of dolphins and the monsters of the deep,
> Of dragons vast, and pinnacles, and towers.[1]

Compare with this Strepsiades' reply in the *Clouds* when told by Socrates that the Sophists and Dithyrambists are the favourites of the Clouds and kept by them in idleness:[2]

> ταῦτ' ἄρ' ἐποίουν Νεφελᾶν στραπταίγλαν δάϊον ὁρμάν,
> πλοκάμους θ' ἑκατογκεφάλα Τυφῶ, πρημαινούσας τε θυέλλας,
> εἶτ' ἀερίας, διεράς, γαμψοὺς οἰωνοὺς ἀερονηχεῖς,
> ὄμβρους θ' ὑδάτων δροσερᾶν Νεφελᾶν·

This was the reason then that they hymned the onset wild of the Clouds, and the gleam
Of the lightning forked, and the tresses of him of the hundred heads, the God Typhos,
And the raging blasts. Then next they sang of the misty, liquid shapes that arose
With talons hooked, like air-floating birds, and the dewy clouds with their watery showers.

and the remark of Socrates a little further on:

> *Socrates.* ἦδη ποτ' ἀναβλέψας εἶδες νεφέλην Κενταύρῳ ὁμοίαν
> ἢ παρδάλει ἢ λύκῳ ἢ ταύρῳ;
> *Strepsiades.* νὴ Δί' ἔγωγ'· εἶτα τί τοῦτο;
> *Socr.* γίγνονται πάνθ' ὅ τι βούλονται.[3]

"Did you then ever look up and see a cloud like a Centaur, wolf or bull, Or leopard?"
*Strepsiades.* "By Zeus, I did indeed. But what of that?"
*Socr.* "They become what they will."

[1] The above lines are taken from Wilson's version.

[2] See ll. 335 ff. of the *Clouds*. Bentley's reading is here given instead of στραπταιγλᾶν as given in Green's text. The Scholiast tells us that Philoxenus employed the word στρεπταιγλᾶν or "whirling-bright."

[3] See ll. 346 ff.

Here then we see that the Dithyrambic writers pictured the Clouds as appearing in all sorts of fantastic shapes, just as we have seen them depicted in the Sanskrit Drama. In the first quotation the epithet *keśava* given to the cloud affords a very close parallel to the πλοκάμους Τυφῶ, as it is evident from the context that these Dithyrambic poets represented Typhos in the form of a jagged trailing cloud of feathery appearance.[1]

Now that many-headed monsters, such as Typhos, and wild animals should be favourite subjects with these writers is just what we should be prepared to expect as a result of Asiatic influence, in accordance with our knowledge of Oriental art. The Centaur, also, an essentially Oriental conception—as we shall presently see—appears to have enjoyed great popularity with this school of poets. For, a few lines after the reference to clouds shaped like centaurs, leopards, etc., just quoted from Aristophanes, there is an allusion[2] to "these long-haired fellows like the son of Xenophantes," *i.e.*, Hieronymus, the dithyrambic poet, and others of his class, where we are told that, as often as the Clouds see any of these, they turn themselves into Centaurs (*i.e.*, in mockery). We know also that Chaeremon, a florid poet of the fourth century, whose style displayed very marked Asiatic characteristics, composed a poem called *The Centaur*. References to this work occur in Aristotle and Athenaeus. The former speaks of it incidentally in *The Poetics*[3] as a "medley composed of all kinds of metres," and Athenaeus as a δρᾶμα πολύμετρον.[4] But we have already seen that variety of metre

[1] Cp. the fine-weather clouds commonly spoken of by sailors as "mares' tails." The word Typhos is akin to the Sanskrit *dhūma* or "smoke," "vapour," "cloud," and denotes a personified volcanic agency. It is true that Farnell, in his *Greece and Babylon*, regards the Typhoeus-myth as of Babylonian origin; but here we are rather concerned with its treatment in later times by the dithyrambic writers, where the influence of Aryan ideas would appear to have affected it. In any case, the Asiatic Aryan might easily have got the myth from the Babylonians and modified it.

[2] ll. 348-51 of the *Clouds*.

[3] See 1447, b. 20: ὁμοίως δὲ κἂν εἴ τις ἅπαντα τὰ μέτρα μιγνύων ποιοῖτο τὴν μίμησιν καθάπερ Χαιρήμων ἐποίησε Κένταυρον μικτὴν ῥαψῳδίαν ἐξ ἁπάντων τῶν μέτρων. Cp. also 1460, a 2: ἔτι δὲ ἀτοπώτερον κ. τ. λ., which shows that the practice was foreign to the Greeks.

[4] See Athenaeus, XIII. 608 d.



is eminently characteristic of Sanskrit poetry. Hence it is evident that the whole conception of this poem was highly Asiatic; and, from the pointed remarks of Aristophanes, it is obvious that towards the end of the fifth century, works on similar subjects were gaining in popularity to a very great extent. We may therefore conclude that, although the Centaur was a creation familiar to the Hellenic mind from the time of Homer, some remarkable increase of interest in the subject arose in the fifth century as a result of increased contact with Persian ideas.

There is, moreover, something peculiarly appropriate in the association of the Centaur with the Clouds, if we are prepared to admit that the conception is derived from the East. The discussion of this subject will be reserved for another chapter, as it is of great importance for the history of the Dionysiac cult. It is sufficient to say here that the Gandharva or Indian equivalent for the Greek Centaur, was pre-eminently a sky-dweller, and hence the association of centaurs and clouds by Aristophanes would be very apposite.

The heavenly bodies also play a very considerable part in Dithyrambic poetry, and herein we have a clear sign of Persian influence. Here, again, Aristophanes affords us valuable information. In his *Peace*, as we have seen, the servant of Trygaeus displays great anxiety concerning the future of the Dithyrambic poets. No sooner is he informed on this point than he persists in his questioning as follows:

οὐκ ἦν ἄρ' οὐδ' ἃ λέγουσι κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα,
ὡς ἀστέρες γιγνόμεθ' ὅταν τις ἀποθάνῃ;

"Then (if you met none but these souls) what they commonly say isn't the case in the air after all,—I mean that we become stars whenever any of us dies?" Trygaeus assures him that the common saying is correct, and tells him that Ion the Dithyrambic poet is now a star there, and that, on his arrival, all the other inhabitants of the air "at once began to address him as Morning Star" (εὐθέως . . . Ἑωΐον αὐτὸν πάντες ἐκάλουν ἀστέρα).

But we know from the *Yashts* of the *Avesta*[1] that the ancient

[1] See Haug, p. 202 and p. 205. Also de Milloué on *L'Origine d'après les livres sacrés de l'Inde et de la Perse* (p. 89).

Persians assigned places in the sun, moon, and stars, to certain heavenly beings. In Hindu mythology also, we know that the region of the atmosphere, or *Bhuvarloka*, was, according to the *Vishṇu-Purana*, the habitation of semi-divine beings called Siddhas.[1] Certain constellations were also supposed to be inhabited by the pious dead, who were regarded as their regents.[2] The extreme antiquity of this belief among the Aryans is shown by the commentator Sāyana on *Rig-Veda*, I. 50. 2, who tells us that in the Vedas the asterisms are inhabited by gods, *or else regarded as the visible forms of pious persons after death*.[3] Here we have an exact parallel to the Aristophanic reference which constitutes one more link between the Dithyramb and the East.[4]

Nor is this the only allusion in this play to Asiatic notions about the planets. In ll. 406-8:

> ἡ γὰρ Σελήνη χὠ πανοῦργος Ἥλιος,
> ὑμῖν ἐπιβουλεύοντε πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον,
> τοῖς βαρβάροισι προδίδοτον τὴν Ἑλλάδα.

we have clear reference to the prevalent Oriental worship of the Sun and Moon, and to the normal difference between the Greek and Persian religions in this respect; while it would also seem, from the second line, as if Oriental influences were beginning to make themselves strongly felt in the religion of Athens at this time. In fact, there is something so pointed about the tone of both these passages, that one is led to infer that here Aristophanes is once again raising a protest against the intrusion of Medism into the life and thought of the City.[5]

The reference to the Dithyrambic poet Ion is interesting in another respect. We are told that the reason he was called the

[1] See Monier-Williams' *Sanskr. Dictionary*, pp. 715 and 1114.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 574, col. 2.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 464, col. 2.
[4] The example quoted by Demetrius, *De Elocutione*, 91 (see Smyth's *Melic Poets*, Introduction, p. lvi, footnote) of dithyrambic language: *θεοτερ-άτους πλάνας, ἄστρων δορύπορον στρατόν* is very characteristic of Sanskrit lyric poetry in comparing the stars to an army.
[5] Since writing the above, I find that the same idea has occurred to Miss Harrison, who is evidently referring to this passage in her *Themis*, p. 461.



Morning Star was because he had written an ode of which the first line began:

> ἀοῖον ἀεροφοίταν ἀστέρα μείναμεν ἀελίου λευκᾷ πτέρυγι πρόδρομον.
>
> We wait the misty morning star with white wing speeding
> Before the Sun.

The fantastic alliterative style of this line had evidently caught the fancy of Athenian wits as a subject for satire. Indeed a love of alliteration appears to have been one of the marks of the dithyrambic style at this time, if we may judge from some other passages satirized by Aristophanes. Thus, in the *Birds*, Cinesias, in some nonsensical lines, which are intended as a specimen of his poetical skill, speaks of himself as

> ἁλίμενον αἰθέρος αὔλακα τέμνων.[1]

"Tracing in heaven a harbourless track," where, of the four words in the line, three begin with the same letter. But perhaps the best example of this tendency given by Aristophanes occurs in the *Frogs* as follows:

> εἴ τις πτερώσας Κλεόκριτον Κινησίᾳ
> αἴροιεν αὖραι πελαγίαν ὑπὲρ πλάκα, κ. τ. λ.[2]

where, again, we have the usual allusions to wings and air-voyages in connection with that intrepid aviator Cinesias.

Now among the many metrical *tours de force* characteristic of Sanskrit lyrical poetry, we find alliteration holds an important position, *e.g.*, in two well-known poems, the *Gītagovinda* and the *Nalodaya*.[3] Both these are highly artificial in style and exhibit great metrical skill, thereby showing other familiar features of the Dithyramb.

We see the same love of alliteration in the *Persae* of Timotheos, a poem which has already been mentioned as presenting well-marked dithyrambic peculiarities. Indeed, a great deal of the obscurity of both Sanskrit and dithyrambic poetry may well be due to the difficulty of clear expression when fettered by complicated metrical rules.

[1] See *Birds*, ll. 1400.
[2] See *Frogs*, ll. 1438-9.
[3] See Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, and Macdonell's *Sanskr. Liter.*

Accordingly in the *Acharnians*, Aristophanes satirizes Hieronymus—one of the dithyrambic poets of the day—when he represents the Chorus as offering Dicaeopolis an invisible helmet in these words:

> λαβὲ δ' ἐμοῦ γ' ἕνεκα παρ' Ἱερωνύμου
> σκοτοδασυπυκνότριχά τιν' Ἄϊδος κυνῆν'[1]

Here we have a double reference to the peculiarities of the dithyrambic style; first, in the use of the long compound adjective which describes the helmet and is obviously a parody of the dithyrambic compound, and in the next place, in the allusion to the invisibility which it bestows, *i.e.*, the obscurity of its owner's language.

Now in the *Persae* of Timotheos, of which we possess a large fragment descriptive of the destruction of the Persian fleet, the following lines occur, affording an instance at once of alliteration and obscure diction:

> εἰ δὲ ἀντίτοιχος ἀκτὶς προσαίξει
> πολυκρότου ῥιπαῖσι τάχα πλευρᾶς
> πευκᾶς πάλιν ἐφέροντο κ. τ. λ.[2]

"But if the ram (of an enemy's ship) dashed like lightning against the bulwarks, they backed their vessels speedily, with many a resounding blow on the pinewood hulls." This translation is of necessity somewhat free, as it is impossible to render accurately into English the peculiar effect of compression produced in the original; and much the same difficulty meets us everywhere in attempting to give a literal version of a Sanskrit passage.

Another very good example of alliteration is to be found in the following from the same poem:

> αὐτίκα μὲν ἀμφιστόμους
> ἄκοντας ἐκ χερῶν ἔρι—
> πτον, δρύπτετο δὲ πρόσωπον ὄνυ—
> χι Περσίδα στολὴν περὶ
> στέρνοις ἔρεικον εὐυφῆ,
> σύντονος δὲ ἁρμόζετο
> Ἀσιὰς οἰμωγά.[3]

[1] See *Acharnians*, ll. 389-90.
[2] See Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's *Persae* of Timotheos, ll. 12-14.
[3] See *Persae*, ll. 176-182. Compare the laboured description of the tiger killing his prey in the *Mālatī and Mādhava* (Wilson's *Hindu Theatre*, Vol. II. p. 43), and the excessive alliteration of the original Prakṛit as there quoted and translated, *Nara turanga jamgaluggarabhrida gala guhā gabbha gambhīra ghaggharovalli*, "roaring with a loud roar from the depth of the cavern of a throat filled with the flesh of man and steed."



A remarkable feature of this poem, noted by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, is the fact that the diction employed by the more important personages is far superior in point of style to that of the minor characters—so much so as to constitute almost a different dialect.

Here we have a parallel to the usual custom in Sanskrit literature, in which the kings, heroes, etc., always speak in Sanskrit, while the women and slaves use merely Prakṛit, a debased form of the classical language; just as, at the present day in India, the native women speak a somewhat different language from the men. Now this is a striking peculiarity in a Greek author; for it cannot be shown that there is any very marked difference between the language of the greater and lesser personages in ordinary Greek drama.

We have also instances of fantastic phraseology of a very Oriental type in the *Persae*, *e.g.*, ἀφρώδης ἀβαχχίωτος ὄμβρος,[1] for "brine"; "mountain-born pines" (πεύκαισι ὀριγόνοισι)[2] for "oars"; ἐγκλήισει . . . πεδία πλόιμα νομάσιν αὐγαῖς[3] for "he will take in the Gulf with comprehensive glance"; στόματος . . . μαρμαροφεγγεῖς παῖδες[4] for "teeth"; and the comparison of the sea, strewn with dead bodies, to the starlit sky.[5]

This last instance recalls the famous metaphor of Aeschylus in the *Agamemnon*,[6] but, whereas the older poet has a certain dignity and restraint about his diction, the fourth century writers aimed at novelty only, and very often produced the ridiculous effects so familiar to us in Oriental writers. But, whatever opinion may be held on the merits of fourth century poets, the undoubted

[1] ll. 71-3. [2] l. 88. [3] ll. 88-9. [4] ll. 103-4.
[5] ll. 105-7:

> κατάστερος δὲ πόντος
> ἐν λιποπνόης ψυχοστερέσιν
> ἐγάργαιρε σώμασιν, κ. τ. λ.

[6] ll. 559-560:

> ὁρῶμεν ἀνθοῦν πέλαγος Αἰγαῖον νεκροῖς
> ἀνδρῶν Ἀχαιῶν ναυτικοῖς τ' ἐρειπίοις.

Asianism of Aeschylus shows that the influence of Persia had been already felt before the Peloponnesian War in Greek poetry as in other provinces of Hellenic culture. In fact, here as elsewhere, the period of the Peloponnesian War marks the time when the Greeks were least affected by that influence.

It is not difficult to multiply examples of the Asianism of Aeschylus. Chief among these appears his love of bold metaphor, *e.g.*, the comparison of the life-blood of the dying Agamemnon to the dew on a cornfield;[1] the phrase "swift-foot eye"[2] in the *Seven against Thebes;* the substitution of the words πτηνὸν ἀργηστὴν ὄφιν[3] in the *Eumenides* for "an arrow"; the simile of the "bitter wrath" that "blows before the prow of the heart" in the *Choephoroi;*[4] and especially the comparison of the *Danaids*, in the *Supplices*, to fruit in an orchard.[5] Very characteristic, too, of Sanskrit metaphorical style is the tendency of Aeschylus to pile one simile upon another, as in the speech of Cassandra in the *Agamemnon* (ll. 1178 ff.), where the oracle is compared in swift succession to a bride, a wind, and a wave.

Now Aristophanes was fully aware of these peculiarities in the style of Aeschylus, in spite of his general appreciation of the great tragedian. For example, when Euripides in the *Frogs* is represented as criticizing his rival and speaking of him as:

> ἄνθρωπον ἀγριοποιὸν αὐθαδόστομον
> . . . . . .
> . . . . κομποφακελορρήμονα.[6]

---

[1] See ll. 1389-92 of the *Agamemnon*:

> κάκφυσιῶν ὀξεῖαν αἵματος σφαγὴν
> βάλλει μ' ἐρεμνῇ ψακάδι φοινίας δρόσου,
> χαίρουσαν οὐδὲν ἧσσον ἢ διοσδότῳ
> γάνει σπορητὸς κάλυκος ἐν λοχεύμασιν.

[2] l. 623. I give the MSS. reading. [3] "A winged glancing snake," l. 181.

[4] ll. 390-92 *Choephoroi*:

> . . . πάροιθεν δὲ πρῳρας
> δριμὺς ἅηται κραδίας
> θυμός, ἔγκοτον στύγος.

[5] ll. 965-973 *Supplices*.

[6] See ll. 837-9. Note that Tucker refers κομποφακελορρήμονα *not* to compound words, but to closely packed phrases.



this really represents what Aristophanes considers just censure of Aeschylus, and is directed against the bold condensed expressions and compounds of Asiatic type which he affected. We have already met some of these Aeschylean compounds, *e.g.*, κωδωνοφαλαροπώλους and σαλπιγγολογχυπηνάδαι. Another instance occurs in the *Eumenides* in δυσοδοπαίπαλα,[1] the MSS. reading, which Sidgwick questions, regarding the form as unique. But in the face of the evidence of Aristophanes, we can hardly doubt that Aeschylus would have been capable of employing such a form. So also in the *Frogs*, where the Coryphaeus thus addresses Aeschylus:

> ἀλλ' ὦ πρῶτος τῶν Ἑλλήνων πυργώσας ῥήματα σεμνὰ
> καὶ κοσμήσας τραγικὸν λῆρον θαρρῶν τὸν κρουνὸν ἀφίει.[2]

we have a pretty clear allusion to the "piled up" compounds and torrential flow of Asiatic poetry as imitated by the tragic poet. In the epithet ἀξύστατον applied to him in the *Clouds* we have yet another hit at his love of uncouth and untranslatable compounds.[3] While anyone who has had the doubtful pleasure of construing an unannotated Sanskrit text will fully appreciate the value of the "wedges" (σφῆνας) brought on the stage in the poetic contest in the *Frogs*;[4] for without some such means of splitting these long compounds the greater part of the text could not be translated. It is to be presumed, therefore, that Aristophanes playfully alludes to a similar necessity in the case of Aeschylus. Moreover, when Aristophanes in the same play ridicules his habit of introducing strange animals like "griffin eagles" (γρυπαιέτους),[5] we are at once reminded of the monsters of Oriental art. In this case, indeed, we have something more than mere conjecture to go upon in holding that the comic poet intends a direct reference to Asianism. For he puts the matter beyond all doubt a few lines later by making Euripides declare

---

[1] See l. 387 of *Eumenides*. [2] See ll. 1004-5.

[3] Sidgwick tells us that Aristophanes is here parodying l. 1467 of the *Agamemnon* where this word occurs and means "not to be allayed."

[4] See l. 801 of the *Frogs*. As a matter of fact Sanskrit students always split the long compounds at the point of suture thus |, as many a text can show, a custom which greatly enhances the value of second-hand texts.

[5] See l. 929.

that *he* did not resemble Aeschylus in his love for these weird animals, saying:

> *οὐχ ἱπποκεκρυόνας μὰ Δί' οὐδὲ τραγελάφους ἅπερ σύ,*
> *ἂν τοῖσι παραπετάσμασιν τοῖς Μηδικοῖς γράφουσιν.*[1]

Finally, in the *Birds* we have a very interesting allusion to Asiatic turgidity, where the Cock or Persian bird is greeted by Peithetairos on his appearance with cries of:

> *τίς ποτ' ἔσθ' ὁ μουσόμαντις ἄτοπος ὄρνις ὀριβάτης;*[2]

"Who on earth is this poetico-prophetic, extraordinary, hill-dwelling bird?" In this line we have the key to Aristophanes' conception of Asianism—it is mystical (*μουσόμαντις*), fantastic (*ἄτοπος*), and "high-falutin'" (*ὀριβάτης*). The last word is a doubtful reading, as a difficulty arises as to the quantity and, even if we retain it, may merely contain a reference to the hill-dwelling Persians; but it is tempting to see in it a further allusion—not out of place in an Aristophanic passage—to the bombastic or "lofty" style of the Oriental. If we read *ἁβροβάτης* we have, of course, an obvious reference to Asiatic luxury and softness.

In this play, too, the Dithyrambic poet, who makes his entry with an appropriate invocation of the Cloud-City, thus:

> *Νεφελοκοκκυγίαν τὰν εὐδαίμονα*
> *κλῄσον, ὦ Μοῦσα,*
> *τεαῖς ἐν ὕμνων ἀοιδαῖς.*[3]

and further shows the affection of his class for this subject of the clouds in the line:

> *πάλαι πάλαι δὴ τήνδ' ἐγὼ κλῄζω πόλιν.*[4]

is represented as poorly-dressed, like a slave—presumably therefore a Phrygian—and wearing the long hair characteristic of his type and of Asiatics generally.[5] Besides, his love of periphrasis shown in the parody:

> *ἐγὼ μελιγλώσσων ἐπέων ἰείς ἀοιδάν,*[6] *κ. τ. λ.*

[1] See ll. 937-8. In the *Peace* also the *ἱπποκάνθαρος* is intended as a parody of Aeschylus' love of "compound" animals.
[2] See l. 276. [3] See *Birds*, l. 905 ff. [4] See l. 921.
[5] Cp. l. 911: *ἔπειτα δῆτα δοῦλος ὢν κόμην ἔχεις*; cp.: *σφραγιδονυχαργοκομήτας.*
[6] See l. 908.



("sending forth a song of honey-sweet words"), and in his using the needless compound *ὑφαντοδόνητον* for the simple *ὑφαντόν* (l. 943), is eminently characteristic of Oriental style, and numerous instances might easily be quoted from Sanskrit lyric poetry.

Another very Oriental linguistic peculiarity which now makes its appearance in Greek poetry is a love of repetition. We see this trait in Hindustani grammar in the formation of the superlative degree, which is expressed by the repetition of the adjective. In all ages of Sanskrit, too, repeated nouns, adjectives, etc., are commonly used to denote an intensive meaning,[1] and instances of this occur in the lyric poets. Hence Euripides in his *Orestes* appropriately makes the excited Phrygian slave break out into lamentations of the following sort:

> *φροῦδα φροῦδα, γᾶ γᾶ* (l. 1373):
> *Ἴλιον Ἴλιον, ὤμοι μοι* (l. 1381):

and

> *ἰαλέμων ἰαλέμων*
> *Δαρδανία κ. τ. λ.*

In fact, the whole speech of this Phrygian is full of these repeated phrases. Euripides himself affected this mannerism, and was mercilessly parodied by Aristophanes in the *Frogs* for so doing.

But the trait of all others most characteristic of Sanskrit poetry is a certain grotesqueness and lack of a sense of humour shown in the frequent introduction of startling metaphors and comparisons, and generally in sudden transitions. That this tendency to variety was also a feature of the Dithyramb we know from Plutarch;[2] and Aristophanes doubtless alludes to this in the *Birds* when he makes the Dithyrambic Poet Cinesias exclaim:[3]

> Lo! with light wings to Olympus I soar,
> Flying now hither, now thither, in greed
> For songs, as with fearless soul I speed
> On a path unknown before.

[1] See Whitney's *Sanskr. Gramm.*, § 1260.
[2] See Plutarch, *De EI Apud Delphos*, c. IX: *καὶ ᾄδουσι τῷ μὲν* (sc. *Διονύσῳ*) *διθυραμβικὰ μέλη παθῶν μεστὰ καὶ μεταβολῆς, πλάνην τινὰ καὶ διαφόρησιν ἐχούσης.*
[3] ll. 1372 ff.: *ἀναπέτομαι δὴ πρὸς Ὄλυμπον πτερύγεσσι κούφαις κ. τ. λ.*

In Sanskrit poetry this quaintness of imagery is especially noticeable in similes connected with the lotus and the elephant, which are compared to the most varied objects, often with ludicrous results.[1] Again and again we find the heroine's gait compared to that of a young elephant, while her lips, eyes, hands, and feet may all equally readily be likened to the blossom of a lotus. And can anything, according to European notions, be more comic than the comparison of the heroine by the hero to an elephant at the end of the *Śakuntalā*, where the recognition scene takes place? Here he wonders at his having failed at first to recognize her in these words: "My mind has passed through such transitions as if one were to say 'that is not an elephant' while its form was before one's eyes and doubt were to arise in the mind on its walking past, but conviction were to take place after seeing its footsteps."[2] It should be remarked that in this passage the comparison is merely accidental, any other object than the elephant being just as easily substituted to illustrate the perplexity of the speaker. A maiden's gait, however, is often deliberately likened to that of an elephant; while the rain-cloud, elephant, and lotus are incessantly employed together in Indian similes, and the first two are frequently compared with each other, *e.g.* in Wilson's translation of the drama called *Mṛicchakati* or *The Toy Cart*, Act V, we read of:

> The Clouds that like unwieldy elephants
> Roll their inflated masses grumbling on.

---

[1] As an example of the far-fetched style of Sanskrit imagery we may note the following from the *Vikramorvaśī*:

> parijanavanitākarārpitābhiḥ
> parivṛita(s) esha vibhāti dīpikābhiḥ,
> giriṛ iva gatimāṇ. . . .
> anutaṭapushpitakarṇikārayashṭiḥ
> (Act III, Scene 2).

"He (*i.e.*, the king) surrounded by lanterns held in the hands of the women of his suite appears as he moves like a mountain whose slopes are covered by the blossoms of the slender *karṇikāra*."

[2] See Act VII. verse 195 of *Śakuntalā*, p. 309 of Monier-Williams' edition:

> yathā gajo neti samaksharūpe tasminn atikrāmati saṁśayaḥ syāt
> padāni dṛishṭvā tu bhavet pratītis tathāvidho me manaso vikāraḥ//



In further illustration of this tendency, the following passage from the Sanskrit prose-romance, *Harsha-Carita* (written about the seventh century of our era),[1] taken from the translation given in Macdonell's *Sanskrit Literature*, will afford an excellent idea of Oriental bad taste and lack of humour. It describes a princess as "lost in the forest and in thought, bent upon death, and the root of a tree, fallen upon calamity and her nurse's bosom . . . her mouth closed with silence as well as by her hand, and held fast by her companions as well as by grief. I saw her with her kindred and her graces all gone, her ears and her soul left bare, her ornaments and her aims abandoned, her bracelets and her hopes broken, her companions and the needle-like grass spears clinging round her feet, . . . her sighs and her hair long, her limbs and her merits exhausted, her aged attendants and her streaming tears falling down at her feet," etc.

Another feature of Sanskrit and of Oriental literature in general is a great love of detail. This is particularly noticeable in the *Harsha-Carita*, which is so filled with lengthy description that there is hardly any room for narrative. Now it is interesting to note that one of Aristotle's criticisms of the typically Hellenistic poet Chaeremon is that he is ἀκριβὴς . . . ὥσπερ λογογράφος.[2] Sandys thinks that this love of detail is shown in a fragment by him, preserved by Athenaeus, enumerating the flowers of a garland.

Now we are told by Athenaeus that Chaeremon had a great partiality for flowers, passages from several of his plays being quoted in proof of this. These are all very reminiscent of Oriental lyric poetry in general, which, to an even greater degree than any poetry of the Hellenistic age, has always delighted in painting the beauty of natural scenery and of flowers in particular. Especially suggestive of Sanskrit lyrical style are the passages from his *Oineus* and *Alphesiboea*. That from the *Oineus* depicts a group of sleeping maidens. The opening lines are painfully typical of Oriental bad taste and want of restraint, recalling many of the worst features of Kālidāsa's style; the concluding lines, of which a translation follows, are poetical, but

[1] See Macdonell's *Sanskr. Liter.*, pp. 333-4.

[2] See Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III. 12. 2.

the reference to the crocus is marred by the fantastic style so often to be met with in Sanskrit poetry, and so frequently derided by Aristophanes as a feature of the new poetic school.

> On beds of elecampane they lay
> Asleep, or wove in wreaths the dark-winged leaves
> Of pansies and the crocus that bestows
> The sun-bright image of its own abode
> On maidens' raiment. Pillowed were their heads
> On marjoram that bloomed 'mid meadows soft,
> Fed by the dew.[1]

The passage from the *Alphesiboea* is even more suggestive of Oriental influence; for there we have a picture in which flowers are compared to women, as often in Sanskrit Lyric, in such a way that the identity of the one class is lost in that of the other; and, were it not that Athenaeus has warned us to expect a description of flowers,[2] we should have fancied that the fragment referred to persons alone. This tendency to personify flowers is further shown in the fragment preserved by Athenaeus from Chaeremon's *Io*, in which they are called *ἔαρος τέκνα*, just as in *The Centaur* he speaks of them as *λειμῶνος τέκνα*, and in his *Dionysos* the ivy is called **Χορῶν ἐραστὴς . . . ἐνιαυτοῦ δὲ παῖς.**

The examples of this tendency in Sanskrit literature are so numerous that there is no difficulty in producing parallels. In the *Śakuntalā*, when the heroine is about to leave the grove in

[1] Athenaeus, XIII. 608a:

> *Ὑπνωμέναι δ' ἔπιπτον ἐλενίων ἔπι,*
> *ἴων τε μελανόφυλλα συγκλῶσαι πτερὰ*
> *κρόκον θ', ὃς ἡλιῶδες εἶδωλον εἰς ὑφάσματα*
> *πέπλων σκιᾶς εἴδωλον εἰσομόργνυται.*
> *ἔρσαις δὲ θαλερὸς ἐκτραφεὶς ἀμάρακος*
> *λειμῶσι μαλακοῖς ἐξέτεινεν αὐχένας.*

[2] See Athenaeus, XIII. 608d: *Ἐπικατάφορος δὲ ὢν ὁ ποιητὴς οὗτος καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνθη, ἐν Ἀλφεσιβοίᾳ φησί·*

> *καὶ σώματος μὲν ὄψεις κατειργάζετο*
> *στίλβοντα λευκῷ χρώματι διαπρεπῆ·*
> *αἰδὼς δ' ἐπερρύθμιζεν ἠπιώτατον*
> *ἐρύθημα λαμπρῷ προστιθεῖσα χρώματι·*
> *κόμαι δὲ κηροχρῶτες κ. τ. λ.*



which she dwelt, one of the characters in the play invokes the trees thus:[1] "Listen, listen ye neighbouring trees of the penance-grove . . . let her be affectionately dismissed by you all"; while another of those present remarks on the signs of grief at her departure shown by the grove and its denizens, as follows:[2] "The deer let fall the mouthfuls of Darbha-grass, the peacocks cease their dancing, the creepers, as they cast their pale leaves, appear to shed tears." Then the heroine proceeds to say farewell to a young jasmine which she calls her "tendril-sister, the moon-light of the grove,"[3] and speaks of its branches as "arms." All this, as we may see, becomes sufficiently exaggerated and ludicrous when the tendency is carried as far as it usually is by Indian poets, and enables us to appreciate the earlier Greek feeling of derision for the fantastic dithyrambic and Hellenistic style.

The following passage from the *Vikramorvaśī* is a further instance of the tendency to personify nature in Hindu poetry. It depicts the heroine recovering from a swoon:[4]

> As shows the night when darkness fades away
> And the moon rises, or as gleams the flame
> Of evening fires through smoky masses thick
> A pathway clearing, or even as the Ganges
> That turbid once with crumbling banks appeared
> Grows clear again, so this fair maid is freed
> From faintness.

---

[1] The versions given are those of Monier-Williams' edition. See Act IV. p. 161 where Kasyapa speaks:

> Bho! Bhoḥ sannihitās tapovanataravaḥ
> . . . sarvair anujnāyatāṃ v. 89.

[2] Act IV. p. 164: Priyaṁvadā speaks:

> udgalitadarbhakavalā mṛigāḥ parityaktanartanā mayūrāḥ |
> apasṛitapāṇḍupattrā muñcanty aśrūṇīva latāḥ v. 92.

[3] P. 165 Monier-Williams' Text:

> latā-bhaginīṁ, vanajyotsnāṁ.

[4] See Monier-Williams' Text. The King speaks:

> āvirbhūte śaśini tamasā ricyamāne 'va rātriṛ, naiśasyā 'rciṛ
> hutabhuja iva chinnabhūyishṭhadhūmā, / mohenā 'ntaṛ varatanuṛ
> iyaṁ lakshyate mucyamānā, Gaṅgā rodhaḥpatanakalushā gacchatī
> 'va prasādaṃ.//

In the above passages we have also some very good examples of the descriptive power of the Sanskrit compounds. Thus the idea "bursting thro' masses of smoke" is expressed by the compound adjective *chinna-bhūyishṭha-dhūmā* applied to the flame; while the picture of a river in flood with turbid stream and crumbling banks is given in the one word—*rodhaḥpatanakalushā.*

A still more striking instance of the Indian love of similes from nature is afforded by the description of Damayantī in the sixteenth canto of the *Tale of Nala*, where she is compared in the space of a few lines[1] several times to the full moon, the crescent moon, the night, the moon-light, the lotus-flower, and a failing stream. And in the *Ṛitusaṇhāra*, a typically Asiatic poem on the six Indian seasons, we have the constant occurrence of comparisons of a similar nature between persons and flowers, together with the usual Oriental extravagance and bad taste, which in this poem, as elsewhere, mar many passages of great beauty and feeling for nature.

But it is in the twelfth canto of the *Tale of Nala* that we get one of the best illustrations of Asiatic exuberance in describing natural scenery. This opens with the description of a forest in which all its trees are enumerated in turn. Needless to say the Sanskrit compound is here given full play. It may not be amiss here to quote the passage as rendered by Dean Milman:[2]

> Thick with Śals, bamboos, Aśwatthas, Dhavas, and the Ebon dark,
> Oily Inguds, Kinśuks, Arjuns, Ním trees, Syandans, Śálmalas;
> Full with Rose-apples and Mangoes, Lodh trees, Catechus and Canes,
> Blushing Lotuses, Kadambas, and the tree with massy leaves;
> Close o'erspread with jujubes, Bel trees, tangled with the holy Fig,
> Palms, Priyálas, Dates, Harítas, trees of every form and name.
> Pregnant with rich mines of metal many a mountain it enclosed,
> Many a shady resonant arbour, many a deep and wondrous glen;
> Many a lake, and pool, and river, birds and beasts of every shape.
> She, in forms terrific round her, serpents, elves and giants saw:
> Pools, and tanks of lucid water, and the shaggy tops of hills,
> Flowing streams and headlong torrents saw, and wondered at the sight.

[1] See *Tale of Nala*, Canto XVI. verses 11-14.

[2] See Canto XII. verses 3-9:

> śālaveṇudhavāśvatthatindukeṅgudakiṁśukaiḥ,
> arjunārishṭhasaṅchannaṁ syandanaiśca saśālmalaiḥ, etc.



And in the same canto we see to what length the Oriental went in his personification of nature. For Damayantī, in her distress at the loss of Nala, here invokes the assistance of the Aśoka tree as follows:

> To another region passed she, there with voice by weeping choked
> Mourns she, till with eyes o'er-flowing an Aśoka tree she saw.
> Best of trees, the Aśoka blooming, in the forest she approached,
> Gemmed all o'er with glowing fruitage, vocal with the songs of birds
> Ah, behold, amid the forest flourishes this happy tree,
> With its leafy garlands radiant as the joyous mountain-king,
> O thou tree with pleasant aspect from my sorrow set me free.

and further on similarly:

> That I may depart ungrieving, fair Aśoka, answer me.
> Truly be thou named Aśoka, as the extinguisher of grief.

Here we have much the same idea as is presented by the Greek worship of Hamadryads.

Similarly, the *Mālatī and Mādhava* contains a long detailed scenic passage full of the names of Indian trees.[1] We may compare also the following beautiful passage from the *Vikramorvaśī*, which is not unworthy of the genius of Theocritus:

> 'Tis past mid-day. Exhausted by the heat,
> The peacock plunges in the scanty pool,
> The tall tree's root: the drowsy bee
> Sleeps in the hollow chamber of the lotus
> Darkened with closing petals: on the brink
> Of the now tepid lake the wild duck lurks
> Amongst the sedgy shade; and even here,
> The parrot from his wiry bower complains,
> And calls for water to allay his thirst.[2]
>
> (Wilson's Version).

Now we meet this love of flowers and scenery with ever-increasing frequency in Greek poetry from the fourth century onwards. In the time of Aristophanes we see it in the case of

[1] See page 100 of Wilson's *Hindu Theatre*, Vol. II. See also verses 26-31, Chapter III. of *Kumāra-Sambhava.*

[2] See *Vikramorvaśī*, Act II. at end:

> Katham arddhaṁ gataṁ divasasya; ataḥ khalu
> ushṇāluḥ śiśire nishīdati taroṛ mūlālavāle śikhī;
> nirbhidyo 'parikarṇikārakusumānyˌ āśerate shaṭpadāḥ,' etc.

Agathon, a tragic poet of dithyrambic type, who wrote a play called *The Flower*, and was bitterly satirized by Aristophanes[1] for his effeminate appearance and life. This circumstance would lead us to expect Asianism in his case. Moreover, Euripides, who is coupled with him by Aristophanes, has, almost alone of the classical Greek poets, shown a strong feeling for Nature in the beautiful lyrics of the *Bacchae*, while at the same time he displays an Oriental love of subtle philosophical disquisitions, and heralds in the new Hellenistic era in many respects.

It is well known that during the Alexandrian Age the Greeks tended to take a greater interest in natural scenery, and various reasons have been offered in explanation of this phenomenon. If we suppose that the signs of this tendency first appeared with the new Dithyrambic School and writers of kindred style at the end of the fifth century, and that this was due to increased intercourse with Asia Minor, it is obvious that after the conquests of Alexandria, when that intercourse must have been much greater, this tendency would become much more apparent.

This we see in the Bucolic poems of Theocritus and in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius. The latter work, with its many beautiful though brief scenic passages, shows a far keener feeling for Nature than might have been expected from the general plan of the work. In the third book we have a typically Oriental comparison in the lines which depict the the meeting of Jason and Medea:[2]

So these twain stood—all stirless and wordless stood face to face:
As oaks they seemed, or as pines upsoaring in stately grace,
Which side by side all still mid the mountains rooted stand
When winds are hushed; but by breath of the breeze when at last they are fanned,
Stir they with multitudinous murmur and sigh—so they
By love's breath stirred were to pour out all in their hearts that lay.
(Way's Version.)

---

[1] See *Thesmophoriazusae*, ll. 82 ff.

[2] *Argonautica*, Bk. III. ll. 967-72:

τὼ δ' ἄνεῳ καὶ ἀνανδοι ἐφέστασαν ἀλληλοισιν,
ἢ δρυσίν, ἢ μακρῇσιν ἐειδόμεναι ἐλάτῃσιν,
αἵ τε παρᾶσσον ἕκηλοι ἐν οὔρεσσιν ἐρρίζωνται,
νηνεμίῃ· κ. τ. λ.



Here and in the following lines descriptive of Medea:[1]

. . . . . ἰαίνετο δὲ φρένας εἴσω
τηκομένη, οἷον τε περὶ ῥοδέῃσιν ἐέρση
τήκεται ἠῴοισιν ἰαινομένη φαέεσσιν.

we have the Sanskrit parallel between persons and trees and flowers, which, though in a modified form familiar to modern poetry, was more or less foreign to strictly classical style.

In Theocritus we need only recall the famous comparison of Bombyca with the violet and hyacinth in the well-known lines from the Tenth Idyll:

καὶ τὸ ἴον μέλαν ἐντί, καὶ ἀ γραπτὰ ὑάκινθος.

or the lines in the Third:[2]

αἴθε γενοίμαν
ἀ βομβεῦσα μέλισσα, καὶ ἐς τεὸν ἄντρον ἱκοίμαν,
τὸν κισσὸν διαδὺς καὶ τὰν πτέριν, ᾇ τὺ πυκάσδῃ

so suggestive of Sanskrit erotic lyric with its excessive employment of similes from plant and animal life, and constant references of a similar sort to the bee and flowers.[3] Detailed description, too, as in the case of Chaeremon, meets us in the Bucolic School.

Instances of this are the long account of the Adonis-festival in Theocritus, and the flower-gathering scene in the *Europa*[4] of Moschus, while, perhaps, of all Hellenistic poetry the most typically Oriental example is to be found in the *Garland* of Meleager. Of this we possess the dedication, a passage of about sixty lines, in which the several Greek poets are each compared to a different flower.

[1] See *Argonautica*, Bk. III. ll. 1019-21, and cp. *Śakuntalā* where the heroine is compared to "a Mādhavī creeper touched by the wind the scorcher of its leaves" in Act III. v. 63:

pattrāṇām iva śoshaneṇa marutā spṛishṭā latā mādhavī.

[2] See Theocr. *Idyll* 3, ll. 12-14.

[3] Cp. *Śakuntalā*, Act III. v. 77:

aparikshatakomalasya tāvatkusumasyeva navasya shaḍpadena |
adharasya pipāsatā mayā te sadayaṁ, sundari, etc.

also Act V. v. 103: abhinavamadhulolupas tvaṁ tathā, etc. And Act III. v. 152: bimbādharaṁ spṛiśasi ced bhramara priyāyās tvāṁ, etc.

[4] See ll. 63-70 of the *Europa*.

This we are told was the model of all subsequent Anthologies, which now became a very popular form of composition in Greece. It is interesting, therefore, to notice that the Persians give titles such as *Baḥāriṣṭān* or *Garden of Spring* and *Guliṣṭan* or *Garden of Roses* to miscellanies on different subjects;[1] and this, together with the circumstance that Meleager and Artemidorus, the earliest Greek writers of Anthologies,[2] were natives of Asia, would seem to show that the origin of Anthologies was Oriental, and their appearance in Greece but one more instance of the excessive interest in natural scenery characteristic of Asiatic influence on Greek literature of the Alexandrian Age.

The tendency to obscurity of style and the love of rare words, mentioned by Aristotle as among the signs of frigidity, are also features of Alexandrian poetry, and meet us particularly in Lycophron.[3] In his case the obscurity is chiefly due to the introduction of mythological and far-fetched references, which were very popular in Alexandrian times. Instances of this abound in Sanskrit lyric poetry, *e.g.* the reference in the *Śakuntalā*[4] to the constellation Viśakha and the Moon, whose history is compared to that of the hero and heroine; in the *Mudrā Rākshasa*[5] the reference to Śiva and Vishṇu in the songs of the First Bard, where Śiva's necklace of skulls is unhappily likened to a "row of swans sailing through the sky"; and also numerous allusions to the bow of Indra, the Sun, and the Moon.[6]

The preludes, especially, are full of mythology and open with

[1] See Sir William Jones: *A Grammar of the Persian Language*, p. 109.

[2] See Croiset's *Greek Literature*, p. 463.

[3] Note, too, that Lycophron resembles the dithyrambic school in his love of alliteration, cp. the following lines from his *Alexandra*:

> καὶ πατρὶ πέμψας τὰς ἐπηκόους λιτάς,
> στῆσαι παλίμπουν εἰς πάτραν, ὅθεν πλάνης
> Παλληνίαν ἐπῆλθε γηγενῶν τροφόν· (ll. 125-7.)

and lines such as:

> ἐν ταυρομόρφῳ τράμπιδος τυπώματι. (l. 1299.)

[4] See Monier-Williams' Ed. Act III. p. 113.

[5] See Wilson's *Hindu Theatre*, *Mudrā Rākshasa* Act III. sc. 3.

[6] The *Uttara-Rāma-Carita* is especially full of mythology. Cp. also *Śakuntalā*, Act VII. v. 191.



a prayer or benediction invoking a deity, after the fashion of the dithyrambic *ἀναβολαί*.[1]

The following quotation[2] from the *Mālatī and Mādhava* may give some idea of the Hindu love for mythology and lurid imagery, and illustrate the nature of the different influences which made themselves felt in varying degree in Aeschylus, Timotheos, and Lycophron, all poets undoubtedly tinged with Asianism:

> Hail! hail! Chāmundā, mighty goddess hail!
> I glorify thy sport, when in the dance
> That fills the court of Śiva with delight,
> Thy foot descending spurns the earthly globe.
> Beneath the weight the broad-backed tortoise reels;[3]
> The egg of Brahma[4] trembles at the shock;
> And in a yawning chasm, that gapes like hell,
> The sevenfold main[5] tumultuously rushes.
> The elephant hide that robes thee, to thy steps
> Swings to and fro; the whirling talons rend
> The crescent on thy brow; from the torn orb
> The trickling nectar falls, and every skull
> That gems thy necklace laughs with horrid life.[6]
> Attendant spirits tremble and applaud;
> The mountain falls before the powerful arms,
> Around whose length the sable serpents twine
> Their swelling forms, and knit terrific bands,
> Whilst from the hood expanded frequent flash
> Envenomed flames.
> As rolls thy awful head,
> The low'ring eye that glows amidst thy brow[7]

[1] See Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, sub *ἀμφιάνακτες*. Also Scholiast on *Clouds*, l. 595.

[2] It is given direct from Wilson's version in his *Hindu Theatre* of the *Mālatī and Mādhava*. See Act V. pp. 58-9.

[3] This refers to a legend according to which the earth was supported on a tortoise.

[4] This refers to the World-Egg from which Brahma emerged first of all things.

[5] This denotes the Seven Seas of the Universe according to Purāṇic mythology.

[6] Śiva is represented in Hindu Art with a necklace of human skulls.

[7] This deity is often depicted with three eyes, one of which is in the centre of the forehead. The whole passage is a correct description of Śiva as revealed in Indian Art.

A fiery circle designates, that wraps
The spheres within its terrible circumference:
Whilst by the banner on thy dreadful staff,
High-waved, the stars are scattered from their orbits.

In this passage we have at once the lurid imagery of Aeschylus, the bad taste and senseless detail of Timotheos, and the mythological extravagance of Lycophron.

To conclude, the most striking feature of the dithyrambic style, viz., the use of long compound words, becomes increasingly popular in Hellenistic poetry, *e.g.* in Philoxenus, as we can see from the examples from his *Deipnon*, given in Athenaeus (XIV. 643). That these were no longer confined to the dithyramb we know also, from the fragments of the *Meliambi* of Cercidas, lately discovered, which abound in long and expressive compounds, *e.g.*, *ῥυποκιβδοτόκωνα* (fr. 1), *πιμελοσαρκοφαγῶν* (fr. 3), *συοπλουτοσύνη* and *ἀστεροπαγερέτας* (fr. 1).

In fact, it may be said that, after the conquests of Alexander, Asianism enters into every department of Greek life and culture so thoroughly that many Asiatic ideas dating from earlier times are falsely supposed to be due to the preponderating Oriental influence which then set in. Thus the legend of the connection of Dionysos with India is believed to date from post-Alexandrian times, and to have arisen from the desire to institute a comparison between Alexander the Great and the wine-god. In the following book we shall have occasion to show that, centuries before the Macedonian conquest, a far closer parallel to Dionysos already existed in the East.

# BOOK II

## SOMA-DIONYSOS AND OSIRIS

# CHAPTER I

## SOMA AND DIONYSOS

Asia and the Bacchic cult in the Classical writers—Langlois—The *Vedas* and the *Zend-Avesta*—The Soma sacrifice—Duncker—Rohde and the Bacchic frenzy—Evidence of the *Sāma-Veda*—Plato and Euripides on the Dionysiac madness—Soma as Giver of Wealth, Seer and Poet—Dionysos Dendrites and Soma the Plant-God—Derivation of Semele—Dionysos Ὑης and Soma the Lord of Waters—The Muses, Nereids and Apsarasas—Triton and the Vedic Trita—Nysa—Soma the god of the hills—Zagros—Εὐοῖ and Svāhā—Dionysos Liknites and Soma the Child-God—Iakchos.

NOW that we have seen how great was the influence exerted on Hellas by the culture of Asia, during and after the Median Supremacy, it may not seem strange that the most popular deity in Greece in the fourth century B.C. should reveal clear tokens of an Asiatic origin.

Among the ancients, Euripides, in his *Bacchae*, shows that he considered Dionysos as coming from Asia; but the birth-place of the god is there given as Thebes, and he is regarded by the poet as an Asiatic only in so far as he has adopted Oriental manners and garb. Later writers, *e.g.*, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, and Apollodorus, all make reference to an Indian expedition of Dionysos; but, speaking generally, they seem to hold that he came to India from Europe originally, and not from the adjacent countries of Media and Persia. Cicero [1] speaks of five Dionysi, and tells us that the third of these was said to have ruled over

[1] Vide *De Natura Deorum*, Bk. III. cap. 23 § 58: "Dionysos multos habemus, primum Jove et Proserpina natum, secundum Nilo. . . . tertium Cabiro patre, eumque regem Asiae praefuisse dicunt, cui Sabazia sunt instituta," etc. Note that Lobeck gives it as his opinion, in his *Aglaophamus*, that these many gods really represent discrepancies in the ritual of the god as practised by different sects.

Asia, and that the Sabazian rites were instituted in his honour, thus equating the Asiatic Dionysos with Sabazios. Here, again, however, we have no proof that this third Dionysos was regarded by Cicero as of Asiatic *origin*. In fact, it is not till we come to modern times that we find this view plainly stated.

The famous French Orientalist, Langlois, in a *Mémoire sur la Divinité Védique appelée Soma*, published in Paris in 1853, at a time when the theory of the common origin of Greek and Indian mythology was being loudly proclaimed, boldly declares that Dionysos is identical with the Aryan Soma.[1] This point of view is consistent with the theory which would place the arrival of Dionysos in Hellas before the date of the Ionic settlement in Asia Minor, *i.e.*, somewhere before the thirteenth century B.C. For the Aryan migrations, as we have seen, are usually supposed to have taken place between 2000 B.C. and 1500 B.C. Nor is it inconsistent with Athenian tradition, according to which, as we learn from Foucart, the god came to Attica in the fifteenth century.[2] Be this as it may, the identification of Soma and Dionysos is equally consistent with the theory which would place his coming much later. For, if we allow that Greece and Asia were in particularly close contact from the time of Croesus onwards, this would account for the introduction into Greece about the sixth century B.C. of an Asiatic cult (itself dating in its proper home from a much earlier period) such as that of Soma or Haoma, which has very many points of resemblance to the Hellenic worship of Dionysos.

Our chief sources of information for the cult of the Aryan deity Haoma, or Soma, are the *Zend-Avesta* and *Vedas*. Of these the *Zend-Avesta* depicts the worship of this god as it existed in Iran or Old Persia among the ancient Persians, *i.e.*, the Aryans, previous to the separation of the stock into its Western and Eastern, or Persian and Indian branches. The

[1] Maury, also, in his first volume of the *Histoire des Religions de la Grèce*, published in Paris in 1857, follows Langlois in identifying Soma and Dionysos; he says of the latter, "Sa legende offre une ressemblance si frappante avec celle du dieu Soma. . . . qu'il est difficile de ne pas croire à une origine asiatique de Dionysos."

[2] See Chapter III. of *Le Culte de Dionysos en Attique*.



*Vedas* represent the form of the cult as it existed among the Indians shortly after the separation of the stock, and also contain evidence of the state of the worship previous to this period. From them we can see that practically the same cult is depicted in the *Avesta* and the *Vedas*. It was formerly held that, of the two, the *Avesta* writings were of the higher antiquity, and Haug, in accordance with this view, would place the beginning of the sacred literature of Persia as early as 2400 B.C.,[1] holding that it was completed about 400 B.C. But Prašek, a more recent authority, gives it as his opinion that the *Avesta*, as we possess it, dates from post-Alexandrian times. He refers, however, to Blochet's view that, even before the Achaemenid dynasty, a similar work may have been in existence.[2] In any case, the Avestan information on the Haoma-cult corresponds sufficiently closely to the Vedic account of the Soma-worship to enable its evidence to be adduced in confirmation of that of the *Vedas*. It is, however, much less copious than the Vedic sources, and hence we shall be chiefly concerned with the latter in this and the following chapters.

Now according to such sound authorities as Max Müller and Professor Macdonell,[3] the *Rig-Veda* was composed and handed down in oral form from about 1200 or 1300 B.C.; and we are told, further, by the latter that the text existed in its present

[1] See p. 136 of Haug's *Essays*.

[2] See Prašek: "Nun bricht sich Tag um Tag sicherer die Überzeugung Bahn, dass in Avesta ein Sammelwerk späterer, arsakidischer, ja vielleicht erst Sâssânidischer Zeit, zu ersehen ist. Mag einem die wohlbekannte Theorie Darmetesters noch so radical erscheinen, eines bleibt immerhin Tatsache, dass das Avesta in seiner zur Zeit Sapors II kanonisierten Redaktion nachalexandreisch ist. *Blochet* hat zwischen den divergierenden Ansichten den Mittelweg betreten mit der Behauptung, dass die Sâssânidische und selbst die nachsâssânidische Tradition mit den Momenten übereinstimmt, die uns Geschichte und Archäologie des alten Irân als Beweismaterial bieten. Nach Blochets wohlbegründeter Meinung ist die uns vorliegende Redaktion des Avesta ganz und gar in das erste Jahrhundert unserer Ära und in die Anfänge der Sâssânidendynastie zu setzen, man darf sich aber nicht dem Glauben hingeben, dass die Achämeniden oder so gar schon deren Vorgänger derartiges nicht besessen hätten, wenn auch nichts davon auf uns überkommen ist."

[3] See Macdonell's *Sanskrit Liter.*, p. 12.

form as early as 600 B.C.[1] Macdonell also holds that the texts of the *Sāma-* and *Atharva-Vedas* and the oldest form of the *Yajur-Veda* were constituted about 1000 B.C.[2] Of these, we shall deal here only with the ninth book of the *Rig-Veda* and with the *Sāma-Veda*, as the evidences for Soma worship are confined for the most part to these portions of the *Vedas*. The *Sāma-Veda* is simply a compendium of Soma-ritual derived from the ninth book of the *Rig-Veda*, and it is of this *Veda*, in consequence, that most use will be made.

Now it should be made clear that till recently we had no MS. in Sanskrit earlier than the fifth century of our era; while we are told that those earlier than the fourteenth century are rare.[3] Hence, the actual texts of the *Vedas* that we possess are, of course, of much more recent date than the original first texts. It is even doubtful whether the *Vedas* were committed to writing before the time of Buddha;[4] but one thing is clear, viz., that the oral system in India was so complete that our present texts more or less faithfully represent the religious beliefs of the early Aryans at the time when they invaded India.

We may now proceed to show in outline what were the leading features of the Soma-cult as depicted in these sacred poems of the East. The following quotation from Monier-Williams' Sanskrit Dictionary, taken from the article on *Soma*, and derived from these sources will afford a convenient synopsis of the subject. "Soma, . . . a particular climbing plant, *Sarcostema Viminalis* or *Asclepias Acida* (said to grow abundantly on the mountains of India and Persia); this celebrated plant sometimes called the 'moon plant,' and perhaps a kind of milk-weed, was formerly a most important ingredient in sacrificial offerings, and is perpetually alluded to in Vedic literature, as well as in the Persian Avesta; it was collected by moonlight on certain mountains, stripped of its numerous leaves, and then carried to the place of sacrifice; the stalks having been there crushed between stones by the priests, were sprinkled with water and placed on a sieve or strainer for purification, whence, after

[1] See Macdonell, p. 50. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 47.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[4] See Weber's *History of Indian Literature*, p. 18, footnote.



further pressure, the acid juice trickled into a vessel; after which it was mixed with clarified butter, flour, etc., made to ferment, and then offered in libations to the gods, or drunk by the Brahmans, by both of whom its exhilarating or intoxicating qualities were supposed to be highly prized; it is sometimes described as having been brought from the sky by a Śyena or Falcon, and guarded by the Gandharvas; sometimes . . . as having been brought from a spot where it had been nourished by the rain-god Parjanya, who is represented, in R.V. IX. 82. 3, as its father, the god Soma being elsewhere described as rejoicing in the society of the waters."

Here we have a conception which is at once that of a vegetation-deity and a god of intoxication, and these two aspects belong also to Dionysos. Now, in the Homa Yasht of the *Zend-Avesta*, which contains all the information we possess as to the Old Persian form of the cult, Homa is described as being "golden-coloured, with hanging tendrils," and reference is made to the exhilarating qualities of the beverage made from the twigs of the Homa. So, too, in the *Sāma-Veda*, Indra, the god of War, is repeatedly summoned to drink the invigorating Soma which gives him strength to slay his foes. Thus in the *Sāma-Veda* (I. v. 2. 4, verse 2) we read: svādishṭhayā madishṭhayā pavasva Soma dhārayā ("flow, O Soma, with sweetest and most intoxicating draught"); and in countless other passages similar invocations may be found.

We know, further, that the early Aryans distinguished between the earthly Soma or Haoma, and the divine plant, which is depicted as white-coloured in the *Avesta*, and as growing on the tree of Heaven.[1] Duncker, who sees in this an analogy to the difference between the heavenly and earthly mead of the Greeks, regards Dionysos as the counterpart of Soma in so far as he is "giver of the drink-offering . . . himself as a sacrificer, the exciter of that devotion, of that stormy and importunate sacrificial song which we found in the worship of the Indians." He also thinks that the vine was brought from Syria to Greece, and that Dionysos, from having been in earlier times a god of

[1] See p. 56 of V. Henry's *Soma et Haoma* (Paris, 1906). Also Duncker's *History of Greece*, Vol. I. pp. 184-7.

mead, became subsequently a vine-god. He does not think that the worship of Dionysos began in Thrace, but says that, about the seventh or sixth centuries, the god underwent a fusion with a deity of a very different nature.

According to Rohde, orgiastic excitement was the original feature of the Dionysiac cult, and the connection with the vine was a later development.[1] This would fit in well enough with the theory of the Asiatic origin of Dionysos, inasmuch as we know of an Asiatic cult of a highly orgiastic nature, viz., that of Cybele, with which the cult of Bacchus was undoubtedly closely connected. Rohde, however, considers that the cult was of Thracian origin, and tells us that the necessary state of ἔκστασις was produced in Thrace by the use of a kind of hasheesh or Indian hemp. So among the Indians Soma, and in later times among the Greeks wine, would serve the same purpose.[2] In a word, while the means of producing the Bacchic frenzy varied according to the customs of the different countries, the principle of the worship was the same, viz., *μαίνεσθαι*. With reference to the epithet "frenzied," applied to Dionysos in the famous passage in the sixth book of the Iliad,[3] Rohde reminds us that the Scholiast here interprets *μαινομένοιο* as *μανιοποιοῦ, βακχείας παρασκευαστικοῦ*, and regards the epithet as an instance of hypallage, and as being rather applicable to the worshippers than to the god himself. This is exactly what we should expect if we are prepared to see in Dionysos a deity of Oriental origin. For this type of hypallage is peculiarly Oriental, and will meet us again when we come to consider another aspect of the god. In any case the *Vedas*

[1] See p. 299 of E. Rohde's *Psyche, Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen* (Leipzig, 1894).

[2] V. Smith, in his *History of Fine Art in India*, tells us, on page 386, in reference to the frequent presence of the vine-motive on Indian bas-reliefs, that "Sir George Watt believes that the plant is indigenous on the lower Himalayan ranges, and is even inclined to think its cultivation may have been diffused into Europe from that region."

[3] *Iliad*, VI. ll. 130 ff.:

> οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ Δρύαντος υἱός, κρατερὸς Λυκόοργος,
> δὴν ἦν, ὅς ῥα θεοῖσιν ἐπουρανίοισιν ἔριζεν·
> ὅς ποτε μαινομένοιο Διωνύσοιο τιθήνας
> σεῦε κατ' ἠγάθεον Νυσήϊον.



depict Soma as one who bewilders the minds of his foes. Thus, in *Sāma-Veda* II. 4. 2. 8 (verse 2) he is spoken of as: *ashāḍham, ugraṁ*, or "irresistible," "savage." The word *ugram*, which is a constant title of Soma in the *Sāma-Veda*, has exactly the sense of *μαινομένοιο* in the Homeric passage, if it is taken as literally applied to Dionysos; while the meaning according to which the frenzy is regarded as *emanating* from the god himself finds numerous parallels in the *Vedas* in the frequent invocation of Soma to "destroy the bad man,"[1] who, apparently, becomes god-possessed. For in *Sāma-Veda* II. 5. 2. 5 (verse 1) Soma is called *manasas patiḥ*, or "lord of the mind," from which we can see that the sphere of his influence was the same as that of Dionysos. Plato, indeed, tells us of a legend according to which Dionysos was driven mad by his step-mother Hera, and, in revenge for this, became himself the sender of madness on others.[2] Lobeck considers that the fact that Rhea was supposed to have cured the god of this frenzy points to the Asiatic or Phrygian origin of the fable and to the use of purificatory rites, such as those enjoined by the Bacchic cult.[3] In any case, however, the idea of the Bacchic frenzy must in course of time have become intimately associated in Hellas with Dionysos as a wine-god. Maury, in fact, goes so far as to say that Dionysos is above all the wine-god of the Greeks and would derive *οἶνος* from a Vedic word "vinas," which he tells us is a title of Soma

[1] Cp. Haug, p. 183, *Homa Yasht*: "O Homa! whatsoever man in this house, in this clan, in this tribe, in this country, may injure (us), take strength from his feet! darken his intellect! disorder his mind!" and cp. the fate of Pentheus, Lycurgus, etc.

[2] Plato, *Legg.* II. 672 B: Λόγος τις ἅμα καὶ φήμη ὑποῤῥεῖ πως, ὡς ὁ θεὸς οὗτος ὑπὸ τῆς μητρυιᾶς Ἥρας διεφορήθη τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν γνώμην, διὸ τάς τε βακχείας καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν μανικὴν ἐμβάλλει χορείαν τιμωρούμενος ὅθεν καὶ τὸν οἶνον ἐπὶ τοῦτ' αὐτὸ δεδώρηται.

[3] Apollod. III. 5. 1.: Διόνυσος δὲ εὑρετὴς ἀμπέλου γενόμενος, Ἥρας μανίαν αὐτῷ ἐμβαλούσης, περιπλανᾶται Αἴγυπτόν τε καὶ Συρίαν. . . . Ἀῦθις δὲ εἰς Κύβελα τῆς Φρυγίας ἀφικνεῖται· κἀκεῖ καθαρθεὶς ὑπὸ Ῥέας, καὶ τὰς τελετὰς ἐκμαθὼν κ. τ. λ. Cp. Pindar, *Isthmian Ode*, VI. ll. 3-5:

> χαλκοκρότου πάρεδρον
> Δαμάτερος . . . εὐρυχαίταν
> . . . . . Διόνυσον.

and means "beloved."[1] But we must bear in mind the other view which regards Dionysos as primarily a god of orgiastic or enthusiastic nature.[2] Union of the worshipper with the deity is, then, supposed to be attained by means of the religious excitement produced in the former, whether by the practice of the ritual or by the influence of intoxication, as we can see from references in the Classics. Thus, in the *Ion* of Plato,[3] in a passage relating to the wonderful effects of the madness or enthusiasm sent by the gods, we are told that the Bacchanalian women draw honey and milk from rivers when they are thus possessed, but cannot do so when in their ordinary state of mind. So, too, the *Bacchae* of Euripides is full of this enthusiasm, *e.g.*, in the account of the strange doings of the Maenads given by the Messenger to Pentheus at line 704:

> θύρσον δέ τις λαβοῦσ' ἔπαισεν ἐς πέτραν,
> ὅθεν δροσώδης ὕδατος ἐκπηδᾷ νοτίς·
> ἄλλη δὲ νάρθηκ' ἐς πέδον καθῆκε γῆς, κ. τ. λ.

All this is very suggestive of Oriental feats of juggling and magic, and leaves a certain impression of Asiatic influence. Thus, Indra, the Aryan War-god, in whose honour the Soma-libation is chiefly offered, can do all things when invigorated by the Soma. The same thing applies to the human participants in the Soma-sacrifice. Hence the Vedic worshippers repeatedly invoke Soma as the giver of power, of riches and treasures, flocks and herds, but, above all, as the giver of immortality.[4]

[1] "Le Soma est surnommé dans les Védas *vinas* c'est-à-dire aimé. En pénétrant dans l'Asie Mineure et la Grèce, les frères des Aryas transportèrent au jus de raisin le nom qu'ils donnaient à la liqueur qui leur servait à honorer les dieux." (Maury, *Hist. des Religions de la Grèce*, Tome I). I am unable, however, to find any word at all corresponding to *vinas* in Monier-Williams' *Sansk. Dict.* and therefore conclude that M. Maury's philological zeal has led him too far.

[2] Kern says, while admitting that later the god became a vine-god in Greece: "Aber in Thrakien diente der Wein in Verein mit anderen berauschenden Getränken und Früchten nur als Mittel zum Zweck, zur Erreichung des ἐνθουσιασμός, eines seligen Zustandes in dem sich der Mensch den Göttern gleichfühlt."

[3] *Ion*, 534 A: ὥσπερ αἱ βάκχαι ἀρύτονται ἐκ τῶν ποταμῶν μέλι καὶ γάλα κατεχόμεναι, ἔμφρονες δὲ οὖσαι οὔ κ. τ. λ.

[4] See *Sāma-Veda*, II. 4. 2. 3. (verse 2): "tvāṁ viśve, amṛita, . . . devā abhi saṁ navanta; tava kratubhir amṛitatvam āyan, *i.e.* "Thee, O deathless one, all the gods approach together; by thy offerings they are wont to attain immortality."



Moreover, the mantic powers[1] attributed to those possessed by Dionysos are the same as those attributed to Soma, who is spoken of in *Sāma-Veda* II. 5. 1. 1 (verse 2) as: ṛishimanā, ya ṛishikṛit, svarshāḥ, sahasranīthaḥ, padavīḥ kavīnām, *i.e.*, "he who, with the mind of a prophet, makes prophets, the bestower of heaven, praised in a thousand hymns, the pathway of poets." In fact Kavi, or Poet-Seer, is a constant epithet of Soma. But there is another explanation of this title of Soma, besides that which would connect it with his orgiastic nature. For we know that the Soma-ritual was always accompanied by elaborate chants, which were a most important part of the ceremony. And the noise of the dropping of the liquid Soma into the sacrificial-bowl was commonly spoken of as a song by his Indian worshippers. Thus, in the preceding verse to the one just quoted we read: "As a poet, by means of songs, through poetry, Soma, because he is a poet, flows through the filter singing." The emphasis here is so great as to render it unnecessary to insist at length on this aspect of Soma's character. But the references just given will enable us to recognize in Soma, the patron of Song, the prototype of Dionysos Melpomenos, the God of Tragic and Musical Festivals, and on this account the patron of the Attic Theatre.[2]

One main aspect of the Dionysiac character has now been dealt with and paralleled with that of Soma. Another very important feature is the association of Dionysos with plant life. In fact, it is doubtful if this is not in reality his primary aspect.

[1] See Rohde, and also Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena*.

[2] Kavir gīrbhiḥ kāvyena kaviḥ saṅt somaḥ pavitram atyeti rebhaṇ. Note that we have the testimony of Arrian as to the connection of the Indian Dionysos with song in his *Anabasis* VI. c. 3: Φιλῳδοὶ γάρ, εἴπερ τινὲς ἄλλοι, Ἰνδοί, καὶ φιλορχήμονες ἀπὸ Διονύσου ἔτι καὶ τῶν ἅμα Διονύσῳ βακχευσάντων κατὰ τὴν Ἰνδῶν γῆν. Langlois, also, in his *Mémoire*, noting the titles Χορεῖος, Πολύυμνος and Θριάμβος bestowed on Dionysos, observes his affinity with Soma as follows: "il distribue, comme maître des lettres et des arts, les plus riches couronnes, de la même manière que, dans l'Inde antique, Soma accueillait à son sacrifice les accents de la prière, la poésie de l'ode sacrée, les élans du dithyrambe," etc.

Thus, Farnell regards him as originally a Thracian vegetation-god, and the epithets Πρινοφόρος, Δρυοφόρος, and Δασύλλιος all point to this connection of Dionysos with trees and plants.

Regarded from this point of view, the ivy is his symbol no less than the vine. His connection with the ivy is shown in his title Κισσός in Acharnae. With this is linked his title of Περικιόνιος, or the God of The Pillar.[1] A small lekythos of Attic workmanship found in Rhodes explains this name. It depicts a primitive statue or fetish of the god in the form of a pillar,[2] from which depend two bearded masks, while two women are represented as about to attach trails of ivy to the pillar. Hence we are told arose the Theban legend of the destruction of the palace of Cadmus by lightning and of the ivy climbing up the pillars to protect the infant god.[3] So, too, Nonnus in his *Dionysiaca* tells us how Semele, before she gave birth to "wreath-loving Dionysos," wove a chaplet of ivy for her head.[4] Other cult-epithets of Dionysos appropriate to this character are Δενδρίτης, Ἔνδενδρος, Φλοιός, and Ἄνθιος.

At Magnesia we learn that he was worshipped as the God of the Plane Tree. Farnell thinks that the reason for his special association with the ivy is to be found in the fancied resemblance between his character as a god of growth in general and the "wanton movement and luxuriant life" of the plant.

Now we have already seen that Soma is in the first instance a plant, which is generally described as "golden" or "flame-

[1] See *Orphic Hymn*, 47: Κικλήσκω Βάκχον περικιόνιον, μεθυδώτην, κ. τ. λ.

[2] See article in Pauly's Lexicon by Kern.

[3] See Eurip. *Phoenissae* ll. 649-656:

Βρόμιον ἔνθα τέκετο μάτηρ
. . . Διὸς γάμοις,
κισσοὺς ὃν περιστεφὴς,
ἑλικτὸς εὐθὺς ἔτι βρέφος
χλοηφόροισιν ἔρνισιν
κατασκίοισιν ὀλβίσας ἐνώτισεν κ. τ. λ.

[4] *Dionysiaca*, Bk. VIII ll. 8-10:

μαρτυρίῃ δὲ τόκοιο φιλοστεφάνου Διονύσου
στέμματι θυμὸν ἔτερπεν, ἐπ' ἀνθοκόμῳ δὲ καρήνῳ
θυιάδος αὐτοέλικτον ἀνέπλεκε κισσὸν ἐθείρης
Βασσαρίδων ἅτε μάντις, κ. τ. λ.



coloured" (arusha). Perhaps here we see the origin of Hesiod's χρυσοκόμης Διώνυσος. In any case the quotation from the *Homa Yasht* which describes Homa as having "hanging tendrils" would show his affinity with Dionysos, the lover of trailing creepers such as the ivy and the vine. In the Sāma-Veda (II. 1. 1. 1. verse 3) Soma is implored to "give health to plants O king";[1] and in the *Homa Yasht* we read: "I praise the cloud and the rain which make thy body grow on the summit of the mountains. I praise the high mountains where thou hast grown, O Homa,"[2] and "I praise the earth, the wide-stretched . . . thy mother, O righteous Homa. I praise the earth that thou mayest grow, spreading fast thy fragrance, as thou growest on the mountain, O Homa."

All this points clearly to a plant-god as the original form of the conception of Homa or Soma, and, moreover, just as Semele the Earth-Goddess is the mother of Dionysos, so we see that Homa's mother is the Earth. As to the origin of the word Semele, various derivations have been given. Of these the most probable connects Semele with a Phrygian form ζεμελω akin to χαμαί, χθαμαλός, χθών, and the Slavonic Zembla in Nova Zembla, all pointing to the fact that among the Phrygians Semele was a goddess of the earth.[3] Now, in Vedic Sanskrit the word "ksham" or "earth" is the philological equivalent of χθών, and is obviously closely related to ζεμελω. Hence this derivation has considerable probability. Moreover, the few words of the Phrygian language with which we are acquainted from inscriptions have a very close resemblance to Indian roots. Thus the form Γέρμη or "warm," quoted by Professor Conway[4] as a Phrygian word, is almost identical with the Sanskrit "gharma" or "heat," and with the Zend "garema," and is more closely related to these forms than

[1] Sa naḥ pavasva śāṁ gave śāṁ janāya śām arvate | śaṁ rājann oshadhibhyaḥ||.

[2] See Haug, page 184. See also for this character of Soma, Langlois: "il est le maître des plantes salutaires, qui reconnaissent pour reine la *somalatâ* (Semele), dont il est sorti dans sa première naissance."

[3] See *Prolegomena*, pp. 403-4.

[4] Speaking at a meeting held by the British Academy, 24th April 1907, after a paper had been read by Professor Ridgeway on *Who were the Romans?*

to the Greek θέρμη. It would seem, then, as if the Phrygian stock was peculiarly closely related to the Iranian and to the Aryan invaders of India. Now there is abundant proof that Dionysos was regarded as a particularly Phrygian deity in ancient times. Hence it should not be surprising to find in Homa or Soma the same vegetation deity that we find honoured among the Phrygians as the son of the Earth-Goddess.

We may therefore dismiss the derivation of Semele from the Sanskrit "Somalatā" (attempted by E. Burnouf),[1] and that from σεμνή through the by-forms σεβλή and σεμλή, alluded to by Preller,[2] and first put forward by Diodorus Siculus.[3] The latter refers to another name of Semele, viz., Thyone, which he tells us was an ancient name of the Earth,[4] and he manifestly regards Dionysos as a vegetation-deity. He also attempts a fanciful derivation of the word from θύειν, "to sacrifice," saying that the goddess was called Thyone, ἀπὸ τῶν θυομένων αὐτῇ θυσιῶν καὶ θυηλῶν.

This presumably has reference to offerings of the first fruits of the Earth to the Earth-Goddess; but the derivation given in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, and supported by the analogy of the Thyiades, which connects it with θύειν, "to storm" or "rage," is preferable as denoting the orgiastic nature of the Phrygian Earth-Goddess,[5] whether we call her Rhea, Cybele, Semele, or Demeter. Now we know that this word θύειν, "to rage," is the Greek equivalent philologically of the Sanskrit root "dhū," which means "to shake violently, agitate, etc." From this is formed a word "dhuni" or "agitator," "one who causes to rage," and it so happens that this is one of the epithets

[1] See Langlois; also Duncker, who disapproves of this derivation.

[2] "Semele hiess seine Mutter . . . eine Personification des im Anhauche des Frühlings von Fruchtbarkeit schwellenden Erdbodens, wie es scheint" (p. 546). He also refers to a derivation from θεμέλη, "dass ist der feste Grund der Erde, woraus Σεμέλη geworden sei."

[3] Diod. Sic. Bk. III. c. 62: Σεμέλην μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ σεμνὴν εἶναι θεοῦ ταύτης τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ τιμὴν κ. τ. λ. See also *Prolegomena*.

[4] In *Homeric Hymns*, V. 21; Pindar, *Pyth.*, III. 177.

[5] See Pausanias, X. 6. 2: ὅσαι τῷ Διονύσῳ μαίνονται, Θυιάδας καλεῖσθαι σφᾶς (sc. φασιν) ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων. As for the connexion between Thyia, θύελλα and Ὀρείθυια, alluded to by Miss Harrison, we find a parallel in the epithet Dhunayas or "agitators," applied to the Maruts or Vedic Gods of Wind.



applied to Soma.[1] Thus we have an exact Sanskrit parallel to Bacchus Thyoneus. So far we have been concerned with the relation of Dionysos to his mother only. We are told by Miss Harrison that his relation "to his father Zeus was slight and artificial." Zeus, in fact, as is generally admitted, represents an old Sky-God, or, as Diodorus tells us, the fertilizing rain of heaven, which, together with the earth, assists the growth of the vine.[2] This rationalistic interpretation of the myth quite harmonizes with the parentage of the Homa-plant, as may be recalled by a reference to the passage above quoted from the *Homa Yasht*. Moreover, in the *Rig-Veda* we have seen that the father of Soma is Parjanya or the rain-cloud, and Soma is frequently described as the Child of Heaven and Earth in the *Sāma-Veda*.

Now this connection of Soma or Dionysos with the fertilizing rain brings us to another aspect of the cult, and one which reveals the philological relationship of Soma to the Greek wine-god. One of the ritual names of Dionysos was Ὕης, a title which finds a place in the invocation of the Phrygian Sabazios[3] and connects him with the principle of moisture. In fact, he is really the god of the sap in plants,[4] and in this way he becomes regarded as more or less of a water-god, though, as Farnell tells us, never worshipped as a deity of rivers and streams. It is rather as a sea-god that he appears in Hellenic worship, *e.g.* as Dionysos Πελάγιος in Thessaly. So too his pursuit by Lycurgus and flight into the sea afford another instance of this aspect. Farnell considers that this represents a ritual act, and it is interesting to note that the dropping of the liquid Soma or Indu into the sacrificial bowl typifies the flight of the

[1] P. 456 Monier-Williams' *Dictionary*.

[2] Diodor. Sic. Bk. III. c. 62: Διὸς μὲν γὰρ καὶ Δήμητρος αὐτὸν (sc. Διόνυσον) λέγεσθαι, διὰ τὸ τὴν ἄμπελον ἔκ τε γῆς ὄμβρων λαμβάνουσαν τὴν αὔξησιν κ. τ. λ. See also *Prolegomena*.

[3] Demosthenes, *De Corona*, § 260, referring to Aeschines' early career: καὶ ἐπορχούμενος ὑῆς ἄττης ἄττης ὑῆς, ἔξαρχος καὶ προηγεμὼν καὶ κιστοφόρος καὶ λικνοφόρος κ. τ. λ.

[4] Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, c. 35: ὅτι δ' οὐ μόνον τοῦ οἴνου Διόνυσον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσης ὑγρᾶς φύσεως Ἕλληνες ἡγοῦνται κύριον καὶ ἀρχηγὸν, ἀρκεῖ Πίνδαρος μάρτυς εἶναι, λέγων·

Δενδρέων δὲ νόμον Διόνυσος πολυγαθὴς αὐξάνοι, ἀγνὸν φέγγος ὁπώρας.

god Soma into the Celestial Sea (samudra).[1] Now the name Soma is derived from the root "su," which is equivalent to ὗειν, so that Soma and Dionysos Ὑης are evidently the same.[2] A few examples from the *Sāma-Veda* will help to illustrate this resemblance. Thus Soma is invoked as follows: "Thou that makest the waters of the Ocean to flow, stream forth."[3] He is spoken of as having "a thousand streams" (sahasradhāraṁ, *S.-V.* I. 6. 2. 4. verse 4); as "conquering in the waters";[4] and he is thus addressed: "Thou dost raise up thy voice in the midst of the sea."[5] Other evidences of the connection of Dionysos with the sea are to be found in the legends of his adoption by Ino Leucothea, a sea-goddess, and of his adventure with the Tyrrhenian pirates, narrated in the Homeric Hymn. It has been thought that this hymn was composed in Naxos, and that the connection of the cult with the islands of the Aegean—whence it spread to Greece—suggested the possibility of his capture by pirates. In Naxos, too, he was known as μουσαγέτης, which points to his union with the fountain-nymphs,[6] and it was one of the places which claimed to have given birth to the god, in other words, was one of the places in which the cult must have been very early established. Other places which show an early

[1] See *Vedic India* and Langlois.

[2] See Monier-Williams' *Dictionary* under "Soma" and "Indu." Note that "Indu" is from *und*, "flow." Cp. Latin "unda," Gk. ὕδωρ.

[3] *Sāma-Veda*, II. 2. 1. 1. (verse 2): tvaṁ samudriyā apo . . . īrayan, pavasva. . . .

[4] *Ibid.*, II. 1. 2. 12. (verse 2): . . . sam apsu jitam.

[5] *Ibid.*, I. 6. 1. 3. (verse 7): . . . samudre vācam invasi.

[6] See article by Kern in Pauly on Dionysos. He says that the Muses were originally fountain-nymphs. Farnell, however, thinks that the title was taken over from Apollo. That the Nymphs who attended Dionysos were the personification of water is shown by the following fragment of the *Cyclops* of Timotheos quoted by Athenaeus 465 a (Bk. XI.):

> . . . εἴκοσι δὲ μέτρ'
> ἀνέχευεν, ἔμισγε δ' αἷμα
> Βακχίου νεορρύτοις
> δακρύοισι Νυμφᾶν,

where "the blood of Bacchus" is a characteristically bombastic phrase for wine. Athenaeus with reference to this passage tells us: καὶ Θεόφραστος δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ μέθης φησὶν, ὅτι τοῦ Διονύσου τροφοὶ αἱ Νύμφαι κατ' ἀλήθειαν· Ἀι γὰρ ἄμπελοι πλεῖστον ὑγρὸν χέουσι τεμνόμεναι καὶ κατὰ φύσιν δακρύουσι·



and close connection with the god are Chios, always famous for the cultivation of the vine, where he was worshipped as Ἀκταῖος, Icaros, and Cos where his second birth was supposed to have taken place.[1] Crete, also, with its legend of his union with Ariadne, has undoubtedly a claim to be considered as one of the earlier centres of the cult.[2] All this tends to show that Dionysos the Sea-God is naturally associated with the islands of the Aegean, while the proximity of these cult-centres, and especially of Crete, to the coast of Asia Minor, and their claim to have originated the worship, point to the fact that Greece derived the cult from the East through the Aegean islands.[3]

We have seen that the title μουσαγέτης has been taken as showing the connection of Dionysos with the water-nymphs. So, too, in the festival of the Agrionia, which represents the flight of Dionysos to the Muses, and in the legend which declared that he was adopted by the Hyades after birth, we have reminiscences of the same tradition.[4] Now, the Hyades, as their name

[1] See fragmentary *Homeric Hymn* I. To Dionysos (Allen and Sikes) ll. 1-4:

> ὁ μὲν γὰρ Δρακάνῳ σ' οἱ δ' Ἰκάρῳ ἠνεμοέσσῃ
> φάσ', οἱ δ' ἐν Νάξῳ, δῖον γένος, εἰραφιῶται,
> οἱ δὲ σ' ἐπ' Ἀλφειῷ ποταμῷ βαθυδινήεντι
> κυσαμένην Σεμέλην τεκέειν Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ, κ. τ. λ.

[2] See Kern in Pauly. Preller (p. 560) in his *Dionysos* regards the legend of the sleeping Ariadne as: "ein liebliches Bild der schlummernden Triebe des Erdbodens, welche durch die Macht des befruchtenden Lenzes von neuem geweckt werden." Here we have a clear conception of Dionysos as a vegetation-deity. So, too, he tells us that the legend of the god dying in winter and waking in summer appears in this fable.

[3] See Farnell's *Cults of the Greek States*: "The orgiastic Thrako-Phrygian religion may have penetrated to Crete at a very early time, perhaps directly from Phrygia before the Hellenic races gained a footing in this island; and this may account for the prominence in Cretan worship of the child-god, the son of the great earth-mother," etc. Also "and at some time before recorded history begins, the influence of the Dionysos-Ariadne cult and myth may have radiated from Crete to the mainland of Greece, suggesting to the Argives the worship of Dionysos Κρήσιος, 'the Cretan,' with a legend of Ariadne attaching."

[4] See Ovid, *Fasti*, Bk. V. 1. 165, with reference to the Hyades

> "Pars Bacchum nutrisse putat; pars credidit esse
> Tethyos has neptes Oceanique senis."

See also Apollodorus, III. 3: καὶ λαβὼν αὐτὸν Ἑρμῆς πρὸς Νύμφας ἐκόμισεν ἐν Νύσῃ τῆς Ἀσίας κατοικούσας, ἃς ὕστερον Ζεὺς καταστερίσας ὠνόμασεν Ὑάδας.

signifies, are Maids of the Misty Clouds, and, as such, the exact equivalents of the Apsarasas of Vedic mythology, who are, moreover, the especial attendants of Soma. Spoken of in the Vedas as *The Waves*, they represent the personified Soma-libations. Thus in the ninth book of the *Rig-Veda* we read:

"The Apsarasas that dwell in the Samudra (*i.e.*, the sacrificial bowl which typifies the sea) near the wise Soma have sent forth his floods,"[1] and elsewhere his father is called the Rain-Cloud, while they are spoken of as his sisters,[2] showing plainly their association with mist and air, and their close resemblance to the Hyades. Their character of nurses to the god is to be noticed in various places in the Vedas, thus, in a Hymn to Soma by Vasu we read as follows: "The waves preserve thee and accompany thee";[3] and, in another by Asita Devala, their relation to Soma is shown to be quasi-maternal, thus: "The Waves had brought forth a young nursling." In the *Sāma-Veda* also Soma is spoken of as delighting in the waters. But the connection between the Hyades and the Apsarasas is much closer even than we might imagine. We have seen from the quotation from the *Fasti*, given in a foot-note, that the Hyades were apparently regarded as a kind of sea-nymphs. Now, Lawson in his *Modern Greek Folklore* has proved that among the Greeks the distinction between sea-nymphs and wood- or tree-nymphs was never closely observed. To show this he adduces the fact that in Modern Greece the title Νεράϊδες or Water-Nymphs is applied to all classes of the ancient nymph, and he tells us that both Dryads and Naiads are often confused and appear to haunt both water and trees.[4] Now, this is just what we find in the case of

[1] *Rig-Veda*, IX. 4. 78, verse 3: Samudriyāḥ Apsarasaḥ manīshiṇaṁ āsīnāḥ aṅtaḥ abhi Somaṁ aksharaṇ.

[2] *Ibid.*, IX. 4. 82, verse 3: Parjanyaḥ pitā mahishasya parṇinaḥ . . . svasāraḥ āpaḥ abhi gāḥ, etc.

[3] See *ibid.*, verse 5. Also Langlois' *Mémoire sur la Divinité Védique Appelée Soma*: "Les Ondes, dont il est le fils ou le père, le frère ou l'époux, sont soumises à ses lois." He also in another paragraph tells us that, in Greek writers later than Hesiod, we have Dionysos appearing as lord of plants and of fluids; and he notes that the Hyades are seven like the seven mothers of the Waters in the Vedas.

[4] See *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, chapter II. 130-73, § 9.



the Apsarasas, who, originally nymphs of clouds and mist,[1] are depicted in the later *Vedas* as dwelling on earth, where, as we are told by Professor Macdonell, "they especially frequent trees, which resound with the music of their lutes and cymbals."[2]

Here, again, we have another parallel to the Greek tree-nymphs. For the lives of these, as we know, were bound up in the trees in which they were supposed to dwell, and Lawson tells us that, according to the beliefs of the Greek peasant, these "Nereids" are distinguished for their sweet voices, dancing, and the wonderful music played by them. They have, indeed, to a great extent, the character of Mermaids, whose dazzling beauty and seductive and frolicsome nature they are supposed to possess. The same thing is true of the Apsarasas, as we learn from the Hindu Drama. Thus the Indian Nymph Urvaśī, who is one of these, resembles the familiar type of Nereid in Greek folklore in that her union with an earthly lover is brief and interrupted.[3] Like the Nereids, also, who in some localities are said to have the feet of goats or asses, and thus betray their connection with the Satyrs or Centaurs with whom they were closely associated in ancient Greek legends,[4] the Apsarasas were regarded as the wives of the Gandharvas. Further, just as Thetis possessed the power of changing her shape at will, while modern Greek folklore assigns a similar capacity to the Nereid,[5] so we read of Urvaśī and others of her class that they were able to assume

[1] From their name *Apsarasas*, i.e. "moving in the waters" or "between the waters of the clouds" fr. *ap*, "water" and the root *sṛī* (Monier-Williams' *Dict.*, p. 59, col. 2).

[2] See Macdonell's *Sanskr. Liter.*, p. 107.

[3] See Lawson's *Modern Greek Folklore* and Macdonell's *Sanskr. Liter.*

[4] The following quotation from Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*, Bk. XIV. ll. 143-147, brings this out very clearly, but makes the Centaurs the offspring of the Naiads. It is doubly interesting as showing that the Naiads and Hyades were one and the same:

Κενταυριὰς ἵκετο φύτλη,
. . . . . .
. . . . ὑγρογόνων γὰρ
Νηιάδων ποτὲ παῖδες ἔσαν βροτοειδέι μορφῇ,
ἃς Ὑάδας καλέουσι.

[5] See Lawson.

various changes of form;[1] and as the Nereid haunted fountains, so we learn that the Apsarasas delighted, above all, in bathing. Again, when Lawson tells us that the Greek peasant looks upon the Nereid as dangerous to offend or to approach too closely, we note in this a parallel to the Vedic Forest-Nymph Araṇyānī, the personified forest, mentioned in *Rig-Veda*, X. 146, of whom it is said:

> Never does Araṇyānī hurt
> Unless one goes too near to her.[2]

Like the Nereids, too, the Apsarasas are only semi-divine, and like them will have nothing to do with permanent wedlock.[3] Finally, the very words Nereus and Nereid bear a close resemblance to the Sanskrit word "nārās" or "waters," of which the following derivation is given in the *Laws of Manu*: "Waters are called *Nārāḥ*, for they are the offspring of Nara (the original or Eternal Man, a name of Brahma); and since they were his abode (ayana) he thence is called Nārāyaṇa."[4] There would be nothing strange in this if "nāra" was the ordinary Sanskrit word for "water," or if the Greek "Nereid" contained a root found in the ordinary Greek word for "water," as we know that both languages are derived from a common ancestor. But, on the contrary, neither in Sanskrit nor in Greek have we any such form usually employed in this sense. Hence we may assume that, whatever may be the real significance or truth of the derivation given in the *Laws of Manu*, the same idea which caused the early Hindu to speak of the waters as the offspring of Nara was transmitted to Greece, and caused the Hellene to apply the name Nereus to his own Sea-god.

[1] See Macdonell, p. 107, and Monier-Williams' *Dictionary*.
[2] See Macdonell, p. 111.
[3] See Lawson and also Wilson's *Theatre of the Hindus*. Note that Urvaśī possesses the power of invisibility, and compare the modern Greek Nereids' sudden disappearances. Cp. also *Orphic Hymns*, LI, especially line 7: *φαινόμεναι, ἀφανεῖς*.
[4] See *Mânava-Dharma-Śâstra*, I. verse 10:

> āpo nārā(s) iti proktā āpo vai narasūnavaḥ;
> tā yad asyāyanaṁ pūrvaṁ tena nārāyaṇaḥ smṛitaḥ.

For a complete summary of the various aspects of the nature of the Nymphs see *Orphic Hymns*, LI.



One more interesting example of the connection between Greek and Indian mythology in this regard remains. Duncker tells us that Dionysos "stands in close connection with the moisture of the sky," and further, that "he grows up on Trito the heavenly spring, at Triton the lake of heaven on the meadow Nysa." Now, just as Triton in the Greek legend[1] was manifestly a god of springs or water, and possessed marvellous magical powers, so in the *Vedas* there is mention of a seer or demi-god, named *Trita* and said to be created in the water,[2] whence he is called Āptya; and another legend narrates how, having discovered a well in the desert, he was thrown by his envious comrades into it. There he managed to perform the Soma-sacrifice in a wondrous manner, and was afterwards celebrated as an offerer of the Soma. Again, in the *Zend-Avesta* Thrita or Trita is, moreover, the first physician, is known as Sama or The Appeaser, and is besides noted as a giant-slayer. All these characteristics may, I think, be shown to appertain to the Greek Triton in like manner. Thus, parallel to Sama "The Appeaser," we have the kindly Triton who assists the Argonauts, *e.g.* in the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar and in the epic of Apollonius Rhodius; while in the latter writer as well as in the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus,[3] Triton's great strength recalls that of Trita the Giant-Slayer. Again, the following lines in the Fourth Pythian:

> . . . φιλίων δ' ἐπέων
> ἄρχεται, ξείνοις ἄτ' ἐλθόντεσσιν εὐεργέται
> δεῖπν' ἐπαγγέλλοντι πρῶτον κ. τ. λ.

may, perhaps, justify us in regarding Triton as at once Physician and Appeaser like Thrita, on account of the emphasis laid on these qualities in the character of Arcesilas of Cyrene, to whom

[1] For this legend see the account given in Diodorus Siculus, Bk. III. (cc. 67-69) of the Libyan Dionysos, the son of Ammon and Amalthea. Nysa is here located "in a certain island surrounded by the river Triton" (c. 68: *ἔν τινι νήσῳ περιεχομένῃ μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Τρίτωνος ποταμοῦ*). Thither the child Dionysos was sent in order to escape his stepmother Rhea. Diodorus gives a wonderful description of the fabulous beauties of the island, which was especially noted for its fountains.
[2] See Monier-Williams' *Dictionary*, pp. 392-3.
[3] Cp. Bk. I. line 679: "ingens . . . Triton."

the ode is addressed. In the lines given above, it is true, the allusion refers immediately to Apollo; but, no doubt, on the principle that Pindar always seeks one or more divine parallels to his human heroes, the mention of Triton at the beginning of the ode was due to his character of kindliness and power to heal wounds of mind and body alike. This at least is what we should expect in accordance with the rule of Pindaric echoes. In the case of Thrita, it seems probable that he owed his title of Physician to his connection with Soma, who, as we shall see later, was regarded as the Healer *par excellence*. In view, therefore, of the other parallels between Trita and Triton, and of the near philological resemblance between the words Trita and Triton, we may assume their identity, and that the like connection of Triton with Dionysos—who, even as Soma, was worshipped as a God of Healing—has resulted in the acquisition by Triton of the epithet of physician. Finally, the legend of the meeting of Triton and the Argonauts, as narrated by Herodotus (IV. 179), with its mention of the tripod and the prophetic powers of the god shows the affinity of Triton to the Ṛishi or Prophet Trita of the *Vedas*.

Let us now deal with the association of Dionysos with *Nysa*, described by Diodorus along with the River Triton as situated in the mythical island where the infant god was concealed from the wrath of Hera. Of the many theories propounded in explanation of the name Dionysos the common ancient interpretation, viz., "God of Nysa," no longer finds favour, chiefly, perhaps, because we know so little about Nysa itself. The account of Diodorus shows pretty clearly the mythical nature of the place. Having first quoted the lines in the shorter Homeric Hymn to Dionysos:

> Ἔστι δέ τις Νύση, ὕπατον ὄρος, ἀνθέον ὕλῃ,
> Τηλοῦ Φοινίκης, σχεδὸν Αἰγύπτοιο ῥοάων.

in proof of the claim of the Arabs that they possessed the birthplace of the god, he then goes on to tell us of the Libyan legend in accordance with which the god was reared in a marvellous island-city, Nysa, surrounded by high mountains and



difficult of access. The reference in the *Bacchae*[1] does not give us any hint as to the locality of Nysa; but, by coupling it with the "Corycian heights" and "the leafy bowers of Olympus," and calling it the "haunt of wild beasts," Euripides leaves us to infer that he regarded it as situated in a mountainous region. On the other hand, the Homeric reference in the sixth book of the Iliad, by connecting it with the tragedy of Lycurgus, implies that it was in Thrace; while the notion that Homer believed it to be in a plain is suggested by his use of the accusative with κατὰ instead of the genitive, in the phrase σεῦε κατ' ἠγάθεον Νυσήϊον ("drove them through the goodly Nysian land"). But, on the contrary, Sophocles, in his *Antigone*, tells us of "the ivy-mantled slopes of Nysa's hills,"[2] where the scene is laid in Euboea; and the same conception of it as a mountainous region is to be found in the Sophoclean fragment preserved in Strabo's account of India. There it is spoken of as *Nyssa*, "where sounds no voice of bird" (ὅπου τις ὄρνις οὐχὶ κλαγγάνει), and is called by Strabo himself "the mountain sacred to Dionysos." In Apollonius Rhodius we read of οὔρεα καὶ πεδίον Νυσήιον,[3] and in the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus it is spoken of as a mountain in Arabia,[4] while Apollodorus, as we have already seen, speaks of Nysa as in Asia (III, 3); and in another place, not in connection with Dionysos, he mentions a mountain, "the one which is called Nysa," as though referring to the well-known Bacchic birth-place. Arrian,[5] also, tells us of a city in Northern

1 Πόθι Νύσας ἄρα τᾶς θηροτρόφου θυρσοφορεῖς
θιάσους, ὦ Διόννσ', ἢ κορυφαῖς Κωρυκίαις;
(*Bacchae*, ll. 55).

2 Νυσαίων ὀρέων
κισσήρεις ὄχθαι κ. τ. λ.
(*Antigone*, ll. 1130-1131).

3 *Argonautica*, II. l. 1214.

4 See *Dionysiaca*, XX. ll. 146-7:
Ἀῤῥαβίης ἐπέβαινε, καὶ εὐόδμων ὑπὸ δένδρων,
Νυσιάδος τανύφυλλον ἐθάμβεε δειράδα λόχμης.
and XL. ll. 296-7:
ἀεξιφύτοιο δὲ λόχμης
Νύσια βοτρυόεντι κατέστεφεν οὔρεα θαλλῷ.

5 Arrian, *Expeditio Alexandri*, Bk. V. chap. I.

India (probably, therefore, in hilly territory), said to have been founded by Dionysos, and called Nysa. On the whole, then, in spite of great diversity of opinion in regard to Nysa's situation,[1] there appears to be a decided tendency among the ancients in favour of regarding it as a mountain. In other words, Dionysos is born or brought up on the heights. In agreement with this, is the legend which makes his second birth take place on Mount Drakonon, as narrated by Theocritus (XXVI. ll. 33-4) in the invocation:

> χαίροι μὲν Διόνυσος, ὃν ἐν Δρακάνῳ νιφόεντι
> Ζεὺς ὕπατος μεγάλαν ἐπιγουνίδα κάτθετο λύσας,

and his title of ὄρειος in Festus and οὐρεσίφοιτος in the *Orphic Hymns*. So, too, his title of Κολωνάτας in Sparta was derived from the Bacchic celebrations held on Mount Taygetus,[2] and that of Λαφύστιος from the rite of the Agrionia celebrated on Mount Laphystion in Boeotia. Best known of all was the nightly festival in his honour held on Mount Cithaeron. In fact, Kern tells us that the cult consists more especially of mountain-festivals which gave free play to the wild orgiastic enthusiasm of his followers.[3] Sophocles, also, refers to the Bacchic god "dwelling

[1] See article by Kern in Pauly as follows: "The land Nysa was later on sought for in many parts of the earth . . . with the widening of the geographical horizon new lands ever made claim to the honour of possessing the spot in which the god of joy had been reared by the nymphs, *e.g.*, Boeotia, Euboea, Phokis, Thessaly, Macedon, the islands of Naxos, then further, Caria, Lydia, Cilicia," etc. And also Preller (p. 548): "Nysa welches ursprünglich wohl nur ein Ort der Phantasie war." And: "Nachmals . . . wurden auch der Nysas eine ganze Menge genannt, unter denen das zu Thrakien sich auf das älteste Zeugniss berufen konnte (*Il.* 6. 133) und auch aus andern Gründen wahrscheinlich, das älteste und ursprüngliche ist." For Nisaea in Media see Sayce's *Herod.* III. p. 282, and Arrian, *Anabasis*, VII. c. 13.

[2] Cp. Vergil, *Georgics*, II. 487:

> "virginibus bacchata Lacaenis
> Taygeta."

[3] "Der Dionysoscult besteht vor allem aus Bergfeiern, in denen sich das wilde Wesen seiner Diener und Dienerinnen austoben kann."



on the lofty hills,"[1] and to his worship on the heights of Delphi.[2] Euripides in the *Iphigenia in Tauris* speaks of

> The Parnassian mount
> for Dionysos revelling.[3]

and all through the *Bacchae*, from the beginning of the first chorus with its allusion to "hallowed Tmolus," and its call to the followers of the god to come[4] "bringing down Dionysos from the Phrygian hills," we note the same view of the character of the god as a hill-dweller.

The very same character belongs to Homa or Soma. We have already seen that in the *Avesta* Homa is said to grow on the high mountains. So, too, Soma is "the mighty dweller on the hills" (girishṭhah)[5] in the *Sāma-Veda*; and in the *Rig-Veda*[6] is spoken of as "born on the hills." Indeed, we know that the Soma-plant would only grow on the higher levels of lofty mountains.[7] In the *Avesta* the celestial Homa is said to have been planted by God on Hara-Berezaiti the "Mother of Mountains," a mythical mountain later identified with Mount Elburz;[8] but the earthly Homa grew in the mountains of Iran, *i.e.*, the

[1] *Œd. Rex*, l. 1105:

> ὁ βακχεῖος θεὸς ναίων ἐπ' ἄκρων ὀρέων.

[2] *Antigone*, ll. 1124-6:

> σὲ δ' ὑπὲρ διλόφου πέτρας στέροψ ὄπωπε
> λιγνύς, ἔνθα Κωρύκιαι
> στείχουσι Νύμφαι Βακχίδες.

[3] *Iph. in Tauris*, ll. 1242-3.

[4] *Bacchae*, ll. 84-5:

> ἴτε βάκχαι, ἴτε βάκχαι, Βρόμιον παῖδα θεὸν θεοῦ
> Διόνυσον κατάγουσαι Φρυγίων ἐξ ὀρέων.

[5] *Sāma-Veda*, I. 5. 2. 4. (verse 7): . . . daksho girishṭhāḥ; also verse 9.

[6] tvaṁ susvānaḥ adribhiḥ, etc. See Max Müller's Text of the *Rig-Veda*, IX. 3. 67, verse 3.

[7] See V. Henry, *Soma et Haoma*, pp. 53-4. Also Z. A. Ragozin, *Vedic India*, p. 170: "The Soma used in India certainly grew on mountains, probably in the Himâlayan highlands of Kashmir." See also Langlois' *Mémoire sur la Divinité Védique appelée Soma*.

[8] See Ragozin's *Media*, pp. 63-65.

Zagros range. Does it then appear strange to see in the epithet *Zagreus*, applied to Dionysos, a reference to his identity with Homa the plant-god of Zagros? In any case, such an interpretation is less far-fetched than that given in the *Etymologicum Magnum* which would explain it as "mighty Hunter," connecting it with ἀγρεύειν and an intensive prefix ζα, and regarding Zagreus as especially a god of the under-world or hunter of souls.[1] With this form of Dionysos we shall deal in Chapter III. The present chapter is concerned rather with the more obvious and cheerful features of the cult. One more instance of the association of Dionysos with the mountains and highlands of Greece may be given. Farnell tells us that in Messenia Mount Eva was the only place connected with the cult, and that there was a legend that it derived its name from the Maenad invocation εὐοῖ said to have been first heard in this country.[2] Now we know that the Sanskrit "svāhā," which primarily means a "good sacrifice," was used indeclinably as meaning "hail!" and frequently in invocations of the gods. This, according to Langlois, affords a good explanation of the Bacchic cry, as the words εὐοῖ and "svāhā" are manifestly closely connected philologically; and the fact that the word originally meant a "sacrifice" would make its restriction by the Greeks to Dionysos particularly appropriate, if we regard him as equivalent to Soma, the "god of the Sacrifice."

In regard to the worship of Dionysos as a mountain-god, it should be noted especially that in his Boeotian hill-festivals he was honoured as λικνίτης,[3] "the child in the cradle," *i.e.*, the birth of Dionysos on the hills is the particular import of these feasts.

[1] This explanation is the one given by Kern, who says: "Zagreus . . . ist ursprünglich ein Jagdgott, der grosse Jäger." Also: "Aus dem Jäger des Wildes ist dann ein Menschenjäger und Unterweltsgott geworden, so dass Zagreus viel eher dem Pluton als dem Dionysos zu vergleichen ist." He regards the identification of Zagreus and Dionysos as late and Orphic. Langlois, strangely enough, approves of the derivation from ἀγρεύειν, regarding Ζαγρεύς as an intensive participle from the root *graha*, "seize." For an explanation of Langlois' view of the Zagreus-myth see chapter III of this book.

[2] See Langlois' *Mémoire* on Soma, where he connects it with εὐοῖ. For *svāhā* see Monier-Williams' *Dict.*, p. 1162.

[3] Cp. Kern's article in Pauly as follows: "Dionysos hatte bei dieser Bergfeier den Namen λικνίτης, weil man ihn sich neugeboren, in seiner Wiege liegend vorstellte, und τριετηρικός, weil er nach dem dortigen ἱερὸς λόγος alle drei Jahre wiedergeboren wurde."



Hence we may see how close is the connection between the Bacchic cult and that of Soma, the hill-born, the young child (Śiśu). For there are few titles in the Vedas more usually applied to Soma than that of "the child." Thus, he is "the new-born lovely child" (*Sāma-Veda*, I. 5. 1. 1. verse 1),[1] "the wild youth,"[2] and we are told that men "delight him with offerings and songs like a child."[3] Again, he is "the child of Heaven" (divaḥ śiśum);[4] and in *Sāma-Veda*, II. 4. 2. 3. verse 2, we read: "To thee, O Deathless One, when thou art born all the gods together come near as to a child;"[5] and elsewhere he is invoked as "yavishṭhya" or "ever young."[6]

Soma, too, has the other qualities associated with youth, and especially with the youthful Dionysos in Art and Poetry, of joyousness, activity, and beauty. Thus, Soma is the "cheerful," "alert" (jāgṛivir) god, the god "of the beautiful hands,"[7] the "beautiful one;"[8] and in the *Homa Yasht*, similarly, mention is made of the "well-shaped" Homa-plant, "with hanging tendrils."[9] Doubtless the tendrils of the plant suggested a likeness to tapering hands, and are hence responsible for the epithet "suhastās" applied to the Soma. We know, besides, that its golden colour was much admired and prized—a fact which may account, as already suggested, for the title χρυσοκόμης Διώνυσος in Hesiod. Indeed, the following lines of Ovid, addressed to Liber or Bacchus, are no less appropriate to Soma:

> Tibi enim inconsumpta iuventas
> Tu puer aeternus, tu formosissimus alto
> Conspiceris caelo.[10]

[1] Śiśum jajnānaṃ haryataṃ.

[2] *S.-V.*, II. 1. 1. 22 (verse 2): *yuvograś*, etc., literally, "young (and) wild."

[3] *Ibid.*, I. 6. 2. 3 (verse 4): śiśuṁ na havyaiḥ svadayanta gūrtibhiḥ.

[4] *Ibid.*, II. 2. 2. 14 (verse 2).

[5] tvāṁ viśve, amṛita, jāyamānaṃ śiśuṁ na devā abhi saṁ navante.

[6] *Ibid.*, II. 1. 1. 4 (verse 2).

[7] *Ibid.*, I. 6. 1. 3 (verse 7), *suhastyā* (*Vedic* vocative).

[8] See *Rig-Veda*, *passim*.

[9] See Haug, p. 179.

[10] Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, IV. ll. 17-19. Cp. also the ἀβρότης of Dionysos in

One more point in connection with the subject of the infant Dionysos deserves attention. It concerns the name *Iakchos*, which was appropriated to the worship of the god in this aspect. The word has occasioned a great deal of discussion. It was connected, above all, with the Eleusinian mysteries and Orphism, and, on this account, the discussion of this aspect of Dionysos might, perhaps, have been reserved for a later chapter. It may, however, be more systematic to deal briefly with the subject here. The word is generally supposed to be derived from the ritual cry of the mystae or celebrants of the Eleusinia, and to mean little more than "the god of the loud cry" (from ἰάχειν "to cry aloud"), and is apparently an onomatopoeic word.[1] Lenormant regards Iakchos as a later name for Plutos, and holds that he was represented originally as the son of Demeter, and not till later as the son of Kore. He also refers to Hesiod[2] as the most ancient authority in support of his theory that Iakchos was originally Plutos, and adduces the epithet πλουτοδότης applied to Iakchos as evidence for this view. That Iakchos, as a form of Dionysos, was more particularly a god of wealth, joy, and prosperity is shown by the following address of the chorus of Mystae in the *Frogs* (l. 324):

*Ἴακχ', ὦ πολυτίμοις ἐν ἕδραις ἐνθάδε ναίων.*

---

the *Bacchae*, and observe that this word always suggests to the Greek an effeminate and Oriental character, and note also ll. 453-9, where Pentheus addresses Dionysos:

*ἀτὰρ τὸ μὲν σῶμ' οὐκ ἄμορφος εἶ, ξένε,*
*ὡς ἐς γυναῖκας, ἐφ' ὅπερ ἐς Θήβας πάρει.*
*πλόκαμός τε γάρ σου ταναὸς οὐ πάλης ὕπο, κ. τ. λ.*

It is even possible on the analogy of the transformation of the youth Ampelos in the *Dionysiaca* into a vine, that by a reverse process the Soma-plant with its hanging tendrils and the leafy vine have provided the myth-makers with the type of the youthful Dionysos with the clustering curls. The examples of Oriental powers of personification given in the chapter on the Dithyramb supply many parallels.

[1] See *Prolegomena* and Tucker's edition of the *Frogs*, l. 316.

[2] *Theogony*, ll. 962-71:

*Δημήτηρ μὲν Πλοῦτον ἐγείνατο, δῖα θεάων,*
*Ἰασίῳ ἥρωϊ μιγεῖσ' ἐρατῇ φιλότητι*
*νειῷ ἔνι τριπόλῳ Κρήτης ἐν πίονι δήμῳ.*



Lenormant would date the introduction of the Dionysiac element into the worship of the Goddesses at the Eleusinia somewhere in the first half of the sixth century B.C. He, in fact, considers Iakchos, under the name of Plutos, as a very ancient divinity of Pelasgic origin and Chthonian character, subsequently blended and confused with the young Thracian vegetation-god Dionysos.[1] It is certain that the cult of Iakchos was associated by the Orphics with that of the infant Zagreus which was brought to Greece from Crete.[2] This would point to Asiatic influence in the worship of Iakchos or Zagreus, as we have already seen that Crete is a very important centre for Asiatic influence on Hellenic culture.

So far we have dealt chiefly with the simpler aspects of the Dionysiac cult, and have shown that these may all be paralleled in the Aryan Homa- or Soma-worship. In the next chapter an attempt will be made to suggest another explanation for the character of Iakchos-Plutos instead of that which regards the word Iakchos as a mere personification of a ritual-cry. In doing this we shall have to deal with some of the more remote and complex aspects of the cult, and once again, shall find in Asiatic religion a parallel to Greek worship.

[1] See Lenormant's *The Eleusinian Mysteries*: "We are of those who trace back to the origin of the mysteries the conception of this 'mystic daimon' (Strabo, X. p. 463) associated with the Great Goddesses and completing their group by the essentially Pelasgic and primitive conception of the saviour *δαίμων* sprung from the mother-goddess. Doubtless he did not at the very beginning bear the name of Ἴακχος, which is not primitive, and has a manifestly Dionysiac character. This name is derived from the joyous cries with which the procession of the young god was accompanied, and it at first denoted the procession itself, or the song which was sung in it before it was applied to the god." For the reference here to Strabo see Bk. X. 463: *Οἱ μὲν οὖν Ἕλληνες οἱ πλεῖστοι τῷ Διονύσῳ προσέθεσαν, καὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι. . . . καὶ τῇ Δήμητρι καὶ Διῒ τὸ ὀργιαστικὸν πᾶν. . . . Ἴακχόν τε καὶ τὸν Διόνυσον καλοῦσι καὶ τὸν ἀρχηγέτην τῶν μυστηρίων, τῆς Δήμητρος δαίμονα.*

[2] See Lenormant.

# CHAPTER II

## DIONYSOS BROMIOS AND SOMA KANIKRADAT

The Yakshas—Their Bacchanalian nature—Derivation of "yaksha" and its kinship with "Iakchos"—*Baghas* and Βάκχος—Evidence for the Bactrian expedition of Dionysos—Diodorus and the Indian expedition—Meros the birth-place of Dionysos and the Hindu Mount Meru—Langlois' explanation of the legend of the thigh-birth—Post-Alexandrian poetry and the Gigantomachy—Aryan aggression in India—Soma the Warrior and Dionysos Ἐνυάλιος—Proselytizing nature of the Soma-cult akin to the spirit of the Dionysiac worship—Bromios and Soma the Thunderer — Soma once compared to a Lion—εἰραφιῶτα the same as vṛishabha—Centaurs and Gandharvas—Callicantzari and Rākshasas—The bear-form very rarely associated with Dionysos—Explanation of this—Soma the Swift akin to Dionysos the leader of Maenads—Soma the Falcon identical with Dionysos Ψίλαξ.

AMONG the earliest Indian sculptures, viz., those connected with the Aśoka Dynasty (273-232 B.C.), which were executed for the most part in honour of Buddhism, are groups of statues representing certain supernatural beings called Yakshas and supposed to be attendants on Kuvera, the Hindu God of Riches.[1] They occupy a prominent position in Buddhist legends, and while sometimes described as malevolent, are also regarded as harmless beings who delight in song and dance.[2] In the later Mathūra Sculptures they, like Kuvera, are closely associated with Bacchanalian scenes.[3] This connection has puzzled Indian archaeologists; but it goes to show that the Yakshas had a

[1] See *History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon* (chapter III.), by Vincent Smith.

[2] See Monier-Williams' *Sanskr. Dict.* sub "yaksha," p. 801.

[3] See *Hist. of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*, chapter V. for Mathūra Sculptures.





character not unlike that of Silenus and the Satyrs. In some sculptures they are further represented as earth-spirits holding up horses' hoofs,[1] and thus they would seem to have a still closer resemblance to the Centaurs or Satyrs of Hellenic mythology. The name Yaksha, which bears a close resemblance to Iakchos, is derived from the root "yaj,"[2] and means "a being honoured by sacrifices." Now while the connection between Βάκχος and Iakchos is obvious, it is interesting to note a resemblance of the same sort between the Vedic *bhaksha* and the later form *yaksha*. Langlois regards the Vedic form *bhaksha*, "sacrifice," as the origin of the word Bacchus, whom he considers as the god of the sacrifice pre-eminently. As a matter of fact we shall presently see that the form from which Βάκχος is actually derived is *Bhaga*; but, as both *bhaksha* and *bhaga* come from the same root (bhaj), we may accept Langlois' derivation for the present, inasmuch as it will help to show the analogy between Ἴακχος and *Yakshas* (nom. sing.), which may be expressed in the form of a proportion Βάκχος: Ἴακχος:: Bhakshas (Bhagas): Yakshas. We may now regard Kuvera, the King of the Yakshas, as a development of Soma the Lord of the Sacrifice, and, with his attendant spirits the music-loving Yakshas, as a doublet of Soma, the lord of music and song. The origin of the Greek conception of Iakchos and his chorus of joyous Mystae, in whose character we note a resemblance to the character of the Satyrs and Yakshas, is therefore apparently to be sought in the East. Moreover, the Indian Kuvera was supposed to be attended by monsters with horses' heads and men's bodies, called Kinnaras, and in later times reckoned among the heavenly musicians. In these we see a still closer resemblance than in the case of the Yakshas to the music-loving Centaurs who followed Dionysos. Again the chthonian character of the Yaksha-king, shown by the fact that

[1] See chap. XI. of above work.

[2] Langlois, who tells us nothing of the Yakshas in his *Mémoire*, would derive Iakchos from Yaksha, the sacrifice, thus: "Un commerce mystérieux entre Dyou (*i.e.* Heaven) et Proserpine . . . produit le feu nouveau, le jeune Iacchus, attaché à la mamelle de Cérès (Soph. *Ant.* 132), c'est-à-dire placé sur le foyer, où il aspire à sacrifier: c'est le sens du mot sanscrit *Yakcha*, analogue au mot Iacchus." This is characteristic of the rationalizing method of the school of comparative mythology as it existed sixty years ago.

in Sanskrit mythology, he was originally a spirit of evil or darkness,[1] is present also in Iakchos, the son of Kore, the bride of Hades. Presumably it was this character of earth-spirit attached to Kuvera which made him lord of the treasures of the Earth, or god of Gold and Riches. In fact, in Kuvera we probably have an instance of a primitive chthonian worship superimposed on the Aryan Soma-cult, the point of union being Soma's character of Earth-born god and lavish bestower of wealth. The most striking resemblance of all between the cult of Iakchos and that of the Yakshas is, however, to be seen in the similarity presented by the festival called *dīpālī* or "Row of Lamps,"[2] held in honour of the Yakshas, to the torch-light feast of Iakchos which fell on 20th September. The *dīpālī*, as its name suggests, was celebrated with nocturnal illuminations,[3] and as it fell on the day of the new moon in the month of Aśvina (September-October) its date must have coincided pretty closely with that of the Greek feast.[4]

As to the derivation of Βάκχος, I would venture to suggest, instead of "Bhakshas," "Baghas," the Zend form of the Sanskrit "Bhagas," which means "Lord," and is a frequent epithet of Indian deities. And we should remember that it was from the Zend form that the Greeks would naturally derive their own Βάκχος, inasmuch as it was primarily through Persia that Greece came in contact with Aryan ideas or culture. Moreover, the Zend word is the exact philological equivalent of the Greek, *gh* in Aryan roots becoming κ or χ medially. Nor, as a matter of fact, is Langlois' interpretation of Βάκχος as Bhakshas, the Lord of the Sacrifice, inconsistent with this derivation. For while Bhagas means primarily "food-distributor," just as the English "lord" originally meant "loafward,"

[1] The connection of Soma with the realm of the dead is reserved for another chapter. Similarly his association with the Gandharvas, beings of almost exactly the same nature as the Kinnaras, will be dealt with later. For purposes of symmetry and clearness of argument the Yaksha-king's worship in regard to its affinity with that of Iakchos is here fully discussed, and the connection between the Yakshas and Soma more briefly narrated.

[2] See Monier-Williams' *Dict.* p. 801, *sub* "yaksha-rātri."

[3] See above, *sub* "dīpālī," p. 416.

[4] See Tucker's *Frogs*, Introduction.



Bhakshas, which means simply "food," is derived from the same root (akin to βόσκω, according to Langlois, and to φαγεῖν, according to Monier-Williams). So, whether or not Langlois has somewhat exceeded his authorities in interpreting it as "the god who gives food to men and in the sacrifice is himself the food," we know that *bhagas* and *bhakshas* are originally the same. We also know that, while Bhagas was applicable as a title to any Indian deity, it was appropriated specially to a Vedic divinity who possessed some of the characteristic aspects of Soma and of Dionysos, *e.g.*, he was associated with marriage,[1] thus resembling the character of Dionysos and Soma as vegetation-deities or gods of fertility, and he was also, like Iakchos and Soma, a giver of wealth. Bhagas, besides, was a name of the Sun and of the Moon, both of which, as we shall later see, were identified with Soma and with Dionysos. Moreover, Hesychius tells us that Βαγαῖος was the Phrygian name of Zeus, and this, according to Chipiez, is easily recognized as the Zend form "bagha," which he interprets as meaning "god."[2] Here again we have the Phrygian language supplying us with a link between Greek and Persian and Indian forms—a fact of the highest importance when we recall that Phrygia is, κατ' ἐξοχήν, the home of the Bacchic cult.

In the place-name Bactria, also (Zend *Bâkhdhi*), we have a reminiscence of the god's connection with the East, figured in Greek legends as his Bactrian expedition. Bactria had always been from very early times a centre of Iranian influence, and an early home of Buddhism.[3] In the prologue to the *Bacchae* Euripides introduces Dionysos on his arrival at Thebes after his famous Asiatic wanderings, and there the god thus tells of his travels:

> Leaving the Lydian and the Phrygian plains
> Teeming with gold, I neared the sun-scorched tracts
> Of Persia and the walls of Bactria.

[1] See Monier-Williams' *Dict.*

[2] See Chipiez and Perrot, p. 4, in a reference to Paul de Lagarde's Essay "Einige Bemerkungen über êrânische Sprachen ausserhalb Erâns" (in the *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1866, Leipzig). See also Haug, pp. 273-4, for *Bagha*.

[3] See Haug. Cp. also Prašek.

This is a very important quotation, as showing that even before the age of Alexander the Greeks recognized the presence of Dionysos in Central Asia. Most scholars hold with Graef that the association of Dionysos with India was a post-Alexandrian invention which had its origin in a desire to flatter the Macedonian conqueror. Now, apart from the fact that the myth probably has some foundation, and that the objection of Graef is hardly tenable, inasmuch as it would have been a far greater compliment to Alexander to have been lauded as *surpassing* even Dionysos in his wanderings, instead of being represented as merely the rival of the god, the evidence of Euripides here shows that, previous to the Macedonian conquests, the Greeks depicted Dionysos as a conqueror of the distant East. Of the late writers who mention the connection of Dionysos with India, Diodorus gives much interesting information. Among the legends current among the Indians in his day, he tells us in the second[1] book of his Histories of one which represents the god as coming from the West with a large force, and overrunning the whole of India, at a very distant period, when the people were still scattered in hamlets, and possessed no important cities. He then relates how the invading army was attacked by disease, and retreated to the hills to a place called Meros, whence arose the legend of the birth of Dionysos from the thigh (*μηρός*) of Zeus. Diodorus further says that these legends are narrated by the natives of the hill-regions, which leads us to suspect that the influence of the Dionysiac cult in India was confined to the North-West corner, and that the legend of the conquest of the *whole* of that country (*cp.* *ἐπελθεῖν δὲ τὴν Ἰνδικὴν ἁπᾶσαν*) was an exaggeration. He also says that these hill-dwellers declare that Hercules formerly lived among them, and tell of his expulsion of wild beasts[2] from the land in similar fashion to the Greek fables concerning his exploits. But if there is any truth in this statement of Diodorus, it probably refers to kindred Indian legends of the deeds of their war-god, Indra. Elsewhere, speaking of the different stories current as to the

[1] See Bk. II. c. 38: *Μυθολογοῦσι δὲ παρὰ τοῖς Ἰνδοῖς οἱ λογιώτατοι, κ. τ. λ.*

[2] See Diodor. Bk. II. c. 39: *Τόν τε Ἡρακλέα φασὶ παρ' αὐτοῖς γεγενῆσθαι, καὶ παραπλησίως τοῖς Ἕλλησι, τό τε ῥόπαλον καὶ λεοντῆν αὐτῷ προσάπτουσι.*



origin of Dionysos, and the theory that there were several Dionysi, he says (c. 63) that the most ancient of these is said to be the Indian Dionysos,[1] and that, as India was said to have an abundant vine-crop produced spontaneously without any cultivation, it was stated that this Indian Dionysos had discovered the use of wine and the culture of the vine, whence he derived the name Lenaeus, or God of the Wine-press. He informs us, in addition, that this god was known as the Bearded Dionysos, on account of the Indian custom of wearing beards,[2] and that men in his own day still showed the place where the God was born (*γενέσθαι*),[3] and that there were many other evidences of his birth there which would be too long to narrate.

Strabo, who makes reference to Megasthenes as believing in the expedition of Dionysos and Heracles to India, but as rejecting the other ancient Greek legends connected with that country, tells us that Eratosthenes refuses to give credence to it, classing it with the other legends as "untrustworthy and mythical."[4] "For," says Strabo, "in the *Bacchae* of Euripides Dionysos makes some such youthful boast as the following: 'Leaving the Phrygian and the Lydian plains,'" etc. From this we can see that Strabo would reject even the Bactrian expedition, and also that these fables were rife in Greece before the period of Megasthenes and Eratosthenes; in other words, before the Alexandrian age. The historian then, after an allusion to Nysa and to Meros, goes on to say that the Oxydracae claimed to be descended from Dionysos because they possessed the vine, and that their kings used to make Bacchic expeditions to the accompaniment of timbrels and with lavish personal equipment. He mentions a legend that Heracles had failed three times in

[1] C. 63: *Καὶ φασι, τὸν μὲν ἀρχαιότατον Ἰνδὸν γεγονέναι, καὶ τῆς χώρας αὐτομάτως διὰ τὴν εὐκρασίαν φερούσης πολλὴν ἄμπελον, πρῶτον τοῦτον ἀποθλίψαι βότρυας, καὶ τὴν χρείαν τῆς περὶ τὸν οἶνον φύσεως ἐπινοῆσαι.*

[2] See c. 63: *Τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ καὶ Καταπώγωνα λέγουσι, διὰ τὸ τοῖς Ἰνδοῖς νόμιμον εἶναι μέχρι τῆς τελευτῆς ἐπιμελῶς ἀνατρέφειν τοὺς πώγωνας.*

[3] C. 63: *Δείκνυσθαι δὲ παρ' Ἰνδοῖς μέχρι τοῦ νῦν τόν τε τόπον, ἐν ᾧ συνέβη γενέσθαι τὸν θεὸν, καὶ προσηγορίας πόλεων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἐγχωρίων διάλεκτον.*

[4] Bk. XV. c. I. *India*, p. 251: *Καὶ τὰ περὶ Ἡρακλέους δὲ καὶ Διονύσου Μεγασθένης μὲν μετ' ὀλίγων πιστὰ ἡγεῖται· τῶν δ' ἄλλων οἱ πλείους, ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ Ἐρατοσθένης ἄπιστα καὶ μυθώδη, καθάπερ καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν.*

an attack on Aornos which Alexander took at the first attempt, and another which placed the prison of Prometheus in the Hindu-Kush range and made Heracles arrive there to set him free. All these tales he regards as flatteries of Alexander for the following reasons: first, because there are discrepancies, and the narrators do not agree with one another, some omitting to mention them at all, and he holds that such striking events could not well have escaped the memory if they had ever occurred; and, next, because he observes that these legends are not corroborated among the peoples through whose territories Dionysos and Heracles would have to pass on their way to India.[1] He regards the legends concerning Heracles as pure fiction, and says that they must have been much later than the Trojan War. These remarks would be difficult to controvert if we were dealing with actual historical events. In the case, however, of events which are only partially historical, and contain a large element of myth, the objections raised by Strabo are not insuperable. In point of fact what we know of the history of the diffusion of the Soma-cult will help to account for these difficulties.

Arrian[2] also, in his *Anabasis* of Alexander, tells us of a city, Nisa, said by its inhabitants to have been founded by Dionysos between the rivers Indus and Cabul, in the Panjāb, and of their embassy to Alexander asking him to spare their lives. He also represents them as speaking of a mountain Meros in its vicinity, which they said was so named from the legend of the thigh-birth. Thus we see that the account of the mountain and the second birth varied in some legends according as the mountain, or the re-birth, was said to have originated the name Meros. Meros the mountain is evidently the Greek translation of Mount Meru,[3] the fabulous mountain of Hindu mythology equivalent to the Greek Olympus. It was said to have consisted of gold

[1] Cap. I. p. 253, *India*: *οὐ γὰρ εἰκὸς, τὰ ἔνδοξα οὕτω καὶ τύφου πλήρη μὴ πεπύσθαι· ἢ πεπύσθαι μὲν, μὴ ἄξια δὲ μνήμης ὑπολαβεῖν, καὶ ταῦτα τοὺς πιστοτάτους αὐτῶν. Ἔπειτα ἐκ τοῦ μηδὲ τοὺς μεταξὺ, δι᾽ ὧν ἐχρῆν τὴν ἐς Ἰνδοὺς ἄφιξιν γενέσθαι τοῖς περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα, μηδὲν ἔχειν τεκμήριον δεικνύναι τῆς ἐκείνων ὁδοῦ διὰ τῆς σφετέρας γῆς.*

[2] Arrian, *Anabasis Alexandri*, Bk. V, cc. 1 and 2.

[3] See Monier-Williams' *Sanskr. Dict.* p. 795, sub *meru*.



and gems, and was associated with the Gandharvas and other semi-divine beings. It appears to have been the abode of Kuvera, who, as we have seen, was probably a Hindu form of Iakchos.

As to the legend of the thigh-birth, we are told by Maury[1] that an Indian tradition says that "Soma has been received 'dans la cuisse d'Indra,'" and he compares this to the similar legend concerning Dionysos. Langlois mentions a like legend relating to the birth of the Nymph Urvaśī, which he supposes to have arisen from a confusion between *ŭru*, meaning "wide" (whence *οὐρανός*, or the "wide space of heaven," and Urvaśī, or "she who lives in the wide space of heaven"), and *ūru*, meaning "a thigh," and he goes on to say that a similar confusion probably gave rise to the story of the thigh-birth of Dionysos.[2] It should, however, be noted that there is no mention of the thigh-birth of Soma in the *Rig-* or *Sāma-Vedas*, and it is therefore possibly a development of Purāṇic mythology. The thigh-birth is, however, of frequent occurrence in Indian myth.

Needless to say, the Greek and Latin[3] poets of the post-Alexandrian Age make reference to the Indian expedition of Dionysos; but, in the nature of things, their evidence is of little value compared with that of historians or pre-Alexandrian poets. It may, however, strike us as somewhat surprising that Langlois, who so strongly insists on the Indian origin of the Dionysos-myth, should regard the legend of the Bacchic expedition to India as post-Alexandrian. Graef, who discounts the idea that previous

[1] See Maury, who refers to the views of A. Kuhn as expressed in the *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 1851, p. 192.

[2] Cp. Langlois: "Je suppose qu'une semblable raison a produit aussi la fable relative à Bacchus, ce qui me semble indiqué par la tradition qui lui donne pour nourrice Macris, dont le nom a le même sens que *ourou*—*εὐρύς*."

[3] Cp. Ovid, *Fasti*, III. ll. 465-6:

> Interea Liber depexis crinibus Indos
> Vincit, et Eoo dives ab orbe redit.

Cp. also Statius, *Silvae*, IV. 6. 65-7 and IV. 2. 49:

> sic jacet ad Gangen Indis ululantibus Euhan.

See also *Thebais*, XII. 787-8, and Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica*, V. ll. 75-81, and VI. ll. 134-140.

to the Macedonian conquest there had been any notion of such an expedition, agrees with Koepp, that the legend, as narrated by Nonnus, arose from that of the Gigantomachy. He also notes the fact that in the *Dionysiaca* no mention is made of such striking features as the Indian Nysa, the triumph of the god, or his foundation of Indian cities, and, above all, of the presence of Hercules, and the help he rendered to Bacchus.[1]

All these discrepancies, indeed, matter little when we reflect on the remote origin of the fable, assuming that its antiquity is as great as any other legend connected with the god. Now, if we regard Soma as the original of the Greek wine-god, a probable explanation of these discrepancies and of the legend itself readily suggests itself. We have seen that the Aryans were passing across Central Asia to India somewhere between 2000-1500 B.C., and during the same period the Western branch of the stock was traversing Iran and Media westward, and finally penetrating to the coasts of Asia Minor. In other words, the cult of Soma or Homa was being spread in two different directions at this time, so that those two branches of the cult who practised it gradually became so widely separated as to lose all contact with each other. We know from the evidence of the *Vedas* that the cult was a highly proselytizing one, and they speak of Soma as a great warrior coming from the northern hills of India down into the plains of the South, where he makes war on those who will not practise his worship.[2] His great ally is Indra, the Aryan War-God, who has been often compared with Heracles. Is it strange to see in this Vedic legend the origin of the myth of the expedition of Dionysos and Heracles to India, or of the warrior Dionysos of the Gigantomachy, depicted, as he usually is in this

[1] See Graef: "In ipsa Nonniana expeditionis narratione desunt quae primae fabulae propria esse didicimus: neque de Nysa Indica neque de triumpho quidquam ibi extat. Deest stelarum mentio neque oppida condit Bacchus aut beneficiis Indos afficit. Praeterea non neglegendum est quod Hercules, qui in versione Macedonica interdum Bacchi est socius, nullas apud Nonnum in bello Indico agit partes."

[2] See *Vedic India*, p. 285, where Indra is shown as the friend of the fair-skinned Âryas and the destroyer of the Dasyus or "Foes" with black skin. Note also that these "foes" were not always of a different race, but were generally nomads or outcasts.



aspect, as surrounded by lions and panthers and other typically Asiatic features? Naturally the Western stock would know nothing of these adventures of their Eastern brethren, now so widely separated from them, and hence it is hardly a matter for wonder that we hear nothing of the Indian expedition of Soma-Dionysos till Alexander the Great and his soldiers heard of it from the lips of the Indians themselves. And, no less naturally, after this date the story would become widely known and spread throughout the Grecian Empire.

A few examples from the *Vedas* will suffice to show this warrior aspect of Soma which so closely resembles the sterner character of Dionysos the assailant of Lycurgus in Thrace and Pentheus in Thebes. Thus, Soma is addressed in the *Sāma-Veda* in the following terms: "Smite . . . like one in armour."[1] And we are told of him that: "He that is mighty in battle hastes to battle."[2]

"This sap that gives blessings, when pressed out, flows down for Indra for battle. Soma is the friend of the conqueror as we know."[3]

"Thou by whose friendship we conquer with thy highest might those that assail us, O Indu."[4]

"O thou that dost greatly rejoice, equipped with goodly armour, send down valour upon us."[5]

"The well-armed god Indu, slayer of the foe, flows down."[6]

From these quotations we may see how close was the connection between Soma and the War-God Indra. In fact, Indra is strengthened for the fray by the Soma-libation, and it is in virtue of this association that Soma himself becomes the well-armed warrior. This exactly agrees with what we know of Dionysos. As Dr. Farnell says, "it is interesting to note that the warlike character which no doubt belonged to the god in his old

[1] *S.-V.*, I. 6. 2. 4. (verse 8): varmīva . . . ruja.

[2] *Ibid.*, II. 1. 1. 2. (verse 2): . . . ā vājaṁ vājy akramīt.

[3] *Ibid.*, II. 1. 1. 17. (verse 2): ayaṁ bharāya sānasir Iṅdrāya pavate sutaḥ; Somo jaitrasya cetati yathā vide.

[4] *Ibid.*, II. 2. 1. 2. (verse 2): yasya te sakhye vayaṁ sāsahyāma pṛitanyataḥ; taveṅdo dyumna uttame.

[5] *Ibid.*, II. 2. 1. 4. (verse 3): ā pavasva suvīryaṁ maṅdamānaḥ svāyudha.

[6] *Ibid.*, II. 1. 1. 10. (verse 2): svāyudhaḥ pavate deva Iṅdur aśastihā, etc.

Thracian home was scarcely recognized in the formal state-cults of Greece. The only community, if we can trust Macrobius, that worshipped him as a god of battles, was the Lacedaemonian . . ." Dr. Farnell also thinks that Macrobius, in mentioning the title Ἐνυάλιος in this context as given often to Dionysos, "may be merely quoting the opinion of the learned who knew that he had close affinities with the Thracian Ares; or he may have been thinking of the verse that has been preserved for us among the *Fragmenta Adespota* in which he is called Ἐνυάλιος and Βρόμιος, the latter word having perhaps merely the sense that it has once in Pindar of 'loud-sounding'; or such titles may have been suggested by the late myths of the battles of Bacchos with the Indians and the Giants. . . ." The reference to Ares in the above quotation is very important in view of the opinion expressed by Miss Harrison in her *Prolegomena* that Ares and Dionysos are rivals.[1] I would venture to suggest that the fable of the Bonds of Hera on which she builds this theory points rather to a union between these deities, inasmuch as it shows both as partisans of the same cause, and this view is confirmed by Dr. Farnell's statements. Now, without at all implying that Ares and Indra are identical, we may consider the Thracian War-God, in the relation that he bears to Dionysos, as the equivalent of Indra, in his relation to Soma. Or, in other words, if we regard Soma as the origin of the Thracian Dionysos, then, not unnaturally, the Thracians would in adopting Soma into their cult-system associate him with their own War-God, just as in the East he was closely linked with the Aryan War-God.

We need not then wonder at the connection of Dionysos with war, nor regard it as a late invention. But, on the other hand, we should not expect to see in him a fully developed God of War any more than we should expect to be able to prove the existence of such a conception of the Aryan Soma.

There is, however, yet another interesting parallel between

[1] Pp. 374-6 of the *Prolegomena*, and cp. the following especially: "Why are Ares and Dionysos thus set in rivalry? Not merely because wine is mightier than war, but because the two, Ares and Dionysos, are Thracian rivals, with Hephaistos of Lemnos for a third. It is a bit of local mythology transplanted later to Olympus." Cp. for the fable *Pausanias*, I. 20. 3.



Soma and Dionysos in connection with this subject, and one, moreover, which affords the clue to the association of Dionysos with the triumphal car. We know that in Alexandrian times the victorious Dionysos was usually represented as riding on a chariot surrounded by his joyous followers much in the same fashion as a modern Carnival King and his retinue. The most famous illustration of this notion was the Great Dionysiac Procession in Alexandria in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, of which an account is preserved in Athenaeus. Now, in the *Vedas*, Soma is repeatedly referred to as riding in triumph in his chariot, and the libations are likened to steeds attached to his car. Thus in the *Sāma-Veda* he is spoken of as *rathin* or "(lord) of the chariot" (II. 6. 2. 18, verse 2), and we read as follows: "the Soma-libations like sounding chariots or spirited steeds have flowed down to us for riches" (pra svānāso rathā ivārvato na śravasyavaḥ somāso rāye akramuḥ; see *S.-V.* II. 4. 2. 1 verse 4). Similarly, in the *Rig-Veda*, we read of him as *jyotiḥ-rathaḥ*, i.e., "mounted on a car of light" (IX. 5. 86 verse 45); and again: "Like a hero he holds weapons in his hand . . . mounted on a chariot" (IX. 4. 76 verse 2).

The explanation of this metaphor is very simple. The sacrificial vessel of the Soma-libations represents the triumphal chariot of the god, and affords an excellent example of the process of the formation of myth from ritual, while it at the same time seems to place beyond doubt the origin of the Dionysiac car.

As has already been said, the cult of Soma was proselytizing in the extreme, and in this it closely resembles the Dionysiac cult. Thus, again and again, Soma is said to pursue and crush the wicked who fail "to press the Soma," *i.e.* to perform the Soma-sacrifice; and those who *sell*[1] the Soma to others are regarded as accursed. It was, in fact, a sacred plant not to be

[1] See *Vedic India*, p. 171: "A regular trade was carried on with the Soma-plant, and the traders belonged to mountain tribes who were not Aryan, and therefore irreverently handled their sacred ware like any other merchandise, bargaining and haggling over it." Also: "To an Aryan Hindu, the man who owned the Soma and did not press it was a hopeless reprobate. In fact he divided mankind into "pressers" and "not-pressers," the latter word being synonymous with "enemy" and "godless barbarians."

made subject to barter by infidels or others. So, too, in the *Bacchae* the uninitiated and unbelieving are made to feel the full force of the power of Dionysos. Similarly, Soma is the Smiter of his foes, just as Dionysos is invoked as Βραϊτά or Smiter in the Delphic Hymn.[1] Now to those who consider Soma and Dionysos as identical an interesting explanation of the epithet Braites applied to the latter is afforded by the very nature of the Soma-ritual. For the Soma-plant, whose stalks are crushed by the priests to make the Soma-libation, becomes itself in the *Vedas* the Crusher or Smiter, by a very characteristic and frequent Oriental conceit in accordance with which the agent and the person or thing acted on are identified.

We should note also that the pressing-stones by means of which the Soma is crushed typify thunderbolts.[2] Now Indra is pre-eminently the Thunder-God of India, and hence it is not surprising to find Soma affiliated to him as himself a Thunderer or god of Loud Noise, and the very counterpart of Dionysos Bromios as we meet him in the *Bacchae*[3] and elsewhere. For we know that Dionysos Bromios[4] derived his title apparently from the legend of his birth amid thunder and lightning, and thus we have a complete parallel between him and Soma, once the plant-god, now the personified libation, coming into being afresh in

[1] See Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena*, p. 416, footnote, and Smyth's *Greek Melic Poets*. Note that Dr. Farnell agrees with Weil's suggestion that Braites is derived from *Fραίω* or *ῥαίω*, and see his explanation of it as "celui qui frappe et qui brise." He dismisses Miss Harrison's connection of the word with the late Latin "braisum."

[2] See *Vedic India*, p. 176.

[3] Cp. Cadmus' lines in the *Bacchae*, ll. 1248-50:

> οἴμοι κακῶν μὲν πρῶτα σῶν, ἔπειτ' ἐμῶν,
> ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἡμᾶς ἐνδίκως μέν, ἀλλ' ἄγαν,
> Βρόμιος ἄναξ ἀπώλεσ' οἰκεῖος γεγώς.

where in his destructive and revengeful aspect the god is appropriately spoken of as Bromios.

[4] See *Prolegomena*, pp. 413-4. And cp. Pindar, who evidently derived Bromios from *βρέμω*. Note especially *Ol.* II. 27:

> ζώει μὲν ἐν Ὀλυμπίοις ἀποθανοῦσα βρόμῳ
> κεραυνοῦ τανύθειρα Σεμέλα.

Observe that the epithet is of extremely frequent occurrence in Nonnus.



this new liquid form amid the thunder of the pressing-stones which extract the juice from the stalks. Soma also has a constant epithet "kanikradat," which, like Bromios, means "bellowing" or "thundering," and is applied to him in this warrior-aspect in the following quotation from the *Sāma-Veda*:

("O Soma), pleasing to Indra, joy-giver, giver of purity, thundering loudly, annihilate all (our) foes."[1] And in the next verse the Soma-libations are spoken of as "annihilating those that do not offer libations."[2]

Akin to this Bromian aspect of Soma and Dionysos is the character of a Lion-God assigned to both. Curiously enough this title is only once—so far as I know—applied to Dionysos in Classical Greek literature, while Soma also in the *Vedas* is just once likened to a lion.[3]

The epithet "kanikradat" is, however, especially given to Soma in his character of Bull-God—a very important aspect, and one that meets us in the case of Dionysos also, where it is closely associated with his Bromian or destructive aspect.[4] For example, in the *Bacchae*, at the moment of the great catastrophe Dionysos as Bacchant calls out[5] . . . *ὁ νικήσων δ' ἐγὼ καὶ Βρόμιος ἔσται*, preparing the audience by the use of the word *Βρόμιος* for the terrible scene that is to come, while it is significant that in the following chorus he is summoned in the epode to appear in his various fearful animal shapes, beginning with that of Bull. And, no sooner is the announcement made of the death of Pentheus, than the chorus breaks out into the cry:

*ὦναξ Βρόμιε θεὸς θεὸς φαίνει μέγας.*[6]

[1] *S.-V.* II. 5. 1. 3. (verse 8): jushṭha Iṅdraya matsaraḥ pavamānaḥ kanikradaṭ; viśvā apa dvisho jahi.

[2] *Ibid.*, II. 5. 1. 3. (verse 9): apaghnaṅto arāvṇaḥ etc.

[3] See *Rig-Veda*, IX. 6. 97, verse 28: siṇhaḥ na bhimaḥ, *i.e.*, "terrible as the lion."

[4] Cp. Maury, who tells us that the surname of Bull which both gods received is a "dernier trait qui achève d'identifier le dieu védique avec le dieu grec." Cp. also Langlois, who regards the Vedic Soma as split up into three distinct personages in the Zoroastrian system, one of whom, viz. Taschter, is a Bull-God.

[5] See ll. 975-6.

[6] See l. 1032. Note the characteristic Oriental repetition in *θεὸς θεὸς* of which Euripides is so fond in emotional passages.

Indeed the bull-form, like the title Bromios, seems to have the greatest prominence throughout the play, *e.g.* where the god on being imprisoned by Pentheus substitutes a bull[1] for himself, and again when, just before the death of the King, Dionysos appears to him in bull-form.[2]

Similarly, in the *Vedas*, Soma is especially invoked as a Bull when stress is laid on his might and ferocity. Thus, we read in the *Sāma-Veda*: "When delighted, verily, thou dost rage like a bull."[3] "The Bull bellows eager for battle in the midst of (all) living creatures."[4]

He is also "the Bull with a thousand streams"[5] (where we see his character of Water-God and Bull-God combined); "the Bull plunging itself into the sea-foam";[6] "a flame-coloured bull roaring loudly to greet the cows, loudly sounding, etc."[7]

Now, according to Plutarch,[8] the Bull-Dionysos is summoned by the Argives to appear out of the water in one of their religious ceremonies, and in this we have a close parallel to the association of Soma the Bull-God with the waters. We know, besides, that the bull was the general type of river-gods in Ancient Greece, and the symbol of fertility in general,[9] and that it was

[1] ll. 616-21.

[2] Cp. ll. 920-1:

> *καὶ ταῦρος ἡμῖν πρόσθεν ἡγεῖσθαι δοκεῖς,*
> *καὶ σῷ κέρατε κρατὶ προσπεφυκέναι.*

Cp. also *Prolegomena*, pp. 431-7; and Schol. on *κερασφόρους γυναῖκας* in Lycophron's *Alexandra*, ll. 1237-8, as follows: *ταυρόκρανος γὰρ φαντάζεται καὶ ζωγραφεῖται* (sc. *Διόνυσος*).

[3] *S.-V.* I. 6. 1. 2 (verse 11): mandāna(s) id vṛishāyase.

[4] *Ibid.*, II. 2. 2. 16 (verse 3): . . . ukshā mimeti bhuvaneshu vājayuḥ.

[5] *Ibid.*, I. 6. 2. 4 (verse 4): sahasradhāraṁ vṛishabhaṁ.

[6] *Ibid.*, I. 6. 2. 2 (verse 11): siṅdhor uchvāse patayaṅtam ukshaṇaṃ etc. Cp. also *ibid.*, II. 5. 2. 5 (verse 6).

[7] *Ibid.*, II. 2. 1. 11 (verse 1): vṛishā śoṇo abhikanikradad gā nadayann, etc. Note that the "cows" are the personified waters.

[8] Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, c. 35: *διὸ καὶ ταυρόμορφα Διονύσου ποιοῦσιν ἀγάλματα πολλοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων· αἱ δ' Ἠλείων γυναῖκες καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν εὐχόμεναι, ποδὶ βοείῳ τὸν θεὸν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς αὐτάς· Ἀργείοις δὲ βουγενὴς Διόνυσος ἐπίκλην ἐστίν· ἀνακαλοῦνται δ' αὐτὸν ὑπὸ σαλπίγγων ἐξ ὕδατος, κ. τ. λ.*

[9] Cp. *Prolegomena*, pp. 434-5, and A. W. Curtius' *Der Stier des Dionysos*: "Der Stier scheint wegen seiner Körperstärke und *Zeugungskraft* bei den Griechen ursprünglich des Symbol der Fruchtbarkeit gewesen zu sein."



as much in his *rôle* of vegetation-deity or god of fertility that Dionysos was identified with this animal-form, as because of his character of a god of loud noise. A. W. Curtius plainly connects both these aspects of the Bull-God with Dionysos, and the quotations just given from the *Sāma-Veda* point to the same symbolic interpretation of the epithets *Vṛishā* and *Ukshā* in the case of Soma. However, there is no doubt from the frequent references in the *Vedas* to the violent leaping of the Bull-Soma into the waters that the noise of the liquid Soma pouring into the sacrificial bowl had also a good deal to say to his being spoken of as a raging bull. Curtius[1] gives the same explanation for the association of water with the Bull-Dionysos, which is the more interesting as he is apparently quite unconscious of any resemblance between Soma and the Greek wine-god.[2] But all these coincidences, together with the fact that the worship of Zagreus and Dionysos Omestes and the rending of the sacramental Bull were especially connected with Crete, and also the prominence of bull-worship in general in this island tend to show that the Bull-Dionysos was introduced into Greece from the East and Asia Minor.

In this connection the epithet *εἰραφιῶτα* applied to Dionysos in the Homeric Hymn is of some importance. In the excellent note on this word given in Messrs. Allen and Sikes' edition, we are told that of the many derivations suggested for this word the one that has found most favour connects it with the Sanskrit

Strangely enough he reminds us that the Bull was the Zoroastrian symbol for Mithra, the Sun-God, but he says nothing at all of Homa in this character.

[1] Cp. A. W. Curtius, *Die Bedeutung des Dionysischen Stiersymboles*: "Da den Alten die Bedeutung des Stieres als Symbol der Fruchtbarkeit des Wassers abhanden gekommen war, so suchten sie den Vergleichungspunkt zwischen Stier und Wasser in etwas anderm: so kam man dazu das Brüllen und Toben des von Sturme erregten Wassers und des Stieres, so wie die gewaltige Kraft, mit welcher das übertretende Wasser daherbraust und der wutende Stier daher stürmt und alles, was ihm in den Weg kommt, überrent für das tertium comparationis zu halten."

[2] He rather identifies the Bull with Indra, to whom certainly as Bull-God there are many allusions in the *Vedas*. He also regards the Bull as the Symbol of Light, and possibly may refer to Soma in his remarks about Śiva, who appears to have been confused with Soma by some writers.

*ṛshabha*—a variant of the forms *vṛishabha(s)* and *vṛishā*, which meet us so frequently in the *Vedas* as epithets of Soma.[1] Other derivations mentioned are those which would connect εἰραφιῶτα with the Latin *verres* and with ἀρνειός and the Lacedaemonian εἶρην, giving it the sense of "male."[2] Now the word *vṛishabha* has all these meanings in Sanskrit, and the sense of "bull" is only a derived signification from that of any male animal, which seems to confirm the derivation preferred by Allen and Sikes.

As to the doubtful ram-form of Dionysos,[3] the origin of this notion has been thought to be found in a confusion of Dionysos with Ammon, who was undoubtedly represented thus. But in the interpretation given above of εἰραφιῶτα and *vṛishabha* we have a warrant for the possible existence of such a type, which may have occurred sporadically. And though we have no direct mention of Soma as a Ram-God, the ritual of the Soma-sacrifice enjoined the use of a woollen sieve of ram's fleece to strain the liquid Soma, while the Soma-stalks had to be brought to the home of the priest, preparatory to the sacrifice, on a car drawn by two rams and two he-goats.[4] Hitherto we have been chiefly occupied in finding parallels in the worship of Soma to the various aspects of Dionysos, with a view to establishing the identity of the two. Conversely, it is at least as instructive and valuable for our purpose to show that where, as in this case of

[1] Cp. *Rig-Veda*, IX. 4. 82 (verse 1): Somaḥ arushaḥ vrishā hariḥ rājā iva dasmaḥ abhi gāḥ acikradat, *i.e.* "Soma, the fiery bull, the golden-coloured, like a powerful king, has bellowed to greet the cows." Also *R.-V.*, IX. 4. 80 (verse 2): śravaḥ Indrāya, Soma; pavase vrishā madaḥ, *i.e.*, "Hearken to Indra, O Soma; (as) a bull, (as) an exhilarating drink thou dost flow down."

[2] See Allen and Sikes' *Homeric Hymns*, pp. 3-4.

[3] See Thraemer in Roscher's *Lexicon*.

[4] See Langlois' *Mémoire*, and cp. Benfey's translation of the plural of *avi* (in the *Sāma-Veda*), the fleece used for filtering the Soma, as "Widderschweife." Note that in one passage in the *Sāma-Veda* Soma is spoken of as the Boar, as follows: mahivrataḥ śuśibandhuḥ pāvakaḥ padā *varāho* abhyeti rebhaṇ, *i.e.* "The Boar, the doer of great deeds, the friend of light, purified, strides forward singing." Here Benfey translates *varāho* as "boar," and this, for it is obviously akin to the Latin "verres" and "porcus," appears to be its usual meaning. But a reference to Monier-Williams' *Dictionary* will show that other senses attached to this word are those of "ram" and "bull." All this clearly points to a fertility-god who may at will assume the shape of any male animal.



the Ram-form, we have no clear warrant for assuming a certain form or aspect of the Greek god, so neither have we any clearer proof of the existence of the corresponding aspect in the case of the Asiatic.

The possibility that there was a Goat-form of Dionysos depends on the authority of Apollodorus,[1] who informs us that the god was worshipped as ἐρίφιος in Metapontum, but it does not appear to have been one of his recognized forms. We know that the goat was sacrificed to him; but this has been interpreted as due to the fact that it was regarded as hostile to him from the injury it was accustomed to inflict on the young vines. If such an aspect of the god did actually exist, then, from the analogy of the two he-goats required for the car on which the Soma was placed, we should be entitled to consider it as one more specialized instance of the worship of Dionysos εἰραφιώτης parallel to that of Soma Vṛishabha, and as pointing to the phallic side of the cult.[2] Soma and Dionysos, in fact, represent the same conception, *i.e.* that of a vegetation-deity or nature-god with all its concomitant features. Such a god is naturally the guardian of crops and herds and the giver of fertility, and in this character may be regarded alternately as a Tree-God or an Animal-God. In the *Sāma-Veda*, accordingly, Soma is frequently invoked as the giver of wealth and increase to herds and plants and horses. He is himself also often spoken of as a Horse, thus:

"(Men) lead thee with bridles adorning thee like a mighty steed."[3]

[1] See Apollodorus, III. 3; also Roscher.

[2] It should be noted that the simplicity of the Vedic worship, though giving clear evidence of this side of the cult, is lacking in the coarser elements that present themselves later both in Greece and India. Langlois notes that the *Veda*, prodigal though it is in physical comparisons, does not make allusion "to a single exterior sign of the cult." Farnell holds that the goat-type did not exist for Dionysos. But, speaking of the bull-form of the god, he says: "The evidence is equally clear, though somewhat slighter, for the occasional incarnation of the Greek Dionysos in the form of a goat." Elsewhere he says: "A god who was conceived as the source of life in Nature—Φυσίζωος, as a Pergamene oracle called him—might acquire certain titles significant of generation; and Dionysos bore the epithet ἐνόρχης in Samos and perhaps elsewhere."

[3] *S.-V.* I. 6. 1. 4 (verse 1): aśvaṁ na tvā vājinaṁ marjayaṅto . . . raśanābhir nayaṅti.

"Soma like a swift steed has reached the sacrificial bowl."[1]

"Indu like a doughty steed," etc.;[2] and many other such passages occur.

Now, while it is true that Dionysos is nowhere identified with the horse in his own person, his favourite comrades, the Centaurs or Horse-Men form a link connecting him with this aspect of Soma. And Soma the Horse-God is closely associated in Hindu mythology with certain semi-divine beings called Gandharvas, who are in every way equivalent to the Greek Centaurs, as we shall presently see. Miss Harrison originally strongly opposed this identification of Centaurs and Gandharvas in her *Prolegomena*;[3] but, writing in the *Classical Review* of September 1910 a review of Lawson's *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, she changes her position and urges that the conceptions are practically the same.[4] In this chapter an effort will be made to show that they are *actually* and not merely *practically* the same.

In the *Rig-Veda* we hear of only one Gandharva[5] (the spouse of the Apsaras), a semi-celestial being who guards the heavenly Soma, even as the Centaurs guarded the infant Dionysos,[6] and

[1] *S.-V.* I. 6. 1. 5 (verse 6): droṇaṁ nanakshe atyo na vājī.

[2] *Ibid.*, II. 1. 1. 18 (verse 2): Iṅdur aśvo na kṛitvyaḥ.

[3] See p. 380: "The Centaurs, it used to be said, are Vedic Gandharvas, cloud-demons. Mythology nowadays has fallen from the clouds, and with it the Centaurs. They next become mountain-torrents, etc. . . . Of the making of such mythology truly there is no end."

[4] See p. 183 of the *Classical Review* of September 1910: "Mr. Lawson proves that Callicantzaros is a descendant from Kentaur, but he nowhere tells us what Kentaur itself is derived from. The old connection with the *Gandharva* has been discredited. In the light of Mr. Lawson's discussion we would ask—may it not be revived? I have no philological competence and must leave the philological question to others. But as regards the content of the two mythological conceptions, Gandharva and Κένταυρος, they are practically identical."

[5] See Monier-Williams' *Dictionary*, *sub* "Gandharva." Cp. also Macdonell.

[6] Nonnus, XIV. ll. 143-50:

. . . Κενταυριὰς ἵκετο φύτλη,
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
Καὶ Διὸς εὐώδινα τιθηνήσαντο γενέθλην
Βάκχον ἔτι πνείοντα πολυρραφέος τοκετοῖο,
παιδοκόμοι ῥυτῆρες ἀθηήτου Διονύσου, κ. τ. λ.



is sometimes identified with it. This Gandharva is also, like Chiron the Centaur, renowned as a physician,[1] and he has charge of the horses of the Sun. He has a mystical power over women, and hence is invoked in marriage ceremonies. And in the attribution of this power to him we see a resemblance to Chiron, and also the origin of the wanton character usually assigned by the Greeks to the Centaurs or Satyrs.[2] In epic times the Gandharvas become more numerous and constitute a class of semi-divine beings whose wives are the Apsarasas. This affords yet another parallel with the Satyrs who are especially associated with the Nereids in modern Greek folklore.[3] Like the music-loving Chiron, too, the Gandharvas are celestial singers and musicians, and, like him, they possess prophetic qualities, being spoken of as the preceptors of the Ṛishis or Seers. In fact, the word "gandharva," used as a common noun, means, among other things, a seer. It also denotes a horse; and in this we note the connection of the Gandharva with the horse-type of Centaur very plainly, as also in the legend which makes the Divine Gandharva the guardian of the horses of the Sun. Now Lawson tells us that, while the horse-form of Centaur was very popular in early Greek art, and hence caused the Centaurs to be identified almost completely with the Hippocentaur, we hear also in

[1] Cp. *Pythians*, III. 45-6, where we are told how the infant Aesculapius was taught medicine by Chiron; and also the legend of Chiron curing Phoenix of his blindness (Apollod. III. 13. 8). Note, too, the Homeric references to Chiron's skill in medicine (*Iliad*, IV. ll. 218-9; XI. ll. 830-2).

[2] Cp. *Nemean Odes*, III. ll. 53-8:

. . . βαθυμῆτα Χείρων . . .
. . . . . .
νύμφευσε δ' αὖτις ἀγλαόκρανον
Νηρέος θύγατρα, γόνον τέ Φοι φέρτατον
ἀτίταλλεν ἐν ἁρμένοισι πάντα θυμὸν αὔξων·

Here we see clearly his character of fertility-daimon, and his close connection with the water-nymphs as shown in his bringing about the wedding of Thetis. Observe also the subject of *Pythian* IX. where Chiron plays the same part in the case of Cyrene, the daughter of Nais. And note the expression *βαθυμῆτα*, in the quotation just given from Pindar, denoting his "wisdom" and prophetic powers.

[3] See Lawson.

ancient Greek literature of ass- and fish-centaurs. Regarding the monsters called Callicantzari, familiar to Modern Greek peasant-fable, as the lineal descendants of the Centaurs, he concludes that, as in Modern Greece, so in former times the Centaurs were represented in different shapes, viz., as horses, wolves, asses, or monkeys. He tells us that in the folk-tales of Greece there are two classes of Callicantzari—one large and destructive and of a black colour, the other small, mischievous, and very commonly deformed. He explains the presence of these different forms, *i.e.* those of horses, wolves, etc., as due to the fact that the Centaurs were regarded as sorcerers who could take any shape at will, and holds that the shaggy, half-human forms attributed to them showed that they belonged to the aboriginal pre-Hellenic population, who were supposed, as is frequently the case with conquered peoples, to possess some magic attributes not given to their conquerors.

In ancient India also we hear of malignant superhuman beings called Rākshasas who were classed together with the Gandharvas as attendants on Kuvera[1] and, like them, dreaded as evil beings. Indeed, the Gandharva is supposed to cause possession by evil spirits, and we may regard the Rākshasas as a more malignant variant of the Gandharvas. These Rākshasas, as we learn from Monier-Williams, are divided into three classes, of which the third or most familiar is described in the *Ramāyāṇa*[2] as possessing the usual characteristics assigned by the Greek peasant to the Callicantzari. Thus, he tells us that some have long arms, others are excessively fat or thin, tall or dwarfish, while some have only one eye or ear, enormous paunches, crooked limbs or projecting teeth, and others, again, have more limbs than the normal, and the heads of donkeys, horses, and elephants. They are also said to wander about at night and ensnare human beings; and, from the fact that they can assume beautiful forms, it is evident that they possess the power of

[1] See Thomson's Index of Proper Names in his translation of the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, p. 140. He gives with hesitation the derivation of their name from *raksh*, "to preserve," as appropriate to them as the guardians of Kuvera's treasures.

[2] See Monier-Williams' *Dictionary*, p. 837, under "*Rākshasa*."



taking different shapes at will. Like the Callicantzari or Centaurs, they represent an aboriginal population, being said to reside in Ceylon, where Rāvaṇa,[1] their chief, fought the Aryan hero Rama. Now the physical peculiarities of the Rākshasas are very like those enumerated in Lawson's account of the Callicantzari. So that we may regard the Rākshasas and the Callicantzari as one and the same, and representing the more baneful aspect of the Centaurs.

On the other hand, in Hanumat,[2] the monkey-god, and his monkey-followers who make war on the Rākshasas we probably have representations of the more propitious character of the Centaurs with something of the nature of the Callicantzari, whom they resemble in swiftness, and in their power of resuming any shape at will. Like the Centaurs also they are able to remove mountains and wield rocks. Lawson, moreover, tells us that the Callicantzari are often represented as having monkeys' arms and tails.

As to the name Ἄσβολος of the Centaur mentioned in the *Shield of Heracles*,[3] which Lawson is unable to interpret, I would venture to suggest that it may be connected with the Sanskrit *aśva* "a horse." In any case it is the exact philological equivalent of the proper name Aśvala (which is formed from *aśva*), as b and v are interchanged frequently in Sanskrit,[4] *e.g. gandharba* and *gandharva*, both of which forms occur. If this interpretation of Ἄσβολος is accepted, we have a parallel to the proper name Arctos in the same passage of Hesiod, which Lawson regards as suggesting a bear-form of centaur.

Now in the longer *Homeric Hymn* to Dionysos, which narrates

[1] Note that Rāvaṇa is half-brother to Kuvera, whose most special attendants are the Yakshas, sometimes also regarded as demons. Evidently Gandharvas, Yakshas, and Rākshasas have a good deal in common, like the Centaurs, Satyrs, and Callicantzari.

[2] See Monier-Williams' *Dict.*, p. 1165.

[3] See *Shield of Heracles*, ll. 184-6:

> Κένταυροι δ' ἐτέρωθεν ἐναντίοι ἠγερέθοντο
> ἀμφὶ μέγαν Πειραῖον ἰὸ' Ἄσβολον οἰωνιστὴν
> Ἄρκτον τ' Οὐρειόν τε μέλαγχαίτην τε Μίμαντα, κ. τ. λ.

[4] Cp. also the variant "Kubera" for "Kuvera."

his capture by pirates, we read how the god displayed his power as follows:

> . . . ὁ δ' ἄρα σφι λέων γένετ' ἔνδοθι νηὸς
> δεινὸς ἐπ' ἀκροτάτης, μέγα δ' ἔβραχεν, ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσσῃ
> ἄρκτον ἐποίησεν λασιαύχενα, σήματα φαίνων.[1]

Crusius considers the mention of the bear mythologically unique, in connection with Dionysos,[2] as we learn from Messrs. Allen and Sikes who, however, remind us that in Nonnus Dionysos takes the form of a bear in his contest with Deriades.[3] Now Nonnus is a very late author, and, like most writers of his period, given to excessive description, and would therefore be quite capable of adding an indefinite number of beast-forms to the recognized metamorphoses of Dionysos. So that even if we are compelled to differ from Crusius on the strength of the passage in Nonnus, it is still tolerably clear that we have no good evidence for a bear-form of the god, especially when we observe that in the *Homeric Hymn* Dionysos is not himself said to take the form of a bear.

But, when we recollect that the bear has always been a native of Thrace and Asia Minor, and must have been familiar to the worshippers of Dionysos in both continents, this seems rather remarkable.[4] Nevertheless, the explanation of its absence in connection with Dionysos is not far to seek. One of the most noteworthy characteristics of the god and his followers was that of great swiftness. In this very hymn we are struck by the

[1] See *Homeric Hymns*, VII. ll. 44-6; and cp. Seneca, *Œdipus*, ll. 457-8:

> Idaeus prora fremuit leo
> tigris puppe sedet Gangetica.

[2] See Allen and Sikes' edition, p. 235.

[3] *Dionysiaca*, XL. ll. 46-9:

> σπεύδων δ' ἀντὶ δράκοντος ὀπιπεύω ῥάχιν ἄρκτου·
> εἰς λοφιὴν δ' ἐπίκυρτον ἐμὸν δόρυ θοῦρον ἰάλλω,
> ἀλλὰ μάτην τανύω δολιχὸν βέλος· ἀντὶ γὰρ ἄρκτου
> φαίνεται ἠερόφοιτος ἀνούτατος ἱπταμένη φλόξ.

[4] It may strike us as remarkable that, if Dionysos was really an Asiatic, he was never likened to a tiger, although in later art tigers form part of his *entourage*. The explanation of this seeming difficulty is interesting. Soma also is never likened to a tiger, for the simple reason that the tiger was unknown to the composers of the *Rig-Veda*, who had not yet penetrated far enough south or east to meet it. There has, as we know, been a change in later times in the habitats of the lion and tiger in India, but, for the history of the cult, we are only concerned with the period of the earlier *Vedas*. See Macdonell's *Sanskr. Liter.*, p. 147, and note what he says as to the bear being only once mentioned in the *Rig-Veda*.



rapidity of the action, which is regarded by Baumeister[1] as a mark of dithyrambic haste, and, accordingly, dithyrambic influence is suspected in this poem. But the Dithyramb was, κατ' ἐξοχήν, the song of Dionysos, and hence speed would be appropriate in this form of composition. Again, the swift god, the leader of rushing Maenads,[2] the god who could so rapidly change from one form to another and destroy with dread suddenness those that dared to oppose him, was naturally associated, as in this hymn, with wild, fierce, but, above all, swift animals. On this account the panther was his favourite companion, suggesting by its lithe, swift movements the rapid onset of the god. For this reason it is not unnatural that the slow and clumsy bear is hardly ever associated with him.

Swiftness is also an essential property of the god Soma; and we have already found him likened to a "swift steed" (atyo na vājī). Indeed, this attribute is, perhaps, the chief reason for the existence of the horse-form of Soma, who is repeatedly spoken of in the *Vedas* as *hastening* to the sacrificial bowl. The very word for "horse" employed here by the Vedic poet, viz. *vājin*, means primarily "winged," and then "swift," whence it is used to denote "a horse." The following passages in the *Sāma-Veda* amply illustrate this character common to Soma and Dionysos alike: "(Soma), when pressed out, like a swift cream-coloured[3] horse easily showed his prowess among the warriors in the

[1] See Allen and Sikes' edition, p. 228.

[2] Cp. *Bacchae*, l. 977:

> ἴτε θοαὶ Λύσσας κύνες ἴτ' εἰς ὄρος,

and the general rush and hurry of the Maenads as depicted in the Messenger's speech at lines 746-8:

> θᾶσσον δὲ διεφοροῦντο σαρκὸς ἐνδυτὰ
> ἢ σε ξυνάψαι βλέφαρα βασιλείοις κόραις.
> χωροῦσι δ' ὥστ' ὄρνιθες ἀρθεῖσαι δρόμῳ κ. τ. λ.

[3] See *S.-V.*, I. 6. 2. 2 (verse 5): hariḥ sṛijāno atyo na satvabhir vrithā pājāṅsi kṛiṇushe nadīshv ā.

floods." Here, as often in the *Vedas*, the metaphors become a little mixed. The translation given is more literal than Benfey's, which, however, makes the sense very plain, and shows that Soma rushing down into the sacrificial bowl is like a horse charging in battle. Again, we read that: "The beloved cream-coloured steed flows . . . rapidly,"[1] and: "This is he who going swiftly round the heavens,"[2] etc.

Hence, also, Soma is frequently compared in the *Vedas* to a bird, and, above all, to a falcon, *e.g.* he is spoken of as: "A falcon sitting in the nest, a bird playing[3] . . ."

"Like a falcon" (very often);[4] and we are told how: "This immortal god like a winged-bird flies to the sacrificial vessels to sit down (in them)."[5]

Now we know from Pausanias[6] that Dionysos was honoured as Ψίλαξ or the Winged God in Amyclae, and we also have monuments which show him with wings.[7] The explanation given by Pausanias as to this title is natural enough. But the real reason of the epithet would appear to be found in a reminiscence of the Soma-ritual, and we have thus one more instance of ritual as the origin of myth. For the speed attributed to the god Soma is nothing more or less than the rapid pouring of the Soma-libation into the sacrificial bowl, as many references in the Vedas clearly prove.

[1] *S.-V.*, I. 6. 2. 3 (verse 11): pavate haryato harir . . . raṇhyā. Perhaps we should recognize a horse-form of Dionysos. Cp. *Orphic Hymns*, XLIX, where he is called ἐριβρεμέταο Ἰάκχου and his nurse is Hippa.

[2] *Ibid.*, II. 3. 1. 4 (verse 3): ayaṃ sa yo divas pari raghuyāmā, etc.

[3] *Ibid.*, II. 5. 1. 1 (verse 3): camūshachyenaḥ śakuno vibhṛitvā.

[4] *Ibid.*, II. 5. 2. 4 (verse 3): śyeno na.

[5] *Ibid.*, II. 5. 2. 2 (verse 1): esha devo amartyaḥ parṇavīr iva dīyate; abhi droṇāny asadaṃ.

[6] See Pausanias, III. 19. 6: *θεῶν δὲ σέβουσιν οἱ ταύτῃ τόν τε Ἀμυκλαῖον καὶ Διόνυσον, ὀρθότατα ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν Ψίλακα ἐπονομάζοντες· ψίλα γὰρ καλοῦσιν οἱ Δωριεῖς τὰ πτερά, ἀνθρώπους δὲ οἶνος ἐπαίρει τε καὶ ἀνακουφίζει γνώμην οὐδέν τι ἧσσον ἢ ὄρνιθας πτερά.*

[7] See article by E. Thraemer in Roscher's Lexicon, on "Dionysos in Art."

# CHAPTER III

## THE ORPHIC DIONYSOS

Dionysos as Wind-God, and Soma as friend of the Maruts—The ritual significance of the λίκνον—Dionysos Hosios and Soma Pavamāna—Agni—Dionysos Πυριπόλος—Soma the God of Light and Phanes—Dionysos Paean, and Soma the Healer—Soma and Dionysos alike regarded as Creators of the Universe—Soma the Moon-God, and Dionysos the Lord of Night—The derivation of Dionysos—The meaning of the νέβρις—A parallel in Hindu mythology to the Pythagorean view of the Moon as the abode of the Happy Dead—Dionysos of the Anthesteria and Soma the lord of Dead Ancestors—Eleusinia—Zagreus—Parallel in the *Avesta* to the Orphic interpretation of the Cretan Omophagy—Isodaites and the sacramental worship of the Vedic Soma—The Titans and the Seven Manus of Vedic myth—The Trieterica—Sabazios and the Snake-God, Soma.

WE have just seen that the Dionysos of Euripides and the *Homeric Hymn* was a god of many forms and swift changes. Plutarch[1] notes this attribute, and speaks of it in contrast to the unvarying nature of Apollo. Among the many transformations of Dionysos he mentions changes into "*winds* and water and stars." This seems at first a little strange. Nowhere else do we recollect having read of a Wind-God Dionysos. But we may regard him as coming in this guise when he shatters the palace of Pentheus, and this character ascribed to him by Plutarch may be the real meaning of his title Thyoneus, which, as we have seen, is the exact equivalent of the epithet Dhuni, applied by the early Indians to their wind-gods, and especially to Soma. Soma, in fact, is often mentioned in

[1] Plutarch, *De EI apud Delphos*, c. IX.: *τῆς δ'εἰς πνεύματα καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ γῆν καὶ ἄστρα καὶ φυτῶν ζώων τε γενέσεις τροπῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ διακοσμήσεως, τὸ μὲν πάθημα καὶ τὴν μεταβολήν, διασπασμόν τινα καὶ διαμελισμὸν αἰνίττονται· Διόνυσον δὲ καὶ Ζαγρέα καὶ Νυκτέλιον καὶ Ἰσοδαίτην αὐτὸν ὀνομάζουσι, κ. τ. λ.*

the *Vedas* as the friend of Vāyu and the Maruts—the Vedic deities of the winds. Thus we read of him as being: "Nectar to the Maruts and to Vāyu";[1] and as "dropping down the sweet liquid, (and) raising Vāyu to the friendship of Indra";[2] and he is bidden: "Arise to Vāyu in accordance with thy duty."[3] Now this affinity can be explained, as in the case of Dionysos, by the fact that Soma, as a god of many shapes and changes and rapid motion, might naturally be likened to the ever-changing wind. As a matter of fact, however, the mythical association of Soma and the winds takes its origin from the ritual of the Soma-sacrifice. That is to say, the air surrounding the sacrificial vessel is evidently supposed to purify the Soma-juice as it flows through the metal strainer used in the ceremony of filtration. This is implied by the following text from the *Rig-Veda*:[4] "The troop of Maruts adorns the lovely new-born child, the bright offerer of the sacrifice," where the reference to the sacrifice points to the *second* birth of Soma. Otherwise, it might be understood of the winds on the mountain-top blowing round the young plant.

Now in the Orphic worship of Dionysos Liknites at Delphi and Eleusis,[5] the λίκνον, or shovel-shaped basket used for carrying the fruits of the Earth, was intimately associated with the child-god. Indeed, Dionysos is usually represented in this cult as seated in the λίκνον as in a cradle. But, as Servius tells us in his Commentary on the *Georgics*, the λίκνον served another purpose. It was, besides, used as the sieve of the threshing-floor; and he tells us somewhat confusedly that the reason Vergil calls it "mystica vannus Iacchi" is because of the affinity between the purification of men's souls by the rites of Father Liber (*i.e.* Iacchus) and the purification of grain by fans.[6] In

[1] *S.-V.*, I. 5. 2. 4 (verse 8): Marudbhyo Vāyave madaḥ.

[2] *Ibid.*, II. 2. 1. 17 (verse 2): madhu ksharayan Indrasya Vāyum sakhyāya vardhayan.

[3] *Ibid.*, I. 5. 2. 5 (verse 7): Vāyum ā roha dharmaṇā.

[4] See *R.-V.*, IX. 5. 96 (verse 17): śiśuṁ jajnānaṁ haryataṁ mṛijanti śumbhantiṁ vahniṁ Marutaḥ gaṇena. Cp. also the epithet "vātajūto," *i.e.* "hastened by the wind," applied to Soma in *S.-V.*, II. 6. 3. 5 (verse 1).

[5] See Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena*, pp. 517-34.

[6] See Servius on Vergil, *Georgics*, I. 165, on "vannus," as follows: "Id est cribrum areale. *Mystica* autem *Iacchi* ideo ait quod Liberi Patris sacra ad purgationem animae pertinebant: et sic homines ejus mysteriis purgabantur, sicut vannis frumenta purgantur." Also Lobeck's *Aglaophamus*, pp. 584 ff.; and Servius on *Aeneid*, VI. 741: "In sacris Liberi omnibus tres sunt istae purgationes, aut taeda et sulphure purgantur aut aqua abluuntur aut aere ventilantur, quod erat in sacris Liberi."



fact, the whole idea of the λίκνον in this cult is, as Miss Harrison points out, a piece of Orphic symbolism whereby the utensils associated with agriculture and appropriate to the worship of a vegetation-deity, such as we know Dionysos primarily was, are brought into connection with the religious life of his votaries. But, as she says further on that "the wind is the natural winnower," while the winnowing-fan only serves to assist its action, we may regard the purification by wind as the essential feature of the ceremony. Hence we have here another parallel between Soma and Dionysos, *i.e.* between Soma, the "new-born nursling purified by the winds," and seated in the sacrificial-bowl, and Iacchus, the child-god, whose cradle is the winnowing-fan purifying all that passes through it by the aid of the wind.

One of the most striking features of the Orphic cult of Dionysos was its insistence on the necessity for ceremonial purifications. Purity or ὁσία becomes in it a special mark of the votaries of Dionysos,[1] who must himself have been regarded as pre-eminently Hosios or Pure. Euripides reveals this view of the god and his worship in the *Bacchae* in the first utterance of the Chorus:[2]

> ὦ μάκαρ, ὅστις εὐδαίμων τελετὰς θεῶν εἰδὼς βιοτὰν ἁγιστεύει
> καὶ θιασεύεται ψυχὰν, ἐν ὄρεσσι βακχεύων ὁσίοις καθαρμοῖσιν·

We have, indeed, seen that a tendency to asceticism and the practice of purificatory rites is a mark of Oriental influence in the teaching of the Orphics, and we might therefore imagine that their form of the worship of Dionysos would incline to import these Asiatic features, even if they were not originally to be found in the cult. Miss Harrison, however, holds that the word

[1] See *Prolegomena* on "the Hosioi and Hosia," pp. 500 ff. and pp. 393-5 on the title "Phoibad," whose presence at Delphi the writer considers to be due to Dionysiac influence; and note what she says on its connection with Phoebus.

[2] See ll. 75-77.

Hosios was "deep-rooted" in the ritual of the Bull-Dionysos. Once again a reference to Soma-worship will explain the apparent conflict between this Orphic conception of the god and the more familiar one of Dionysos as a god of revelry. Soma was especially known as Pavamāna or the Pure One. Again and again in the *Vedas* is he invoked by this name, which was bestowed on him by the Hindus in virtue of the elaborate process of filtration or purification to which the Soma-juice was subjected.[1] It may be almost said that the most customary Vedic epithet of Soma is that of Pavamāna. Reference is also made frequently to the bright, sparkling appearance of the libations in the sacrificial vessel, and hence Soma is often addressed as Dyumattama or Brightly Shining. A few examples from the *Rig-Veda* will help to show this, *e.g.*: "Pavamāna, bright, rich, and to be adored glitters under the dew of the libations";[2] "purified in his imperishable form (Soma) is clothed in all his splendour. He glitters like a warrior in the midst of the cows (of the sacrifice)."[3] Allusion is made, too, to the fingers of the sacrificing priest, which help to crush the stalk, and extract the juice of the Soma, as though these were the real offerers of the libations, thus: "Ten ministrants purify thee";[4] and to the filter, *e.g.*, "The pure Soma with the thousand streams after he has passed through the filter enters the bowl of Vāyu and of Indra."[5] And in the *Sāma-Veda* Soma is addressed as follows: "For thou art a bestower of blessings by means of thy light, O Pure One, we call thee the brightly-shining, the heaven-gazing";[6] "for thou . . . O heavenly One, Purifier, brightly-shining, art summoning the tribes to immortality";[7] "O Pure One, with light upon light, O god, poured out for the gods."[8]

[1] See Haug's *Essays on the Parsis*, Appendix III, pp. 393-409; and also *Vedic India*.

[2] See *R.-V.*, IX. 1. 3 (verse 3).

[3] See *ibid.*, IX. 1. 16 (verse 6).

[4] See *ibid.*, IX. 1. 8 (verse 4).

[5] See *ibid.*, IX. 1. 13 (verse 1).

[6] *S.-V.*, I. 5. 2. 5 (verse 4): vṛishā hy asi bhānunā; dyumaṅtaṁ tvā havāmahe, Pavamāna, svardṛiśaṃ.

[7] *Ibid.*, I. 6. 2. 4 (verse 6): tvaṁ hy . . . daivya Pavamāna janimāni dyumattamaḥ amṛitatvāya ghoshayaṇ.

[8] *Ibid.*, II. 3. 1. 5 (verse 2): "Pavamāna rucā rucā deva devebhyaḥ sutaḥ.



Another reason for the association of the idea of purity with Soma is his connection with Agni, the god of the sacrificial fire, of whom, indeed, Langlois and Maury[1] regard him as a manifestation. Soma, in fact, is supposed to be liquid fire[2] dwelling in the sap of plants. But Agni, the god of blazing fire and bright light, is especially connected with the second birth of Soma, when the latter is crushed by the pressing-stones and offered in sacrifice, and, according to the Brahmanical rite,[3] poured on the flames of the sacrificial altar. And it is evident that Agni is considered as distinct from Soma, though intimately joined to him, from the fact that in the *Vedas* Agni is frequently summoned along with Indra to drink the offering. In one place in the *Sāma-Veda* the Soma-libation is likened to a flame mounting upwards in the sacrifice,[4] and in the *Rig-Veda* he is said to mount upon Agni's back.[5] Now we have seen in the previous chapter that Soma is considered as re-born when his juice is extracted and offered in the sacrifice, and the noise of the pressing-stones is compared to thunder. And as Agni, or the Sacrificial Fire, also represents the Lightning of Heaven,[6] we have here an obvious parallel to the birth of Dionysos from Semele amid thunder and lightning in the rebirth of Soma

[1] See *Histoire des Religions de la Grèce*, I. pp. 118 ff., where he speaks of Soma as "Agni-Soma" and tells us that he is born of "manthanam," *i.e.* of the production of the divine fire. See also *Themis*, p. 536: "Persian religion laid . . . special stress on Fire-worship, and along with this went a minute attention to ritual purity," etc.

[2] See *Vedic India*, p. 162.

[3] See Haug, *Essays on the Parsis*, p. 282; and note what he there tells us of the difference between the Indian and Persian Soma-sacrifice, viz., that "the Parsis never throw any of the juice into the fire," but only "show it to the fire, and then drink it." It will be seen, however, that the presence of fire was an essential element in both rites.

[4] See *S.-V.*, II. 5. 1. 16 (verse 3): dhārā ya ūrdhvo adhvare bhrājā na yāti gavyayuḥ.

[5] See *R.-V.*, IX. 2. 36 (verse 6): "ā divaḥ pṛishṭaṁ . . . rohasi . . ."

[6] See *Vedic India*, p. 162, and also p. 167 as follows: "We have now learned to know Agni: 1st, in heaven as the Sun; 2nd, in the atmosphere as Lightning; 3rd, on earth as the Domestic, and 4th, as the Sacrificial Fire." It should be observed that Miss Ragozin tends to blend the characters of Soma and Agni together, and, indeed, they appear to have much in common, according to the *Vedas*.

amid the thunder of the pressing-stones and the crackling and blaze of the sacrificial fire. The analogy becomes still closer when we recall the following lines from *Orphic Hymns* XLVII relating to the birth of Dionysos:

> ἠνίκα πυρφόρος αὐγὴ ἐκίνησεν χθόνα πᾶσαν,
> πρηστῆρος ῥοίζοις· ὃ δ' ἀνέδραμε δεσμὸς ἁπάντων

and note their resemblance to the Vedic notion of Soma as a light *rising up* to Heaven swiftly and passing through all things simultaneously. The parallel between the birth of Dionysos and that of Soma has been noted by Maury, who regards the similar Greek fable of the birth of Ischys from Coronis as derived from the birth-legend of Dionysos, just as the rebirth of Soma was the prototype of similar Indian fables.[1] He also notes the analogy between the epithet Dvijanman,[2] frequently applied to Soma in the *Vedas*, and the names Διθύραμβος and Διμήτωρ given to Dionysos.[3] The title Διμήτωρ, which occurs in *Orphic Hymns* L, is not, it is true, strictly parallel to Dvijanman, although it contains the same idea. I venture, however, to complete the parallel by adducing in support of Maury's view the following from the *Rig-Veda*: "This god considers the two great (deities), Heaven and Earth, as two mothers by whose milk he is nourished."[4] This quotation, indeed, has reference obviously, not to the rebirth at the sacrifice, but to the first birth of Soma, the plant-god, and the epithet Dvijanman, also, has been so explained by the Scholiast, according to Benfey in his edition of the *Sāma-Veda*. There can, however, be little

[1] See *Histoire des Religions de la Grèce*, Vol. I. p. 121: "De même que la légende de Sémélé et de Dionysos a donné lieu en Grèce à des légendes analogues taillées sur son patron la légende Védique, sous l'empire de conceptions identiques, s'est diversifiée plus tard en différentes fables dont l'analogie avec celles que je viens de rappeler est aussi frappante que decisive pour la question d'origine."

[2] See *S.-V.*, II. 9. 1. 4 (verses 2 and 3).

[3] Cp. "Soma est tiré de la flamme du sacrifice; il sort de l'arâni (*i.e.* fire-stick) et est transporté ensuite dans les cieux par les invocations des prêtres. Cette double naissance a valu à la divinité védique le surnom de Dwidjanman, *né deux fois* ou *né sous deux formes*, qui correspond exactement à ceux de Διθύραμβος, Διμήτωρ, que la double naissance avait valus à Dionysos."

[4] See *R.-V.*, IX. 1. 18 (verse 5).



doubt from many passages in the *Vedas* that the second birth is meant by this word.

Langlois also takes the same view as Maury as to the identity of Soma and Dionysos in regard to this connection with Fire,[1] and recalls the fact that Dionysos bore the names Πυριπόλος and Πυρωπός. We may add to these the epithet πυρίσπορε found in one of the *Orphic Hymns*,[2] and compare with them the Sanskrit *arusha*, or the Fiery One, as a title of Soma.

Now this close association of Soma with Agni is responsible for the identification of Soma with the Sun. Thus we read of Soma in the *Sāma-Veda* that: "he is all-seeing as the Sun; he hastens to heaven, etc.";[3] "this god, when purified, stands above all beings; Soma is like the Sun-God";[4] "this god, when purified, lit up the Dawns";[5] "the Pure One has created a mighty light enfolding all men, like unto the glorious lightning of Heaven";[6] "great, wondrous to behold, like Mitra he has shone forth equal to the Sun."[7] In fact, according to the *Vedas*, the specialized Sun-God, Sūrya, is said, in the exaggerated style of the poet, to derive his light from Soma, *e.g.* where the latter is thus invoked: "Flow down with this stream wherewith thou didst light up the Sun."[8]

But Dionysos also as the young god born amid thunder and lightning, was accredited with possessing power over Fire and

[1] He holds that Bacchus is, like Soma, the child of Heaven (Dyou) and Earth, and that this Earth, which carries the offering and is already impregnated with the divine substance, wishing to see more closely the splendours of the Sacrifice, is consumed by the fires of Dyou. We need not agree with him in identifying the Indian Mâtariswan, who first obtains the terrestrial fire, with Mercury who carries away the new-born Dionysos. He also notes the analogy between Bacchus Bimater and Dvijanman.

[2] *Orphic Hymns*, XLV, line 1.

[3] *S.-V.*, II. 1. 2. 16 (verse 2): ayam Sūrya ivopadṛig ayaṁ . . . dhavati . . . ā divaṃ.

[4] *Ibid.*, II. 1. 2. 16 (verse 3): ayaṁ viśvāni tishṭhati punāno bhuvano pari; Somo devo na Sūryaḥ.

[5] *Ibid.*, II. 2. 1. 17 (verse 3): ayaṁ punāna ushaso arocayad.

[6] *Ibid.*, I. 5. 2. 5 (verse 8): Pavamāno ajījanad divaś citraṁ na tanyatuṃ; jyotir vaiśvānaraṁ bṛihat.

[7] *Ibid.*, I. 6. 1. 2 (verse 1): . . . mahān Mitro na darśataḥ; saṁ Sūryeṇa didyute.

[8] *Ibid.*, I. 6. 1. 1 (verse 7): ayā pavasva dhārayā yayā Sūryam arocayaḥ.

Light. This is well brought out in the *Bacchae* when he gives the order to the Chorus:

ἄπτε κεραύνιον αἴθοπα λαμπάδα
σύμφλεγε σύμφλεγε δώματα Πενθέως

and it replies making reference to the circumstances of his birth,

ἄ ἄ
πῦρ οὐ λεύσσεις οὐδ' αὐγάζεις
Σεμέλας ἱερὸν ἀμφὶ τάφον, ἵν
ποτε κεραυνόβολος ἔλιπε φλόγα
δίου βροντᾶς;[1]

and again, at the crisis of the drama, just before the death of Pentheus, when, as narrated by the Messenger, "he set up a column of mystic light 'twixt earth and heaven,"[2] marking the solemnity of the occasion and revealing himself as closely akin to Soma, the Lord and Giver of Light. The very words employed in this latter quotation recall certain passages in the *Vedas*. In the *Rig-Veda* Soma is thus invoked: "Thou dost appear to raise up thy standard to Heaven," etc.;[3] and in several places his "rays" are said "to reach to heaven,"[4] while he is called "the standard of the sacrifice."[5] Similarly, in the *Sāma-Veda* men are told to sing the song of praise to "Soma the heaven-touching,"[6] he "fills heaven and earth" with his rays,[7] and the sacrificial fire is a light stretching widely between heaven and earth.[8] In plain English, the Soma-juice, when poured on the sacrificial fire and set alight, shoots upwards in a tongue of bright flame, and appears like a column of fire rising up to heaven. The *Vedas*, indeed, lay particular stress on this part of the sacrifice, and on the flight of the god upwards from the altar while still connected with earth. Hence, if we accept

[1] See ll. 596-99.
[2] The above is Dr. Tyrrell's version of ll. 1082-3:

. . . καὶ πρὸς οὐρανὸν
καὶ γαῖαν ἐστήριζε φῶς σεμνοῦ πυρός.

[3] See *R.-V.*, IX. 3. 64 (verse 8).
[4] See *ibid.*, IX. 4. 73 (verse 6).
[5] See *ibid.*, IX. 5. 86 (verse 7).
[6] "divispṛiśe Somāya" II. 6. 3. 3 (verse 1).
[7] Cp. *S.-V.*, II. 7. 1. 3 (verse 3), and II. 6. 3. 18 (verse 3).
[8] *S.-V.*, II. 5. 2. 9 (verse 1): citrabhānuṁ rodasī aṅtar urvī, etc.



the view that Soma and Dionysos are identical, it is not surprising that the catastrophe in the *Bacchae* should be ushered in by the solemn reminiscence of the god's daily ascent to heaven from the hearth of the Fire-God implied in the words καὶ πρὸς οὐρανὸν καὶ γαῖαν ἐστήριζε φῶς σεμνοῦ πυρός.[1]

Now the association of Soma with Fire is easy enough to understand, inasmuch as it is chiefly to be attributed to the circumstances of the Soma-sacrifice, and not so much to the idea of an indwelling liquid fire present in all plants. But it is not so easy to see the connection of Dionysos with the same element, unless, indeed, we are prepared to admit his identity with Soma, and that in the Vedic texts we have the true explanation of the aetiological myth of the birth of Dionysos. In fact, apart from these references in the *Bacchae* and a few other passages, we do not hear much of Dionysos as a fire-god in classical literature.[2] But among the Orphics this connection of the god with fire was always a prominent feature, as we should perhaps expect in the case of a religious school so strongly tinged with Orientalism. To them the "fire-breathing"[3] Dionysos was also a Sun-God and god of Light, even as the Vedic Soma. Thus among the Orphic fragments preserved in the Satires of Macrobius we find the following:

Ἥλιος, ὃν Διόνυσον ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν.[4]

And from the same source we learn that the Orphics identified

[1] Note that the word στηρίζω, which denotes the idea of setting up a column or *standard*, is philologically akin to the latter word, and this, as we have seen, is one of the metaphors applied to the Soma-sacrifice. As the word is especially used of a pillar firmly set in the ground and supporting a roof, it further recalls the notion of Soma as the stayer of Heaven and upholder of the earth, which we shall subsequently see is one of his attributes.
[2] L. Preller in the article on Dionysos in his *Griechische Mythologie*, p. 562, says: "Ja er beherrscht auch das Feuer und seinen Gott Hephaestos, nach der schon früher erwähnten Dichtung, dass es unter allen Göttern nur dem Dionysos gelingen wollte, den durch seinen Sturz vom Himmel erzürnten Gott des Feuers durch Wein zu besänftigen und in der Trunkenheit zum Himmel zurück und eine Versöhnung mit Hera herbeizuführen."
[3] See *Orphic Hymns*, LII. l. 3.
[4] See Macrobius, *Sat.* I. 18: "Solem Liberum esse manifeste pronunciavit Orpheus hoc versu: Ἥλιος, κ. τ. λ.

Dionysos with their god Phanes, another name for the Sun-God as lord of Light.[1] Besides the Orphics we know that Pindar, also, associated Dionysos with bright light when he spoke of him as *ἁγνὸν φέγγος ὀπώρας*.[2]

In the brief account of the aspects of Dionysos given in the first chapter of Book I, it was stated that Dionysos was closely associated with Apollo, especially at Delphi. Plutarch, indeed, tells us that Dionysos had as much to do with Delphi as Apollo,[3] and that each deity was the complement of the other, Apollo representing the principle of Unity, and Dionysos that of Multiplicity in the Cosmos. But in the fragmentary Delphic Paean to Dionysos the fusion of the two deities appears almost complete. For here Dionysos is addressed by the title of Paean or Healer, a title especially consecrated to Apollo. Similarly the Apolline character of Dionysos is shown in the following fragment of Euripides:

*δέσποτα φιλοδάφνε Βάκχε, Παιὰν Ἄπολλον εὔλυρε*[4]

where the laurel, usually sacred to Apollo, is evidently considered as an attribute of the Bacchic god. Now Apollo, who was primarily the Sun-God, or Phoebus the pure, brightly-

[1] See *Sat.* I. 18:

*ὃν δὴ νῦν καλέουσι Φάνητά τε καὶ Διόνυσον,*
*Εὐβουλῆά τ' ἄνακτα, καὶ Ἀνταύγην ἀρίδηλον·*
*ἄλλοι δ' ἄλλο καλοῦσιν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων.*
*πρῶτος δ' ἐς φάος ἦλθε, Διώνυσος δ' ἐπεκλήθη,*
*οὕνεκα δινεῖται κατ' ἀπείρονα μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον·*

The above lines recall the mention of the *αἰθέριος δῖνος* in Aristophanes' *Clouds*, ll. 380-1, which is clearly directed against the Orphics and air-worship in general.

Note that Langlois in his *Mémoire* would derive Phanes from *bhanu*, "light." Cp.: "Je ne parle pas des développements philosophiques donnés plus tard au personnage de Bacchus par les Orphiques et les néo-platoniciens, bien qu'ils me paraissent d'une origine plus ancienne qu'on ne croit (par exemple, je suppose que Phanès n'est autre chose que bhânou, la lumière").

[2] See Frg. apud Plutarch, *De Isid. et Osir.* c. XXXV.

[3] See *De EI apud Delphos*, c. IX.: *Ἐὰν οὖν ἔρηταί τις τί ταῦτα πρὸς τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα, φήσομεν οὐχὶ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον, ᾧ τῶν Δελφῶν οὐδὲν ἧττον ἢ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι μέτεστιν.* See also *Prolegomena*, pp. 439-41.

[4] See Frg. 480 in Nauck's edition. The fragment occurs in the Satires of Macrobius and is supposed to be from the *Licymnius* of Euripides.



shining One, was also God of Music, Seer, Prophet, and Healer. We might imagine then that Dionysos, who being, as we have just seen, identified with the Sun-God by the Orphics, and especially associated by them with Purity and Light, was, besides, worshipped among the Greeks as a god of Music and Song and Prophet, might naturally be confused with Apollo. And we might further suppose that the worshippers of Dionysos, carrying this tendency to identification to its conclusion, bestowed on him a title which was not really his, viz., that of Healer. We know, however, that the god did actually bear the title of *Ἰατρός*, though Dr. Farnell would restrict its use to Athens and regards this aspect of the god merely as a development of his mantic character.[1] It is therefore interesting to note that Soma also, as many passages in the *Vedas* testify, is a god of healing. Thus, in an invocation of Soma in the *Sāma-Veda* we read: "Let sickness be removed together with the evil spirits,"[2] and he is bidden "shed down for us health for the ox, for man, for the horse; and health, too, O King, for plants."[3] And in the *Homa Yasht* of the *Avesta* Homa is addressed as "vaêdhyâ," or "master of physicians,"[4] and his healing powers are strongly insisted on. To conclude the subject of the "Delphic" Dionysos, it should be stated that Langlois considers that Plutarch's remark in his *De EI apud Delphos* that

[1] See Athenaeus, I. 22 E.: *Καὶ Μνησίθεος δὲ Ἀθηναῖος Διόνυσος ἰατρὸν φησι τὴν Πυθίαν χρῆσαι τιμᾶν Ἀθηναίοις.* Speaking of the practice of the sick consulting Dionysos at Amphikleia in their dreams, Dr. Farnell says: "We may believe, then, that wherever Dionysos was called *Ἰατρός*, 'the physician,' this conception of him arose from the same practice and the same ancient view of him. It is only indeed at Athens that a Dionysos *Ἰατρός* is attested on fair evidence; and when Athenaeus, quoting from a certain Mnasitheos, says that he enjoyed this title everywhere, we may regard this only as a *façon de parler*. Nor do we know on what authority Hesychios interprets *Παιώνιος* as a title of Dionysos, understanding it probably in the sense of 'the healer.'"

[2] *S.-V.*, I. 6. 2. 2 (verse 8): Indrāya Soma sushutaḥ pari sravāpāmīvā bhavatu rakshasā saha.

[3] *Ibid.*, II. 1. 1. 1 (verse 3): sa naḥ pavasva śaṁ gave, śaṁ janāya, śaṁ arvate; śaṁ rājann oshadibhyaḥ.

[4] See p. 183 of Haug's *Essays on the Parsis*. Langlois also tells us that Dionysos bears the title *Ἰατρός*, and notes in this his resemblance to the Indian Soma.

Dionysos and Apollo are the same god, and that both have an equal right to Parnassus, the most striking trait in the resemblance between Soma and Dionysos. For he thinks that Soma and Agni, the Vedic Sun-God, are one and the same, believing Agni to be a god of triple form, *i.e.* a Sun-God, a Water-God, and an Earth-God, these three aspects being exemplified in Agni-Soma.

Closely connected with this aspect of Dionysos, and manifestly a part of his Apolline character, is his function of "Saviour," a title bestowed on him at Troezen.[1] Soma, also, is spoken of as "the giver of blessings, the bestower of safety" in the *Sāma-Veda*.[2] Now Dr. Farnell regards Dionysos in his aspect of Σαώτης as a paramount divinity of the State, and this is just what we should expect as the result of his association with Apollo. For, as Orpheus considered Apollo to be identical with the Sun-God and the chief of all the gods,[3] Dionysos would accordingly in his Apolline character tend to hold the position of Supreme Universal Deity. This, in fact, is what we know the Orphics did actually proclaim Dionysos to be, addressing him as Zeus and Helios, and Creator of All Things, thus:

ἀγλαὲ Ζεῦ, Διόνυσε, πάτερ πόντου, πάτερ αἴης,
Ἥλιε παγγενέτορ, Πὰν αἰόλε, χρυσεοφεγγές.[4]

Similarly, Soma is very often mentioned in the *Vedas* as the Lord and Creator of the Universe, and, like the Orphic Phanes, as the begetter of his own parents. For example, we read in the *Sāma-Veda* that "Soma flows, the creator of thought, of heaven and earth, the creator of Agni and of the Sun, the creator of Indra and of Vishṇu";[5] and "the well-armed god Indu flows

[1] See Pausan., II. 31. 5, and Kern's article in Pauly, and also Farnell's *Cults of the Greek States*.

[2] *S.-V.*, II. 1. 2. 12 (verse 2): vṛidhaḥ supāraḥ.

[3] See Lobeck's *Aglaophamus*, p. 297.

[4] See Macrobius, Sat. I. 23. Cp. also Proclus in *Timaeus*, 3, p. 137, 26: τὰ λόγια τὸν μέγιστον τοῦτον θεὸν (Φάνητα) πηγὴν πηγῶν προσαγορεύει, καὶ μόνον ἀπογεννῆσαι τὰ πάντα φησίν.

ἔνθεν ἄδην θρώσκει γένεσις πολυποικίλου ὕλης,
ἔνθεν συρόμενος πρηστήρ, ἀμυδροῦ πυρὸς ἄνθος, κ. τ. λ.

[5] *S.-V.*, I. 6. 1. 4 (verse 5). Somaḥ pavate janitā matīnāṁ, janitā divo, janitā pṛithivyāḥ, janitāgner, janitā Sūryasya, janiteṅdrasya, janitota Vishṇoḥ.



down, the slayer of the wicked . . . our father, the creator of the gods, possessed of might, who stayeth the Heavens and upholdeth the earth."[1] And in the *Rig-Veda* we find the following invocation: "O Soma, as though thou didst reveal to view the worlds thou dost light up heaven, and seemest to send forth the sun."[2]

Soma, in fact, is essentially a planet-god, and, in post-Vedic mythology, more especially a Moon-God. There are, however, traces of this conception even in the *Vedas*, and we know that according to the *Vishṇu-Purāṇa* Brahmā appointed Soma or the Moon to be the monarch of planets and plants.[3] It is more particularly under the title of Indu that Soma is regarded as the moon. This word, properly speaking, denotes a "bright drop" of any liquid, and especially of the sparkling Soma-juice, and then comes to be identified with the moon on account of its shining appearance. That the principle of moisture was considered by the ancients as peculiarly inherent in the moon is shown by Plutarch in his *De Facie in Orbe Lunae*, where he quotes Alcman as speaking of dew as "the daughter of Zeus and the hallowed Moon," and he himself contrasts it with the Sun in this respect.[4] Evidently then the Greek, like the Hindu, regarded the moon as "a golden drop hung up in the heavens."[5]

Note that here Soma as begetter of Heaven and Earth is creator of his own parents, and cp. πάτερ αἴης above.

[1] *S.-V.*, II. 1. 1. 10 (verse 2): svāyudhaḥ pavate deva Iṅdur, aśastihā, . . . pitā, devānāṁ janitā, sudaksho vishṭhambo divo, dharuṇaḥ pṛithivyāḥ.

[2] See *R.-V.*, IX. 1. 17 (verse 5). For his omnipotence cp. *R.-V.*, IX. 5. 86 (verse 28): tava imāḥ prajāḥ divyasya retasaḥ; tvaṁ viśvasya bhuvanasya rājasi atha, idaṁ viśvam, Pavamāna, te vaśe tvaṁ Iṅdo prathamaḥ dhāmadhāḥ asi, *i.e.*, "All these creatures are of thy heavenly seed; thou dost rule over all the world, all this is thine, O Pure One," etc.

[3] See Monier-Williams' *Sanskr. Dict.*, p. 139, col. 3. At the present day in India Soma is simply a Moon-God, and has lost nearly all his other characteristics.

[4] See c. 25: λέγεις γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐξηγούμενος ταῦτα τὰ Ἀλκμᾶνος:

Διός θυγάτηρ, ἔρσα, τρέφει
καὶ σελάνας διάς,

ὅτι τὸν Δία τὸν ἀέρα καλεῖ, καὶ φησιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῆς σελήνης καθυγραινόμενον εἰς δρόσους τρέπεσθαι· κινδυνεύει γὰρ, ὦ ἑταῖρε, πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον ἀντιπαθῆ φύσιν ἔχειν.

[5] See *Vedic India*, p. 178. Also Langlois, who tells us in his *Mémoire* that

And we know that the Soma-plant was called by the Hindus the "moon-plant," because it was gathered by moon-light when it was supposed to contain most moisture.[1] The Soma-plant is on this account given various names meaning Lord or Ruler of Night, such as Niśādhīśa and Niśapati; and in the *Sāma-Veda* this moon-aspect of Soma is shown by the following verses: "By day he appears golden, by night glowing";[2] "thou shinest forth by day and by night."[3]

Now one of the less familiar legends connected with Dionysos made him the son of the Moon-Goddess. Thus Ulpian tells us that "some call Dionysos the son of Selene," and Eusebius doubts whether his mother is Selene or Persephone.[4] Cicero in the list of the various Dionysi given in his *De Natura Deorum* (III. 23) speaks of the fourth Dionysos as born "Jove et Luna, cui sacra Orphica putantur confici." The mention of his connection with the Orphic ritual makes it seem very likely that this Dionysos should be associated with the moon, as we have already seen how strong was the inclination of the Orphics to deify the heavenly bodies; hence we need not agree with M. Foucart[5] when he suggests that Cicero has here probably confused the two goddesses Σελήνη and Σεμέλη, on the strength of the fact that in Johannes Lydus (*De Mensibus*, IV. 38), and Ampelius (Bk. IX), the fourth Dionysos is spoken of as the son of Semele. Indeed, it would be more natural that Johannes Lydus and Ampelius should have wrongly designated this Dionysos as the son of the more familiar Semele, than that Cicero should without good reason mention a goddess not popularly regarded as the

the legend which makes Dionysos the child of the Moon regards him as presiding over the watery element. Cp. the word "nabhaścamasa," *i.e.*, "drinking vessel of Heaven," as a name for the Moon in Sanskrit (see Monier-Williams' *Dictionary*, p. 468).

[1] See *Vedic India*, p. 173, extract from Windischmann.

[2] *S.-V.*, II. 4. 2. 1 (verse 3): divā harir dadṛiśe naktam ṛijrah.

[3] *Ibid.*, II. 9. 2. 2 (verse 2): kshapo vastushu rājasi.

[4] See Lobeck's *Aglaophamus*, p. 1133, where he quotes Ulpian as follows: Ἔνιοι δὲ (sc. καλοῦσι) παῖδα Σελήνης τὸν Διόνυσον. Lobeck here mentions the identification of Dionysos with Epaphus, and that of the latter's mother, Io, with Isis by some writers, adding that these "believed her to be the Moon, the mother of Liber."

[5] See *Le Culte de Dionysos en Attique*, c. 1.



mother of Dionysos, such as Selene. Moreover, Preller[1] produces evidence to show that the Phrygian Moon-God was the same as Sabazios, and this as we know was the Phrygian title of Dionysos. In the forty-fourth book of his *Dionysiaca* Nonnus clearly brings out the association of Dionysos with the moon, when he makes the god appeal to Selene to aid him against Pentheus, in terms which prove that the night-worshipped god considers that he has a peculiar right to claim the assistance of the night-goddess. And when the "bull-visaged" Moon[2] makes answer:

> Night-shining Dionysos, ward of plants,
> And comrade of the Moon, be thine the care
> Of clustering vines. To me are ever dear
> The Bacchic rites, in that the teeming earth
> First maketh ripe the seeds men set therein
> When it hath caught the moist gleam of the Moon
> That knows not sleep.[3]

we are given an explanation of the association of Selene with Dionysos which would make the moon possess a special influence on the growth of plants in virtue of its apparently "dewy" nature.

With reference to the title Lord of Night bestowed on the Moon-God by the Hindus, we may perhaps be able to find an interesting clue to the meaning of the name Dionysos. Langlois considers that Dionysos or Soma is "le dieu qui brille le jour et la nuit, le matin et le soir; le dieu dont la fête se célèbre la nuit et le jour, mais le plus souvent la nuit, parce que l'obscurité a

[1] See footnote on p. 577 of his *Griech. Mythologie* as follows: "Nach Prokl. in *Tim.* 4. 251 (in Lobeck, *Agl.* 1047) wurde auch der asiatische Mondgott bei den Phrygern als Sabazios und in den Sabazien verherrlicht. Auf diese letztere Nachricht fällt ein gewisses Licht durch ein Relief aus Koula in Phrygien vom Jahre 101 n. Chr., mit der Inschr.: ἡ Κολοηνῶν κατοικία καθιέρωσαν Δία Σαβάζιον, auf welchen ein Mann mit phrygischer Mütze, Caduceus und Halbmond, also wohl Μήν, ein Gespann fuhrt, auf dem ein Gott, Sabazios, sitzt; auf einem der Pferde ein Adler, zu den Füssen des andern eine Schlange."

[2] Line 217: ταυρῶπις . . . Μήνη. Note that the epithet is peculiarly suited to a deity associated with the Bull-Dionysos. Here, however, as in the case of the Egyptian Moon-Goddess, Isis, who is also represented as a cow, the epithet doubtless refers to the horned appearance of the new moon.

[3] ll. 218-22:

> νυκτοφαὲς Διόνυσε φυτηκόμε, σύνδρομε Μήνης,
> σῆς σταφυλῆς ἀλέγιζε· κ. τ. λ.

quelque chose de plus imposant," deriving the name from "dyou" or "day," and niśa (niça) or "night."[1] Now Dr. Farnell, who regards the word as a Thrako-Phrygian form, holds that the first part Διο-, akin to Zeus, is an undoubted part of the root; and Kretschmer derives the word from Διο- and -νυσος, *i.e.*, a supposed masculine form of a Thracian word νυσα "nymph" or "daughter."[2] Both these would then appear to agree with Langlois in connecting the first part of the word with "dyou" or "day;" for we know that the form Διο- is an Indo-European root closely related to this word. Both "dyou" and Διο- are, however, ultimately derived from a root "div," meaning "shine," which gives us the word "deva" meaning "god" in Sanskrit, and thus in that language having the exact sense of Διο-. And there can be little doubt that a word formed after the fashion approved by Langlois would be somewhat unnatural without the assistance of some verbal noun, such as "shining" to help out the sense of the two nouns "day and night," which, according to him, would constitute the whole of the compound. Hence we might preferably consider "Dionysos" as derived from "deva" and "niśa." To this, however, there are two objections. The word "deva," while meaning "god" among the Indian Aryans, bore exactly the opposite sense, viz., "demon," among their Iranian brethren, from whom it is natural to suppose the Greeks would have heard the words rather than from the Indians, unless indeed we imagine that the word originally meant "god" among the proto-Aryans, and so formed part of the heritage of the Hellenic people from the beginning. This objection is therefore perhaps not of very real importance. But a more serious difficulty lies in the fact that a Sanskrit compound form "devaniśas" would mean rather "night of the god" than "god of the night," as the first part of the compound should be the one in the dependent case. Hence we are forced to consider that the form Διόνυσος could only have arisen from two separate words, viz., "deva" (voc.) and "niśas" (genit. of a short form "niś").[3] But

[1] See his *Mémoire.*

[2] See *The Cults of the Greek States*, vol. V., on Dionysos.

[3] Note that Langlois regards the Bacchic Nysa as derived from *niśā*, "night," and as equivalent to the mysterious cavern of night to which the earth is compared in the *Vedas*. This, he tells us, is the same cave as we find associated with Mithra in the *Avesta* and mentioned in Porphyry as finding a place in Platonic and Pythagorean doctrine. He says also: "Bacchus ne peut être reçu qu'au sein de la *nuit* (niśā), dans le Nyseium sacré (Hom. *Iliad*, VI. 133), dans ce champ nysien où Pluton vient enlever Proserpine, où Lycurgue exerce ses fureurs, enfin dans cet antre cosmique qui a deux portes, et est nommé *Dithyrum*, d'où le dieu a pris son surnom de *Dithyrambus*." Perhaps we should rather translate Dithyrambus as Lord of the *Divine Doors*. These Divine Doors are invoked in Hymns to Agni in the *Rig-Veda*. In the *Bṛhad-Devatā*, a summary of the deities and myths contained in the *Rig-Veda*, we learn that "the Litter and the Divine Doors are contained" in Agni (barhir dvāraśca devyo Agnim, etc.); and again in III. 6-7 they are spoken of as the "wives of all the gods" (dvāras tu devyo yāḥ proktā viśveshāṁ tās tu patnayaḥ, etc.), *i.e.*, according to the context and to Macdonell's interpretation, wives of Agni who comprehends all the terrestrial deities. Now these expressions are shown from the mention of the Sacrificial Litter to relate to the Soma-Sacrifice, the Divine Doors being a symbolical phrase for the entrance to the place of sacrifice (see Langlois' version of the *Rig-Veda*); and I think it is evident from III. 6-7 of the *Bṛhad-Devatā* that they are regarded as mothers of Soma, the child of the sacrifice. On this analogy, perhaps, we may consider Dionysos as the Child of the Divine Doors. Cp. also the following Orphic frg. from Hermias' Commentary on the *Phaedrus*: ἐν τοῖς προθύροις γὰρ τοῦ ἄντρου τῆς νυκτὸς κάθηται ὁ Φάνης·



this seems most unlikely, as it would imply that the words were taken over bodily from some Indian sacrificial chant, in which Soma was invoked as Lord of Night.

There is a still further objection, which applies equally to Langlois' derivation, viz., that "niśas" is not the philological but merely the *phonetic* equivalent, or nearly so, of -νυσος, Greek *υ* representing *u* and not *i* in Sanskrit. On the whole, then, it seems safer to regard the name Dionysos as an unsolved problem connected with the cult rather than to make any positive attempt to derive the word.

Apart from the writings of the Orphics, the evidence just adduced for the association of Dionysos with the Moon is derived from late sources. We need not, however, assume that in earlier times a belief in this association was confined to Orphic circles. Thus, in a Chorus in the *Antigone* of Sophocles the god is invoked as:

ἰὼ πῦρ πνειόντων χοράγ' ἄστρων, νυχίων
φθεγμάτων ἐπίσκοπε

and in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes as:

νυκτέρου τελετῆς φωσφόρος ἀστήρ.

Now the Sophoclean phrase clearly recalls the Sanskrit title of the moon "nakshatrarāja"[1] or "king of stars," and at the same time suggests that Dionysos is at once Moon-God and Star-God. We may remember that at the beginning of this chapter Plutarch[2] was quoted as speaking of the various changes of the god into "winds and water and *stars*." We have yet another reference to the star-aspect of Dionysos in an Orphic fragment preserved by Macrobius, which explains the significance of the νέβρις or fawn-skin worn by the god and his followers. The dappled appearance of the skin is supposed to symbolize the star-strewn sky, and is further regarded by Orpheus as representing the connection of Dionysos with the Sun. Here he tells how the god:

> First dons a robe like to its glittering rays
> And bright as fire, then o'er his shoulder casts
> The dappled fawn-skin garb of goodly width,
> Dotted with countless circles to portray
> The stars inlaid in Heaven's hallowed vault.[3]

Now Soma as the brightly-shining god that "creates the stars in heaven, the sun in the sky,"[4] from whom "depend the stars and the sun,"[5] and who is, as we have seen, in his aspect of Moon "the lord of stars" has, in this character, the antelope as

[1] See Monier-Williams' *Sanskr. Dict.* sub *nakshatra.*

[2] For close correspondence with the statement in Plutarch cp. the following from *Rig-Veda*, IX. 1. 22 (verse 2): ete vātāḥ iva uravaḥ parjanasya, etc., *i.e.*, "They (the Soma-libations) extend like the winds, they are like the rain-drops from the Cloud, like the flames of Agni."

[3] See Macrobius, Sat. I. 18:

πρῶτα μὲν ἀργυφέαις ἐναλίγκιον ἀκτίνεσσιν
πέπλον φοινίκεον πυρὶ εἴκελον ἀμφιβαλέσθαι.
αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε νεβροῖο παναιόλου εὐρὺ καθάψαι
δέρμα πολύστικτον θηρός, κατὰ δεξιὸν ὦμον,
ἄστρων δαιδαλέων μίμημ' ἱεροῦ τε πόλοιο.

Cp. also Nonnus, Bk. XIV. ll. 238-9: νεβρίδα λαχνήεσσαν ἐπὶ στέρνοιο κ. τ. λ.

[4] See *Rig-Veda*, IX. 2. 42 (verse 1).

[5] See *ibid.*, IX. 5. 86 (verse 29): tvaṁ dyāṁ ca pṛithivīṁ ca ati jabhrishe; tava jyotishī, Pavamāna, Sūryaḥ.



his symbol. In fact, one of the names given to the Moon by the early Indians was "mṛiga-piplu"[1] or "marked like an antelope," the spotted appearance of the moon being the origin of this epithet.[2] And the Sanskrit name for the fifth Nakshatra or lunar mansion over which Soma presides is "mṛiga-śiras" or "the deer-headed."[3] This Nakshatra was in the belt of Orion which is spoken of as "leading the Paurvas," *i.e.*, Pleiades, in a passage in the *Homa Yasht* translated by Haug as follows: "Mazda brought to thee (*i.e.*, Homa) the star-studded spirit-fashioned girdle (the belt of Orion) leading the Paurvas; then thou art begirt with it," etc.[4] But we know that the Bull-Dionysos was especially associated with the Pleiades on ancient gems and in classical mythology—these being Spring constellations and forming part of the sign Taurus or the Equinoctial Bull.[5] According to A. W. Curtius, in his article on this subject, this Equinoctial Bull had to do with the notion of the Great World Year or Rebirth of the World when the Sun came back again to the star-group of the Bull at spring-time. He goes on to say that this doctrine of a παλιγγένεσις is expressly taught by Zoroaster, to whom the Bull or sign of the Sun-God Mithra is the symbol of the fertility of the year, and must evidently be closely associated with the spring Zodiacal Bull and with the Bull-Dionysos.[6] Now while the Bull is indeed a symbol of Mithra we know that it was also a symbol of Homa or Soma,

[1] See Monier-Williams' *Sanskr. Dict.*, p. 790 *sub* "mṛiga."

[2] Langlois considers that the meaning of the nebris of Dionysos may be illustrated as follows: "Chez les Indiens, le cerf porcin est appelé *ṛichatî*; c'est le nom qu'on donne aussi aux gouttes d'eau. Il semble que la peau tachetée de l'animal a quelque analogie avec la surface du nuage trouée par la pluie. Ce sont des cerfs porcins que le Vent attelle à son char, et le char du Vent est formé de nuages. La *nebris*, si l'on considère le charactère de Bacchus pluvieux, se trouvera mieux expliquée de cette manière."

[3] See Monier-Williams' *Sanskr. Dict.*

[4] See Haug's *Essays on the Parsis*, p. 182 and footnote.

[5] See A. W. Curtius, *Der Stier des Dionysos.*

[6] "Dieser Vorstellung von einer Neugeburt der Welt (παλιγγένεσις, ἀποκατάστασις) findet sich besonders ausgeführt in der Lehre des Zoroaster, in welcher der Stier des Sonnengottes Mithras das Symbol der Jahresfruchtbarkeit ist und wohl mit dem jeden Frühling neue Fruchtbarkeit ankündigenden Zodiakalstier verbunden werden muss, in grossem Ansehen."

and the passage just quoted from the *Homa Yasht* points clearly to the association of Homa with the Zodiacal Bull, inasmuch as the asterism over which he rules is spoken of as "leading" the constellations which form part of this sign. According to Langlois,[1] indeed, we are to see in Mithra one of the forms of the Vedic Soma, and we have already noted that Soma is compared to him in the *Sāma-Veda* in regard to his aspect of Sun-God. But, be this as it may, there would seem to be clear evidence that in the star-aspect of Soma we have a close parallel to Dionysos "the leader of fire-breathing stars."

But there is yet another function of Soma connected with his aspect of Moon-God which is of great importance to this enquiry concerning the identity of Soma and Dionysos. And it is probable that in investigating this side of the Vedic deity's nature we shall arrive at a better understanding of the meaning of Dionysos' connection with certain festivals among the Greeks which seem at first hardly compatible with the functions usually assigned to him.

Maury in comparing the two divinities remarks that: "Agni-Soma finit par se confondre avec Varouna, le soleil de nuit, qui préside aux vapeurs et à l'humidité, et à ce titre, il se transforme, comme le dieu grec en une divinité des morts et de la nuit." Now whether Maury is correct or not in ascribing the chthonian character of Soma to his confusion with Varuna, an old Vedic Sky-God and Ruler of Light and Darkness, there is no doubt that Soma, as Moon-God, had a peculiarly close association with the Dead. For the moon was regarded by the Hindu as the resting-place *par excellence* of the Happy Dead and especially of the Pitaras or Manes, to whom were consecrated the days of new and full moon.[2] Soma himself bears the title of Pitṛimat or "Accompanied by the Manes," and in the *Rig-Veda* it is said that the Pitaras "have received him as a nursling."[3]

[1] See his *Mémoire* as follows: "C'est donc aussi Hom, Taschter et Mithra, confondus pour une œuvre commune, qui est le développement du principe générateur," etc.

[2] See Monier-Williams' *Sanskr. Dict.* sub *pitṛi*, p. 574. Also *Vedic India*, pp. 180-1.

[3] See *R.-V.*, IX. 4. 83 (verse 3): nṛicakshasaḥ Pitaraḥ garbhaṁ ādadhuḥ, *i.e.*, "The Pitaras, guardians of men, have received him as a nursling."



Now according to the Persians and Hindus, as we have already seen in the chapter on the Dithyramb, the stars were supposed to be the habitations of the dead. And according to the Hindu system of cosmogony, which recognized three regions, viz., Heaven, the Atmosphere, and the Earth, the middle region or that of the Atmosphere, Bhuvarloka, was assigned to the Siddhas, a class of semi-divine beings that had once been mortal.[1] Similar to the Siddhas are the Pitaras (or pious ancestors of the living) who go to dwell after death in the moon where they are ruled over by Soma. In other words the Hindu assigned to the pious dead the region of the Atmosphere and the nearest but one of the seven orbits of the heavenly region, viz., the orbit of the Moon.[2] In this doctrine we note a striking resemblance to Pythagorean ideas on eschatology, as set forth in Plutarch's *De Facie in Orbe Lunae.*[3] There we are told that man is made up of three parts *νοῦς*, *ψυχή*, and *σῶμα*. Of these, the first and highest, *νοῦς*, belongs to the Sun, *ψυχή*, which ranks next, has the Moon for its habitat, while *σῶμα* is purely terrestrial. Corresponding to these three divisions there are three classes of people, viz., those who after a temporary sojourn on the Moon, whither they find their way after death, are completely purified, and, accordingly, are admitted to the Sun and the region of the Aether; those who inhabit the middle region of the Atmosphere, but on account of their piety are at once after death allowed to enter the higher portions of this region, and subsequently admitted to the Moon, which is situated between the Sun and the Atmosphere; and third and last those who are confined to the lower parts of the Atmosphere next the earth, and there are punished for their crimes in life. The parallel between Hindu and Greek notions on the subject becomes almost complete when we learn

[1] See Monier-Williams' *Sanskr. Dict.*, and the Appendix to Thomson's translation of the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, *sub* "Siddha."

[2] See Monier-Williams' *Śakuntalā*, p. 275. Observe that according to the system of the seven Mārgas or Orbits there given the Bhuvarloka counts as the lowest orbit of the heavenly region (instead of as a separate middle region). It should be observed that the Hindu system differs from that of Plutarch in that it assigns the Sun to the orbit next to the Bhuvarloka, while the Moon occupies the orbit just above that of the Sun.

[3] See chapter XXVIII. and Stewart's *Myths of Plato*, pp. 437-45.

that the inhabitants of the Middle region and the Moon, styled Daemones, resemble the Pitaras in that they are semi-divine beings enjoying a state of bliss who protect those on earth that invoke their assistance, and are regarded as the guardians of mankind.[1]

Now we know that Dionysos was a god of the dead and in this character bore various titles, such as Ζαγρεύς, Ἰσοδαίτης, Εὐβουλεύς and Νυκτέλιος; while Dr. Farnell tells us that his association with the nether world is shown in monuments from Tralles, Paros, Boeotia and Tarentum. The reason assigned for his possession of this character is that as a vegetation-deity or plant-god he is supposed to die down in the winter and grow up again in the spring. Hence, too, among the Orphics his worship was connected with the idea of a resurrection and a future life, and hence became a vehicle of mysticism. Traces of this aspect are revealed in Greek ritual, *e.g.*, at the Lenaea, which, while chiefly concerned with the awakening of the infant god, shows also a chthonian significance in that it dealt, in the words of Dr. Farnell, "with the sleeping vegetation-god and the buried forces of the earth," and in the presence thereat of the 'dadouchos' and the supervisor of the mysteries, both of whom were "functionaries specially associated with the powers of the lower world." Similarly, the reference in the *Frogs*[2] of Aristophanes to the hymn of praise sung in honour of Dionysos at the Feast of Pots, which took place on the last day of the Anthesteria, affords clear proof of his chthonian nature. For, though the first two days of the Anthesteria were obviously devoted to the celebration of his more joyous functions as a wine-god, the evidence of Theopompus shows that the Χύτροι or Feast of Pots was concerned wholly with ceremonies of a funereal kind.[3]

[1] See *De Facie in Orbe Lunae*, c. XXX.: Οὐκ ἀεὶ δὲ διατρίβουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῇ οἱ δαίμονες, ἀλλὰ χρηστηρίων δεῦρο κατίασιν ἐπιμεληsόμενοι, καὶ ταῖς ἀνωτάτω συμπάρεισι καὶ συνοργιάζουσι τῶν τελετῶν, κ. τ. λ. [2] ll. 213-9.

[3] See frg. 316(c) in Grenfell and Hunt's edition, where the Schol. in Aristophan. *Ran.* 218 is quoted as follows: Χύτροι ἑορτὴ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις· ἄγεται δὲ παρὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν ἣν καὶ Θεόπομπος ἐκτίθεται γράφων οὕτως·

'διασωθέντας οὖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὑπερ ἐθάρρησαν ἡμέρᾳ, τῷ ταύτης ὀνόματι προσαγορεῦσαι καὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν ἅπασαν'. ἔπειτα· 'θύειν αὐτοῖς ἔθος ἔχουσι, τῶν μὲν Ὀλυμπίων θεῶν οὐδενὶ τὸ παράπαν, Ἑρμῇ δὲ χθονίῳ κ. τ. λ.



Dr. Farnell considers that "the feast evidently took its name from the vessels in which was cooked the cereal food or porridge intended probably for the souls of the family ancestors." Nor to those who are willing to admit the identity of Soma and Dionysos is there anything improbable in this theory. For here we should have a Greek god who is manifestly the same as Soma Pitṛimat, the Lord of Dead Ancestors.[1] Moreover, it is known that the ancient Hindus made offerings to the Pitaras on the days of new and full moon;[2] and Nilsson,[3] speaking of the Anthesteria and the funereal offerings which then took place, notes the remarkable coincidence between Greek and Persian custom in this matter as follows: "veteres Persae animos colebant tempore Hamaspathmaêdaya dicto a X ad XX diem Martii. praeterea mirum quantum in hac superstitione cum Graecis conveniunt." Here then we can easily see the source from which Greece may have derived the feast of Χύτροι, and it is evident that not merely the custom but the date of the feast was the same in Greece and Persia, when we recollect that it took place in Greece on the thirteenth day of Anthesterion, *i.e.*, about the beginning of March. The *piṇḍa*, also, or cake offered by the Hindus in the oblations to the Manes, was composed usually of rice and flour, and this accords with what Dr. Farnell conjectures as to the cereal nature of the Greek offerings. In spite, however, of the allusion in the *Frogs* to the association of Dionysos with this feast, he fails to see what the god can have had to do with such a ceremony as the Χύτροι, and thinks that the evidence of Theopompus points to its having been held originally in honour of Hermes Chthonios alone, and that the introduction of Dionysos came later. Miss Harrison regards the Anthesteria as formerly an All Souls' Feast, sacred to Ge, and so

[1] Cp. Langlois who, in his *Mémoire*, speaking of the character of Soma in the time of the Purāṇas, and of the disappearance of his character as a Solar deity, says: "Il n'est plus que le régent de la lune, maître de la nuit (Niśâ-pati) et des planètes, roi des brahmanes et des plantes, dépositaire de la divine ambroisie, *gardien des Mânes* et père des fluides."

[2] See Monier-Williams' *Sanskr. Dict.*, pp. 573-4, *sub* "piṇḍ" and "pitṛi"; and also L. de Milloué's *Culte et Cérémonies en l'Honneur des Morts dans l'extrême Orient*, pp. 138-52.

[3] See his *Studia de Dionysiis Atticis*, p. 116, footnote.

taken over later by Dionysos the earth-born vegetation-deity. This view fits in well enough with the identification of Dionysos with Soma; but, according to what has been shown, there is no need to explain away the presence of the god at this feast, or to consider Ge as the deity in whose honour it was formerly held. Dr. Farnell, indeed, points out that the first two days, viz., the Πιθοίγια and Χόες, have a manifestly Dionysiac air, but, failing to see the connection of the god with the remaining day, he attempts to account for its chthonian character by saying that it was a primaeval ghost-ceremony which fell so near the date of the Πιθοίγια and Χόες that it "became attached to the Anthesteria as a mournful *finale*."

There is yet another Attic feast in which we can trace the chthonian character of Dionysos. In the Eleusinia his close association with Persephone, the Queen of the under-world, marks this aspect plainly. Lenormant[1] tells us that these mysteries at Eleusis are held to be of Pelasgian origin, to which, according to him, all the chthonian cults of Greece are to be traced. He thinks, therefore, that the feast was originally held in honour of the Arcadian Demeter and Poseidon Hippios, both old Pelasgian deities, that, subsequently, some time before the Ionian migrations, Athens was admitted to take her part in these mysteries, and that Iacchos was a much later importation from Thrace. He believes that the Demophon of the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, which dates from about the seventh century B.C., represents an imperfect counterpart of Iacchos, who was probably formerly designated by the name Plutos; and, speaking of the association of Plutos with Kore, says that "the god of vegetation was naturally substituted in a myth which represented the phenomena of germination for the god of the infernal regions, Hâdês or Aïdôneus, whose character as a divinity of the earth and of production—recalled, however, by the name of Pluton—became gradually more and more faint." We know, however, on the authority of a well-known passage in Herodotus,[2] that the

[1] See his *Eleusinian Mysteries* in the *Contemporary Review*.

[2] See Bk. VIII. c. 65. A salient feature of the worship of Iacchos at the Eleusinia was the torch-light procession to Eleusis which took place on the 20th of Boedromion, and this, as we have seen in a previous chapter, must



procession of Iacchos to Eleusis was firmly established by the time of the Median Wars. This would put the date of the connection of Dionysos with Eleusinia somewhere between the seventh and fifth centuries B.C. As regards the association of Demeter with Dionysos, it should here be remarked that there is no exact equivalent to either Demeter or Persephone in the Soma-worship. In the following chapter an account will be given of a theory put forward by M. Foucart which would attribute the association of Demeter with Dionysos to the influence of Egyptian religion.

But all these feasts of Dionysos, however ancient, are but the later representatives of a more primitive and savage worship of the god, who, under the names of Zagreus and Sabazios, was honoured as a deity of the underworld among the Cretans and Phrygians.[1]

We have already met the name Zagreus as an appellation of Dionysos, and have seen that, under this title, he was regarded as a "hunter of souls" on the strength of a somewhat fanciful interpretation of the name which marks its Orphic character.[2] Our chief early literary reference to Zagreus—besides that in a fragment of the lost Epic *Alcmaeonis*, which is the earliest mention of him known to us,[3] and another in the lost *Sisyphus* of Aeschylus[4]—occurs in a fragment of Euripides' *Cretans*. There his worship is closely associated with that of Rhea and the Kouretes, and Zagreus himself appears to be identified with Idaean Zeus. From this Miss Harrison concludes that Zagreus was the original supreme deity in Crete whose worship was

have coincided pretty closely in date with the similar Hindu festival of torches known as "dīpālī," and held in honour of the Yakshas at the beginning of autumn.

[1] See Dr. Farnell's *Cults of the Greek States*, where we are told that the name "Zagreus" always had a chthonian connotation.

[2] See chapter I. of this book.

[3] See *Etym. Gud.*, p. 227, in Lobeck's *Aglaophamus*, p. 621: ὁ τὴν Ἀλκμαιωνίδα γράψας ἔφη·

Πότνια γῆ Ζαγρεῦ τε θεῶν πανυπέρτατε πάντων.

Also Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena*, p. 480.

[4] See Lobeck, p. 621, where his character as god of the under-world and his association with Pluto are clearly shown by the writer of the *Etym. Gud.*

supplanted by that of Zeus. This would of course show the extreme antiquity of his worship in the island—a fact of some importance with regard to the theory of the Asiatic origin of the Dionysiac cult, inasmuch as Crete has always been very closely in touch with Asia Minor. In this passage his character as a god of night and savage rites is made manifest, and also the mystic nature of the worship as follows:

ἁγνὸν δὲ βίον τείνομεν ἐξ οὗ
Διὸς Ἰδαίου μύστης γενόμην,
καὶ νυκτιπόλου Ζαγρέως βροντὰς
τάς τ' ὠμοφάγους δαῖτας τελέσας
μητρί τ' ὀρείῳ δᾷδας ἀνασχὼν
καὶ Κουρήτων
βάκχος ἐκλήθην ὁσιωθείς.[1]

My days have run, the servant I,
Initiate, of Idaean Jove;
Where midnight Zagreus roves, I rove;
I have endured his thunder-cry;
Fulfilled his red and bleeding feasts;
Held the Great Mother's mountain flame;
I am Set Free and named by name
A Bacchos of the Mailed Priests.[2]

Now the worship of the Cretan Rhea who was identified with the Phrygian Cybele, had always a decidedly orgiastic character. And we have just seen that Rhea and Dionysos were closely associated in Crete. Lobeck, too, draws attention to the fact that the Phrygian and Orphic cults had common features, such as lustral ceremonies and magic rites and orgiastic excitement.[3] We know, also, that in the *Bacchae* Euripides represents Dionysos as speaking of castanets as Ῥέας τε μητρὸς ἐμά θ' εὑρήματα,[4] thereby associating himself closely with the Earth-Goddess. Similarly, in the well-known choral ode[5] in the *Helena* Cybele, who is there confounded with Demeter, employs the "Bromian castanets" and her rites are manifestly regarded as identical with those of Dionysos. But it is perhaps Nonnus who shows us most plainly

[1] ll. 9-15 of frg. 475 in Nauck's edition.
[2] The above is Prof. Gilbert Murray's version as given on page 479 of the *Prolegomena*.
[3] See pp. 695-7 of the *Aglaophamus*.
[4] See l. 59.
[5] See ll. 1301-1368.



that it is as Zagreus that the god is especially linked with the Earth-Goddess. According to him Zagreus was an older Dionysos, the "ill-fated" son of Zeus and Persephone[1]—who here stands for her mother, the Earth-Goddess—and he was slain in infancy by the Titans acting as the agents of his jealous step-mother Hera. Nonnus describes how they lured him away, and, smearing their faces with gypsum (τῖτᾶνος) to disguise themselves, set upon him, and stabbed him with their daggers.[2] From other sources we learn that when they had slain him they rent him asunder and ate him, but that his heart was rescued by Athene, and being placed in a mock image of the god made of gypsum caused him to come to life again.[3] Nonnus briefly alludes to this[4] and gives us to understand that he came to life as Dionysos, and then became capable of assuming the various animal shapes which we have seen were associated with the god, and, among others, that of a "horned serpent."[5] But it is significant that Dionysos should at the last be changed into a bull and under this form be once again attacked and cut to pieces by them. Now this myth is merely the aetiological account of an ancient rite in which a Bull-God was slain and eaten, while the Titans are but its primitive worshippers, whose smearing with gypsum is only part of the make-believe natural to childish or savage minds when about to take part in ritual ceremonies.[6] We have still further evidence of the prevalence of these customs in connection with the Cretan worship of Dionysos in Diodorus Siculus[7] and in Firmicus Maternus. The latter speaks of the orgies in which the Cretans commemorated the sufferings of the infant god by tearing in pieces with their teeth

[1] See *Dionysiaca*, Bk. V. ll. 562 ff.
[2] See *ibid.* Bk. VI. ll, 169-73.
[3] See *Prolegomena*, pp. 490 ff. See also Olympiodorus' commentary on the *Phaedo* concerning the cannibalism and fate of the Titans.
[4] See *Dionysiaca*, ll. 174-5:

ἔνθα διχαζομένων μελέων Τιτῆνι σιδήρῳ
τέρμα βίου Διόνυσος ἔχων παλινάγρετον ἀρχὴν κ. τ. λ.

[5] See ll. 177-205.
[6] See *Prolegomena*, pp. 491-4.
[7] See Bk. V. chapter 75: τοῦτον δὲ τὸν θεὸν γεγονέναι φασὶν ἐκ Διὸς καὶ Περσεφόνης κατὰ τὴν Κρήτην, ὃν Ὀρφεὺς κατὰ τὰς τελετὰς παρέδωκε διασπώμενον ὑπὸ τῶν Τιτάνων.

a *live* bull.[1] This, according to Miss Harrison, is an exaggerated account of a custom of eating the bull's *raw* flesh. That this rite was closely connected with cannibalism would appear from the statement of Euelpis of Carystos,[2] according to whom men sacrificed to Dionysos ὠμάδιος in Tenedos and Chios ἄνθρωπον διασπῶντες. Similarly, in Plutarch's *Life of Themistocles*, we read that three Persian nobles were sacrificed to Dionysos ὠμηστής before the Battle of Salamis.[3]

Needless to say, all these savage ceremonies had for the Orphic a certain mystic significance. Lobeck[4] quotes Alexander Lycopolita as saying that the more subtle of the Greeks in telling of the dismemberment of Dionysos by the Titans really meant τὴν θείαν δύναμιν μερίζεσθαι εἰς τὴν ὕλην, *i.e.*, the partition of the Divine Soul into its various manifestations in the World, or the familiar Platonic and Indian notion of the emanation of the Many from the One, of Phenomena from Being. Among others who support this view of the myth are the philosopher and Platonic commentator Proculus and Macrobius.[5] Plutarch,[6] also, in several places gives the same interpretation of the sufferings of Dionysos, which he compares to those of Osiris, and regards both myths as symbolic of the presence of a Divine Soul in Creation and of the transmigrations of the individual soul.

Now we are told by Haug[7] that in one of the very oldest portions of the *Zend-Avesta*, viz., the *Gâtha Ahunavaiti*, the

[1] See Firm. Mat. *De Err. Profan. Relig.*, c. VI. *apud Proleg.*, p. 484, footnote, as follows: "Cretenses, . . . festos funeris dies statuunt et annuum sacrum trieterica consecratione componunt, omnia per ordinem facientes, quae puer moriens aut fecit aut passus est. Vivum laniant dentibus taurum crudeles epulas annuis commemorationibus excitantes," etc.

[2] See Kern's article on *Dionysos* in Pauly.

[3] See chapter XIII. [4] *Aglaophamus*, Bk. II. pp. 710 ff.

[5] See *Aglaophamus*, p. 711, where he quotes Procl. in *Tim.* I. 53, as follows: ὁ τοῦ Διονύσου διασπασμός δηλοῖ τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἀμερίστου δημιουργίας μεριστὴν πρόοδον ὑπὸ τοῦ Διός.

[6] See *De EI apud Delphos*, c. IX., and *De Esu Carn.* Orat. I. 7: τὰ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον μεμυθευμένα πάθη τοῦ διαμελεϊσμοῦ καὶ τὰ Τιτάνων ἐπ' αὐτὸν τολμήματα, γευσαμένων τοῦ φόνου, κολάσεις δὲ τούτων καὶ κεραυνώσεις ἀνηγμένος ἐστὶ μῦθος εἰς τὴν παλιγγενεσίαν. Cp. also *De Is. et Osir.* c. XXXV.

[7] See Haug, pp. 147-8. Cp. also what he says as to the part played by the Ribhus in the Fourth Book of the *Rig-Veda*, who are said to "have cut the cow and made fertile the earth."



*Gēush Urvâ* or "soul of the animated creation" (which means also the "soul of the cow," *i.e.*, of the Earth regarded as a cow), was crying aloud on account of attacks upon its life. Haug further tells us that "according to tradition, it was the first animated creature in the shape of an ox, from which, after having been killed and cut into pieces, the whole living creation is said to have sprung," and adds that while the slayer of this primary ox is often alluded to in the *Zend-Avesta*, his name is not given, but tradition assigns the murder to the Evil One. Here obviously we have a Persian parallel to the Cretan rending of the Bull and its Orphic interpretation. But it may be asked what has all this to do with Soma, and where do we find in Aryan ritual a parallel to the slaying of Zagreus by the Titans? Before answering this question let us consider the Cretan rite and its significance a little more closely.

According to Dr. Farnell, Omophagy was a means of entering into communion with the god, and hence the Titans are not to be viewed as foes but as friends. Yet we have seen them represented as enemies and evil-doers in the Greek legend, just as in the Persian myth the Evil One is the author of the slaying of the Ox. In both cases we have a late aetiological myth substituted for an early religious ceremony whose significance has been partly forgotten. Reinach tells us that the eating of raw flesh off a still living victim was characteristic of savages who thought they thereby became partakers of the strength of the animal if it was a large wild one.[1] He holds that in the fifth century B.C. the custom of devouring live bulls at certain feasts of Dionysos was well known by the Athenians, and quotes *Bacchae* 735 *seqq.* to show that the Maenads had evidently devoured the victims of their frenzy. He further reminds us that Dionysos was supposed to be torn in pieces in the form of a kid, the rite being called αἰγίζειν, and concludes that the ceremony known as νεβρισμός denoted a mystic celebration of the Death of Dionysos in which the celebrants ate the raw flesh of a fawn.[2] Similarly, he sees in

[1] See the chapter on "La Mort d'Orphée" in his *Cultes, Mythes, et Religions*," Vol. II., and cp. the modern Hindu notion that the man who eats a tiger's heart may expect to increase in courage thereby.

[2] On the authority of Harpocration and Photius. The former explains

the wearing of goat-skins by the early performers of tragedy a ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ akin to that practised by priests and priestesses in different Greek cults who called themselves bulls, horses, bears, etc., thus identifying themselves with old zoomorphic deities, and he alludes to the custom of calling Bacchants Βάκχοι[1] as an illustration of this tendency to identify the worshipper with the god. He rejects the explanation given in later times of these animal-sacrifices, viz., that the animal injured the god or his property, or else that it was his friend and consecrated to him, and so constituted a suitable sacrifice; for, according to Reinach, Dionysos was himself originally worshipped as a goat. In the same way, Reinach regards the ivy as another form of Dionysos, and we may agree with him in this when we recollect that Dionysos is really a Plant-God in his primary aspect. He quotes Plutarch with reference to the Maenads' rending the ivy with hands and teeth in their frenzy, and sees in this custom a species of omophagy or mystic communion with the god. The fox he considers as yet another form of the god in his Thracian worship, and he believes that the Maenads wore the fox-skin (βασσάρα) because the fox was a feminine totem, while the Bull he supposes to have been a masculine one and that hence men only were associated with the Bull-feast.

Be this as it may, it is evident that the essence of omophagy lay in the mystic communion with the deity which it was believed to impart, and the form taken by the god might vary according to circumstances or to the places where the rite was practised. Now in the *Vedas*, as we have seen, the Soma-libation is regarded as a feast to which all the gods are invited and participation in which bestows strength and immortality on men. In fact, those that assist in the Soma-sacrifice become in some measure sharers in the divinity of Soma, and, accordingly, we have in ancient India a parallel to the notion of ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ in the Dionysiac omophagy and to the worship of Isodaites or

νεβρισμός as "the act of tearing fawns in pieces," κατά τινα ἄῤῥητον λόγον. Photius renders νεβρίζειν as "to wear a fawn-skin" or "to tear fawns in pieces," κατὰ μίμησιν τοῦ περὶ Διονύσου πάθους.

[1] See Miss Harrison's *Themis*, p. 16: "Every single element . . . in both the ritual and myth of Zagreus can be explained, I believe, by the analogy of *primitive rites of tribal initiation*."



the God of the Equal Feast, a title which, according to Plutarch, was bestowed on Dionysos.[1] Langlois, indeed, in noticing this resemblance between the sacrificial aspect of the Dionysiac cult and that of Soma-worship observes that Dionysos is truly "l'enfant du sanctuaire" and only appeared in the sixteenth century B.C. after the Thracian invasion, whether in Thebes or Athens, after a feast offered to the gods by Cadmus or by Amphictyon. In the Soma-worship also he sees the origin of the Zagreus-myth. Thus he tells us that one of the rams attached to the sacrificial Soma-car was killed and cut up and eaten by the Brahmans, and—inverting the natural order of myth-making—he regards this as a commemoration of a Vedic myth in accordance with which Indra is changed into a black ram with a huge fleece representing the sky on which the clouds extend. Zagreus is then, according to Langlois, the Cloud, the son of Dyoû (Heaven) and Persephone or Proserpine, the Sacrificial Flame. To illustrate this view he gives a fanciful derivation of the name Proserpine, which connects it with the progress of the flame, from the verb "proserpo," ignoring the fact that the form Proserpine has arisen from the Greek Persephone, by a species of metathesis, and has nothing whatever to do with the Latin verb. Similarly, his attempt to see in the Vedic ritual a counterpart to the Sacred Marriage of Zeus and Persephone is extremely strained and far-fetched. He admits, indeed, that he can find no equivalent to the Eleusinia in ancient India, although he fancies that the Eleusinian deities have an Indian origin. I should therefore venture to suggest that the most reasonable explanation of the association of the Eleusinian deities and

[1] Dr. Farnell says that no other authority supports Plutarch in stating that this was one of the titles of Dionysos, but adds that Hesychios cites the word as applied "by some people" to Plouton. He admits that "the name Ἰσοδαίτης, which of course descends from the well-known Homeric phrase, could allude to 'the equal feast,' the sacramental meal of which all partook in common; it could then have been borrowed and interpreted after their wont by the Orphic teachers who applied it to their chthonian Dionysos . . . Finally, it is in every way probable that Plutarch derived all his lore in this matter from Orphic sources."

Miss Harrison, in her *Prolegomena*, p. 481, says with reference to the passage in Plutarch: ". . . it seems almost certain that Ἰσοδαίτης refers to the ὠμόφαγοι δαῖτες of the Zagreus ritual shared alike by all mystics."

Dionysos at the same feasts is that which would attribute it to the "contamination" of two different cults. This, as we have seen, is Lenormant's view, and it would make Dionysos the interloper. In the following chapter we shall have occasion to examine a theory of Egyptian influence on Greek ritual, which, if accepted, will help us to understand why these two particular cults of Demeter and Dionysos should have become merged in the Eleusinia.

With the first part of Langlois' theory there is, however, no need to dispute. I refer to his view that the Zagreus-myth arose from the Brahmanical custom of killing and eating a ram at the Soma-sacrifice. And it is very probable that this ram's fate was considered typical of that of the Soma-plant, to the rending and bruising of whose stalks there are countless references in the Vedic Hymns; just as the Cretan omophagy is typical of the sufferings of the infant Dionysos. So, when we read in the *Rig-Veda* of the new-born Soma that "Soma uniting himself to the Waves utters a cry; *he delivers to Manu his body which he has devoted to the gods*," [1] we can see whence the Greeks derived the notion of Dionysos Isodaites and his slaying by the Titans. For the Titans, as the primitive worshippers of Dionysos and the children of Ouranos and Ge, are the exact equivalent of the Manus, who, as we are told by Monier-Williams, are "fourteen successive mythical progenitors and sovereigns of the Earth." [2] For, according to one manner of computation, the number of the Titans was fourteen, *i.e.*, there were seven Titans and seven Titanesses in the Orphic legend. They are, however, more frequently regarded as seven, owing to the fact that only the "male powers," as Dr. Farnell reminds us, "were accused of the outrage on the infant god who was 'divided into seven parts' by the seven murderers." A somewhat similar discrepancy exists in the Hindu myth concerning the number of the Manus. These, according to the *Code of Manu* [3] and to the earlier mythology, were originally seven in number including the first Manu who

[1] See *R.-V.*, IX. 4. 74 (verse 5).
[2] See his *Sanskr. Dict.*, *sub* "Manu," p. 743.
[3] See *Mānava Dharma Śāstra*, Book I, 61-3: svayambhuvasyasya manoḥ shad vacya manavo apare, etc.



created the six others, and, as the Primaeval Man, was believed to have been the first to institute sacrifices. But the later mythology as represented by the *Vishṇu-Purāṇa* [1] now makes these seven create seven more, so that the number of the Hindu Titans may also be variously regarded as seven or fourteen. It is true that in the extract given above from the *Rig-Veda* we read of only one Manu as connected with the sacrifice of the Soma; but over and over again in the *Vedas* we have reference to the seven Ṛishis or priests who are spoken of as the seven brothers that offer the sacrifice [2] and are evidently regarded as another form of the Manus. So, too, the seven sacred metres employed in the sacrificial chants are called the seven sisters who "send forth" the Soma "into the field of the sacrifice" [3] and would thus appear to be the Hindu equivalent of the seven Titanesses. Nor is it too much to see in the "seven torrents" of the Soma-libation the origin of the Orphic legend of the seven parts into which Dionysos was divided.[4]

As regards the derivation of the word Titan, while agreeing with Miss Harrison that it is formed properly from τῖτᾰνος, "white clay," and that this has probably no etymological connection with Τῖτᾶνες,[5] we must still recollect that the Orphics connected the word with τετάσθαι, interpreting the myth as having to do with the World-Soul "stretched" throughout the world.[6] Now this interpretation is somewhat like that of Langlois, who, in his *Mémoire*, considers the Titans as powers of the air, presumably clouds, connecting the word with the Sanskrit "titânah," which he renders "qui veut couvrir en s'étendant," and must therefore derive from the root "tan," *i.e.*, "extend,"

[1] See Monier-Williams' *Sanskr. Dict.*, p. 743.
[2] See *R.-V.*, IX. 1. 10 (verses 3 and 7).
[3] See *ibid.*, IX. 3. 66 (verse 8).
[4] See Procl. in *Timaeus*, L. 3p. 184. 47: ἑπτὰ δὲ πάντα μέρη κούρου διεμοιρήσαντο, φησὶν ὁ θεολόγος περὶ τῶν Τιτάνων. For the "seven torrents" see *R.-V.*, IX. 3. 66 (verse 6).
[5] See *Prolegomena*, p. 493; and p. 17 of *Themis*.
[6] See Proclus in Plat. *Tim.* III. 184 D in Abel's *Orphica* as follows: καὶ τάχα ἂν τὸ διὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου τεταμένην εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ Τιτανικοῦ μερισμοῦ τοὺς Ὀρφικοὺς ἀναμιμνήσκοι, δι' ὃν οὐ μόνον ἡ ψυχὴ περικαλύπτοι τὸ πᾶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τέταται δι' αὐτοῦ παντός.

"stretch out." That this would be an appropriate word to use of the air we know from the fact that its past participle passive "tata," when used as a noun, means "wind," "air." Miss Harrison, too, in her *Themis* regards the Titans as powers of the air and as beings midway between the Olympians and the old chthonian forces. Moreover, she holds that the stress laid on the Titans by the Orphics is a sign of Persian naturism in religion—a view which may tend to confirm the Asiatic origin of the myth in question.

We have just seen that in the Orphic account of the death of Zagreus the god is supposed to be divided into seven parts. But, as Dr. Farnell reminds us, there is another and much older variant of the myth. According to the fragmentary Homeric Hymn to Dionysos the infant god was dismembered into three parts.[1] It is true that the reading is doubtful and depends on an emendation, but if we retain it—and there is no other interpretation that would appear to make such good sense—it is interesting to note that according to this reading the author would attribute the origin of the trieteric festivals of Dionysos to a desire to commemorate his division into three portions by the Titans. These trieteric rites, which were, as their name signifies, enacted every other year, are unknown in Attic ritual, but, according to Dr. Farnell, may once have been celebrated at Athens. We know, however, that they were enacted at Thebes, Delphi, and Crete, and that they usually took place in the winter. Both Rohde and Dr. Farnell consider them as celebrating the periodic appearances and disappearances of the god, thus connecting them with his aspect of vegetation-deity. The latter believes that there is good reason for thinking that they belonged to the aboriginal Thracian religion, and, referring to the testimony of Ovid and Diodorus who associated them with Thrace, holds that

[1] See ll. 11-12:

*ὡς δὲ τάμεν τρία σοι πάντως, τριετηρίσιν αἰεὶ*
*ἄνθρωποι ῥέξουσι τελήεσσας ἑκατόμβας.*

Note that this is Allen and Sikes' emendation for *τὰ μὲν*. They think, however, that there may here be a reference to the three titles of Dionysos, viz., Zagreus, Bromios, and Iakchos (see Nonnus, XLVIII. 965 ff.) to which we may regard as parallel the three forms of Soma as God of the Dead, Fire- or Sun-God, and Infant God of the Sacrifice.



they are to be connected with the custom of land-shifting every other year frequent in early society. Now this interpretation of the trieterica would recall the Vedic "cutting of the cow and making fertile the earth" by connecting the rite with the early history of agriculture. But as to the *symbolic* sense of the myth of the division of Dionysos into three parts, I would venture to suggest that it may be connected with his Orphic title Τρίγονος, a title for which at first sight it is not easy to account. Now in the *Sāma-Veda* reference is made to Soma as lighting up the Three Shining Worlds, *i.e.*, Heaven, the Atmosphere (or the Abode of the Dead and of the Waters of the Sky) and the Earth.[1] Hence we may perhaps regard the Vedic deity as "born thrice," in the sense that he makes his appearance in each of these three worlds, *i.e.*, as equivalent to the Orphic Dionysos Τρίγονος, who, as we have seen, is also Lord in three worlds as Sun-God, Moon-God, and Vegetation-deity, that is to say, he, no less than Soma, rules in Heaven, the Air, and the Earth.[2]

There remains one other aspect common to Soma and Dionysos which has not yet been dealt with. We have seen that one of the forms assumed by the infant Dionysos when he comes to life after the first attack by the Titans is that of a "horned serpent." Nonnus also speaks of Zagreus as the "horned child" of Persephone[3] and Zeus, while the latter is represented

[1] See *S.-V.*, II. 9. 1. 4 (verse 2): abhi dvijanmā trī rocanāni viśvā rajāṅsi śuśucāno asthāt.

[2] Cp. Langlois in his *Mémoire*: "Avec le Bacchus terrestre, χθόνιος (Orpheus, Hymn. ad Amphict.), ou le Bacchus du sacrifice, avec Bacchus pluvieux, et Apollon n'avons-nous pas la triple forme d'Agni-Soma? N'avons-nous pas le Dieu que l'auteur des hymnes d'Orphée, quel qu'il soit, appelle Τρίγονος?" Note that here "Bacchus pluvieux" is the counterpart of Soma as lord of the Moon and Atmosphere or the Region of the Waters of the Sky, and that in this division of Langlois, in order to correspond with mine, "Bacchus pluvieux" must be the equivalent of Soma as lord of the Dead instead of Bacchus χθόνιος. For Langlois regards χθόνιος as equivalent to "terrestrial" and not "infernal"—an interpretation which can, I think, hardly expect to find favour with classical scholars, as it is based on a Hindu use of the word "terrestrial" whereby it is applied to the Earth itself and even to the *cloud-covered* heaven, *i.e.*, the atmosphere.

For the idea of the triple form of Agni, cp. also L. de Milloué, *Triades et Trinités*, especially pp. 216-7.

[3] See Bk. VI, l. 165: Ζαγρέα γειναμένη κερόεν βρέφος κ. τ. λ.

as appearing in the form of a serpent to Persephone.[1] Reinach[2] further tells us that Athenagoras represents both the parents of Persephone as serpents, and the goddess herself as horned, but we do not know whether she was herself a horned serpent. According to Reinach, it is doubtful whether Nonnus regards Zagreus as a Bull or as a Serpent. He considers that the myth of the horned serpent was derived from the Celts[3] through Thrace, holding that there was some affinity between the Celts, Illyrians, and Thracians. No doubt the monumental evidence adduced by him to prove that a horned serpent was worshipped in Gaul[4] may incline us to agree with him as to the origin of the myth as narrated by Nonnus. But we are not dependent on the *Dionysiaca* alone for evidence concerning the snake-aspect of Dionysos. In the *Bacchae* also he is summoned to appear as a "many-headed Snake,"[5] and in the *Orphic Hymns*[6] in his form of Phanes he becomes the parent of a "serpent of

[1] See Bk. V, ll. 565-6:

*αἰνομόρου Ζαγρῆος ἔχων πόθον ὑψιμέδων Ζεύς,*
*ὃν τέκε Περσεφόνεια δρακοντείῃ Διὸς εὐνῇ κ. τ. λ.*

Also ll. 155 ff. of Bk. VI.

[2] See the chapter in his *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*, on *Zagreus, Le Serpent Cornu.*

[3] Cp. "Les anciens ont dit que les Druides avaient été les élèves ou les maîtres de Pythagore, et ils ont identifié en substance l'orphisme et la pythagorisme," etc. . . . "Les anciens croyaient savoir également qu'il avait existé des relations étroites entre les Celtes, les Illyriens et les Thraces et n'auraient pas trouvé étonnant qu'on constatât une analogie entre les croyances religieuses de la Thrace, berceau de l'orphisme, et celles de la Gaule celtique."

[4] "Sur l'autel de Mavilly le serpent cornu figure à côté des images des douze dieux du panthéon romain; il représente à lui seul, sur ce monument d'une importance capitale, le panthéon gaulois. On le trouve encore, sur l'autel de Paris, dans la main d'une sorte de Mercure tricéphale, qui est accompagné d'un bélier; il se rencontre sur la tranche de la stèle de Beauvais. . . . et sur différents monuments de provenance celtique," etc.

[5] l. 1017: *φάνηθι ταῦρος ἢ πολύκρανος ἰδεῖν δράκων.* It is true, however, that Prof. Tyrrell brackets *δράκων* as spoiling the metre.

[6] See frg. ex Athenagora apol., p. 72:

*ἂν δὲ Φάνης ἄλλην γενεὴν τεκνώσατο δεινὴν*
*νηδύος ἐξ ἱερῆς, προσιδεῖν φοβερωπὸν ἐχιδναν,*
*ἧς χαῖται μὲν ἀπὸ κρατός, καλόν τε πρόσωπον*
*ἦν ἐσιδεῖν, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ μέρη φοβεροῖο δοάκοντος*
*αὐχένος ἐξ ἄκρου.*



dreadful aspect." The snake, too, is indirectly associated with the god in the *Bacchae*, where we read how the Maenads:

> Their dappled fawn-skins girt with snakes that licked
> Their cheeks.[1]

Similarly, Proclus tells us of Hippa, the mythical nurse of Dionysos, that she received him from Zeus after she had set the λίκνον on her head and had "encircled her heart with a snake."[2]

Now Miss Harrison in discussing the nature of Zagreus, whom she believes to have been a Bull-God, contrasts this with another form of Dionysos, viz., Sabazios, in which the god appeared as a snake.[3] Sabazios, who, as we have seen, is identified by Preller with the Phrygian Moon-God, is depicted on a Phrygian monument from Koula as seated behind a team, while a snake is shown at the feet of one of the horses. We are told that Sabazios is a Phrygian or Thracian name for Dionysos, and we have some interesting references in Aristophanes and Demosthenes to this deity, all of which mark his un-Hellenic nature. Thus, in the *Birds*, where the Hawk bids prayers be offered "to the Sabazian finch and the bustard, mighty Mother of the gods and of men,"[4] we have a punning allusion to the Phrygian origin of the god in the word φρυγίλῳ, "finch," and in his close association with Cybele, who is here represented by the Bustard. Similarly, at the beginning of the *Wasps*,[5] Sabazios is mentioned in conjunction with "a certain Mede," and just following on a reference to the Corybantes, from all of which circumstances it is tolerably evident that Aristophanes regarded him as a Phrygian. Yet the scholiast on this passage tells us that Sabazios was the Thracian Dionysos, thus showing that the

[1] See ll. 697-8; and cp. ll. 767-8.

[2] See Procl. in *Tim.* 2p. 124-5: *Ἡ μὲν γὰρ Ἵππα τοῦ παντὸς οὖσα ψυχὴ καὶ οὕτω κεκλημένη παρὰ τῷ θεολόγῳ—λίκνον ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς θεμένη, καὶ δράκοντι αὐτὸ περιστρέψασα τὸ καρδιαῖον, ὑποδέχεται Διόνυσον.*

[3] See p. 495 of her *Prolegomena.* But see Diod. IV. 4 for a different view of Sabazios as a "horned" god from having been the first to yoke oxen, From this it is evident that Diodorus regards Sabazios as a Bull-God.

[4] See ll. 875-7:

ΙΕ. *καὶ φρυγίλῳ Σαβαζίῳ, καὶ στρουθῷ μεγάλῃ μητρὶ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων,*
ΠΕ. *δέσποινα Κυβέλη, στρουθὲ, μῆτερ Κλεοκρίτου.*

[5] See ll. 9-13.

terms Phrygian and Thracian were much the same. It is, however, important to note that in both these passages the references lay stress rather on the Asiatic associations of the cult. But, whether Asiatic or Thracian, the cult, as Miss Harrison and Dr. Farnell hold, was certainly un-Hellenic. This is shown clearly in the reference in the well-known passage in Demosthenes' *De Corona*[1] to the part played by Aeschines in assisting his mother at her initiations and other practices connected with the worship. Among the ceremonies to which he alludes are the carrying of tame snakes and the utterance of certain cries such as εὐοῖ σαβοῖ and ὑῆς ἄττης ἄττης ὑῆς.[2] Now while these invocations prove that the worship was the same as the Dionysiac, and some of the formulæ and ceremonies belonging to the rites as described by Demosthenes point to its Orphic character, the form ἄττης has been taken as evidence of association with the cult of the Phrygian Attis, and hence suggests its Asiatic affinities. As regards the name Sabazios, Langlois believes that it means "venerandus," and is connected with the Sanskrit "sabhājya," the future participle passive of the verb "sabhāj," "to adore." In any case the word has a manifestly Iranian appearance and might easily have been derived from contact with Persia. It is even probable that the cult of Sabazios was unknown to the Greeks before the rise of the Median Empire, a conclusion suggested by the fact that all the references to it that have been given date from about the fifth century B.C., or subsequently. To these we may add one more which is taken from the *Characters* of Theophrastus, a writer of the fourth century B.C., when, as we know, Persian influence in Greece was at its height. There we learn that the Superstitious Man if he sees the red snake in his house will invoke Sabazios.[3]

[1] See §§ 259-61.

[2] τοὺς ὄφεις τοὺς παρείας θλίβων καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς κεφαλῆς αἰωρῶν, καὶ βοῶν εὐοῖ σαβοῖ, καὶ ἐπορχούμενος ὑῆς ἄττης ἄττης ὑῆς, ἔξαρχος καὶ προηγεμὼν καὶ κιστοφόρος καὶ λικνοφόρος καὶ τοιαῦτα ὑπὸ τῶν γραδίων προσαγορευόμενος, κ. τ. λ. We may here observe that it is strange that Demosthenes, who was half-Thracian, should refer so scornfully to the worship of Sabazios, as if it were some unusual foreign cult, if these rites were indeed derived from Thrace.

[3] See *Characters* XXVIII (XVI) as follows: καὶ ἐὰν ἴδῃ ὄφιν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, ἐὰν μὲν παρείαν, Σαβάζιον καλεῖν, κ. τ. λ.



Let us now try to discover what was the reason for the association of the snake with Dionysos, or rather with Sabazios, the title under which he was worshipped by the Phrygians. For from the scanty evidence in Greek literature of a snake-aspect of Dionysos we are forced to the conclusion that this character of the god was derived altogether from the Sabazian cult and Phrygia, and hence has nothing to do with any ancient Pelasgian worship of dead heroes, in which the snake, as we learn from the *Prolegomena*, was commonly regarded as the embodiment of a dead person. Indeed, if such were the case we should expect to find both very ancient and abundant evidence of the association of Dionysos with the snake. At the same time, while it would seem apparent that the cult was not of great antiquity in *Greece*, there can be little doubt that it represents a pre-Aryan stratum of religion in *Asia*, its original home. For snake-worship was essentially un-Aryan. In fact, in the *Vedas* the snake is everywhere the symbol of the demons and of the powers of evil, and the Aryan gods are perpetually at war with the serpent races.[1] Yet these are not without a certain supernatural power, and manifestly represent the gods of the enemies of the Aryans, just as in Greek mythology the Python represents the earlier Pelasgian worship of the chthonian powers, which was replaced by the coming of the Aryan or Olympian Apollo, and his brethren. Consequently, in the *Vedas* we do not find the higher deities, such as Indra and Soma, compared to serpents as a rule, but rather depicted as at war with them, and especially with the serpent-demon, Ahi. In spite, however, of this general rule, we do actually find once or twice in the *Vedas* a reference to a snake-form of Soma. Thus in the *Sāma-Veda* he is compared to a snake *gliding* over his dead skin;[2] and among the various allusions in the *Rig-Veda* to his swiftly-gliding motion (*i.e.* that of the Soma-libations) we find the following: "Pure and greatly beloved he glides into all bodies"[3]—an expression which suggests that the origin of his comparison to a snake is to be seen in the smooth, rapid passage

[1] See *Les Symboles Religieux Orientaux et leurs Rapports avec ceux du Paganisme Européen*, p. 150, by L. de Milloué.

[2] See *S.-V.*, II. 7. 3. 21 (verse 2): ahir na jūrṇām iti sarpati tvacam.

[3] See *R.-V.*, IX. 2. 25 (verse 4).

of the liquid Soma into the sacrificial bowl, whence it was supposed to be diffused among all his worshippers. This latter quotation also recalls a statement in the writings of Clement and Arnobius, who, as Miss Harrison informs us in her *Prolegomena*, declare that "one of the 'tokens' of the mysteries of Sabazios was 'the god (gliding) through the bosom.'"[1] Now, though the rite here referred to was supposed to perpetuate the legend of the birth of Zagreus, it would be more accurate to say that the legend itself arose from some ancient piece of ritual. This I believe to have been that of the Soma libation. For Soma was not merely, like Dionysos, a god of swift motion and many changes; but his nature as derived from Vedic ritual would make it peculiarly appropriate that he should be likened to a snake. This we can understand when we recall the allusion in the *Sāma-Veda* to his change of skin, a metaphor especially suitable to the action of peeling the stalks of the Soma-plant before they were crushed and the juice thence extracted was offered in sacrifice. Now, it is a striking fact that while we have evidence for the existence of a snake-aspect of both Soma and Dionysos, in each case this aspect is not one of very frequent occurrence. And I venture to suggest that a case such as is presented by this aspect affords perhaps one of the best proofs of the ultimate identity of these two deities. For it shows that their resemblance is not merely confined to their possession of the same attributes, but may be observed, as here, very clearly wherever we find that a characteristic not very prominent in the case of the one is equally rare in the case of the other. And it seems not a little remarkable, in dealing with such a complex conception as the Greek Dionysos, that we should be able to find parallels for every one of his manifold aspects in the cult of the Asiatic Soma, while, at the same time, the latter, with but one exception which can readily be accounted for,[2] does not

[1] See p. 417.

[2] Soma is alluded to once in the *Rig-Veda* as an elephant. To this we have no parallel in the case of Dionysos. Yet the question of the ultimate identity of the two deities is in no way affected by this circumstance. For even if the elephant were a frequent and clearly recognized form of Soma we should hardly expect this aspect to be retained by the Greeks when they



possess any attribute which is not to be met with in the case of the Greek deity.

received the worship from the East. It is rather, on the other hand, remarkable that an elephant-form of Soma is not of more frequent occurrence. Similarly, it is interesting to note that neither Dionysos nor Soma are ever compared to panthers or tigers, although the former is supposed to be accompanied by them and though the comparison of Soma, at least, to a panther is only what we might have expected.

# CHAPTER IV

## OSIRIS

*Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν γὰρ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς θεὸν Ὄσιριν ὀνομαζόμενόν φασιν εἶναι τὸν παρ' Ἕλλησι Διόνυσον καλούμενον.—Diod. Sic.*, Bk. IV. chap. I.

Difference between Greek and Egyptian religion—Osiris a vegetation-god—Osiris a god of the Dead—Isis and Osiris and the Zagreus-myth—Foucart's views on the Anthesteria and the cult of Osiris—Osiris a culture-hero—Osiris and Rā—The animal forms of Osiris—Osiris a Moon-God—Osiris a Water-God—Discrepancies between the aspects of Osiris and of Dionysos—Date of the coming of Dionysos to Greece—Contact between Greece and Egypt—The Thrako-Phrygian Dionysos—Orpheus—Absence of the worship of Dionysos in the North-West of Greece—Direction of the Aryan migrations—Conclusion.

LET us now turn to examine the points of resemblance between the worship of Dionysos and that of the Egyptian Osiris, which has been held by M. Foucart to have exerted a strong influence on the Dionysiac cult in Attica. The original nature of Osiris has been much disputed, and various contradictory theories on the subject have been put forward. Egyptian religion differed greatly from Hellenic, and in nothing, perhaps, more than in the fact that the Egyptian deities possessed hardly any distinctly characteristic attributes, but were constantly fused and combined with each other in various ways—a circumstance which gave rise to the existence of numerous compound forms such as Ptah-Sokar-Osiris.[1] This peculiarity had its origin in the highly local nature of Egyptian worship. Hence when any Egyptian god was introduced into a new city he

[1] See p. 9 of *The Greek Gods in Egypt*, by J. G. Milne, in the Proceedings of the Classical Association of Ireland for 1911-12.





tended to add to his own attributes and titles those of the established deity of his new home. We shall not be surprised, then, to find the god Usiri, Usra or Osiris—called by Brugsch "the Egyptian Dionysos-Bakchos"—variously described as a Water-God, a Bull-God, a Sun-God, a God of the Dead, or a Vegetation-deity. To Brugsch, for example, Osiris and the gods of his cycle appear to form together a chain of rising and disappearing, past and present, death and life in the universe.[1] Osiris himself, he holds, represented the principle of disappearance, while having at the same time within him the germ of the principle of life. Thus we see that, according to Brugsch's view, the primitive conception of Osiris would be something the same as that of the vegetation-deity Dionysos. Very similar is Frazer's conception of his character, which would make him a god of corn and trees.[2] For instance, he tells us that in inscriptions he is spoken of as residing in trees, while a manuscript of the Louvre speaks of the cedar as sprung from him. Moreover, the sycamore, tamarisk and fir-tree are mentioned as his abodes, and he is referred to as "the one in the tree." Hence the pine-cone is associated with him, and often appears on monuments as offered to him. We learn on the authority of Diodorus Siculus and Plutarch that the ivy also was sacred to him especially, and that he taught men to cultivate the vine and corn and crops in general.[3] All this makes his resemblance to Dionysos seem very striking, but it should be noted as an important difference between Soma and Dionysos, on the one hand, and Osiris, on the other, that, whereas the two former are gods of intoxication *par excellence*, the latter, as far as the evidence of Egyptian writings

[1] "Die ununterbrochene Verjüngung der unsterblichen Natur nach gottlichem Willen und nach ewigen Gesetzen, das ist das grosse Thema, für welches die Mitglieder des Osiriskreises ihren Namen und ihre Bedeutung in gemeinsamer Verkettung der einzelnen hergaben."

[2] See *Adonis, Attis and Osiris*.

[3] See Diodor. Sic. I. 17: Τὸν δὲ Ὄσιριν λέγουσιν . . . διδάξαι τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων τήν τε τῆς ἀμπέλου φυτείαν καὶ τὸν σπόρον τοῦ τε πυρίνου καὶ κριθίνου καρποῦ. And again: Τοῦ δὲ κιττοῦ τὴν εὕρεσιν ἀνατιθέασιν Ὀσίριδι, καὶ καθιεροῦσιν αὐτὸν τούτῳ τῷ θεῷ, καθάπερ οἱ Ἕλληνες Διονύσῳ. Καὶ κατὰ τὴν Αἰγυπτίων διάλεκτον ὀνομάζεσθαί φασι τὸν κιττὸν φυτὸν Ὀσίριδος. Cp. also Plutarch, in his *De Isid. et Osir.*, c. XXXVII., where he tells us that the ivy was called by the Egyptians χενόσιρις or the "plant of Osiris."

is concerned, has no special connection with the vine more than with any other plant, and is never regarded as a deity of intoxication.[1] This fact alone, more than any other, I suggest, militates against the identification of Dionysos with Osiris. It is probable therefore that, in spite of certain points of resemblance between the Greek and Egyptian deities, they are really distinct, and that we are to see in the various aspects of Osiris but developments of his primary character of vegetation-deity—which he shares in common with Dionysos—and purely fortuitous accretions derived from the worship of other Egyptian gods, with whom he became identified in local shrines after the peculiar national method of syncretism of cults.

Now from this character of plant-god, according to Frazer, was derived the association of Osiris with the realm of the Dead,[2] which, as Wallis-Budge informs us, goes back to a very remote period.[3] Yet while Osiris thus appears to recall the Zagreus-aspect of Dionysos, the plant-god that dies down in the winter, and, before he comes up again in the spring, dwells as a ruler in the dark underworld, there is nothing in this resemblance to lead us to consider that Dionysos and Osiris are the same. For any vegetation-deity would tend to be regarded

[1] In a passage of Diodorus, Sicul. I. 15 in which he makes an obvious effort to equate him with Dionysos and to assign Nysa to him as his abode in childhood, we read as follows: *Εὑρετὴν δ' αὐτὸν γενέσθαι φασὶ τῆς ἀμπέλου περὶ τὴν Νύσην, καὶ τὴν ἐργασίαν τοῦ ταύτης καρποῦ προσεπινοήσαντα, πρῶτον οἴνῳ χρήσασθαι, καὶ διδάξαι τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους τήν τε φυτείαν τῆς ἀμπέλου, καὶ τὴν χρῆσιν τοῦ οἴνου, καὶ τὴν συγκομιδὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τήρησιν.*

[2] He says that in a scene in the hall of Osiris at Dendera a coniferous tree is represented as growing between the dead and the reviving Osiris, as if to show that the tree was the symbol of the divine resurrection. He also declares that Osiris, as a god of corn, came to be regarded as a god of resurrection, and hence as a god of the dead.

[3] See his *Egyptian Ideas of the Future Life*, p. 56: ". . . We know not whether Osiris was the god of the resurrection to the predynastic or prehistoric Egyptians, or whether that *rôle* was attributed to him after Mena began to rule in Egypt. There is, however, good reason for assuming that in the earliest dynastic times he occupied the position of god and judge of those who had risen from the dead by his help, for already in the IVth dynasty, about B.C. 3800, king Men-kau-Rā is identified with him, and on his coffin not only is he called 'Osiris, King of the South and North, Men-kau-Rā, living for ever,' but the genealogy of Osiris is attributed to him," etc.



in this way as a ruler of the underworld. With this aspect of Osiris is associated his worship under the form of a pillar known as a *dad* or *didou*—a custom which at once reminds us of the cult of Dionysos.

Maspero and M. Sourdille alike regard the *dad* as originally a branching tree—according to the latter it might be merely "un arbre depouillé de son feuillage, un arbre pendant l'hiver," which then became a god of vegetation and finally a man.[1] M. Naville, on the other hand, regards the *dad* as depicting a skeleton, and holds that Osiris stood for the primitive male human being. According to this last theory the association of Osiris with the dead would be easy to understand, as he would then be the type or representative of the human race. The aetiological account of this association of Osiris with Death, which would attribute it to his murder and dismemberment by his brother Typhon or Set, is clearly put before us by Plutarch in his essay *Concerning Isis and Osiris*, and there compared with the slaying of Dionysos by the Titans. And when Erman[2] declares that the tradition of the death of Osiris is the origin of his attribute of ruler of the underworld, we are immediately reminded of the view which makes Zagreus, the god slain by the Titans, a "hunter of dead men's souls." Osiris is, in fact, a dead vegetation-god whose body, when cut in pieces and scattered on the soil, becomes, according to savage notions, the means of fertilizing it. So far, however, there is nothing in either the Greek or Egyptian legend which would warrant our assumption that in each case we have to deal with the *same* vegetation-deity. M. Foucart, indeed, regards the Orphic legend of the Titans as derived from Egypt. He maintains that the *πάθη* of Dionysos have an exact counterpart in those of Osiris; that both are surprised and slain by foes who dismember their bodies and scatter the fragments; and that in each case it is a goddess who reunites the members and recalls life in the body. But he forgets to observe that whereas the Egyptian corn-goddess, Isis, who restores Osiris to life would find her natural counterpart in

[1] See C. Sourdille's *Hérodote et la Religion de L'Égypte*, p. 72.

[2] See *A Handbook of Egyptian Religion*, chap. I., on Religious Beliefs in the Early Period.

the Greek corn-goddess, Demeter,[1] the mother of Zagreus, it is not the latter who here plays the part of Isis but rather Athene. Again, even if with Foucart we imagine that in Attic ritual Demeter did actually occupy the same position as Isis in this respect, her relation to Dionysos is not the same as that of the Egyptian goddess to Osiris, but is rather that of Isis to Horus, the son born to Osiris after his resurrection. Of course if we consider Horus as "the renewed life of Osiris,"[2] just as Dionysos is the restored Zagreus, the parallel becomes tolerably close. Moreover, it must be admitted that in the Hindu myth of the rebirth of Soma there is no goddess to take the place of Demeter or Isis, although he is spoken of as "the child of Heaven and Earth" in his plant-aspect before the sacrificial rebirth. But, on the other hand, we are reminded that while, in the Vedic and Greek myths, Heaven is the father and Earth the mother of the infant vegetation-god, in the Egyptian legend, Osiris, as the son of Nut and Seb, differs from Soma and Dionysos in having Heaven for his mother and Earth for his father.[3] The point, it is true, is a very small one, and the difference is properly one of grammar rather than of myth, but is worth mention on account of Foucart's contention that the phrase Γῆς παῖς εἰμὶ καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος, found on one of the Orphic funeral Tablets of Petilia, which has been supposed to refer to the Titanic origin of the dead man, really represents his identification of himself with Dionysos after the Egyptian fashion whereby the dead were identified with Osiris, the Son of Heaven and Earth.[4] And when Foucart says that the conception of a god subject to death betrays its Egyptian origin, inasmuch as the Greeks always endowed their gods with immortality, whereas the Egyptians did not believe in a vital distinction between men and gods on this point, we must remember that a vegetation-

[1] See *Adonis, Attis and Osiris*, where Frazer tells us that Isis was originally a "rustic corn-mother" corresponding to Demeter.

[2] See Reinach, *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*, where he says that the rebirth of a god after a violent death was a feature common to the myths concerning Adonis, Attis and Zagreus. In the case of Osiris he says that he is reborn "sous la forme d'Horus enfant, qui est Osiris."

[3] See *Egyptian Ideas of the Future Life*, pp. 94-5.

[4] See his *Culte de Dionysos en Attique*, chap. II.



deity in any country would be in the nature of things subject to death and rebirth. As regards the part played by Isis and Demeter in collecting the fragments of the murdered gods, here, also, the coincidence between the Greek and Egyptian myths is but to be expected. For the presence of the goddesses is a token of the phallic element in both cults characteristic of the worship of a vegetation-deity or fertility-god. According to the testimony of Herodotus[1] phallogogy was an Egyptian rite taught to the Greeks by Melampus who had seen it performed at the feast of Osiris. The feast, as we learn from Plutarch,[2] was called the Pamylia, and Foucart considers that the Priapean nature of Dionysos corresponded to that of Osiris Paamules, and that the Dionysia κατ' ἀγροὺς borrowed some features from the Pamylia. Nor is this the only Attic feast in which he would see the influence of the worship of Osiris. In the Anthesteria he believes that the fourteen altars required are a reminiscence of the fourteen pieces into which Osiris was dismembered. He reminds us that in the ritual of Tentyris for the great feast of Osiris in the month of Koiak the number fourteen occurs repeatedly. Thus, there are fourteen moulds to make the fourteen divine members into the body of Osiris, fourteen measures of sacred oil for anointing them, and fourteen amulets to protect him against his enemies. But when he builds up a theory that at the Anthesteria Dionysos was depicted as torn into fourteen pieces this is against the evidence of the Orphic and Homeric Hymns. And we have not the slightest proof that these fourteen pieces were placed on the fourteen altars at this feast, and that, as in the Egyptian rite, the divine body was then reconstructed and raised to life by the fourteen Gerarai or Holy Women.[3] All that we know is that at the Anthesteria there were fourteen altars and fourteen priestesses. Yet we hear of a college of sixteen sacred women at Elis associated with the worship of Dionysos, and this number exactly corresponds with the sixteen Brahmanical priests whose presence was required at the Soma-sacrifice.[4] The explanation which I would venture to suggest for this discrepancy in Greek ritual in

[1] Book II., c. 48.

[2] See *De Iside et Osir.*, c. XXXVI.

[3] See *The Cults of the Greek States*.

[4] See Haug, p. 282.

the numbers of the ministrants of Dionysos would attribute it to a desire to commemorate his character of Moon-God. For we know that between new and full moon in different months there elapse from fourteen to sixteen days; and if we regard the myths of Zagreus and Soma as representing the division of the moon—a conceit quite in the manner of Vedic allegory to which we have a parallel in the division of the moon by the Vedic magicians known as the Ṛibhus—these fourteen or sixteen days would be considered as fragments of the god, and as such would have a proportionate number of priests or priestesses attached to their service. In any case whatever points in common the Greek and Egyptian cults may possess, or whatever influence the rites concerning the death of Osiris may have exerted on the myth of Zagreus, one thing is clear, we have no evidence that there was any sacramental partaking of his body analogous to the ceremonies of the Soma-cult and Dionysos-worship. Nor again is there any mention of Osiris as having been devoured by his enemy Typhon.[1] This, too, I think, constitutes an insuperable objection to the theory that the worship of the Theban and Attic Dionysos was derived from that of Osiris. In accordance with this conviction I trust that it will be possible to show presently that the aspects which are common to Dionysos and Osiris are simply those which are characteristic of vegetation-deities in general, while the more special attributes of Dionysos are not to be found in the cult of Osiris.

In accordance with a natural development of his character of vegetation-god Osiris appears also as a culture-hero and teacher of civilization. In this he bears a certain resemblance to Dionysos and Soma and also to Orpheus; but differs markedly from the two former in the fact that he is said by Plutarch to be averse to the use of arms, relying rather on reason and persuasion and

[1] Reinach thinks that, although it is not expressly stated that he was devoured in this fashion, it is probable that such was the case. He deduces this from the resemblance between Orpheus and Osiris, both of whom he considers are said to have put down cannibalism—the former, on the authority of Horace, *De Arte Poetica*, ll. 391-2, the latter, on that of Diodorus Siculus, I. 17—and holds that the legend of their violent death implies a revolt against their doctrines, and a revival of the ancient custom in their case. The references are, however, not explicit.



music in hisefforts to subjugate the minds of men.[1] It is rather Horus his son who shows the warrior-character in vanquishing the enemies of his father,[2] just as it is Horus and not Osiris who resembles Dionysos in his concealment by his mother after birth. And even Horus' warrior-aspect as revealed in this legend may be foreign to his nature and due to confusion with another deity. For Weidemann tells us that Horus originally stood for "at least two distinct deities," viz., Horus the son of Isis, and Horus the Sun-God, and that the attempted blending of the two was a later development, as was also the likening of the war which Horus, the Sun-God, waged against the Darkness to the prolonged fight of Horus, the son of Isis, against Set. There is, however, one important difference between Horus or Osiris and Dionysos. For though the Egyptian deities alike resemble the Greek god in their association with life and rejuvenation, and in the circumstance of their hidden abode after birth, yet neither Osiris nor Horus bears the distinctive title of "Child of the Hills" which, as we have seen, was common to Soma and Dionysos. Horus, in fact, so far from having been hidden in the mountains was actually reared by Isis in the papyrus-swamps of the Delta. It is true that in the case of the gods of a flat country, such as Egypt, such a title could hardly exist; but if Dionysos was really derived from Egypt and merely adopted this epithet on coming to mountainous Greece, why is it that none of the native Hellenic deities is similarly styled in whose case the epithet "hill-born" would be so much more appropriate? Here again, I venture to say, we have another great objection to the theory of the Egyptian origin. Moreover, as Sourdille shows, the conception of Osiris as a civilizer of the whole world is foreign to Egyptian thought. For the Egyptians disliked

[1] See Plutarch, *De Isid. et Osir.*, c. 13: *Βασιλεύοντα δ' Ὄσιριν Αἰγυπτίους μὲν εὐθὺς ἀπόρου βίου καὶ θηριώδους ἀπαλλάξαι, καρπούς τε δείξαντα, καὶ νόμους θέμενον αὐτοῖς, καὶ θεοὺς δείξαντα τιμᾷν· ὕστερον δὲ γῆν πᾶσαν ἡμερούμενον ἐπελθεῖν, ἐλάχιστα μὲν ὅπλων δεηθέντα, πειθοῖ δὲ τοὺς πλείστους καὶ λόγῳ μετ' ᾠδῆς πάσης καὶ μουσικῆς θελγομένους προσαγόμενον, ὅθεν Ἕλλησι δόξαι Διονύσῳ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι·*

[2] See, however, Plutarch, *De Isid et Osir.*, c. XIX., where Osiris is said to come from the dead to Horus to train him for battle. Note also what M. Naville says as to the fact that the jackal-god of the Thinite period, Apouatou, later known as Osiris, was the guide of the kings in war.

foreigners and regarded him merely as the civilizer of their own country. But this is the very antithesis of the proselytizing Dionysos and Soma—another point against the identification of the Greek with the Egyptian god.

As regards the association of Osiris with Music and Wisdom, we have, however, an analogy with Dionysos. This association of Osiris with Wisdom connects him with Thoth, the god of Wisdom, who is said to have supplied Isis with the magical formulae needed for raising him to life,[1] and to have made him "true of voice."[2] But it would seem that the god differs from Dionysos in not being himself a giver of wisdom or a prophet. It is only when linked with Rā, the Egyptian Sun-God, that he appears to reveal these characteristics. His connection with Rā is, according to Brugsch, due to the fact that he represents, as god of the dead, the Setting Sun, whence he is called Usiri or Usra. He is, in fact, the god of the West and of the Winter Sun more particularly, and from this we can easily see his character of dead vegetation-deity. M. Naville tells us that the power of Osiris over the dead is mentioned in an inscription from the pyramid of Merenra, a king of the Fifth Dynasty. There Osiris is called the "bright-shining guide" and invoked to descend "into the bark of Rā, where the gods love to enter," etc., and is identified with the god Rā himself who is said to be born every day. Now the emblem of all solar deities in Egypt was the hawk, Rā being, as we learn from Weidemann, "almost invariably represented as a hawk-headed man." This symbol appears also in the case of Sokaris and Horus, according to MM. Naville and Sourdille. The latter informs us that Sokaris seems to have been originally a solar god representing the sun in the winter solstice, and hence a god of the dead. At one time distinct from Osiris he became identified with him as god of the dead when the cult of Osiris was spread throughout the whole of Egypt.[3] We shall not then be surprised to find the hawk associated with Osiris also at Dendera, where there is a

[1] See *Egyptian Ideas of the Future Life*, p. 95.
[2] See Erman's *Handbook of Egyptian Religion*, chap. I.
[3] See *Hérodote et la Religion de L'Égypte*, pp. 137-9. M. Naville tells us that Osiris was worshipped as Sokari at Memphis.



hawk-headed mummy of the god in a coffin depicted as enclosed in a tree.[1] Now in this hawk-aspect of Osiris we have, it is true, a parallel to the hawk-form of Dionysos at Amyclae; but it is a parallel which only arises owing to a confusion with another deity. Whereas the hawk-form in the case of Soma is quite different, and properly belongs to his own nature as a god of swift, upward motion when mounting on the sacrificial flames. Again, the hawk is not the only bird-form associated with Osiris. M. Sourdille tells us that he is also represented as a heron,[2] and to this form we have no parallel in the case either of Dionysos or of Soma. Similarly, we learn that Osiris was a later form of the Egyptian jackal-god, Apouatou; and though this is a very natural animal-form for a god of the dead, nowhere do we read of Dionysos or Soma as compared to a jackal or associated with it. Yet the jackal was not unknown to Homer,[3] and must always have been familiar to Asiatics. Now one of the strongest proofs of the identity of Soma and Dionysos, it has been suggested, lies in the fact that all their aspects are the same, neither god presenting any form which does not make its appearance in the cult of the other. But it would seem that the same conditions do not exist in the case of the cults of Osiris and Dionysos as shown by these superfluous aspects in the worship of the Egyptian god. Similarly, though the goat and ram forms of Dionysos have no sure warrant, and are at most only rare specialized forms of his character of fertility-god, these are well-known in the case of Osiris, who was worshipped as a ram or a goat at Mendes. That is to say, while Egyptian inscriptions speak of the god of Mendes as a ram, Herodotus, the Greek writers, and Roman coins of Mendes all represent him as a goat.[4] M. Sourdille draws attention to the fact that Herodotus identifies this god with Pan, and, while holding that Osiris was the chief god of Mendes, thinks that the goat-form must have

[1] See *Adonis, Attis and Osiris*.
[2] See footnote on page 81 as follows: "Comme autre forme représentant Osiris, il faut citer le bonou, héron ou vanneau, mis aussi parfois en rapport avec Râ, et dans lequel on a cru voir, peut-être à tort, le phénix dont parle Hérodote."
[3] See *Iliad*, ll. 473-5.
[4] See *Hérodote et la Religion de L'Égypte*, p. 165.

been the true one. But under whatever form the god was here worshipped, there is no doubt that, as in the case of Dionysos, this aspect was but a specialization of his character of fertility-god.[1] Hence it is not to be wondered at if he should share these aspects with Dionysos as they are merely a natural development of the character which they hold in common. Rather is it important to note any discrepancies in this case, especially as it has been shown that Soma and Dionysos practically coincide in all their animal-aspects. Now, as far as I am aware, we have no Egyptian parallel to the association of Dionysos with the horse[2] which appears in his connection with the Centaurs; while the lion-form of Dionysos is unknown in the case of Osiris. Further, the snake has no connection with the Egyptian god till the Hellenistic period, when, as we learn from Erman, Isis takes a serpent-form and Osiris then accommodates himself to her.[3] It is clear, therefore, that the worship of Sabazios is in no way affected by contact with Egypt.

Even to the bull-form of Dionysos we have no sure parallel in the cult of Osiris. Yet of all the animal-aspects of the Greek god this is at once the most characteristic and the most certain. Indeed the god Serapis, who, as is well known, is a compound deity representing Osiris and the ancient Egyptian Bull-God, Apis, does not come into existence till Alexandrian times.[4] With the

[1] See Sourdille, p. 168: "Les textes ne laissent aucun doute sur la signification qu'on lui attribuait, comme à tous les dieux béliers: il etait 'Baïnib-didouit, le grand dieu, la vie de Râ, celui qui féconde," etc.

[2] Against this may be adduced the choice of a horse as the most useful animal in war by the youthful Horus in Plutarch's narrative of the Death and Resurrection of Osiris. But surely this is a very appropriate choice and does not denote any special connection of Osiris with the horse. In any case the horse, as Wallis-Budge tells us, was unknown in Egypt before 1500 B.C., the period when the Aryans were invading Egypt. Hence this reference must belong to a period later than that date and might even be a sign of their influence.

[3] See his *Handbook of Egyptian Religion*. Sokaris, who was identified with Osiris at Memphis, was depicted as a great winged snake with three human heads. But we must remember that he was originally distinct from Osiris.

[4] See Weidemann, who, while he says that Apis, the Bull-God, is as old as Egyptian history, speaks of Serapis as a half-Greek, half-Egyptian deity.



Egyptian Bull-God, Hapi or Apis, Osiris had, properly speaking, nothing to do. The worship of Apis, as Roscher tells us, goes back to the time of the Pyramids, and begins to attain importance in the time of the New Empire.[1] He then became regarded as a reincarnation of the chief god of Memphis, Ptah, a solar deity,[2] and bore between his horns as a symbol of this connection a sun-disc. Then, as Osiris was identified with the Sun, Greek writers such as Strabo,[3] Plutarch,[4] and Diodorus,[5] declared that Apis was an incarnation of Osiris. In short, the name Serapis is merely a Greek modification of User-Hap or Osiris-Apis, a form which means nothing more than the dead sacred Bull-God in accordance with the custom by which all dead persons were identified with Osiris as god of the dead.[6]

Now, though Roscher tells us that Apis bears the solar disc between his horns as marking that he is a solar deity, he also informs us that later writers, in contradiction to this, represent him as having a crescent on his right side, on which account he became an animal of the Moon. Plutarch,[7] indeed, strongly

[1] *I.e.*, the 18th Dynasty, beginning about 1580 B.C. For the ever-increasing importance of the cult, see Sourdille, p. 147: "C'est surtout à partir du règne de Psammétichos I^er^ que le culte d'Apis, qui remontait à la plus haute antiquité, paraît avoir acquis une importance particulièrement grande"; and again, on p. 149: "Avec les Ptolémées, quand on lui eut attribué des traits d'Hadès et d'Asclépios, il devint, sous le nom de Sérapis, le plus grand dieu de l'Égypte."

[2] See Roscher, and also Sourdille, p. 145: "Le taureau Apis, exactement Hapi, était 'la vie renouvelée de Ptah,' c'est à dire la forme vivante sous laquelle Ptah se manifestait."

[3] See Bk. XVII, c. 1: *Ἐγγὺς δὲ καὶ ἡ Μέμφις αὐτὴ, τὸ βασίλειον τῶν Αἰγυπτίων. . . . ἔχει δὲ ἱερά τό τε τοῦ Ἄπιδος, ὅς ἐστιν ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ Ὄσιρις· ὅπου ὁ βοῦς ὁ Ἄπις ἐν σηκῷ τινι τρέφεται, κ. τ. λ.*

[4] See *De Isid. et Osir.*, c. 20 and c. 29: *οἱ δὲ πλεῖστοι τῶν ἱερέων εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ φασι τὸν Ὄσιριν συμπεπλέχθαι καὶ τὸν Ἄπιν, ἐξηγούμενοι καὶ διδάσκοντες ἡμᾶς, ὡς εὔμορφον εἰκόνα χρὴ νομίζειν τῆς Ὀσίριδος ψυχῆς τὸν Ἄπιν.*

[5] See Diod. Sic., c. 85.

[6] M. Naville tells us, however, that in the "Book of the Dead" Osiris is in one place addressed as "Bull of Ament," but this is hardly sufficient justification for regarding Osiris as a Bull-God.

[7] See *De Isid. et Osir.*, c. 43, where he narrates the birth-legend of the Apis-bull as follows: *τὸν δὲ Ἄπιν, εἰκόνα μὲν Ὀσίριδος, ἔμψυχον εἶναι, γενέσθαι δὲ, ὅταν φῶς ἐρείσῃ γόνιμον ἀπὸ τῆς σελήνης, καὶ καθάψηται βοὸς ὀργώσης. διὸ καὶ τοῖς τῆς σελήνης σχήμασιν ἔοικε πολλὰ τοῦ Ἄπιδος, . . . ἔτι δὲ τῇ νουμηνίᾳ τοῦ Φαμενὼθ*

insists on his lunar character, which he associates with his identification with Osiris, and he regards the latter as a Moon-God. But Frazer tells us that "the identification of Osiris with the moon appears to be based on a comparatively late theory that all things grow and decay with the waxing and waning of the moon." He shows that this belief is almost universal, being found even among the Mexican Indians, and considers this aspect as simply a development of Osiris' nature as a vegetation-deity. Indeed we have already seen that the Greeks associated the connection of Dionysos with the moon with his dominion over plants and crops; but a similar notion in the case of Osiris proves nothing as to the ultimate identity of the two gods, if we are prepared to admit that, in order to establish it, something more is needed than evidence that the broad general features of this conception are common to both. Among the chief proofs that Osiris was connected with the moon is the fact that he was said to have lived twenty-eight years, and this Frazer thinks may "fairly be considered as a mythical expression for a lunar month." Similarly, the rending of his body into fourteen pieces he interprets as a reference to the waning moon, which, as he says, "appears to lose a portion of itself on each of the fourteen days that make up the second half of a lunar month"; and he draws attention to the legend that Osiris' body was found by his enemy at the full moon, showing that the dismemberment of the god would begin with the waning of the moon.[1] And we read on a memorial tablet of Ramses IV at Abydos[2] the statement that "thy nature, Osiris, is more secret than that of all the gods." . . . "Thou art the moon which is in heaven. Thou rejuvenatest thyself at thy desire, thou becomest young according to thy wish. Thou appearest in order to dispel darkness," etc. Moreover, while Brugsch tells us that Osiris is the new moon,[3] we know

μηνὸς ἑορτὴν ἄγουσιν, ἔμβασιν Ὀσίριδος εἰς τὴν σελήνην ὀνομάζοντες, ἔαρος ἀρχὴν οὖσαν. οὕτω τὴν Ὀσίριδος δύναμιν ἐν τῇ σελήνῃ τίθενται, κ. τ. λ.

[1] Note that this interpretation of Frazer closely resembles my interpretation of the meaning of the fourteen Gerarai and the sixteen holy women of Elis.

[2] See Erman's *Handbook of Egyptian Religion*, chap. II.

[3] See his *Religion und Mythologie der Alten Aegypter*, where we read as follows: "Der Gott wird angerufen als Mond (āāḥu): 'O du Stier, der sich immerdar am Himmel verjüngt.'"



also that once a year at the full moon figs were offered to him; and in a hymn addressed by Isis to Osiris there is distinct reference to Osiris as the moon and to the agency of the magician-god Thoth[1] as placing his soul in the sky-ship Maat.

But there is another view of his association with the moon, viz., that put forward by Sourdille. He tells us indeed that there is no single deity that represents the moon among the Egyptians,[2] but adds that it is sometimes identified with the god Khonsu who was commissioned to watch over the days of the month and the stars and held special sway over one of the Egyptian months. The verb "khonsou," he informs us, means "to sail," and has reference to the moon as the heavenly ship. This notion, we may remark in passing, recalls that of Soma as a golden bowl in the heavens. Khonsu also is often a doublet of Thoth,[3] and hence, according to Sourdille, is identified with Osiris. He presumably regards Thoth as especially closely associated with Osiris on account of his assistance in raising the dead god to life. Khonsu, however, is not merely a Moon-God, but also a Sun-God, being associated with Rā, and accordingly his association with Osiris naturally follows. Sourdille further tells us that the moon was regarded by the Egyptians as the left eye of heaven and the sun as the right, and that as the moon reflects the light of the sun, especially when at the full, the Sun-God, Rā-Osiris, appears to be united with it.[4] This attracted particular attention at the spring season, and we learn from Plutarch that there was a feast celebrated on the first of Phamenoth called the entering of Osiris into the Moon.

Another very important aspect of Osiris was that of Water-God or god of the Nile. This is not wholly unconnected with his character of Moon-God. For, as we have already seen in the case of Soma and Dionysos, the moon is popularly supposed to be the giver of dew and moisture. But his association with the

[1] See *Adonis, Attis and Osiris*.

[2] See p. 129 of his *Hérodote et la Religion de L'Égypte*.

[3] J. G. Milne, in his article on *The Greek Gods in Egypt*, says: "Thoth was a moon-god, and had been united in Upper Egypt with another moon-god, Khonsu."

[4] See pp. 129-30.

Nile as the great fertilizer of Egypt is primarily, of course, a part of his character of vegetation-deity. Brugsch, who sees in Osiris a god of fertility and also of the Winter Sun, regards his identification with the Nile as due to the fact that its waters retire from the land about the season of winter when they have prepared the way for the coming harvest.[1] In fact, Osiris and Isis represent the Nile and the Earth fertilized by it.[2] This character of the god is clearly shown in the tablet of Ramses IV already alluded to, where he is thus addressed: "Verily thou art the Nile, great upon the banks at the time of the beginning of the season; man and gods live by the moisture which comes from thee." M. Naville, indeed, declares that this was his primary character,[3] and, together with Wallis-Budge, regards Hapi also as equivalent to the Nile. If this be so, then Apis the Bull-God represents very much the same notion of the bull as the type of a river-god and fertility-god, which, as we know, prevailed in ancient Greece. Plutarch, needless to say, seizes on this aspect to prove the identity of Dionysos Ὕης and Osiris, even attempting, after the light-hearted fashion of his day in dealing with questions of philology, to connect the name of the Egyptian god, which he gives as Ὕσιρις, with ὗειν.[4] For, as he tells us, Osiris is not merely the Nile but the source of all moisture.

We may now sum up the various aspects of Osiris, and consider how far he may be regarded as one and the same with Dionysos. In the first place Osiris seems to have been, like the Greek god, a vegetation-deity, the lord of plants and crops, and, as such, associated with the realm of the dead. Subsequently, but still at a time long before the Aryan onset on Egypt in the 18th Dynasty, *i.e.*, before 1500 B.C., he became identified with the Sun-God, Rā. This new character, then, had nothing to do with Aryan influence and cannot, like that of Serapis, have been itself derived from any confusion with the aspects of Dionysos. But the fact that Rā tended to absorb and confuse all the Egyptian deities and their special characteristics should prevent us from attaching undue importance to any characteristics of Osiris connected with the association with Rā. Thus Frazer tells us that the numerous identifications of different deities in Egypt which, as has been stated at the beginning of this chapter, were liable to cause such confusion in dealing with the problems of Egyptian mythology "sprang from attempts to unify and amalgamate the many local cults of Egypt." He further says that "of the deities who thus acted as centres of attraction, absorbing in themselves a multitude of minor divinities, by far the most important was the Sun-God, Rā. There appear to have been few gods in Egypt who were not at one time or other identified with him." This tendency is seen, also, to some extent in Aryan myths. And just as Soma and Dionysos are identified with the Sun, and, on this account, become regarded as Creators and Lords of the Universe, so too the association of Osiris with Rā assigns him the position of "the creator of the world, which he formed with his hand, of its water, its air, its plants, all its cattle," etc.[1] But the association of Soma and Dionysos with the Sun stands on a different footing. For mythology connects each closely with Fire, and we have the same legend in each case as to the birth of the god amid flame. The origin of this legend is made very plain by examination of the Vedic ritual, and the connection of Soma with Agni, the God of Light, is naturally close, inasmuch as the god of the sacrifice must inevitably be united with the Flame of the Sacrificial fire. Hence the identi-

[1] He thinks that the periodic falling of the Nile during the winter-season brought about a comparison with Osiris in as far as "die abnehmenden Wasser in die Zeit der winterlichen Aussaat fielen und die fruchtbarste Haupternte im ganzen Jahre vorbereiteten."

[2] M. Sourdille (pp. 72-3) regards this as a development of his character of plant-god and vegetation-deity, but adds, with reference to his identification with the Nile, "soit que cette conception ait été une spéculation des prêtres d'Héliopolis, soit beaucoup plutôt qu'Osiris se soit confondu avec un dieu Nil, probablement le bélier ou bouc de Mendès." From this we may see the difficulty of making any definite statements as to the aspects of Egyptian deities.

[3] Cp. "Il est certain qu'Osiris est d'abord l'élément humide, le Nil, et c'est pourquoi dans une des listes de l'Ennéade, il est remplacé par Nou" (*i.e.*, the primaeval watery mass).

[4] See chapter XXXIV: *καὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ὗην* (sc. *καλοῦσι*), *ὡς κύριον τῆς ὑγρᾶς φύσεως, οὐχ ἕτερον ὄντα τοῦ Ὀσίριδος. καὶ γὰρ τὸν Ὄσιριν Ἑλλάνικος Ὕσιριν ἔοικεν ἀκηκοέναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερέων λεγόμενον. οὕτω γὰρ ὀνομάζων διατελεῖ τὸν θεόν, εἰκότως ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως καὶ τῆς εὑρέσεως.*



[1] The above is taken from a translation of an inscription of the 18th dynasty on p. 213 of Weidemann's *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*.

fication of Soma with the Light-God is to be differently regarded from that of Osiris with the Egyptian Sun-God. For in the latter case the identification is merely fortuitous and not due to any special ritual connection of Osiris with Rā.

As concerns the moon-aspect of Osiris, this may be considered either as part of his character of a vegetation-god, or else as arising from his association with Rā. In the latter case its importance as a feature of his character is not very great. With Soma, on the other hand, this aspect is very clearly marked, and is directly derived from the Vedic ritual where the golden liquid in the sacrificial vessel suggests an immediate comparison with the moon.

With reference to the animals associated with Osiris, we have seen that, with the exception of the Hawk, which is properly a solar animal, and perhaps the Ram, Dionysos and Osiris have hardly anything in common.

Again, the character of God of War and Loud Noise cannot be proved as existing in the case of Osiris; while his cult reveals practically no parallel to the milder aspects of Dionysos, such as those of God of Music, Healing, and Wisdom. For it is only in virtue of Osiris' association with Thoth that he can claim to be considered as a God of Wisdom and Music. And the physician-aspect of Serapis only arises from a confusion with another Apis, viz., the son of Phoroneus, and has nothing whatever to do with the character of Hapi the Bull-God, even if the latter can be regarded as a form of Osiris.

Finally, the Wind-God aspect of Dionysos is unknown in the case of Osiris, and, as has already been noted, the latter is nowhere considered as a deity of intoxication, nor even, on the evidence of Egyptian authorities, as a wine-god.

In the *ceremonies* connected with the cult of Osiris we have, on the contrary, a closer resemblance to the worship of Dionysos. Thus, Foucart tells us that the Chytroi resemble the Egyptian practice of offerings of food to the dead and of prayers to Osiris; though it must be admitted that such customs prevail in other countries, and that Osiris as god of the dead would naturally receive prayers on their behalf. The Eleusinia and Anthesteria may, however, show signs of Egyptian influence, nor is this improbable in regard to the former festival, at least when we recollect the extreme antiquity of Eleusis and that it must always have been of easy access to Egyptian sailors and traders, as Foucart points out. In conclusion, the feast of Koiak with its torchlight processions and revelry bears a close resemblance to the Hindu feast known as *dīpālī*, so that it may be difficult to say whether the torches at the Eleusinia and revels connected with the worship of Dionysos at certain Attic festivals are derived from Egypt or from farther East.



But when all these points have been examined it may be allowed that we have not the same close parallel between the cults of Dionysos and Osiris that we have found to exist in the case of the former god and Soma. On this account it may be well to recall the warning of Lenormant against the mistake of being too prone to identify cults which merely present certain common features. Thus he tells us, with reference to the question of the identification of Dionysos and Demeter with Osiris and Isis, that it would be necessary, either to be able to derive the names of the Greek from those of the Egyptian deities—a thing which cannot be done—or else to show that the legends connected with them are not merely analogous, but identical, with the same followers and secondary personages.[1] Yet we have seen that there are many striking discrepancies between the Greek and Egyptian cults, while the most salient features of the worship of Dionysos are lacking in that of Osiris. And where do we find in the cult of Osiris a parallel to the Centaurs, Hyades and Nereids, such as is presented by the Gandharvas and Apsarasas of Vedic mythology?

But, before coming to any definite conclusion concerning the relative claims of Soma and Osiris to the position of prototype

[1] Cp. "Pour admettre que Dionysos soit Osiris venu d'Égypte, ou Déméter soit Isis, il faudrait ou que les noms des divinités grecques pussent être dérivés de ceux des divinités égyptiennes, ce qui n'est pas, ou que leurs légendes fussent non pas analogues, mais identiques, avec le même cortège d'acteurs secondaires. Il est singulier que l'exégèse mythologique se soit complu à expliquer les ressemblances par des emprunts bien plus longtemps que la linguistique. Pour justifier le recours de cette hypothèse, il ne suffit pas de la constatation d'une ressemblance entre deux mots ou deux mythes : il faut tout un faisceau d'analogies et d'homophonies."

of Dionysos, it will be well to inquire at what time the cult of Dionysos was first practised in Greece, and, if not indigenous there, from what quarter it can have arrived. As regards the date of its appearance opinions are divided, but the majority of authorities favour the view that the cult was known in Greece some time during the second millenium B.C. Farnell, for instance, though noting, as we have seen, that Dionysos "plays no ancestral part in the early genealogies," and that "certain communities preserved a tradition of his late arrival, and the opposition that his rites provoked,"[1] and that "he seems to have no recognized place in the Homeric Pantheon," being only mentioned four times, and in those portions that are supposed to belong to the latest stratum,[2] declares that "there are reasons for thinking the god had entered Attica before the date of the Ionic settlement in Asia Minor." This would put the arrival of the cult in Attica some time before the thirteenth century B.C.[3] He refers to the fact that the Lenean festival—celebrated by the "King" Archon, and hence of early date—gave its name to the month Lenaeon which appeared in the calendar of all the Ionian States instead of the more familiar and later name of Gamelion. Another evidence of the early date of the cult mentioned by him is the association of Theseus and Ariadne with the old Dionysiac festival of the Oschophoria. Langlois, who in his *Mémoire* considers Cadmus as the introducer of the cult, states, on the authority of Herodotus,[4] that it must have made its appearance in Greece about the sixteenth century B.C. Maury, on the other hand, though profoundly convinced of its Vedic origin, and therefore likely to regard it as of considerable antiquity, speaks of it as occupying only a secondary position in Homer, and refers to Herodotus as saying that Dionysos was the most modern of the Hellenic gods[5]—a statement which

[1] See *The Cults of the Greek States*, vol. V. chap. IV. p. 85.

[2] See pp. 88-9.

[3] See Bury's *History of Greece*.

[4] See Bk. II., c. 145: Διονύσῳ μὲν τῷ ἐκ Σεμέλης τῆς Κάδμου λεγομένῳ γενέσθαι κατὰ ἑξακόσια ἔτεα καὶ χίλια μάλιστά ἐστι ἐς ἐμέ, κ. τ. λ.

[5] See Bk. II., c. 52: ἔπειτα δὲ χρόνου πολλοῦ διεξελθόντος ἐπύθοντο ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἀπιγμένα τὰ οὐνόματα τῶν θεῶν τῶν ἄλλων, Διονύσου δὲ ὕστερον πολλῷ ἐπύθοντο (sc. οἱ Πελασγοί).



does not in itself imply that Herodotus regarded the cult as of recent date.

Professor Bury would put its introduction into Northern Greece about the eighth century B.C., and does not consider that it began to extend throughout Greece till about the sixth century. Miss Harrison, also, in her *Prolegomena*, emphasises the view that Dionysos is a late comer into Greece, and would assign to his arrival much the same period as that given by Professor Bury. Kern, similarly, writing in Pauly's Lexicon, seems to think that the cult made its way into Greece between the eighth and sixth centuries B.C.

Foucart, on the contrary, tells us that Athenian traditions placed the arrival of Dionysos in Attica in the fifteenth century,[1] and alludes to the evidence of Thucydides, Herodotus and Strabo, to the effect that the Ionian colonies which started from Attica brought with them to the coasts of Asia Minor the cult of the Eleusinian Demeter and the feast of Dionysos celebrated on the twelfth of Anthesterion,[2] showing that before the Ionian migration these two deities made part of the Athenian religion. He also reminds us that in the inscriptions of the Tetrapolis of Marathon we have a proof that the Athenians practised the cult of Dionysos before the reign of Theseus.

Now it is clear that, in spite of the absence of frequent allusion to Dionysos in Homer, the cult must have actually existed in pre-Homeric times. For, from the evidence referred to by Dr. Farnell and M. Foucart it is manifest that the ritual was known in Attica some time during the second millenium B.C. But it would seem as if, from some cause or another, the cult thus early practised in Greece lost favour some time before the date of the Homeric poems, *i.e.*, about the ninth century B.C.

[1] See *Le Culte de Dionysos en Attique*, chap. III.

[2] Cp. Strabo, Bk. XIV., c. 1: Ἄρξαι δέ φησιν (sc. Φερεκύδης) Ἀνδροκλον τῆς τῶν Ἰώνων ἀποικίας, . . . υἱὸν γνήσιον Κόδρου τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀθηνῶν· γενέσθαι τοῦτον Ἐφέσου κτίστην· . . . καὶ ἔτι νῦν οἱ ἐκ τοῦ γένους ὀνομάζονται βασιλεῖς, ἔχοντές τινας τιμάς, προεδρίαν τε ἐν ἀγῶσι, καὶ πορφύραν ἐπίσημον τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γένους, . . . καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τῆς Ἐλευσινίας Δήμητρος. See also Thuc., Bk. II., c. 15: καὶ τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου, ᾧ τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια τῇ δωδεκάτῃ ποεῖται ἐν μηνὶ Ἀνθεστηριῶνι, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἀπ Ἀθηναίων Ἴωνες ἔτι καὶ νῦν νομίζουσιν. And Herodot., I. 148.

We know, however, that in the sixth century it was widely spread throughout Greece, and at Athens Peisistratus at this time displayed particular zeal in the promotion of the worship of Dionysos. If the cult were indigenous and of remote antiquity, as some suppose, it is difficult to conceive how it could ever have tended to disappear, only to reappear again in increased splendour. That is to say, an ancient indigenous cult might easily lose ground almost altogether in course of time, but would hardly be likely to be revived vigorously several hundred years later. If, on the other hand, it was introduced from abroad, it might quite naturally wane for a time and even seem to forget its own origin, becoming later suddenly renewed when once again the nation responsible for its introduction was brought into close contact with Hellas.

Let us now try to see which of the three peoples that would seem most likely to have effected its introduction, viz., the Thracians, Egyptians, and Aryan Asiatics, were the original worshippers of Dionysos. Of these the Egyptians would appear, according to Foucart, to have been in contact with the Greek world and the islands of the Aegean about the end of the sixteenth century B.C. This would tally with the date of the introduction of the Dionysiac cult into Athens. We have had reason, however, to remark that there are some important points of difference between the cults of Osiris and Dionysos. Again, we have scanty ground for inferring a particularly close intercourse between Greece and Egypt during the eighth, seventh, and sixth centuries, such as we should naturally expect if we are to account for the marked revival of the Dionysiac cult about this time by supposing that it was originally derived from Egypt and subsequently re-established and extended in popularity under the same influence. We know, it is true, of the foundation of Naucratis about the middle of the seventh century by Asiatic Greeks, and we have monumental evidence of the presence of Greek mercenaries at Abusimbel near the beginning of the sixth. Under Amasis, also, Greek influence in Egypt was strong; but all this evidence rather points to the possibility of the presence of Greek ideas in Egypt than of Egyptian ideas in Greece.

In the case of Asiatic influence on Greece, on the other hand, the circumstances are different. For the effects of the contact between Greek and Asiatic, begun by the Aryan emigrations just about the period when Egypt is supposed to have first come into touch with Greek civilization, or even earlier, and continued by the Ionian migrations and the subsequent prolonged rivalry between the Persian power and the Asiatic Greeks, were by no means slight or evanescent. So far-reaching, indeed, had the influence of Asia on her western neighbour become by the time of the fourth century B.C., that the Greeks themselves loudly protested that Persia had invaded nearly every branch of their culture. To this we have no parallel in regard to Egypt. For it is mainly due to the efforts of a few travellers and enquirers, such as Herodotus and Plutarch, to prove a close connection between Greek and Egyptian ideas that we are led to believe that Egypt exercised any considerable influence on Greek thought. Their conscious attempts to connect Greece and Egypt might even in themselves arouse suspicion, the methods employed, *e.g.*, by Herodotus, often reminding us of the strained philological imaginings of Varro. Very different is the credence to be given to a voice, such as that of Aristophanes, full of indignant disgust at the omnipresent Median influence in Greece, or to the actual historical evidence of political intrigues extending over a period of centuries between Persia and Greece.



Again, if we assume that Dionysos and Osiris are one and the same, how do we account for the existence of a deity such as the Vedic Soma bearing a still closer likeness to Dionysos even than the Egyptian god, unless, indeed, we are prepared to assume that, like "Elizabeth, Elspeth, Betsy and Bess" of the nursery rhyme, they are all one? But the conception is too complex not to differ in points of detail, and these differences have already been noted, proving that, if the notion of a vegetation-god is common to many countries, and presents many of the same features in each, yet that there are many important modifications to be observed which set apart one deity from the other as the peculiar property of this or that people.

Accordingly, while we have two great objections to the theory which would make Osiris the prototype of Dionysos, viz., (1) the existence of an Asiatic god who resembles the Greek deity in

every respect, (2) the absence of close contact between Greece and Egypt, it would not be right to reject absolutely the view that Osiris has influenced the cult of Dionysos in some degree. Doubtless, as M. Foucart holds, the Eleusinian Mysteries may have been affected by the worship of Osiris and Isis. For instance, the importance of Demeter at Eleusis may be due to "contamination" with the cult of Isis; unless we accept the view that the mysteries primarily belonged to her, and that Dionysos was merely an interloper—a fact which is true to some extent. At all events, we cannot see any equivalent in the worship of Soma to Demeter. Similarly, the association of Dionysos with the ivy recalls the consecration of this plant to Osiris by the Egyptians. And here, again, we have no exact parallel in the case of the Vedic Soma. Unless, therefore, we are willing to regard the ivy as the representation of any creeping plant, and as having no special significance, we are confronted by the problem of accounting for its presence in both the Greek and Egyptian cults, while it is, as far as I know, absent in the Vedic. These are, however, minor points, and hardly compel us to consider them as tokens of the Egyptian origin of Osiris; while as regards Demeter and her association with Dionysos we may have to deal with Pelasgian rather than with Oriental influence of any sort.

We have, however, to consider yet another problem, viz., that of the "Thracian" or, as he is sometimes called, the "Thrako-Phrygian" Dionysos. In this double title, "Thracian" or "Thrako-Phrygian," lies the whole crux of the question of the Thracian origin of Dionysos. It has, indeed, been admitted by one of the chief supporters of the Thracian origin of the cult that we know "extraordinarily little" of the Thracian Dionysos. Much, indeed, of their information concerning the worship of this deity is derived from Phrygia. For it is claimed that the Phrygians are a Thracian stock, having migrated into Asia from Europe. Recent archaeologists, however, incline to the belief that the earliest migrations of this Aryan stock were in the contrary direction. If this be so, we should rather speak of the Thracians as a Phrygian stock, and the term "Phrygian" Dionysos would be more accurate. Phrygian speech was, as we



have seen, very closely akin to Sanskrit, and we noted at least one striking example of this in connection with the very name of the Bacchic deity. Nor should it surprise us to find in Soma but another name for the Phrygian Dionysos. The central situation of Phrygia, too, is peculiarly favourable as a starting-place for the migration of the Soma-cult into Crete and the Aegean Islands, and thence to Southern Greece; while the worship of the god in Thrace may be accounted for, either by the theory that it was indigenous there and spread down into Phrygia, or else, which would appear to fit in better with modern archaeological research, that it was brought north from Phrygia into Thrace during those early migrations of the Aryans into Europe which took place during the second millenium B.C. This last view, indeed, was the opinion of M. Langlois as far back as 1852, when he strongly insisted on the fact that the worship of Soma came into Greece *via* Thrace, and regarded Cadmus as the introducer of the religion on account of his mythical association with Dionysos. He held that Cadmus was a Thracian by adoption, who settled in Boeotia even before the first Egyptian colonies arrived in Greece, and he rebutted the notion of Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, and Plutarch that the Dionysiac cult came from Egypt.[1] There is no doubt that, as Langlois[2] points out, there is a striking similarity between the name Bryges or Phrygians and the mythical Indian tribe of Brighus, who were the predecessors of Manu, the first of the

[1] See his *Mémoire*, where, speaking of the Aryan emigrations, he states that whatever may have been the route of these hordes towards Thrace "il semble certain que c'est de là qu'à diverses reprises des races différentes descendirent dans la Grèce. Mais surtout c'est de la Thrace que vint aux Grecs la civilisation religieuse; c'est de la Thrace qu'arrive à Delphes ce personage, réel ou symbolique, qu'on appelle Cadmus, comme c'est dans la Thrace qu'il retourne (Apollodorus, III. c. V.). Quand les colonies égyptiennes se presentèrent le pays était peuplé." Langlois shows that, according to Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* (Bk. IV.), Cadmus is represented as setting out for Delphi from Thrace, and notes the fact that, according to Pausanias (IX. c. V.) he allies himself with the Aonians.

[2] Langlois holds that the Bryges had *very early come westward to Thrace*, and then "plus tard crurent devoir se rapatrier," *i.e.*, by going back to Asia from Thrace. For the Brighus and their connection with Fire, see *Vedic India*, pp. 164 and 364.

human race, and were, as their name reveals, the discoverers of Fire.

But the great champion of the theory of the Thracian origin is undoubtedly Lobeck. With him there is no question of any other Dionysos than the Thracian, and he would consequently explain the theory of the many Dionysi as indicating the discrepancies in the ritual of the god as practised by different sects. He holds that the cult came into Greece "one or two centuries after the time of Homer," and thinks that nearly all the Homeric references to Dionysos are spurious. But this view is disproved by the monumental and ritual evidence adduced for the existence of the worship in Attica from the time of Theseus. And here it should be noted that in general the supporters of the theory of the Thracian origin tend to put the date of the introduction of the cult into Greece far too late. The obvious inference is that they have no very clear proof of the practice of the cult in Thrace previous to the date of the Homeric poems. This would in itself be a strong argument against their view, were it not that the Thracians, being a barbarous people, could not be expected to leave such clear literary and monumental evidence of their practice of the cult in remote times, as we find in the case of the more civilized Athenians, who possessed organized feasts and ceremonies from the middle of the second millenium B.C. When, however, Lobeck points to the mention of Lycurgus in connection with the introduction of the worship into Thrace as a proof of his theory, we can hardly agree with him. For if anything could plainly show that Dionysos was *not* an indigenous god of Thrace it is just this legend, according to which he meets on his arrival there with a hostile reception at the hands of the Thracian king. Indeed, I venture to say that this very legend disposes of all possibility of the *ultimate* Thracian origin of the worship. Moreover, according to a well-known passage in Herodotus[1] the Scythians did not originally practise the cult except the Borysthenites, who, as he tells us significantly enough, were formerly natives of the Asiatic city of Miletus; and, when their king adopted the customs of the latter tribe, he thereby caused great indignation among his

[1] See Herod. IV., cc. 78-9.



subjects, who went so far as to rise in rebellion against him on this account. When, however, Lobeck points to the close association of Orpheus with the cult he is on surer ground.[1] Yet even so we cannot be certain that Orpheus represents merely the primitive Thracian worshippers of the god. For the connection of Orpheus with Crete is just as well attested, as some of the chief supporters of the Thracian theory point out. Thus, Dr. Farnell tells us that "the orgiastic Thrako-Phrygian religion may have penetrated to Crete at a very early time, perhaps directly from Phrygia before the Hellenic races gained a footing in this island; and this may account for the prominence in Cretan worship of the child-god, the son of the Great Earth-Mother," etc. He thinks that the Omophagia in Crete "descended from the aboriginal period" of the religion, and that the higher forms of Orphism were there developed at an early date, adding that "the island could even claim to be the cradle of the sect of Orpheus." Similarly, Miss Harrison,[2] though holding that "Orpheus, before the dawn of history, had made his home in Thrace," thinks that he may have arrived there from Crete, and says that an examination of the mysteries of Orphism will probably lead to the conclusion that Crete was the home of the sect.

[1] See *Aglaophamus*, p. 290: "perspicuum est, oram maritimam, quae ab Hebri ostiis ad Pindum protenditur, quasi domestico sacrorum Bacchicorum solo habitam esse," and, "Illa vero ipsa Thraciae loca, quae Bacchi sacris insignita sunt, etiam Orphei vestigia plurima ostendunt" (p. 294). Also pp. 297 to 298: "Interim, quoniam non constat, Pierum, Paeonum, aliarumque gentium migrationibus novos ritus introductos esse, concedamus licet, sacra Bacchica a Thraciae incolis antiquitus ascita et Graecis fama tenus cognita ipsique Homero . . . ante oculos fuisse."

[2] See *Prolegomena*, pp. 459 ff. Note that in her most recent work, *Themis*, she strongly insists on the Oriental side of Orphism, attributing to Persian influence the Orphic emphasis on Dike, which she holds is the same as the Vedic *ṛta* and Avestan *asha*, or the Way which is also the Right. Speaking of Oriental influences in Greek Philosophy and Art after the Persian Wars, she says: "We shall find confirmation of this view if we look at another movement of the sixth century B.C., the movement known as Orphic. Orphic religion contains within itself much that is indigenous. Its main *fond* is primitive Aegean religion. . . . But what differentiates it out from the rest of the popular religion of Greece is, I have long believed, certain imported elements of Oriental and mainly Iranian nature-worship and formal mysticism."

As to the association of Orpheus with Dionysos, different views prevail. Some, like M. Reinach,[1] regard him as a variant for Dionysos, and consequently as a mythical being; others, as Miss Harrison, consider him merely as the founder of the cult. The evidence of the ancients, *e.g.*, Apollodorus,[2] Apollonius Rhodius[3] and Diodorus Siculus[4] would place his date somewhere about the period of the Trojan War, and the greatest doubt exists as to the date and authorship of the Orphic poems.

Similarly, various interpretations have been given by scholars of the name Orpheus itself. Thomaschek[5] considers it as representing a Phrygian form, *Orbheu, akin to the Sanskrit *ṛbhvan*, *i.e.*, "artistic," "skilful," and this would connect it with the ancient Hindu semi-divine craftsmen, the Ṛibhus. This derivation, needless to say, commands the approval of Oriental scholars, among them Monier-Williams. These Ṛibhus are said to have performed the great feat of dividing Soma, the Moon, into its four phases and so to have won for themselves immortality, and the right to be present at all Soma-sacrifices.[6] This derivation, accordingly,

[1] He regards the violent death of Orpheus as parallel to the σπαραγμός of Dionysos and notes that the cults of Orpheus and Dionysos are united, if not associated, in a number of places, viz., on Pangaeus, on Mt. Haemus, at Smyrna, and on Mt. Helicon, and he alludes to the famous passage in Herodotus in which the latter seems to identify the Ὀρφικά and the Βακχικά. With reference to Plutarch's comparison between Dionysos and Osiris (see *De Isid. et Osir.*, c. 13) because both are accounted skilled in song and music, he says: "Mais la mythologie ne fait pas de Dionysos un musicien; Plutarque a sans doute voulu parler d'Orphée, considéré comme une hypostase de Dionysos." We can hardly agree with this view of M. Reinach concerning Dionysos' character of a Music-God, when we recall his presidency over musical festivals at Athens. A good explanation of this aspect of the god, as we have already seen, is to be found in the Vedic Soma-ritual.

[2] See I. 9. 16, where Orpheus' name occurs in the list of Argonauts, together with those of Telamon and Peleus.

[3] *Argonautica*, Bk. I., ll. 23-4, where his Thracian origin is referred to.

[4] Bk. IV., c. 25: *οὗτος γὰρ ἦν υἱὸς μὲν Οἰάγρου, Θρᾳξὶ δὲ τὸ γένος· . . . Συνεστρατεύσατο δὲ καὶ τοῖς Ἀργοναύταις, κ. τ. λ.*

[5] See Gruppe's article in Roscher's *Lexicon*, vol. III., p. 1062.

[6] See *Vedic India*, pp. 249-50; and *Bṛhad-Devatā*, III., 83-90. Reinach rejects this idea and connects "Orpheus" with ὀρφνός, regarding him as probably in origin a god of the underworld, and comparable in this character with Dionysos *νυκτέλιος*. So, too, Gruppe who holds that his original habitat and that of Dionysos was near Hyrie and Anthedon, in the East of Boeotia.



would afford a tempting explanation of the connection of Orpheus with Dionysos to those who hold the theory that Soma and Dionysos are identical. But it is better, perhaps, to regard the name Orpheus as akin to ὄρφνη, ὀρφναῖος, and as signifying his association with the mysteries of the dark underworld. Certainly, as we have seen, the chthonian element in the cult of Dionysos was largely a feature of the Orphic teaching.

But the really important question for our present purpose in connection with the subject of Orpheus concerns the places associated with the sect. A fairly general agreement exists as to the connection of Orpheus with Thrace and Macedon as evinced by the legends regarding his parentage. Besides these places we hear also of his association with the coast of Asia Minor, *e.g.*, in Smyrna, with the islands of the Aegean, *e.g.*, Lesbos and Samothrace, with the Dorian districts of Aegina and Taenaron, in the centre of Greece with Delphi, and in Attica with Eleusis and Phlya. Finally, according to Pausanias (IX. 30. 6), his descent into the underworld is associated by the Thesprotians with their own territory; while it is well known that in Magna Graecia his sect was established at Croton.[1] With the exception of Thesprotia, all these regions are associated with Dionysos also, traces of whose worship from early times have been found in practically all the islands of the Aegean—*e.g.* at Naxos, Samos, Chios, Lesbos, Thera, Rhodes, Tenedos, Andros, Cos and Crete; along the coast of Asia Minor—*e.g.* at Lampsacus, Magnesia, Smyrna, Erythrae, Teos, Tralles and in Pamphylia; throughout a great part of the Peloponnesus—*e.g.* in Corinth, Sicyon and Argolis; in Laconia, at Sparta and Amyclae; in Arcadia, at Phigaleia and Heraea; in Elis and Achaia; in Central Greece at Delphi, in Boeotia, in Thessaly, where he was worshipped at Pagasae as πελάγιος, and in Attica and Megara.[2] The legend of King Oeneus connects Dionysos with Calydon and Pleuron also; and it should be noted further that his worship was known at Naples and Metapontum, where it was closely associated with Orphism.

With the practice of the cult in Sicily as an evidence of its

[1] See article in Roscher's *Lexicon*, vol. III., pp. 1082 ff.

[2] See article in Pauly's *Lexicon* by Kern.

association with the West we are little concerned; for in this quarter its introduction would be of comparatively late date and brought by colonists from the mainland of Greece and the islands of the Aegean. But it is exceedingly interesting to observe that *nowhere on the west coast of Greece north of the Peloponnese* do we hear of any legends connected with the cult, except at Calydon and Pleuron which are almost on the Gulf of Corinth, and closely in touch with the opposite coast. We may perhaps add to these exceptions the "Phaeacian land," *i.e.*, Corcyra, on account of the legend of the flight thither of Macris, the nurse of Dionysos, and Thesprotia, on account of the local fable which connected the descent of Orpheus to Hades with that region. Yet even these few exceptions are all on the sea-coast, and so would be in touch with the East of Greece, the Aegean Islands and Asia Minor. And it is remarkable that there is not the slightest record preserved in Greek literature, or the smallest archaeological evidence of any connection of the people of Acarnania, Ambracia, Northern Aetolia or Athamania with the cult. Yet those are just the places where we should expect to find it most deeply rooted if it were originally derived from Thrace and Macedon. For the wild tribes of those regions would be not merely far nearer geographically to Thrace than the Peloponnese and the southern islands of the Aegean, but would also be much more inclined than the more civilized southern states of Greece to adopt such a worship as that of Dionysos with its orgiastic excitement and savage rites. Surely too the "hill-born" god would be particularly at home among the Agraeans and Dolopians, nor can we think that Thucydides would fail to record the presence of an ancient worship of Dionysos in these regions in his narrative of the Athenian campaign of 426-5 B.C. against the Amphilochians and Ambraciots—especially when we see that Herodotus in his account of the campaigns of Xerxes finds time to note that, among the Thracian tribes through which he passed, the Satrae, who refused him submission and had never yet been conquered, possessed an oracle of Dionysos (Herodot. VII. 110.). Miss Harrison, indeed, in referring to this statement of Herodotus sees in the fact that the Satrae had never been conquered a clear proof of



the indigenous nature of the worship among them. She loses sight of the fact that a worship is not necessarily imposed by force, but may easily be introduced by immigrants or traders. To those who know that the latter method was the usual means by which the Soma-cult was propagated there will be no difficulty in thinking that Soma or Dionysos might at an early period have found his way into the fastnesses of the Satrae. While the fact that, according to Herodotus, their shrine of Dionysos was "situated on the topmost mountains," points to the affinity of their god with the Soma that is to be found only on the highest ranges.

I must confess that I think this negative evidence, *i.e.*, the non-mention of the cult in connection with the wild hilly regions of the North-West of Greece, a fact of the very highest importance in regard to the question of the ultimate Thracian origin. For without such negative evidence the supporters of the Thracian theory might certainly concede that Soma and Dionysos were one and the same, on account of the extraordinarily close correspondence between these deities, and yet maintain the Thracian origin of the cult, inasmuch as the popular view up till quite recently of the Aryan migrations has been that the Aryans, coming originally from somewhere in the region of the Balkans, poured southward into Greece at a later date, and eastward into Asia Minor down as far as Crete.[1] This is, in fact, what may be called the Thrako-Phrygian theory, and it would make the Thracians the proto-Aryans. But a more

[1] See *The Discoveries in Crete*, p. 191: "South Russia or Central Europe was the home of the original Indo-European race, which unaided and on its own merits, evolved the spirals of Petrény and Galicia. At the end of the Neolithic Age they moved southward across the Danube and the Balkans into Thrace. There they divided into two streams. One crossed the Hellespont and colonized Troy, the other moved down the coast of the Greek mainland. One or the other crossed into Crete, and created the Minoan culture." See also *Ionia and the East*, p. 102: "At some early epoch, however, had begun an infiltration of peoples from South-eastern Europe across the Thracian straits. I stated in my third lecture the evidence for their appearance so far back as sub-neolithic time. These gradually infused a European element into all the populations of the western peninsula, into the so-called Mysians, for example, into the Maeonians, into the Lydians, and into the Carians."

recent view alluded to by H. R. Hall, goes to show that, on the contrary, these first Aryan migrations were in an opposite direction, and that Asia was the original home of the Aryan. Hall, in fact, declares that the theory of the Asiatic origin of the Indo-European is "now coming to the front."[1] This new or newly-revived view, then, would account for the very early presence of the cult in Crete and Phrygia, if we suppose the original home or the Aryans to have been somewhere about the southern shores of the Caspian, and that they migrated during the second millenium B.C. in two directions, one, eastward to India, the other, westward into Phrygia and Crete; and that the centre of the cult of Soma-Dionysos among the western Aryans was originally in the Zagros Range, whence it spread westwards to Phrygia, and thence across the sea into Thrace, Thessaly, Boeotia, etc., while at the same time it was carried southwards to Crete and thence to the Peloponnese.

In any case we should bear in mind that the mere mention by the ancients of any place, *e.g.*, Thrace, as the *original* home of the cult goes for nothing. In fact, such mention would only signify that they received the cult from that quarter, and not unnaturally early enquirers, lacking scientific method, would tend to describe as the home of the cult the nearest place outside their own land from which it could have approached them. Accordingly, to the Greeks north of the Peloponnese Thrace

[1] See his *Discoveries in Crete and their Relation to the History of Egypt and Palestine* (1909): "We thus seem to find in Northern Greece and in Iran two closely-related stone-using cultures, of which one (*i.e.*, the Thessalian) reached the Age of Metal at a much earlier period than the other. It is not impossible that the Western branch of this Neolithic culture, which ended late, belonged to migrant tribes of the people of the Eastern branch. If this were so, it might be suggested, now that the theory of European origin for the Indo-European seems doubtful and unproved, and the old idea of an Asiatic origin is again coming to the front, that the geometric and often polychrome ceramic of Anau in Transcaspia, Moussian in Elam . . . Dimini in Thessaly, and Drachmani and Chaironeia in Boeotia, with the nearly related polychrome ceramic of Galicia and South Russia, represents the oldest art of the Indo-Europeans," etc. For the theory of the Asiatic origin of the Indo-Europeans he refers to Meyer, *Gesch. des Alterthums*, I. ii. (second edit. 1909), pp. 184 ff., to which I have, unfortunately, not had access.



would appear to be the original home of the cult. Similarly, Crete and the islands of the Aegean tended to occupy the same position in regard to the Peloponnese itself. And in all these cases we find that the cult-centres are described as birthplaces of the god, or, in other words, as the first places from which the worship seemed to emanate. On the whole, however, it would seem as if Phrygia, more especially, was deemed by the ancients the starting-place of the cult. Nor is this unnatural. For we may regard it as the centre from which the Soma-cult radiated throughout the Greek world. Of the more eastern countries which it permeated, *e.g.*, India, the Greeks would naturally be ignorant at a time when their knowledge of these lands was slight; but as their intimacy with them increased we observe an increasing tendency to attribute the origin of the cult to the East.

To conclude, we may now briefly compare the merits of the three different theories. If we accept the view that the cult came from Egypt we are compelled to recognize as the original of Dionysos a deity who, while resembling him in many points, lacks some of the most vital attributes of the Greek god. Further, we have in this case to explain the existence of a totally distinct Asiatic god, viz., Soma, who possesses all the requisite points of similarity to Dionysos, yet has nothing to do with Egypt; and, in addition, we have to account for the persistent ancient traditions of the arrival of Dionysos from the north of Greece and from Asia. Moreover, there is some difficulty in understanding why the Greeks, who were in no way related to the Egyptians and had little in common with their culture, should have specially selected the cult of Osiris for adoption.

If we accept the theory of the Thracian origin, we have also to explain the existence of a parallel such as Soma and interpret the references to the connection of Dionysos with Phrygia, Crete, and India. This can only be done by saying that the Thracians were the proto-Aryans, and that the Soma-cult, or cult of Dionysos, starting in Thrace in very remote times, spread into Asia and Greece subsequently. But, as we have already seen, we are confronted by the problem of the absence of the worship throughout the North-West of Greece, while it is to be found in

almost every other part of the Greek world, and even in Spain[1] and Italy. Beside this difficulty the problem of the non-mention of the Soma-sacrifice in Homer or elsewhere in Greek literature shrinks into insignificance. For it is evident that just about the period of the Homeric poems the cult of Dionysos was only coming into popularity, although known and practised long previously, and details of ritual would in any case be out of place in a warlike poem such as the Iliad. In the Odyssey, certainly, we might expect such a reference (inasmuch as the famous passage known as the *Nekuia* gives us a lengthy description of propitiatory rites connected with the dead), if, indeed, it were true that the Greeks ever practised the Soma-sacrifice. But it does not necessarily follow that they adopted this sacrificial form of worship for general use. We must remember that, as Maury and Langlois hold, Soma on entering Greece became a wine-god, or in other words, the vehicle of intoxication was changed from the Soma to wine. The elaborate chants of the priests were, it may be conceived, preserved in the form of cult-epithets, and the metaphors applied by them to the Soma crystallized into the picturesque myths attached to the legend of Dionysos. These, then, represented all that was popularly known in Greece of the sacrificial rites connected with the preparation of the Soma, while possibly at the Eleusinia and the other feasts associated with Dionysos the more esoteric doctrine of the sacrifice may have survived in certain religious ceremonies of which we at the present day are ignorant, and can only infer their existence from the scattered reminiscences of ancient ritual that have come down to us.

[1] See Pliny's *Natural History*, Bk. III. 6, as follows: "In universam Hispaniam M. Varro pervenisse Hiberos et Persas et Phoenicas Celtasque et Poenos tradit; Lusum enim Liberi patris aut lyssam cum eo bacchantium nomen dedisse Lusitaniae, et Pana praefectum eius universae." In spite of the absurdity of Varro's philology the quotation is interesting as showing the connection of Dionysos with the East. Observe that the Spanish historian, Hurtado de Mendoza, in his *Guerra de Granada*, Book IV., p. 161, understands the passage as referring to the arrival of Dionysos in Spain after his conquest of India, thus: "Marco Varron, autor gravissimo, y diligente en buscar los principios de los pueblos, dice (segun Plinio refiere) que en España vinieron los persas, iberos y fenices, todas naciones de Oriente con Baco. Por este se entiende tambien haber sido hecha la empresa de la India," etc.



The theory of Maury and Langlois, on the other hand, will allow of the epithet Thracian being applied to Dionysos in the sense that his worship was firmly established in Thrace in very distant times, and was first brought to North-East Greece from that quarter; while at the same time it will answer practically all the most difficult questions connected with the cult, and may even be consistent with the admission of a certain amount of Egyptian influence at the Eleusinia.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## (A.)—CLASSICAL AUTHORS


AESCHYLUS: *Agamemnon*, edit. by A. Sidgwick (Clar. Press, 1890).
*Choephoroe*, edit. by A. Sidgwick (Clar. Press, 1892).
*Eumenides*, edit. by A. Sidgwick (Clar. Press, 1895).
*Persae*, edit. by A. Sidgwick (Clar. Press, 1903).
*Septem Contra Thebas*, edit. by A. Sidgwick (Clar. Press, 1903).
*Supplices*, edit. by T. G. Tucker (Macmillan, 1889).
ANTHOLOGY, SELECT EPIGRAMS FROM THE GREEK: edit. by J. W. Mackail (Longmans, Green and Co., 1907).
APOLLODORUS: *Bibliotheca* (Leipzig, 1877).
APOLLONIUS RHODIUS: *Argonautica*, edit. by R. C. Seaton (Oxford Text).
*The Argonauts*, by A. S. Way (Dent and Co., London).
ARATUS: *Phaenomena*, ed. E. Maass (Berlin, 1893).
ARISTOPHANES: *Acharnians*, edit. by W. J. M. Starkie (Macmillan, 1909).
*Birds*, edit. by W. C. Green (Camb. Univ. Press, 1890).
*Clouds*, edit. by W. W. Merry (Clar. Press, 1899).
*Ecclesiazusae*, edit. by T. Bergk (Leipzig, 1852).
*Frogs*, edit. by T. G. Tucker (Macmillan, 1906).
*Peace*, edit. by W. C. Green (Longmans, London, 1873).
ARISTOTLE: *De Anima*, ed. G. Biehl (Leipzig, 1911).
*De Coelo*, ed. C. Prantl (Leipzig, 1881).
*Metaphysics*, ed. W. Christ (Leipzig, 1903).
*Poetics*, edit. by S. H. Butcher (Macmillan, 1907).
*Politics*, edit. by R. Broughton (Oxford Text, 1876).
*Rhetoric*, edit. by J. E. Sandys (Camb. Univ. Press, 1877).
ARRIAN: *Anabasis*, (Leipzig, 1869).
ATHENAEUS: *Deipnosophistae* (Leipzig, 1888).
——— ——— edidit Kaibel (Leipzig, 1890).
AULUS GELLIUS: *Noctes Atticae* (Leipzig, 1887).
BACCHYLIDES: edit. by R. C. Jebb (Camb. Univ. Press, 1905).

CERCIDAS: *Meliambi*, in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part VIII, edit. by A. S. Hunt (London, 1911).
CICERO: *Brutus*, edit. by M. Kellogg (Ginn and Co., 1902).
*De Natura Deorum*, ed. C. F. W. Mueller (Leipzig, 1887).
*Letters*, Vol. I., edited by R. Y. Tyrrell (Dublin Univ. Press, 1885).
*Orator*, edit. by J. E. Sandys (Camb. Univ. Press, 1885).
CTESIAS: *Fragments of the Persika*, edit. by J. Gilmore (London, 1888).
DEMOSTHENES: *De Corona*, edit. by A. Holmes (Catena Classic. Series, 1892).
DIODORUS SICULUS: *Bibliotheca Historica* (Leipzig, 1875).
DIOGENES LAERTIUS: *De Vitis Philosophorum* (Leipzig, 1895).
DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSENSIS: *Opera Rhetorica* (Leipzig, 1889).
EURIPIDES: *Bacchae*, edit by R. Y. Tyrrell (Macmillan, 1892).
*Fragmenta*, ed. Aug. Nauck (Leipzig, 1908).
*Helena*, edit. by C. S. Jerram (Clar. Press, 1882).
*Ion*, edit. by C. S. Jerram (Clar. Press, 1896).
*Iphigenia in Tauris*, edit. by C. S. Jerram (Clar. Press, 1885).
GREEK MELIC POETS, edit. by H. W. Smyth (Macmillan, 1906).
GREEK PHILOSOPHY, TEXTS TO ILLUSTRATE THE HISTORY OF, edit. by H. Jackson (Macmillan, 1901).
HERODOTUS: Bks. I-III., edit. by A. H. Sayce (Macmillan, 1883).
Bks. IV.-VI., edit. by R. W. Macan, Vols. I. and II., (Macmillan, 1895).
Bks. I.-IX., edit. by J. W. Blakesley (London, 1854).
HESIOD: edit. by F. A. Paley (Bell and Sons, London, 1883).
HISTORICI GRAECI, Vol. I., ed. C. and T. Müller (Paris, 1878).
HOMER: *Homeric Hymns*, edit. by T. W. Allen and E. Sikes (Macmillan, 1904).
*Iliad*, edit. by D. B. Munro (Clar. Press (1884-8).
*Odyssey*, edit. by W. W. Merry (Clar. Press, 1892-1901).
HORACE: *Epistles*, ed. by A. S. Wilkins (Macmillan, 1889).
ISOCRATES: ed. G. E. Benseler and F. Blass (Leipzig, 1906-7).
*Ad Demonicum et Panegyricus*, edit. by J. E. Sandys (Longmans, Green and Co., 1897).
LONGINUS: *On the Sublime*, edit. by A. O. Prickard (Oxford Text).
LYCOPHRON: *Alexandra*, ed. G. Kinkel (Leipzig, 1880).
NONNUS: *Dionysiaca*, ed. A. Koechly (Leipzig, 1857).
ORPHICA, ed. E. Abel (Leipzig, 1885).
——— ed. Hermann (Leipzig, 1805).
OVID: *Fasti*, edit. by G. H. Hallam (Macmillan, 1902).
*Metamorphoses*, in Corpus Poetarum Latinorum, edit. by G. Walker (London, 1835).



PAUSANIAS, ed. I. Bekker (Berlin, 1826).
PINDAR: *Isthmian Odes*, edit. by J. B. Bury (Macmillan, 1892).
*Nemean Odes*, edit. by J. B. Bury (Macmillan, 1890).
*Olympian and Pythian Odes*, edit. by B. L. Gildersleeve (Macmillan, 1906).
*Olympian and Pythian Odes*, edit. by C. A. M. Fennell (Camb. Univ. Press, 1879).
PLATO: *Cratylus*, ed. M. Wohlrab (Leipzig, 1908).
*Gorgias*, edit. by W. H. Thompson (G. Bell and Sons, London, 1894).
*Io and Menexenus*, ed. C. F. Hermann (Leipzig, 1898).
*Leges*, ed. G. Stallbaum (Leipzig, 1869).
*Phaedo*, edited by R. D. Archer-Hind (Macmillan, 1883).
*Phaedrus*, edit. by W. H. Thompson (G. Bell and Sons, 1868).
*Philebus*, edit. by R. G. Bury (Camb. Univ. Press, 1897).
*Republic*, edit. by J. Adam (Camb. Univ. Press, 1902).
*Sophistes and Politicus*, edit. by L. Campbell (Clar. Press, 1867).
*Theaetetus*, edit. by L. Campbell (Clar. Press, 1883).
*Timaeus*, edit. by R. D. Archer-Hind (Macmillan, 1888).
PLINY: *Naturalis Historia*, Vol. I. of D. Detlefsen's edition (Berlin, 1866).
PLUTARCH: *De EI apud Delphos*, in G. N. Bernardakis' edition of *Moralia* (Leipzig, 1891).
*Moralia* (Leipzig, 1889).
*Themistocles*, edit. by H. A. Holden (Macmillan, 1892).
POETARUM PHILOSOPHORUM FRAGMENTA, ed. H. Diels (Berlin, 1901).
QUINTILIAN: *Institutio Oratoria*, recensuit E. Bonnell (Leipzig, 1891).
SENECA: *Tragoediae*, ed. F. Leo (Berlin, 1879).
SOPHOCLES: *Antigone*, edit. by R. C. Jebb (Camb. Univ. Press, 1891).
*Oedipus Tyrannus*, edit. by R. C. Jebb (Camb. Univ. Press, 1887).
STATIUS: *Silvae*, ed. A. Klotz (Leipzig, 1900).
*Thebais*, recens. P. Kohlmann (Leipzig, 1884).
STRABO: *Rerum Geographicarum Libri XVII* (Leipzig, 1871).
THEOCRITUS: *Bucolicorum Graecor. Theocriti Bionis Moschi Reliquiae*, recensuit H. L. Ahrens (Leipzig, 1904).
*The Idylls and Epigrams*, edit. by H. Snow (Clar. Press, 1869).
THEOPHRASTUS: *Characters*, edit. by R. C. Jebb and J. E. Sandys (Macmillan, 1909).
THEOPOMPUS: *Fragments*, edit. by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (Oxford Classical Text, 1909).
THUCYDIDES, edit. by T. Arnold (Oxford, 1868).
Bk. I., edit. by W. H. Forbes (Clar. Press, 1895).

THUCYDIDES, Bks. III. and VI., edit. by A. W. Spratt (Camb. Univ. Press, 1905).
Bk. VII., edit. by H. A. Holden (Camb. Univ. Press, 1891).
TIBULLUS: *Libri Quattuor* recensuit L. Mueller (Leipzig, 1905).
*Selections from Tibullus*, edit. by J. P. Postgate (Macmillan, 1903).
TIMOTHEOS: *Persae*, ed. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Leipzig, 1903).
VALERIUS FLACCUS: *Argonautica*, ed. C. Schenkl. (Berlin, 1871).
XENOPHON: *Cyropaedia* (Leipzig, 1881).

## (B.)—WRITERS DEALING WITH CLASSICAL SUBJECTS

ADAM, J.: *The Religious Teachers of Greece* (Edinburgh, 1908).
BOYLAN, REV. P.: *Aegean Culture and the 18th Dynasty*, in the Proceedings of the Classical Association of Ireland for 1912-13.
BURNET, J.: *Early Greek Philosophy* (First and Second Editions, 1892 and 1908, London).
BURROWS, RONALD M.: *The Discoveries in Crete* (London, 1908).
BURY, J. B.: *The Ancient Greek Historians* (Macmillan, 1909).
*History of Greece* (Macmillan, 1904).
COX, SIR GEORGE W.: *The Mythology of the Aryan Nations* (Kegan Paul, Trench and Trübner, 1903).
CROISET, A. and M.: *An Abridged History of Greek Literature*, translated by Heffelbower (Macmillan, 1904).
CRUSIUS, O.: Article on the *Dithyramb* in Pauly-Wissowa's Real-Encyclopädie (Stuttgart, 1903).
CURTIUS, A. W.: *Der Stier des Dionysos* (Jena, 1882).
DUNCKER, M.: *History of Greece*, Vol. I., translated by S. F. Alleyne and E. Abbott (Bentley and Son, London, 1883).
FARNELL, LEWIS R.: *The Cults of the Greek States*, Vol. V (Oxford, Clar. Press, 1909).
*Greece and Babylon, a comparative Sketch of Mesopotamian, Anatolian and Hellenic Religions* (Edinburgh, 1911).
FOUCART, P.: *Le Culte de Dionysos en Attique* (Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscript. XXXVII), Paris, 1904.
GARDNER, ERNEST A.: *Handbook of Greek Sculpture* (Macmillan, 1897).
*Religion and Art in Ancient Greece* (London and New York, 1910).
GILES, P.: *A Short Manual of Comparative Philology*, 2nd edition (Macmillan, 1901).



GOMPERZ, THEODOR: *Greek Thinkers*, translated by L. Magnus (London, 1901).
GRAEF, B.: *De Bacchi Expeditione Indica Monumentis Expressa* (Berlin, 1886).
GRUPPE, O.: Article on *Orpheus* in Roscher's *Lexikon* (1897-1902).
HALL, H. R.: *The Discoveries in Crete and their Relation to the History of Egypt and Palestine* (reprinted from the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, December, 1909).
HARRISON, J. E.: *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (2nd edit., Camb., 1908).
*Themis* (Camb. Press, 1912).
HOGARTH, DAVID G.: *Ionia and the East* (Oxford, 1909).
HOLM, ADOLF: *History of Greece*, Vol. I (Macmillan, 1906).
JEBB, SIR R. C.: *The Attic Orators* (Macmillan, 1893, 2nd edition).
JEVONS, F. B.: *A Manual of Greek Antiquities* (London, 1895).
KERN: Article on *Dionysos* in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie* (Stuttgart, 1903).
LAWSON, J. C.: *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion* (Camb. Press, 1910).
LENORMANT, F.: *The Eleusinian Mysteries* (in the Contemporary Review).
LIDDELL and SCOTT: *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 6th edition (Oxford, 1869).
LOBECK, CHR.: *Aglaophamus*, Book II (1829).
MAHAFFY, J. P.: *A History of Classical Greek Literature* (Macmillan, 1903).
MAURY: *Histoire des Religions de la Grèce* (Paris, 1857), Vol. I.
MILNE, J. G.: *The Greek Gods in Egypt*, in the Proceedings of the Classical Association of Ireland for 1911-2.
MURRAY, GILBERT: *A History of Ancient Greek Literature* (Heinemann, London, 1897).
NILSSON, M. P.: *Studia de Dionysiis Atticis* (Linden, 1900).
NORDEN, E.: *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, Vol. I (Leipzig, 1898).
NORWOOD, G.: *The Riddle of the Bacchae* (Manchester, 1908).
PRELLER, L.: *Griechische Mythologie* (Berlin, 1872).
REINACH, SALOMON: *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*, Vol. II (Paris, 1909).
RIBBECK, OTTO: *Anfänge und Entwickelung des Dionysoscultus in Attika* (Kiel, 1869).
RIDGEWAY, W.: *The Origin of Tragedy* (Camb. Press, 1910).
ROHDE, ERWIN: *Psyche, Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen* (Leipzig, 1894).

ROSCHER, W. H.: *Lexikon der Mythologie*, Vol. I (Leipzig, 1884-6). Article on *Apis*.
STEWART, J. A.: *The Myths of Plato* (Macmillan, 1905).
VOIGT, F. A.: Article on *Dionysos* in Roscher's Lexicon (1884-6).
WHIBLEY, L.: *A Companion to Greek Studies* (Camb. Press, 1905).
WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. VON: *Greek Historical Writing* (Oxford, 1908).

## (C.)—ORIENTAL

BALLANTYNE, JAMES R.: *The Sāṅkhya Aphorisms of Kapila* (3rd edition, Trübner and Co., London, 1885).
BARNETT, L. D.: *Some Sayings from the Upanishads* (Luzac and Co., 1905).
BENFEY, T.: *Die Hymnen des Sāma-Veda*, Sanskrit Text, Notes and German Translation (Leipzig, 1848).
BÖHLEN, P. A.: The *Ritusaṇhāra* of Kālidāsa, Text and Trans. into Latin (Leipzig, 1840).
BRUGSCH, HEINRICH: *Religion und Mythologie der Alten Aegypter* (Leipzig, 1888).
BUDGE, WALLIS, E. A.: *Egyptian Ideas of the Future Life* (3rd edition, Kegan Paul, Trench and Trübner, 1908).
BURNELL, A. C., and HOPKINS, E. W.: *The Ordinances of Manu* (translated from the Sanskrit), Trübner, 1891.
C. CHIPIEZ and G. PERROT: *Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité*, Vol. V (Paris, 1890).
COLEBROOKE, H. T.: *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vols. II. and III. (London, 1873).
DEUSSEN, PAUL: *Outline of the Vedânta System of Philosophy, according to Shaṅkāra*, translated by Woods and Rundle (London, 1906).
ERMAN, ADOLF: *A Handbook of Egyptian Religion*, translated by A. S. Griffith (London, 1907).
FRAZER, J. G.: *Adonis, Attis and Osiris* (Macmillan, 1907).
GARBE, R.: *The Philosophy of Ancient India* (Religion of Science Library. Trübner, London, 1879).
GILDEMEISTER, J.: *Kalidasae Meghadûta et Çringaratilaka* (Sanskrit Text and Latin recension and vocabulary, Bonn, 1840).
GOUGH, A. E.: *The Philosophy of the Upanishads and Ancient Indian Metaphysics* (Kegan Paul, Trench and Trübner, 1903).



HAUG, MARTIN: *Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings and Religion of the Parsis*, edited and enlarged by E. W. West (Trübner and Co., 1884).
HENRY, V.: *Sôma et Haoma* (in Tome 22 of the Conférences faites au Musée Guimet, Paris, 1906).
HIRZEL, B.: *Sakuntala oder der Erkennungsring*, translated into German verse from the Sanskrit and Prakrit (Zurich, 1849).
JACOB, G. A.: *A Manual of Hindu Pantheism* (The Vedântasâra) (Kegan Paul, Trench and Trübner, 1904).
JARRETT, T.: *Nalopâkhyânam* (Sanskrit text and vocabulary), Cambridge Press, 1882.
JOHNSON, FRANCIS: *Hitopadeśa* (Sanskrit text and translation), 2nd edition, London, 1864.
JOLLY, J.: *Mânava-Dharma-Śâstra*, Sanskrit text critically edited with critical notes (Trübner and Co., 1887).
JONES, SIR W.: *A Grammar of the Persian Language* (London, 1823).
LANGLOIS, A.: A French Translation of the *Rig-Veda* (Biblioth. Internationale Universelle, Paris, 1870).
*Mémoire Sur La Divinité Védique Appelée Soma* (Académie des Inscript. et Belles-Lettres, Vol. XIX. Paris, 1853).
LILLIE, ARTHUR: *Râma and Homer* (Trübner and Co., 1912).
MACDONELL, A.: The *Bṛhad-Devatā*, Parts I. and II., Sanskrit text and Translation (Harvard Oriental Series, 1904).
*History of Sanskrit Literature* (Heinemann, 1900).
DE MILLOUÉ: *Culte et Cérémonie en l'honneur des Morts chez les peuples de l'Extrême-Orient* (Confér. au Musée Guim., 25 novembre 1900).
*La Vie religieuse de l'Inde*, etc. (Confér. au Musée Guimet, 5 février 1899).
*Le Mysticisme indou* (Confér. au Musée Guim., 23 avril 1900).
*Le Râmâyana* (Confér. au Musée Guim., 11 février 1900).
*Les Symboles religieux orientaux et leurs rapports avec ceux du Paganisme européen* (Confér. au Musée Guimet, 26 février 1899).
*L'Existence de l'Âme et sa Nature chez les Indous, les Grecs, les Perses*, etc. (Confér. au Musée Guimet, 1898).
*L'idée de Dieu et la nature des Dieux chez les peuples de l'Extrême-Orient* (Conférences au Musée Guimet, Paris, 1898).
*L'Origine du Monde d'après les livres sacrés de l'Inde et de la Perse*, etc. (Confér. au Musée Guimet, 29 Janvier, 1899).
*Triades et Trinités. Leur nature, leur origine et leur rôle dans les différentes religions* (Confér. au Musée Guim., 24 février 1901).
*Un point de Mythologie comparée: Les Dieux du Feu* (Confér. au Musée Guim., 16 décembre 1900).

MONIER-WILLIAMS, SIR MONIER: *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford, 1888).

*Nalopākhyānam*, the Sanskrit text; and translation by Milman (Oxford, 1860).

*Śakuntalā* of Kālidāsa, Sanskrit text edit. with notes, 2nd edition (Clar. Press, 1876).

*Vikramorvaśī* of Kālidāsa, Sanskrit text only (Hertford, 1849).

MOOR, E. and A. P.: *Plates Illustrating the Hindu Pantheon*, reprinted from the work of Major E. Moor, and edited with brief descriptive index by Rev. Allen Page Moor (Williams and Norgate, 1861).

MUELLER, MAX: *The Hymns of the Rig-Veda* in the Samhitā and Pada Texts (London, 1877).

*The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy* (Longmans, 1903).

NAVILLE, ÉDOUARD: *La Religion des Anciens Égyptiens* (E. Leroux, Paris, 1907, Biblioth. de Vulgarisation, Tome XXIII).

OLDENBERG, H.: *Ancient India, its Language and Religions* (Religion of Science Library, Trübner, 1898).

OUVRY, Colonel H. A.: *The Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa translated into English Prose (Williams and Norgate, London, 1868).

PEILE, J.: *Notes on the Nalopākhyānam* (Camb. Press, 1881).

PIERRET, PAUL: *Les Interprétations de la Religion Égyptienne* (Conférences au Musée Guimet, Tome XX, Paris, 1906).

PRAŠEK, J. V.: *Geschichte der Meder und Perser bis zur makedonischen Eroberung*, Vol. I (Gotha, 1906).

RAGOZIN, Z. A.: *Media, Babylon and Persia* (Fisher Unwin, 1897).

*Vedic India* (Fisher Unwin, 1895).

RÖER, E.: *The Taittiriya* and *Aittareya Upanishads*, with the Commentary of Śankara Acharya and the Gloss of Ananda Giri, and the *Śwetaśwatara Upanishad*, etc. (Calcutta, 1850).

ŚAṄKARA ACĀRYA: *Sarva-Siddhānta-Saṅgraha* (Madras, 1909).

SMALL, G.: *A Handbook of Sanskrit Literature* (Williams and Norgate, London, 1866).

SMITH, VINCENT A.: *A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon from the earliest times to the present day* (Oxford, 1911).

SOURDILLE, C.: *Hérodote et la Religion de l'Égypte* (Paris, 1910).

STENZLER, A. F.: *The Kumārasambhava*, edit. in Sanskrit and Latin (Berlin, sold by Valpy, London, 1838).

THOMSON, J. C.: *The Bhagavad-Gītā*, Sanskrit text and translation (Hertford, 1855).

VAUX, W. S. W.: *Nineveh and Persepolis*, 3rd edition (A. Hall, Virtue and Co., London, 1851).



WEBER, A.: *The History of Indian Literature*, translated from the second German edition, by Mann and Zachariae (Trübner, 1904).

WHITNEY, W. D.: *A Sanskrit Grammar*, 3rd edition (Trübner, 1896).

WILD, A. C.: *The Indian Origin of Greek Music* (published in the Proceedings of the Bombay Classical Association, 1910).

WILSON, H. H.: *Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus*, Vols. I. and II. (London, 1835).

## (D.)—SPANISH

CALDERON DE LA BARCA: *La Vida es Sueño* (Biblioth. Universal, Perlado, Paez y Ca., Madrid, 1910).

FITZMAURICE-KELLY, J.: *A History of Spanish Literature* (Heinemann, 1907).

HERNANDEZ, P. and A. LE ROY: *Morceaux Choisis des Classiques Espagnols* (Hachette et Cie., Paris, 1903).

HURTADO DE MENDOZA: *La Guerra de Granada* (Madrid, 1911).

MESA Y LOPEZ, RAFAEL: *Antologia de Los Mejores Poetas Castellanos* (Nelson and Sons, 1913).

# INDEX

CHISWICK PRESS: PRINTED BY CHARLES WHITTINGHAM AND CO.
TOOKS COURT, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.